

in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 12387. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12388. A bill to provide career status as rural carriers without examination to certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 12389. A bill to establish an Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 790. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOWDY (for himself and Mr. DENNIS):

H.J. Res. 791. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 794. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.J. Res. 795. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H. Res. 452. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 454. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact of East-West trade and assistance to nations which support aggression, directly or indirectly; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12390. A bill for the relief of Antonio Caputo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12391. A bill for the relief of Dolores M. Maga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12392. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Cho Eng Co; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDOVA:

H.R. 12393. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Fernandez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12394. A bill for the relief of Paolo Raffaelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 12395. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Krotzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12396. A bill for the relief of Lucien Le Minez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 12397. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antoinette L. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12398. A bill for the relief of Domenico Annibale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 12399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Department under which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Kerin W.* to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Tae Pung Hills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

156. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Doug Shear, Arlington, Tex., relative to taxation of State and local government securities, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OPPOSITION TO PAY TV

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, over the past 12 years, it has fallen to me to inveigh and warn against a seductive but potentially lethal expedient whose adoption would threaten the continued existence of one of the most cherished and widely enjoyed fruits of modern technology—the privilege of receiving television programs without charge.

I refer to the proposed authorization of so-called subscription TV—STV—a technique formerly and more candidly referred to as "pay TV," because if it is authorized and instituted, we, the viewing public, will pay and pay and pay. We will pay not only the subscription price which, at first, will no doubt be moderate. Much more significantly, we will pay in the siphoning off of the better program which will slowly but surely be withdrawn from the present sphere of free broadcast entertainment, with a steady decline in the quality of TV fare available under what is left of the free reception system.

As I take the floor today on this perennial issue, I shall necessarily repeat much that I have had to say time and time again. I must do so because there is nothing really new about this ill-conceived proposal which would destroy TV as we know it and would turn the price of a TV set into a mere downpayment, subject to further charges, program by program, till the end of time.

Today, I shall merely summarize the principal reasons why pay TV should be rejected.

First. The radio spectrum is a precious natural resource which belongs to the people, not to licensees. There is and will always be a critical shortage of frequencies. Free TV, with all its faults, and they are many, has become a birthright of all Americans and must be carefully preserved.

Second. The promise of better and more diverse program sources is a mirage. True, the best of present TV fare will be diverted to the pay TV channels, but this only means that we will have to pay for what we now receive without charge. Sports events and first-run movies will be among the first to go.

Third. It is now established that between 20 and 30 percent of our population would not be in a position to afford pay TV service. The proposal would cre-

ate a caste system among television viewers, between those who can and those who cannot afford to pay.

Fourth. The promise that pay TV will be required to abstain from commercials cannot be kept. If pay TV succeeds, it will generate irresistible pressures for added advertising revenue.

Fifth. The admission of pay TV to the already heterogeneous roster of activities that are being inadequately regulated by the Federal Communications Commission will further compound existing confusion concerning the relationships among broadcasters, networks, CATV, and satellites.

Sixth. The Hartford pay TV experiment has not been an outstanding success. It hardly warrants further disruption of communications patterns. But whether pay TV would succeed or whether it would fail, it ought not to be unloosed at the expense of the viewers of free TV.

Mr. Speaker, the FCC has given us fair warning that it will shortly begin processing applications for subscription television authorizations. The Commission has done this in the face of concerted and repeated opposition expressed in Congress, and particularly by the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, and in

the face of grave, unresolved doubt concerning its legal authority to authorize subscription television.

In the circumstances, I urge the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report favorably for enactment H.R. 420, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authorizations to broadcast pay TV programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must act promptly for it is later than some of us may think.

AUTHORITY AND POWER IN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, this spring the Nation has witnessed the most violent and disruptive period that our colleges and universities have ever experienced. At institution after institution across the country the educational process was brought to a halt by confrontations between students, faculty, administrators, and police. News reports reflected the hostility, suspicion and misunderstanding which have come to characterize relations between the various elements at so many of our schools.

President Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., of the University of Virginia, noted in his recent address at commencement exercises in Charlottesville that "one of the tragedies of the current national student unrest is the dissipation of energy so critically needed to solve overwhelming human problems of race relations, poverty, pollution of the environment, and the decay of the cities. In his dispassionate and scholarly remarks Dr. Shannon placed in perspective the rights and responsibilities of the students on the one hand and the university as an institution on the other. He discussed the distinction, in the academic context, between authority, which derives from "regard or esteem," and power, which is the "capacity for action or force."

Dr. Shannon's address is characterized by that very "devotion to reason" which he ascribes to the University of Virginia and to its founder, Thomas Jefferson. At a time when feelings on all sides are inflamed, when competing forces are inclined to shun reason and authority for emotion and power, Dr. Shannon's approach has a particular relevance. I ask unanimous consent that his address be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS AT THE FINAL EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, JUNE 8, 1969

(By Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president)

Mr. Rector and Visitors, Members of the Faculty, Members of the Graduating Class, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a privilege, as President of the University of Virginia, to welcome you to these graduation exercises. This year we not only felicitate the recipients of degrees, but continue to celebrate the

150th anniversary year of the granting of the charter of this institution. I am particularly happy, therefore, to bring my personal greetings to the members of the Sesquicentennial year class and to express my very best wishes to each of you. I expect that many of you will be back to celebrate the Bicentennial of the University and to be received into the Thomas Jefferson Society of Alumni at your 50th class reunion.

In a very few minutes I shall have the pleasure of conferring upon you the various degrees which each of you has earned, and I shall begin by saying to you that I do so by authority vested in the General Faculty and by it delegated to me.

Authority is not a much favored word or concept just now. But if, as someone has said, "vocabulary is the opiate of the radicals," it behooves us to consider the meaning of a word that is central to our proceedings.

The charter of any university, public or private, is established through the authority of the state, and the authority to grant degrees originates from this source. But it is authority in its best sense which gives health and wholeness to a university and which binds an entire society together. This is not authority based on command, but authority which authenticates itself by the respect that it draws from those who recognize its validity.

Accordingly, the authority of the General Faculty rests not primarily in the legal prerogatives of the University but in the academic standing of the faculty as teachers and scholars. The value of our enterprise here rests in the ability, training, experience, perception, understanding, and accomplishment—that is, the professional competence—of these men and women.

In a recent article, Robert Brustein explores the decline of professional attitudes evidenced in university faculties in the United States today. "During a time when all authority is being radically questioned," he writes, "faculty members are becoming more reluctant to accept the responsibility of their wisdom and experience and are, therefore, often willing to abandon their authoritative position in order to placate the young."

Furthermore, Brustein exposes the current tendency to draw a false analogy between universities and the body politic. Although there are many democratic procedures and elections involved in conducting the business of a faculty and in the operation of a university, the faculty are not the elected representatives of the students or of any constituency. A meeting of a faculty is a professional meeting and not one to be confounded with a meeting of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The faculties of the University of Virginia, whom I salute, maintain an authority based on professional standards and qualifications; and their recognized quality and distinction enhance the validity of each of the degrees which you, as members of the graduating class, receive.

In a time of civil and academic strife, it is instructive to pursue the meaning of authority a step farther and to note the distinction between *authority* and *power*. As Robert A. Nesbit has written recently:

"The most dangerous intellectual aspect of the contemporary scene is the widespread refusal of thinking men to distinguish between authority and power. They see the one as being as much a threat to liberty as the other, but this way madness lies and the ultimate sovereignty of power. There can be no possible freedom in society apart from authority. It is out of . . . [the] disposition toward fruitful self-discipline that authority emerges, and its legitimacy is recognized. Abolish the disposition and you equally abolish the capacity for liberty."

Authority rests upon regard or esteem.

By definition, it stems from the influence of character and from mental or moral quality. In contrast, power is the ability to act, the capacity for action or force. Where authority is disregarded or where it fails, power in the sense of force or coercion takes place. The experience of several American universities in the last two years offers terrible testimony to this fact. The contemporary thrust for power by certain students in some universities seems to derive from a basic misconception of the nature of a university. With a limited few, this thrust is an announced ruthless and calculated step toward the destruction of one of society's central institutions.

As Nesbit wisely observes, "Authority, unlike power, is not rooted in force alone, whether latent or actual. It is built into the very fabric of human associations. Civil society is a tissue of authorities. Authority has no reality save in the allegiances of the members of an organization. . . ."

The allegiances of this and any university must be inspired by the purposes of the institution and the people who animate them. The faculty and administrative officers, in the quality and distinction of mind and character and their commitment to ideals, must be worthy of allegiance. The students, in their dedication to learning and their responsibility for their own actions, must be worthy of respect, regard, and trust. Within the university there must be vision and progressive change, while at the same time recognition that change is not an end in itself, and that change can lead to debilitation and paralysis, as well as to increased strength and vigor.

This University, so innovative in its founding, must be ready, as it has been, to modify its practices and seek fresh means to engage the enthusiasm and release the creative talents of all its members—on either side of thirty. We must discover ways of understanding various approaches to goals held in common and be willing to reconcile differences without anger and discord. We must be able to disagree over methods without impugning each other's motives and without self-righteousness and dogmatism.

The University will count upon your help, as graduate students and alumni, to make the educational experience on these Grounds increasingly stimulating and significant. As all of you know, excellence comes by devotion to high standards of discipline and performance—usually a lonely, time-consuming, and demanding effort. It does not result from passionate outbursts and emotional diversions or from a mere search for power for power's sake.

I believe we would all agree that force and coercion make impossible pursuit of the central purposes of a university—attainment of knowledge, thought exercised upon knowledge, and the discovery of new knowledge through free inquiry. There can certainly be no genuine intellectual activity by either students or faculty under conditions of intimidation or disruption.

As J. C. Helms has written about the events at Harvard this spring, the violence, noise, and chaos that occurred there for some ten days may have brought to many a new sense of euphoria and togetherness, but very little higher learning. At Cornell, where the shattering of authority caused the loss to that institution of President James A. Perkins, who has been one of the most perceptive, innovative, and dedicated leaders in American higher education, forty-one senior professors last month issued a statement as to the conditions for teaching and scholarly work that a university must maintain. They are quoted as saying, "We recognize the need for many substantial changes. There are, however, essential conditions for preserving our integrity as teachers and fulfilling our responsibilities to students. For the sake of both teachers and students, we must have

freedom to inquire, to teach, and to learn without intimidation. We must maintain standards of professional judgment and scholarly achievement."

Internal force or threat of force against freedom to teach, to speak, and to hear can be as mortal as external interference with the processes of a university.

Universities are losing public allegiance at the very time when they need increased public support and understanding, and when universities are more essential to the failure and the vitality of American society than ever before. When even a small minority of students and faculty attempts to politicize and radicalize universities and to make them instruments of political power, authority succumbs to power; and force must frequently be brought in, or will be sent in by governors or other civil authority, to restore and preserve basic order.

The fabric of the university has been rent whenever this has occurred, and no one yet knows how much time will be required to mend it. In the words of Meyer Abrams of Cornell, "The university was designed as an open forum and was not designed to cope with violence." One of the tragedies of the current national student unrest is the dissipation of energy so critically needed to solve overwhelming human problems of race relations, poverty, pollution of the environment, and the decay of cities. The capabilities of strong and compassionate minds are being distracted and wasted by disorder. The trained and disciplined mind searches not for scapegoats but for reasons and solutions.

The mind is man's primary human attribute, and reason has been his chief means of advancement. Reason, of course, is the ultimate source of authority in any university and in a democratic nation. If reason is lost in the academy, it is certain to be lost in the nation and supplanted with raw power and repression.

Here at the University of Virginia our hallmark is devotion to reason. I like to think that the authority of reason, so deeply woven into the fabric of this University by Thomas Jefferson, is the chief explanation why student dissent here during the past academic session has been carried out through orderly processes and discussion rather than by threats and physical damage. In founding the university of Virginia, Jefferson argued that any error was always to be tolerated so long as reason remained free to combat it. His appeal for the correction of evils in society was always to the common reason of the free men of that society. To be truly free a man must be educated. Hence the reliance on reason in this University and the authority that it gives to you, its graduates, as you enter the life of the nation.

According to John Gardner, in his book *No easy Victories*, "Each preceding generation has had its great work to perform—founding the nation, conquering the wilderness, settling the land. Ours is to make a livable society for every American."

Our society is deeply concerned over the inequalities that remain within its own ranks. We must find the means of bringing millions of black and other still disadvantaged Americans into the full range of the opportunities our country affords. We must find the means of challenging the idealism and energies of youth to creative participation in quickening the human quality of national life. We must support and encourage, as expressed in the words carved over our gateway, "the will to work for men." These tasks will not be accomplished by despair and destructive rage. These and similar tasks will yield to hope and determination, to forbearance and perseverance, to study and imagination, and to faith in what Mr. Jefferson envisioned as the continuing and constructive American revolution.

THE RIGHT TICKET BUT THE WRONG TRAIN

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard a sermon I shall long remember. It was beautifully preached to a National Presbyterian Church congregation by Dr. Lowell Russell Ditzen, director of the National Presbyterian Center on Nebraska Avenue here in Washington.

The title itself, "The Right Ticket But the Wrong Train," in addition to being both intriguing and meaningful, is a sermon. This was the kind of sermon all of us periodically need to hear. It is not always pleasing to stand before life's mirror and see yourself yesterday, today and tomorrow, but all of us need to do it more often.

How many of us make plans that are never carried out—commitments to ourselves and others which are never kept. We start out in the right spirit and with the best of intentions, but too often never get any further; or if we do, too frequently we have "the right ticket" but end up on "the wrong train."

Someone has said, "The life of every man is a diary in which he means to write one thing, but he writes another; and his humblest hour is when he compares the diary as it is with what he had hoped to make it." With that thought in mind and to afford everyone an opportunity to read it, I am placing in the RECORD Dr. Ditzen's sermon, "The Right Ticket But the Wrong Train":

THE RIGHT TICKET BUT THE WRONG TRAIN
(A sermon by Lowell Russell Ditzen, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Litt. D.)

Text: "Father, give me the portion of the goods that falleth to me."—(Luke 15:12.)

Scripture: Luke 16:11-32; II Kings 17:1-12.

If you have talked to a person coming to America to make this land his or her home, you know how keen is the anticipation of that newcomer. You will be aware, too, of the strange ideas many such pilgrims have about this country and of the odd adventures that befall some. Usually they have a destination in mind, but little knowledge as to how to get there and much misinformation as to what the place is like.

Up in the Mohawk Valley of New York tales are circulated that come from several generations past, when waves of Welshmen migrated to that area. A number settled in and about a little town called Remsen. See it now and it's a couple of stores and a dozen houses. But first comers had written back such glowing accounts of Remsen that some eager settlers landing at New York City and seeing the skyscrapers there, exclaimed, "If this is New York City, what must great Remsen City be!"

A more recent arrival, an emigre from the decimations of Europe before the second World War, arrived destined for Philadelphia. He made his way to the Pennsylvania Station where he bought the right ticket. But through errors unbeknown to him, he got on the wrong train and ended up at Atlantic City. When told he wasn't where he expected to be, he couldn't believe it. Surely he was in Philadelphia! It was stamped right there on his ticket. Hadn't he planned and dreamed

for months and miles of being with his relatives to begin a new life in Philadelphia? This must be some strange American joke. You couldn't fool him! But the people at the station refused to be convinced that Atlantic City was Philadelphia. Finally they got the idea across: "Friend, you may have purchased the right ticket, but you're traveled on the wrong train!"

Now are there not those, who in the journey of life, with the best of intentions and the finest of beginnings, get on the wrong train, and when the journey is over, find to their dismay they are where they didn't want to be at all?

I have yet to meet a sensitive and mature couple who come to the time of their wedding without being willing to get the right ticket. There is receptiveness to the counsel that it takes a lot of cooperation and forgiveness and sharing and sacrifice to make a successful marriage and a happy home. That they understand. They have the right ticket. But there are some, who, in the adventure of marriage, end up where they didn't want to be at all: hopes unrealized; sweet anticipations turned rancid; love gone. They had the proper destination in mind at the beginning, but they ended up far from the anticipated goal.

We've known individuals who started out with a strong purpose to make a success in business or some calling. They're going to the top and they have the resources, it would seem, to get there. But while they seem to have their hands on the right ticket, not a few of them find, when the journey is over, that they aren't where they intended to be at all. They got on the wrong train. I've often wished that some Ph. D. student would analyze the "most likely to succeed" individuals in high school annuals. Did they make it? Or did they end up in a far country where no one gave them any attention?

Jesus portrays the thought we're feeling after in an indelible picture of a young man saying, "Father, give me the portion of the goods that is due unto me."

Who will deny that young man in that moment? In the promise of his budding manhood he wants to go away from home to make his own way. He probably is compelled by a vision that sees himself coming back home laden with honors and successes from afar. He had the right ticket. But the way of transport he unwittingly boarded took him to a country way off from the end of which he dreamed. Ask him when he starts off in that moment of high purpose and enthusiasm, if he's intending to end up scrapping with pigs for bits of garbage, and he'd say, "That ridiculous. Not on your life." But he ended up there just the same.

This theme of ours, it seems to me, ought to say something to us as Churchmen.

For generations, the Christian Churches, Jewish Synagogues, and other major world religions have been preaching the dream of the brotherhood of man—the idea and the ideal of a kingdom of righteousness and mercy for the total family of mankind. Millions of spiritually motivated people have responded with enkindled hearts to that high hope. But God knows that time after time, with that right ticket, we have zoomed over the wrong roadbed, ending up in wars which lead us into economic depletions, political confusions, and social disruptions. No question about the right ticket, but certainly the wrong train.

Let the Church talk not alone about the ideal of peace in the world, but let's all, who are a part of its life, pray and work in the day by day steps that will give such a dream a semblance of possibility. We each can practice greater justice and mercy toward the people whose lives touch ours. We can elevate our professions and make our businesses more equitable in their opportunities and

and services. The alabaster cities need foundations in the here and now.

Certainly, this thought of ours suggests the importance of discipline.

That word comes from the Latin word "discipulus" which has its rootage in the idea "to learn." The word is related to "disciple." A disciplined person is a learning person. He has subjected his life to a purpose, a principle, or a teacher, and so he becomes committed to a definite order and regime. That's necessary, isn't it? Mustn't something comparable to that be given priority in any field of activity if an individual wishes to achieve?

In Machiavelli's classic book, "On the Art of War," he emphasizes the factors that make for success in military struggle. One, he says, is the battle. Then analyzing what makes for success in such engagements, he comes to the determining factor of discipline. "Good order," he writes, "makes men bold. Few men are brave by nature, but discipline makes them so." Isn't that true? Some of you as mothers have had a grand vision of a home of beautiful order and peace, of children going into the world with a mature and high spirit. But what determines whether that dream is to become a reality? Isn't it in the daily battles with the irritations, intrusions, and tasks that drag one down and could make the vision wane? Isn't it "discipline," the fighting for self-control, the learning to grow, to let the heart be enlarged by forgiveness and patience and love?

You men represent many different fields of science, business, and the professions. Don't each of you know no matter what our specialized area, that it's the keeping of appointments, analyzing minute facts, meeting tiny details, that decides whether or not our goal is realized? Who will deny that "discipline" is the sesame to help get through each day and to carry tasks to large fulfillment?

And shouldn't this word of ours give a prod to all of us as Americans? We have a magnificent ideal in our heritage that comes to the living present saying, "this is to be a nation of free men, who in their freedom will build together for the common good—granting equal and increasing opportunities for all." That is a ticket for corporate living that has been purchased at the price of deep thought and painful effort of generations. But, if, with that ticket we try to ride on the roadbed of individual and group selfishness, God help us, because we'll end up where we didn't want to be at all. No strong nation in the past was destroyed from the outside. There was an inner deterioration which rotted the core of corporate life. When outside pressure came, the structure fell.

The other day I entered a New York taxi to find the driver a lady. Before we reached our destination she had given me her life history, which included a chapter when she returned for a time to her native Puerto Rico. "But I just had to come back to America. This really is the most wonderful country in the world. I want my children to grow up here." How right she is! But we need to remind ourselves of this fact. We need to appreciate and constantly protect what our fathers brought into being.

The time is at hand for us as Americans to say to ourselves and each other, "It's really ourselves that we have to overcome. Our pettiness, our indulgence, our carelessness, our warnings of groups against groups, our lack of responsiveness to public responsibility—these are our real enemies! Let's defeat them! We have the right ticket. Let's be sure we stay on the right trail!"

There are so many wonderful things about that story of the prodigal son. The picture of that enthusiastic young man, brought up in a fine home, setting out to make his way in the world, his opulent that is in its suggestiveness! But he made mistakes and sank low.

The words, "he came to himself," are suggestive. Though he got into a pathetic state, there was still great good in him. He redis-

covered, in his abject state, that self of high potential which he had forgotten. We should remember, that, as we are moved to wipe off the slate some individual who may have deflected from "the accepted way" that there is latent hope and will and goodness in that person. One of the first functions of the Christian is to keep alive in himself and cultivate in others that "good and best self" which is in every man. How said that no one tried help the prodigal when he really hit bottom—when he needed help most of all. One of the proofs of our really trying to be Christ's disciples is to give the helping hand and heart to the prodigals of our time.

Then note that the prodigal remembered, when he was really down and out, that he still had a home and a father. Jesus, in telling the parable, was telling more than a story of just one boy and his father. He was trying to tell us that God is like that father, and that we all are like the prodigal son. Being human beings, we at times do foolish things. We end up where we don't want to be. But the love and the compassion of the Father is always concerned for us, reaching out toward us.

As we realize our foolishness, sincerely repent and return to our home, we are forgiven, offered a new start and a fresh opportunity. What an undergirding and comforting assurance that truly is!

There was nothing questionable about the prodigal son's beginning. He had a good ticket, but he got on the wrong train, ending up where he didn't want to be. Yet, coming to himself, seeing his folly and remembering his Father, he went back home where he was received again into the family circle where he belonged.

So it can be with us! We have a Father and an Eternal citizenship! We may wander far. But the Father's love follows us no matter how lost we may seem. That will redeem us as we turn our steps to that home from whence we came.

DR. RICHARD WEIGLE: OUTSTANDING AMERICAN EDUCATOR

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the June 1 issue of the New Mexican, there appears an article paying a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Richard Weigle, on his 20th anniversary as president of St. John's College. St. John's is a small liberal arts college founded in 1784 in Annapolis, Md.; it is one of Maryland's finest educational institutions. St. John's has recently opened a second campus in Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Education has been a vital part of our American heritage since the days when our forefathers first landed on these shores. The belief in education on the part of generations of Americans has resulted in the finest educational system in the world. Today, all Americans have the right to and the opportunity for a free public education.

From the recognition of this right, however, has arisen the continuing problem of the impersonalization of education in the large megaversity, which faces our education today. It is to this problem that Dr. Weigle has offered a fresh and successful approach.

The article calls attention to the efforts of this deeply committed educator to en-

large the concept of liberal arts studies to include active student participation in their own educational experience. This has been realized through closer teacher-student relations brought about by his stress on the intellectual development of the student through the use of a combined liberal arts and great books curriculum.

In 1949, Dr. Weigle gave up a promising career in the State Department to devote his life to the ideal of a academic independence at St. John's. Since then, he has greatly strengthened the financial and academic status of the college. The expansion to New Mexico opens a new chapter in the history of their fine school. More importantly, Dr. Weigle has changed the skepticism toward his concept of education by other colleges and universities to recognition of its success. More and more of these other schools are restructuring their curricula along the lines of St. John's. The success of Dr. Weigle's ideals at the Annapolis campus has brought him national prominence.

Richard Weigle has had a profound effect on American education. In an age of technology and great size, he has shown that a small liberal arts school, where teachers teach rather than just publish, can play a significant role in the educational process. He has reaffirmed the value of a liberal arts education and bring credit to St. John's and to Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. JOHN'S DR. RICHARD WEIGLE OBSERVES 20 YEARS AS PRESIDENT

Dr. Richard D. Weigle is observing his twentieth anniversary this year as president of St. John's College, which now has campuses both at Annapolis, Md., and Santa Fe.

When Dick Weigle came to Annapolis from the U.S. State Department in 1949, he was considered a competent young administrator with a solid background in education and international relations.

At that time the St. John's concept of liberal education, initiated 12 years earlier by Scott Buchanan and Stringfellow Barr, generally was looked on as a successful experiment. However, many observers had serious doubts as to whether the small, private college could survive with its academic independence and idealism intact.

In the 20 years since then, St. John's not only has survived as an institution, but has triumphed as an educational ideal. It has inspired other colleges and universities throughout the country to offer variations of the St. John's program. This is partly because of its intellectual appeal and partly because its liberal arts-great books curriculum brings teacher and student together and makes students active participants, rather than bystanders, in their own education. Under Weigle's leadership, the Annapolis campus was strengthened financially, as well as academically, building up a \$9 million endowment fund.

In the fifties, St. John's went co-educational. When the student population reached the 300 mark, believed at that time to be the appropriate size for a true learning community. President Weigle proposed an unusual expansion plan.

He urged the establishment of a second college and the site chosen was half a continent away—Santa Fe. The Board of Visitors

and Governors approved the plan in 1961, and the new \$5 million campus enrolled its first students three years later.

As the president of a college with two distinct campuses, Weigle is concerned with the diverse interests of two faculties, two student bodies and two communities.

He participates actively in the academic life of the college, often attending student seminars on the two campuses. He taught a special class, called a "preceptorial", this year at Santa Fe on the Chinese classics.

He plays a prominent role in national educational circles, including such organizations as the Association of American Colleges, which elected him chairman a few years ago. He also has headed the association's Commission on Liberal Education and served as director of the Independent College Funds of America.

When asked recently to describe President Weigle, a fellow-educator used such phrases as "constant concern for St. John's", "disciplined", "highly rational" and "very selfless".

Weigle received his first degree from Yale University when he was 19. Later he went back to Yale for his M.A. in 1937 and Ph.D. in 1939. He began his teaching career as an instructor in English at Yall Union Middle School (Yale-in-China) in Changsha, Hunan in the mid-thirties.

During the three years before the United States entered World War II, he served as an instructor and assistant professor in history, economics and international relations at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.

After service with the U.S. Army Air Force in China in the war, he entered the U.S. State Department. He was executive officer in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs when he resigned to go to Annapolis.

Born in 1912 in Northfield, Minn., he is the son of Luther A. Weigle and the late Clara B. Weigle. The elder Weigle is Dean Emeritus of the Yale Divinity School and chairman of the committee which brought out the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

In 1942 Richard Weigle married the former Mary Grace Day of Madison, Wis. They are the parents of two daughters, Mary Martha and Constance Day.

LEGISLATION TO REVISE THE QUOTA CONTROL SYSTEM ON THE IMPORTATION ON CERTAIN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would revise the quota control system on the importation on certain meat and meat products. This legislation is vitally important to cattle farmers of our country who find themselves competing more and more for a market with meat and meat products which are being brought into this country from all over the world.

There are those, who refer to such legislation as "protectionist" legislation. I personally am willing to admit that I am introducing this legislation in part to protect the cattle farmers of our country, who have invested a tremendous amount of money in land equipment and stock to produce fresh red meat for the American consumer. I also am willing to admit I am introducing this legislation in part to protect the consumer of

meat products, who wants to buy fresh meat rather than meat butchered in some foreign country and shipped to stores here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit at this point a statement on the need for such legislation by Mr. Bill House, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. President House, as a spokesman for the American beef cattle industry, makes a very good case for revising our importation laws. His statement follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., June 12.—"The outlook both for immediate and long-range supplies of manufacturing grade beef is good," said Bill House, President of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

House set the record straight concerning accusations put forth by the Meat Importers' Council in an address at the annual meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in Lincoln. The ANCA spokesman said, "Cow slaughter this year is running six to seven percent above last year's pace. In 1964, 8.3 million head of commercial cattle were slaughtered . . . last year the total was 9.8 million head . . . a jump of 15.3 percent."

The Cedar Vale, Kansas rancher said that recent scare tactics employed by the Meat Importers' Council concerning declining domestic commercial beef supplies have no foundation. House stressed the fact that the American cattlemen has proven he is perfectly able to supply all qualities of beef our consumers demand with the most wholesome product obtainable anywhere, and still have enough production left over to export to beef-deficient countries.

President House reassured the American consumer that the U.S. beef cattle industry will continue to produce enough manufacturing grade beef. House said, "In 1914 there were 15.5 million beef cows . . . in 1969 there were 36.1 million . . . a healthy increase of 132 percent. These animals, combined with the slaughter of dairy cows, illustrate very clearly the trend that cattlemen are keeping more females in their herds."

House zeroed in on the total beef import picture and said, "It is obvious that domestically-produced supplies of beef have been more than adequate to meet demand, and all projections reveal that this will continue in the future."

House reiterated the need for modifications to the 1964 Meat Import Act in order to further help stabilize the domestic beef cattle industry. House said, "Ever-increasing quantities of imported beef create uncertainties and distort the economic picture, which could have long-range effect on domestic supplies to the detriment of U.S. consumers." House saluted Senator Roman Hruska (R-Nebr.) for his efforts to amend the Import Act and modify the flow of the more than one billion pounds of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef pouring into the United States.

PUBLIC OPINION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the Gallup poll, appearing in the Roanoke Times, dated June 15, 1969, showing that public confidence in the U.S. Supreme Court has steadily declined since 1963.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Roanoke Times, June 15, 1969]

U.S. OPINION OF HIGH COURT HAS DECLINED

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—When Warren E. Burger assumes his role as chief justice, he will head a Supreme Court that is at a relatively low point in public esteem.

Six years ago, in 1963, when the American people were first asked to record their attitudes toward the Supreme Court, 43 per cent gave the court a favorable rating ("excellent" or "good"). Five years later, in 1968, the percentage had declined to 36 per cent. In the latest survey, conducted May 23 through 27, the comparable percentage was 33 per cent.

Among adults today, 8 per cent rate the court as "excellent," 25 per cent say "good," 31 per cent say "fair," and 23 per cent say "poor." The final 13 per cent have no opinion.

An important factor behind the court's decline in public favor, as judged by the views expressed in surveys, is on the growing feeling that the court is "too soft" on criminals. Others complain that the rights of the individual are being protected at the expense of society as a whole. Another fairly large group argue that the court's role should be one of "interpreting" rather than "making" laws.

The latest results show no significant change in favorable attitudes over the last 12 months. It was during this period that Abe Fortas resigned as a Supreme Court justice following the disclosure that he had accepted funds for service to the foundation of Louis E. Wolfson, who was convicted of stock manipulation.

While 23 per cent give the Supreme Court a rating of "poor," an increase of 8 percentage points since 1963, many citizens interviewed applaud this body for helping to move society forward at an impressive pace while fully protecting the rights of individuals and minority groups.

Much of the explanation for the ratings given the Supreme Court can be seen in the public's reaction to widely discussed decisions made by the court in the last 15 years. The public favored three of these decisions, opposed three and was evenly divided on one.

A majority of the American people favored the 1954 ruling on desegregation in schools, the 1964 ruling on reapportionment, and the 1965 ruling on distribution of birth control information.

Majorities opposed the 1963 ruling on religious practices in public schools, the 1965 ruling on communist registration and the 1966 ruling on admissibility of confessions as evidence in trials.

They were evenly divided on the 1967 ruling on interracial marriages.

This was the question asked in the current study and in three previous surveys:

In general, what kind of rating would you give the Supreme Court—excellent, good, fair or poor?

The latest results, based on interviews with 1,515 adults, and the trend:

	[In percent]			
	1969	1968	1967	1963
Excellent.....	8	8	15	10
Good.....	25	28	30	33
Fair.....	31	32	29	26
Poor.....	23	21	17	15
No opinion.....	13	11	9	16

A citizen's evaluation of the Supreme Court bears a close relationship to his educational attainment. Forty-three per cent of the college-trained give the court an "excellent" or "good" rating, while only 25 per cent of persons with a grammar school background do so.

Younger adults are more favorably disposed toward the court than are older persons; 46 per cent of persons in their 20s give the Supreme Court a favorable rating. Democrats rate it somewhat higher than Republicans, while southern whites are far more critical of the court than are northern whites.

When new appointments are made by President Nixon, the public would prefer a conservative to a liberal by a 2-to-1 ratio. This is seen in a further question asked in the same survey.

Although the survey was conducted before the selection and confirmation of Burger, a conservative on law-and-order, it is unlikely that the public's views following his selection would be much different.

With one vacancy left to fill, the appointment of a conservative would give the Burger court a more conservative tone and could tip the balance in a number of important future decisions. Close decisions of the Warren court have included those involving the legal rights of suspected criminals, the civil rights of various groups, the vote laws of states and the apportionment of congressional districts and other political boundaries.

This question was asked in the survey:

When new appointments are made by the President to the Supreme Court, would you like to have these people be people who are liberal or conservative in their political views?

Here are the latest results and the trend, showing attitudes slightly less liberal than one year ago:

Who Should Fill Vacancies?

	[In percent]	
	1969	1968
Liberals.....	25	30
Conservatives.....	52	51
No opinion.....	23	19

Marked differences are found on the basis of educational attainment, with college-trained most people inclined to favor liberal appointments. This is consistent with results to the previous question which show people with a college background the most likely to be favorably disposed toward the Supreme Court.

People reached in the survey who favor the appointment of liberals would likely agree with a 40-year-old Detroit physician who said, "We've got to keep the country moving. Only liberals can match the times."

Those with opposite views would be likely to side with a 33-year-old salesman from Pennsylvania who said, "We've got to calm things down. It's time for the pendulum to swing back from the left where it's been going since 1932."

TEACHING ETHICS AND MORALITY IS IMPORTANT NATIONAL OBJECTIVE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker the nine Democratic House Members of the Florida congressional delegation today are introducing a bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles. The content and nature of the instruction would be prescribed by State school agencies.

Introducing the bill with me are Con-

gressmen ROBERT L. F. SIKES, JAMES A. HALEY, DANTE B. FASCELL, PAUL G. ROGERS, CLAUDE D. PEPPER, DON FUQUA, SAM M. GIBBONS, and BILL CHAPPELL.

There is a great need in America today for broad instruction in the development of man's moral and ethical values. Such a program can be developed in the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation and the Federal Government can give stimulus to this through the grant procedure.

The teaching of ethics and instruction in moral values are a proper function of our schools, especially in view of recent Supreme Court rulings prohibiting prayer and Bible reading in public schools. Educational programs of this nature and textbooks for such have already been developed in some school systems in the Nation.

The curriculum and academic instruction in morals and ethics could take the form of assembly programs or individual classes. Lessons of courage, heroism, and good works developed from actual stories and biographies of great men and women could be the teaching avenue.

Programs on the growth of the freedom of worship—how it became part of our Constitution; on patriotism—how brave men fought to preserve our freedom; on good citizenship—why it is important to obey the law and on the objective history of religion, which the Supreme Court has approved, could all be topics of classroom discussion.

J. Edgar Hoover has said that we have as a society failed our youth by failing "to teach them the meaning of discipline, restraint, self-respect, and respect for law and order and the rights of others." The teaching of moral and ethical standards belongs in the home, church, and school.

The juvenile crime rate is growing at a much faster rate than the overall crime rate and this is an indication of failure to teach our children the difference between good and bad. The latest figures show that arrests of juveniles for serious crimes increased 50 percent in 1967 over 1960, while the population in the juvenile age group, 10-17, increased only 22 percent.

If we are to reverse the rising crime rate, costing the Nation \$27 billion annually, then we must concentrate on the problem where it hurts the most: our young people.

The legislation we are introducing today will attack the problem at the roots and through strong classroom teaching of moral and ethical values our young people will be better able to cope with the challenge of right and wrong.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 12339

A bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "GRANTS FOR TEACHING MORAL AND ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

"SEC. 807. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to State educational agencies to

assist them in establishing and carrying out programs under which students attending public elementary and secondary schools will be provided instruction in moral and ethical principles. The content and nature of such instruction shall conform to general standards prescribed by such state agencies.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

Sec. 2. Section 804 of such Act is amended by inserting after "this Act" the following: "(other than section 807)".

RUSSIA AND THE "PUEBLO" AFFAIR

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Reader's Digest has just published an article which may be of critical importance for public understanding of our relations with the Soviet Union. It is an account by the escaped Czechoslovak defector, Gen. Jan Sejna, of his conversations with Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko in May, 1967—8 months before the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

According to Sejna, Grechko boasted to his Czech comrades that the Soviets intended to assist the North Koreans in the capture of a U.S. intelligence ship. He quotes Grechko as saying:

We have decided to humiliate the Americans. Just as we humiliated them in the air by shooting down the U-2, we are going to humiliate them at sea by grabbing one of these ships.

He further quotes Grechko as follows:

Our Korean comrades of course, are not capable of carrying this off without us; but we will guide and protect them.

Sejna further says that the Czech military apparatus was informed of the capture of the *Pueblo* in the following manner by the principal Warsaw Pact representative in Prague:

During the night we learned that, with the collaboration of our Korean comrades, we have achieved a great success.

Mr. President there is no way of verifying General Sejna's story, although the Digest says that all cross-references were checked and found accurate. However, the story is consistent with what we know about the close relationship of the North Korean Communists with the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Russia Plotted the *Pueblo* Affair," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMUNIST GENERAL'S STARTLING CHARGE: RUSSIA PLOTTED THE "PUEBLO" AFFAIR (By General Jan Sejna)

(NOTE.—General Jan Sejna is one of the highest-ranking communists ever to defect to the West. Until February 1968 he was the Czechoslovak Communist Party senior secretary assigned to the Ministry of National Defense, charged with political control of the Czechoslovak Ministry and General Staff. As such, he dealt almost daily with the Soviet

marshals, generals and agents who rule Eastern Europe as a Soviet colony, and was privy to many military and political secrets of the Warsaw Pact nations.

(During 1967 and early 1968, in the struggle for control of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, he was accused of siding with the forces of arch-Stalinist Antonin Novotny. The general contends that he represented a group of politicians and young officers opposed to hard-line military men seeking their own gain in the political intrigue that has characterized the turmoil in Prague. Nevertheless, when Novotny lost, Sejna fled to the United States—bringing with him a perspective of the communist world rarely before available to the West.

(The following article, the first he has released since his flight, is excerpted from Sejna's forthcoming book. Much of what he reports here cannot be confirmed because of the rarefied circles in which he moved. But he has been interviewed at length by Digest editors, and specific references that could be cross-checked have been painstakingly investigated. No contradictions have been discovered.)

I first learned in May 1967 that the Russians were planning to capture an American intelligence ship—eight months before the USS *Pueblo* was seized off Korea. Some dozen Czechoslovak and Russian generals had gathered at the state guest villa in Prague for a luncheon honoring the Soviet defense minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko. I remember that the meal of delicate Czechoslovak fish, beef soup with liver dumplings, veal roulade, cream tarts and fruit was especially excellent. Our three-hour conversation was fueled by Italian aperitifs, Russian vodka, red and white Bulgarian wines, and some truly fine French cognac which we had liberated from the Germans.

Marshal Grechko, whom I had often encountered at Warsaw Pact conferences and during private visits in Prague, is taciturn to the point of rudeness when sober. But when he consumes too much vodka and Cinzano, he becomes a belligerent, loose-tongued braggart. Drinking heavily that afternoon, he embarked on his favorite subject—the invincibility of the Soviet armed forces—with emphasis this time on the multiplying might of Russian sea power.

He admitted that the Soviet Union had been powerless to intervene during the Cuban and Middle East crises because of the supremacy of American naval forces. The refusal of Nikita Khrushchev to allot enough money to develop a powerful Soviet fleet was a primary reason why the Russian military supported his ouster. But now Soviet naval strength was growing and would soon challenge the Americans on all the oceans of the world.

"It is absolutely insolent the way the Americans sail their damn ships around as if they owned the water," Grechko declared. "Their espionage ships come right up to our shores to spy on our communications. But I can tell you this: we have decided to humble the Americans. Just as we humiliated them in the air by shooting down the U-2, we are going to humiliate them at sea by grabbing one of these ships."

Marshal Grechko did not specify when, where or how the Russians expected to command a U.S. ship. But he indicated that the seizure would be accomplished somewhere in the Pacific, in collaboration with the North Koreans. The Russians, he said, did not want to stage an incident in waters which might involve the Warsaw Pact in a confrontation with NATO. The Black Sea also had been ruled out because the world looked upon it as "a Russian lake"; loss of an American ship there would not be sufficiently "sensational." The Pacific had been chosen because it was considered an American preserve.

As I listened to Grechko, it became apparent that the Russians were almost as intent upon hurting the Chinese as upon hurting

the Americans. "Our Korean comrades, of course, are not capable of carrying this off without us," Grechko said. "But we will guide and protect them. This will again show them that it is we, not the Chinese, upon whom they can depend. They will see that we act while the Chinese simply bray and posture."

General Josef Vosahlo, deputy minister in charge of the Czech air force, asked, "Is there not a danger that the American reaction could cause serious complications?"

"Don't worry about that," Grechko replied. "The Americans haven't dared to blockade Haiphong, because they know that our ships would shoot their way through. They won't do anything about an incident like this, either. We are not afraid of them, and that is what the whole world will see."

Grechko's arrogance made me privately want to doubt anything he said that day. Still, I wondered, I had disbelieved Khrushchev in 1961 when he secretly let us know that within a few months a wall would be erected to seal off West Berlin. I now also recalled a conversation I had had in March 1966 with Grechko's predecessor, Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, a much more prudent man. He had confided that the Russians suspected American ships of being extremely effective in ferreting out Soviet secrets. "Mark my word," he had vowed, "we are going to do something about those ships."

In the months following the Grechko luncheon, nothing related to his boasts came to my attention, and I almost forgot about them. Then, on the morning of January 24, 1968, I received a call from the secretariat of the National Defense Minister, informing me that "an unusually important announcement" would be made at the morning briefing. In the ministry council chamber, Soviet Colonel General Aleksandr Kushchev, the principal Warsaw Pact representative in Prague, rose.

"During the night we learned that, with the collaboration of our Korean comrades, we have achieved a great success," he began. We all were stunned as he announced that the *Pueblo* had been hijacked and was at the moment in communist custody.

"The entire operation went off smoothly—incredibly smoothly," Kushchev reported. "The *Pueblo* crew, to a man, capitulated. They did not fire a shot. Frankly, we thought it would be much more complicated. The Americans were so bewildered that they failed to destroy thousands of documents. It will take our experts quite a while to analyze them. We may have a gold mine.

"We've all heard about what a great communications and command system the Americans have," Kushchev went on. "How they use computers, how they can respond instantly to an attack. Well, yesterday it took Washington literally hours to pull itself together and even begin to react. This is a precise example of how the most advanced military technology cannot compensate for a lack of will and leadership."

Kushchev bragged on about the propaganda triumph. "On the one hand, it is a humiliation for the United States: we have made clear that the Americans do not rule the seas anymore. On the other, this is a disgrace for China. It proves to the entire socialist camp that the Soviet Union helped North Korea gain stature, while the loud-mouthed Chinese could do absolutely nothing."

No one in the room doubted that capture of the *Pueblo* was a great coup. However, I and some of my fellow officers could not quite accept Kushchev's account of it. Accustomed as we were to Soviet propaganda exaggerations, we simply could not believe that the crew had not attempted some resistance to prevent the capture of thousands of valuable documents.

In the next few days, though, other Soviet officers confirmed Kushchev's version. Also, I began to see indications that the intelligence information the Russians were ex-

tracting from the *Pueblo* was immensely valuable.

At the weekly general staff briefing on February 23, we heard an extraordinarily detailed analysis of the deployment and operations of American naval forces in the Pacific. The source was identified as the *Pueblo*. Furthermore, we were told that, by using codes found aboard the ship, the Russians now were able to read previously indecipherable American messages that they had been recording on tape.

I derive no pleasure in recounting this American defeat and Soviet victory. I report these details now because I think they carry with them a message of importance to the people of the United States and the West:

The Soviet Union today is increasingly dominated by a militaristic clique of marshals who, with few exceptions, are perilously ignorant of the West. These narrow-minded hard-liners understand and react only to the prospect of superior force. Signs of weakness tempt them to risk ever more irresponsible adventures.

Unless they are convinced that the American government and the American people are prepared to resist future aggression, then more aggression is inevitable. On the basis of my personal experiences with these men, I know that each time one of their military gambles pays off, they edge closer to the brink. And by recklessness and miscalculation, they are likely to plunge the world into the war that ordinary men everywhere desperately want to avert.

RIDING THE COLORADO RAPIDS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Information Agency's publication, *Topic*, has just published an interesting article for its overseas readers on the experience of boating through the Grand Canyon of Arizona.

"Riding the Colorado Rapids" is an exciting pictorial essay by Patricia Caulfield, describing a trip she and 12 others took through the Grand Canyon. Not satisfied to view the canyon from its rim, as do most sightseers, they ran the river for 15 days, covering 300 miles.

The article recreates the thrill of riding one of America's great "white water" rivers, an experience several of my colleagues shared with me 3 years ago and which a number of us plan to repeat during the August recess this year.

Without objection I will insert the text of Miss Caulfield's article in the *RECORD* at this point:

RIDING THE COLORADO RAPIDS

(By Patricia Caulfield)

Our sturdy little dories made a smooth line through the stretch of quiet water with the rhythmic slap-slap of the oars the only sound punctuating the continuous rumble of distant thunder. This muted rumbling would soon engulf us in another ear-splitting roar—this we knew well from 15 days of hurtling through hundreds of great and small rapids (one dropped 30 feet in 400 yards) in the capricious Colorado River. As we neared the last bend in the smooth waters before the river took a giant tumble down a precipitous, boulder-strewn drop, we braced ourselves for the jolting ride. It plunged our small crafts down steep drops and submarined them through walls of water beating off the rocks.

Suddenly in mid-rapids one boat was upended, flipped over and tossed about like a cork in a storm. For a long minute we watched the churning water, until its three passengers, buoyed by their life jackets, surfaced and floundered to safety on the sandy shore while their dory careened onward downstream.

Our 300-mile journey from Lee's Ferry, Arizona to Lake Mead, Nevada was nearly over and we would soon go our separate ways. Thirteen in all, our ages ranged from 15 to 66, our home states from Maine to California, our occupations from student to housewife, from bronco buster to magazine editor. Our common ground was a wish to see the Grand Canyon from its mile-deep floor, instead of from its rim, as most people do, and to see it the hard way by running the rapids of the Colorado River. In its passage through the Grand Canyon it is the most difficult stretch of "white water" in the world.

INFLATION WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, inflation is probably the second most important problem which confronts our Government today. There have been so many suggestions made to bring a solution to this problem, but I have been very much impressed by a statement made by Mr. Angus Powell, president of the Lea Companies, with the thought that his comments are of particular significance to the Members of this body. I take pleasure in inserting Mr. Powell's comments in the RECORD:

INFLATION WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

(By Angus Powell)

Inflation is the most sinister, and the most deceptive, of all the problems that face America today. It is economic opium in that at first it delights the participants as they take their various "trips," and once addiction prevails, disaster is the result.

Too many persons in this country never give a second thought to the fact that the United States of America is not a "super country" that can withstand anything. By comparison, I remember so well the amazing baseball record of the late Lou Gehrig. He played in 2,130 consecutive games and made a phenomenal batting and fielding record. Those feats earned him the title, "The Iron Man of Baseball." But before the eyes of millions of Americans, their "Iron Man" contracted a terminal disease and died a relatively young man before his career had ended.

This can happen to America if we are not careful, courageous, and honest with one another.

What is inflation doing to this country? . . . Have we really got the disease? . . . What are some of its important causes? . . . What should be done about it?

WHAT INFLATION IS DOING TO THIS COUNTRY—SOME HIGHLIGHTS

(1) Senator Miller (Rep.—Iowa), in a speech before the Senate in June, 1968, asserted that in the past seven years inflation has added \$100 Billion to the cost of all purchased goods and services. Further, it has stolen \$32 Billion from our personal savings. It has devalued our life insurance and pension reserves by \$30 Billion, and has sliced \$15 Billion from the value of Government and other bonds.

One of the tragic hangovers resulting from inflation is the undeniable moral effect it has on our nation—it steals from the elderly and thrifty, and literally makes "suckers" out of them. It encourages everyone to distrust his government. Mr. George Champion, Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan Bank, in a recent speech referred to the above by quoting an international banking executive, who put his finger on the crux of the matter when he said, in effect, "the people of a country will remain healthy only as long as their country has sound money."

This year the interest charges on the Federal debt will exceed \$15 Billion, up from \$9 Billion in 1960, and the average interest rate is up about 33.3%, from 3.3% to 4.4%. How much money does this mean? Senator Harry Byrd, Jr. (Dem.—Va.), said in a public statement last summer that if the Federal Government were to levy a 100% tax on all income over \$10,000 (\$20,000 on joint return), the revenue produced would amount to \$13.2 Billion—not nearly enough to pay the interest on the national debt.

(2) Cost of Living. Today the dollar will buy what 39c would in 1939. The cost of living is rising at an alarming rate . . . it rose 2% in 1965, 3.3% in 1966, 3% in 1967, and the estimated rate in 1968 is 4.5%. Quoting Senator Miller again, at the rate of 4.5% increase, the cost of living and the loss in value of cash convertible assets will amount to more than our Federal income tax. In some areas of our country the rate is a 5% increase annually. When this rate is compounded over a ten-year period, the increase amounts to the astounding figure of 65%.

(3) Effect on Home Purchases. In a section of one of our large metropolitan areas, a moderately priced home in 1964 sold for \$14,900. The identical home today sells for \$21,500—a 44% increase.

(4) According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, wages in July, 1968, were the highest ever recorded, amounting to \$109.16 per week. In 1957-59 dollars, this amounts to \$79.25 slightly more than it was three years ago. In addition, local and state tax increases have to be accounted for.

(5) I am serving on the Boards of three educational institutions—a college preparatory school, a state teachers college, and a theological seminary—and it is tragic to see what inflation is doing to the operation of these institutions. Their sources of income cannot keep up with the uncontrollable costs facing them at every turn. The relative salary level of Ph.D. and M.A. degree holders is shockingly out of proportion to what it was just a few years ago. This group of extremely important citizens in our country, along with millions of other salaried and fixed income persons, is caught in a giant squeeze play. Little wonder that these groups are restless! A nation never can be strong if large segments of its people do not enjoy the same opportunities for benefits that other groups in our country enjoy.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CAUSES OF INFLATION?

The answer one gets to this question is colored to a large extent by the person who gives it. Labor leaders blame business; business blames excessive government spending, pro-labor laws, and unreasonable wage demands by labor operating under favorable monopolistic laws; Government—except for the period 1952-1960—has thrown its weight decidedly behind labor leaders' demands. The truth is, all three of the above groups are involved in the answer to this question. The following are the main causes:

(1) Federal Government spending—outside of war essentials—far exceeds safe limits. One clear example . . . since 1960, about 500,000 employees have been added to the Federal payroll. I read recently that since 1960, the Federal Government has cost the taxpayers nearly \$1 Trillion, which exceeds the total cost, including all wars, of operating the Government from 1789 to 1954. The Federal

Government—except for the period 1952-1960—has vigorously followed the economic theory of "spend and spend; tax and tax." In 1967, our deficit was \$25 Billion.

(2) Wage increases in industry have exceeded increases in productivity. Mr. George Champion recently pointed out that productivity during the past decade increased about 3% annually on the average, attributed almost entirely to capital expenditures. Wage increases today are 6.5% annually and in many sections of the country are phenomenally higher in the building trades.

Mr. A. H. Raskin, Assistant Editor of the editorial page of The New York Times, writing in the February, 1968 issue of Saturday Review, points out in his article, "Profit Sharing In The Paycheck," that: "Collective bargaining has become a dog chasing its own tail, with inflation eating up wage increases before workers ever get a chance to spend them." He points out also that: "The inter-relatedness of the economy and the mammoth size of the bargaining units in steel, automobiles, aluminum, railroads, shipping, and most other large industries, make it ridiculous to suggest that the adverse effects of irresponsible labor-management decisions can be neatly contained." He expresses the same concern and hope that a great majority of the American people share when he makes the plea that: "Some day, someone in the White House or on Capitol Hill will address himself seriously to the problem of providing workable statutory safeguards against victimization of the country by abuses of concentrated labor-management power."

Realizing that about 65% of the cost of all products manufactured in the United States is represented, directly and indirectly, by labor costs, it can be seen what is happening to cost in the normal three-year labor contract period. For example, a \$3,000 automobile has about \$2,000 (65%) worth of labor in its cost. At the present rate of increase, the total increase in three years will amount to about 20%, or \$400. Productivity increases, at best, can be expected to offset the above amount by \$200, or one-half of the increase. The balance will have to come out of the profit column or be passed on in price increases.

Already the rate of return on invested capital in American industry has dropped from 13% in 1965 to 11% today—a drop of more than 15%. Therefore the availability of capital from modernization and expansion is caught in a double squeeze—the supply is diminishing and replacement costs are increasing rapidly. It also is important to note that many persons in America think American businesses are making as much as 20% net profit in sales. The fact is, the average is about 5%. The success of our entire free enterprise system rests upon this relatively small percentage figure.

WHAT MUST BE DONE ABOUT INFLATION?

It must be stopped as soon as possible, not just slowed down. Surgery can do the job now . . . tomorrow the disease could be terminal. Let us never forget what Arnold Toynbee pointed out in his history of civilization. He said: "Nineteen out of a total of twenty-one of the world's great civilizations were destroyed from within, and only two of them were conquered by an outside enemy."

Thankfully, I am convinced there is an answer to this critical problem, but before we can take even a step, we in America must be willing to put the needs of our country first. Those who will direct and execute this program in the government, labor, business, and professional sectors, must level with the people and give them a new brand of leadership with integrity being the foundation of this leadership. Americans today, thanks to our communications media and educational systems, are the most intelligent and the best informed people the world has ever known. The great majority of them will not stand for doubletalk. They are paying an

enormous tax, which amounts to about one-and-one-half-days pay per week, and they have a right to demand intelligent and fair action.

PLAN OF ATTACK

Before any plan of attack on inflation can succeed, there must be a willingness on the part of government, labor and business, to do what is necessary to curb it. In short, the Government must drastically cut its political and non-essential spending, and balance its budget as soon as possible. Labor must work more closely with business management in an attempt to produce more goods in proportion to wage increases granted. Big business must lead the way in holding down prices as its part in this attack on inflation.

A great deal has already been written about cutting government expenditures, and I shall not pursue this phase of the subject further. I will direct my remarks to the field of business and labor because it is here that the vital organs of our free enterprise system must function in harmony for a common objective and for a common good.

To this question there is a sound answer which has tremendous possibilities. First, we must look eyeball to eyeball at some basic facts which are benchmarks in our country today, and recognize their existence:

1. We live in a politically oriented society and, by definition, the majority rules . . . the elected make our laws.

2. Highly organized minorities can have an unusually large influence on all levels of the political sector.

3. Elected representatives are extremely sensitive to the will of the control element in their electorate—they always have been and always will be.

4. In the past twenty-five years, America has been caught up in a combination of massive revolutions which have overlapping causes and effects at certain points. It is amazing how well we have digested these upheavals. I refer to:

(a) The social revolution—integration and mass education.

(b) The economic revolution—the greatest boom in the history of mankind; it has resulted, temporarily at least, in the greatest affluence for the greatest number of persons that the world has ever known. The base of the great middle class in America has been broadened substantially.

(c) The moral revolution—which manifests itself in so many directions:

(i) Massive problems as a result of the disregard for law and order.

(ii) Frustration of the Church and churchmen.

(iii) Basic degeneration of established moral codes in our society.

(d) Continuation of the industrial revolution. We are in an entirely new chapter in this vital area. Businessmen have created a society that is completely interdependent—i.e., automation, assembly-line production, highly coordinated marketing and distribution systems, and widely distributed stock ownership.

5. America is a nation whose existence and growth depend upon its business economy. If America falls economically, America falls overall, and becomes another statistic for Mr. Toynbee's loss column. No nation can grow or survive without a sound economy.

American business today has the greatest responsibility it ever has had—not only to its stockholders and employees, but to the American people and our nation. Likewise, it has its greatest challenge and opportunity.

WHAT CAN BUSINESS AND THE GOVERNMENT DO TO STOP INFLATION?

In the first place, business leaders must broaden their scope of interest and involvement, and provide more leadership in areas most of them overlook or are fearful of becoming involved in. The business leader's role should be more positive and broader in concept. Businessmen spend too much time being

against something. They are on the defensive too often and not on the offensive enough.

Business leaders have got to recognize that it is they who have created, to a large extent, the interdependent society in which we live—that equity owners, management, and workers, are completely dependent on one another. No business can function without any one of the three categories performing. The big step that must be taken by business leadership is to involve all employees—not only as workers, but as partners. Company employees are not going to tolerate much longer a situation wherein they as a group in our business system are treated like a fifth wheel when it comes to dividing up the "kitty"—in plain simple truth, they want a piece of the action, because they feel they deserve it.

Fortunately, there is hard evidence that, in most cases, those companies which have ventured into well-designed employee stock ownership and profit-sharing plans have prospered extremely well. Already there are at least sixty-five national corporations, employing 5,000 or more employees, that have profit sharing and/or stock ownership plans in force, each tailored to the individual needs of each respective business. Among them are companies such as Sears Roebuck, Eastman Kodak, Kroger, Motorola, J. C. Penney, Standard Oil of California, Bank of America, Texas Instruments, and thousands of smaller companies.

In fact, the world's highest paid industrial employees, working for the world's largest manufacturer of welding equipment, have both a profit-sharing and stock ownership plan: The Lincoln Electric Company has been a forerunner in proving conclusively what can be accomplished when owners, management, and hourly-paid employees join together in all aspects of the business to generate unusual success for all concerned and, in the process, sell its product on the low side of the market-price structure.

To summarize: In order to defeat inflation and assure continued sound growth, Government and business must concentrate on the preservation and encouragement of those factors which serve as the foundation of our free enterprise system. Business must do those things that bring labor, management and stockholders together: This country can not endure much longer the divisiveness which exists today. The Government must back up and direct its attention more to the role of impartial referee and rules-maker and encourage the private sector to enter the problem-solving area which the Federal Government has excessively invaded. Of course, the Federal Government will have to continue in some of these areas, but to nowhere near the extent to which it is involved today. Tremendous sums of money can be saved in this way and at the same time private enterprise will be adding to the tax bill.

WHAT CAN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DO TO SPEED THIS PROGRAM?

Chief Justice John Marshall said years ago, "The Power to tax is the power to destroy." Let us never forget this.

Conversely, the way the power to tax is employed can substantially encourage business to adopt specific courses of action. This is a well established principle already employed by the Federal Government.

Therefore, I urgently recommend to our President and the Congress the following plan as a major program in the broad range attack on inflation. Monetary controls alone can not accomplish the total job.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PHASE OF THE ATTACK

(1) Any corporation, bank, business, or partnership would be permitted to deduct 6% of capital invested, figured in accordance with accepted accounting rules, as a business expense in arriving at pre-tax operating profits, provided:

(a) Said corporation, bank, business, or

partnership paid out such an amount in cash as a dividend or partnership share.

(b) If said corporation or bank stock is listed or publically held, it must have in force an approved stock purchase plan under which a substantial percent of the stock of the company or bank would be made available over a period of time for this purpose, with the total shares involved not to exceed eventually 25% of the equity ownership, unless the company itself wishes it to do so. The objective of this provision would be to encourage every qualified employee to accumulate a meaningful amount of his company's stock.

(c) Each corporation, bank, business, or partnership would have to have an approved profit-sharing plan. In order to be approved it would have to have substance, and be approved by the IRS.

(2) Any corporation, bank or partnership electing to adopt (1) above would be given broad legal assurances that would protect it against strikes. It is obvious that if a company has a broad stock ownership plan for its employees (if it is a listed company) and a profit-sharing plan of substance which is divided among all employees, strikes cannot be justified on any basis except as a tool of power to be used by power-oriented labor leaders. The day has passed when the working man needs massive protection from his management.

This plan would not be a scheme to weaken the importance of the unions. Rather enlightened union leadership would see the great benefits to be attained for all employees as the result of it. Furthermore, it would commit everyone to the essential task of working toward the best objectives of the business and its customers. The labor leaders' role would change significantly from that of instilling fear and encouraging distrust in management, to the objective of encouraging creativity, productivity, service, and cost reduction under a climate where everyone gains—including, of course, the customer, who is everyone's final boss.

(3) Hold the line on price increases. Under conditions which exist today, this is not going to be done voluntarily. It could happen in three ways, however, two of which could be dangerous; the third incorporates interesting possibilities:

(a) The Government could freeze wages and prices—a strong possibility if present trends continue.

(b) A major depression would depress prices, but the other effects would be disastrous and many businesses and people would be seriously hurt.

(c) The Government, through a tax credit plan, could materially restrict price escalations on a voluntary basis. For example:

Any business that did not increase prices during its fiscal year would be allowed a tax credit of 10% of net pre-tax profits. This percentage would be reduced according to a diminishing scale that would vary in proportion to the amount of total sales of a company which did not carry a price increase during the year. As an example, if 50% of a company's sales comprised items whose prices were increased, this company would be able to take a 10% credit on only 50% of its profit. Additional ground rules, far less complicated than many present tax regulations, could be established to cover the size of those increases a company did make under the plan.

In conclusion, we are talking about a vital decision and course of action for America. What I have outlined above obviously would have to be checked out and evaluated in terms of tax revenue for the Government. It is a plan designed to motivate people and assure sound growth and, at the same time, attack our most violent and deceptive enemy—inflation. This plan will correct, in part at least, one of the outrageous practices of double taxation with which stockholders and corporations are saddled today, because

it will permit business to take a reasonable tax deduction on capital invested. The fact that this money would have to be paid out to stockholders would mean that the money would go into widespread circulation and still would generate taxable income on an even wider base. When one accounts for the stimulating effects that this program would have on our economy, I am certain that tax revenues would increase.

This is a positive regeneration plan insofar as financial, commercial, and industrial growth is concerned. It would bolster the foundations of our free enterprise system. It also could be tailored to the public utilities and transportation fields. While there is no substitute for good management in any operation, private or public, stock ownership and/or profit sharing plans have achieved outstanding results in many companies. Moreover, it is significant to note that these companies are usually more competitive, sell at lower prices, and pay out more in taxes.

One of the major thrusts of this program is to make every employed American a capitalist in the truest sense. Only in this way will our free enterprise system survive, only in this way will the latent possibilities of the vast majority of our countrymen be challenged. An informed, involved, and participating citizenry is our greatest bulwark against Communism and general deterioration. It is our best assurance that we in America will remain a vibrant, energetic, and strong nation, dedicated to freedom, opportunity and equal justice for all. Such a program would revitalize America at this time of unusual crisis.

NEW JERSEY NEWSPAPER ASKS SECRETARY KENNEDY TO ANSWER CHARGES

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my mail has reflected a growing concern over Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy's obvious conflicts of interest.

Many people are questioning the Secretary's failure to explain his financial ties to the Continental Illinois National Bank despite my repeated requests for the information.

An editorial from the May 11 edition of the Newark, N.J., News has just come to my attention and this editorial plainly illustrates the concern being expressed across the country. Mr. Speaker, I place this editorial in the RECORD:

PATMAN VERSUS KENNEDY

Treasury Secretary David Kennedy owes the nation more than silence over his continuing financial relationship with the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., which he headed until he took over his federal post.

Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and a nemesis of Treasury leaders, wants Mr. Kennedy to explain how he can take an objective view of banking matters in view of the fact his remuneration from the bank has exceeded his income from the government.

Mr. Kennedy has ignored the suggestion that he answer questions before the House Committee. An aide pointed out the secretary put some of his bank shares in a trust over which he exercises no control, and sold other stock acquired last month under an option plan.

But there has been no direct reply to Mr. Patman's demand that Mr. Kennedy renounce a \$200,000 severance allowance he is to receive from the bank after he leaves government service. Nor has there been any statement on charges he receives a \$4,800 monthly pension, has accepted \$600,000 in a profit-sharing plan, and benefits from having the bank pay most of the cost of his life and health insurance.

Considering that his department exercises jurisdiction over national banks and is involved in the dispute over regulation of one-bank holding companies, such as the one recently set up by Continental Illinois, Mr. Kennedy should take advantage of the opportunity to testify on the questions of propriety which justifiably have been raised.

CONSERVATION LEGISLATION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a package of 13 conservation bills, the passage of which is vital if we are to protect this country's natural beauty from the onslaught of lumber companies, housing developers, miners, and other groups who would destroy it.

Four of the bills have as their purpose the enlargement of existing national parks or the establishment of additional ones. In my judgment, the bill establishing the Redwood National Park, passed by this body last summer, failed to include some of the most important stands of redwoods—those along Skunk Cabbage Creek and in the Bald Ridge-Emerald Mile area. One of the bills I am introducing today would correct that omission. Others would provide for the establishment of the Channel Islands National Park in the State of California, authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means for establishing certain areas as marine sanctuaries, and increase the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore.

In addition to protecting the few remaining areas of great natural beauty in this country, I feel it is vital that we do more to improve the quality of the Nation's waterways. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill identical to S. 7, originally sponsored by Senator MUSKIE, and one identical to H.R. 6296, originally sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY). Mr. TUNNEY's bill, which would create a commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the discharge of oil and other pollutants from vessels, onshore and offshore facilities, and other sources, should do much to help prevent future disasters similar to those which have spoiled parts of the California coastline in the past year. Senator MUSKIE's bill deals with vessel pollution and thermal pollution, as well as oil pollution. We must deal forcefully with all three of these problems if we are to improve the quality of our waters, or even maintain their present deteriorating quality.

Coal mining operations have attracted a good deal of attention in recent weeks

because of their effect on the men who run the mines. Too often, we forget that mining operations also affect the surrounding countryside, causing stream pollution, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, and other damage to natural beauty. The Mined Lands Conservation Act, originally introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), would authorize long-range programs for the reclamation, acquisition, and conservation of lands and water adversely affected by coal mining operations. If it is adopted by the Congress, it can go far toward repairing the damage that has already been done in many parts of the Nation, and perhaps help prevent such damage in the future.

In addition to protecting the physical resources of this country, we must pay more attention to the preservation of its animal resources. To that end, I am introducing today legislation which would provide for a comprehensive study of the polar bear and walrus for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; a bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals; and legislation to govern the use of pesticides and other chemicals.

Perhaps most important, if this country is ever to have a sensible and well-planned conservation policy, is the establishment of a Council of Conservation Advisers or a Council on Environmental Quality. The President has already announced the formation of such a council—composed of several Cabinet members and the President's science adviser, and chaired by the President—and I am heartened by his step in this direction. However, I feel we need a permanent council, composed of experts in environmental problems and their solution, who could conduct continuing studies of Government programs affecting the environment and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of our environmental quality. I, therefore, hope the Congress will take early action on a measure of this kind, and on the other bills which I have introduced today.

CRITICS OF VIETNAM WAR GIVE COMFORT TO ENEMY

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a communication from a lady in my congressional district. She sent me the following editorial which she suggested I share with my colleagues, which I now respectfully do:

CRITICS OF VIETNAM WAR GIVE COMFORT TO ENEMY

The dawn of this Memorial Day finds thousands of American servicemen on duty throughout the world and by the time the day ends, more will have died in defense of freedom in Vietnam.

It is particularly fitting that this nation pause to honor these Americans.

They, and they alone, stand between Communist aggression and the right of others to live as they please.

They are protecting a guarantee—a solemn promise made by the United States to South Vietnam that Americans would offer protection in the event of aggression. They are paying the price to assure the survival of the free world.

These patriotic Americans, most of whom come from the mainstream of life, greatly overshadow the dissenters, the self-styled leaders, the headline hunters and the stupid who are actively aiding and abetting the enemies of this country.

It is particularly incredible that a young senator who has never worn the uniform of his country should, from the safety and comfort of his Washington office, adversely criticize the action of a field commander in Vietnam. It is even more incredible that a senior senator should call his own nation an aggressor and brand its young fighting men with the stigma of "fighting an illegal war."

But there is no cure for these people. They are exercising their right of free speech which is being guaranteed to them by the Americans they so freely criticize. They are also prolonging the Vietnam War by giving hope to the enemy in a most wanton and reckless fashion.

But the fluent speaker in the halls of Congress, the mob leaders and their followers—Americans all—fail to recognize the responsibility that accompanies the right of free speech.

It would be well for them to talk to an infantry rifleman or a shotgun rider on a helicopter. There they could get a lesson in the responsibilities of a citizen.

History will by-pass these deluded people because, in the final analysis, they contribute nothing to their nation or its people. They are the losers.

The only way to fight a war is to fight to win. Any other way amounts to appeasement and appeasement leads a nation on the downward path.

There are many markers along the road to freedom—Nathan Hale, Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln, the Argonne, Omaha Beach, Bataan, Porkchop Hill, and Vietnam.

"We as military men," wrote an Army sergeant in 1965, "are welded by regulations, tempered by discipline, and share the strongest dedication to our country. Our ultimate challenge comes in war, and, perhaps in mortality."

"But we are also heirs to a responsibility which grows in magnitude by the hour."

"We accept this responsibility because we are Americans and we are free men."

It is to the men of this nation who accept responsibility and who take up each challenge so that we can live in honor and dignity and freedom, that Memorial Day is dedicated.

It is at that moment when one is circling endlessly over an airport that he begins to ask some of the most penetrating questions about modern technology. The reason that progress has been accompanied by frustration is simple, I believe. Progress has come without adequate planning. In just 10 years, the number of passenger trips made by airlines has tripled, and the use of air freight has been multiplied five times. And because our total transportation systems were not ready for this acceleration, the quality and efficiency of service has, in many cases, declined. Now we discover that similar increases are expected in the next 10 years.

We would be foolish, indeed, if we failed to learn the lesson of the last decade and failed to plan intelligently for the growth that is coming. The President's message provides us with a basis for such intelligent planning. It calls for an increase in the construction of facilities and equipment which is appropriate to the expected increase in demand for air service. It provides, too, for additional research and development so that our technological progress can be equal to the demands of the coming decades. It establishes a principle whereby those who use the airlines and those who run them will see their taxes which are related to air travel applied directly to airport and airway programs.

The President's program is realistic because it anticipates that additional revenues must be generated. The Congress will, I am sure, work closely with the administration to make certain that the formulas which are devised for these revenue sources are realistic.

Intelligent and responsible planning is needed now if we are to reduce the snarls and frustrations which threaten the future of air transportation. The President's proposals deserve our support, for they are both intelligent and responsible.

ADDRESS BY JOHN E. DAVIS, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, TO THE NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last week the North Dakota American Legion Convention was held in Grand Forks.

One of the featured speakers at this year's gathering was the Honorable John Davis, former Governor of North Dakota, past national commander of the American Legion, and current national director of civil defense. The major portion of this distinguished man's speech dealt with the immediate need of the ABM.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people and the urgency of this matter, I insert in the RECORD the speech of the Honorable John Davis:

ADDRESS OF JOHN E. DAVIS

I am more than delighted that my first major speaking engagement as National Director of Civil Defense is here at home, before so many old friends and fellow Legionnaires. I felt deep regret, of course, at leaving North Dakota once again, but I could not easily decline the opportunity and the privilege of serving with Secretary Laird and Secretary Resor in the administration of President Nixon.

I have been on the job in Washington less than a month. But I have seen more than enough to make me extremely proud of America's new leadership and its dedication to the basic simple virtues which Americans have cherished since the founding of our Nation.

Americans cherish peace—but peace with honor and justice. This is what we strive for today in our continuous confrontation with the Communist world.

For Americans, Government must be the servant and not the master of our people; so we listen to the views of all, not just a few, as we chart our Nation's course. But we will not confuse freedom to dissent with license to destroy our great national institutions.

We cherish the freedoms for which so many Legionnaires have fought and sacrificed; and for this reason, we insist on a military defense for this Nation second to no other in the world.

As your National Commander in 1966 and 1967, and in my present post, I have concerned myself with the state of our national defenses and with the nature of the threats to our security. I have found no substantial reason yet to convince me that we can drop our guard against aggression. There is, in fact, a need today to further strengthen our defenses.

We are the first generation of Americans to live in an age of nuclear weapons. It is a most perilous age, because while we have mastered the technology of the nuclear weapon, we have not yet been able to establish, in concert with other nuclear powers, the necessary political, social and moral guarantees against its use. This age, these weapons, will be an acid test of our national patience and our determination to do what is necessary and right to preserve our way of life and to provide future generations with some degree of security against the nuclear threat.

In the absence of international agreements to control or banish nuclear weapons our national policy has been one of deterrence—that is, maintaining the offensive strength necessary to destroy an aggressor should he launch an attack against us. And it is true that our nuclear striking power today could survive an attack by all of the nuclear weapons now in the Soviet inventory and still retaliate with a blow which would destroy the Soviet Union as a Nation.

Because deterrence is so necessary to the survival of our Nation, we must make every reasonable effort to protect our retaliatory forces. This is the reason for the decision to deploy the Safeguard ABM System. We see certain trends in Soviet deployments and developmental activities which, if continued, could lead to substantial threats to our nuclear retaliatory forces. First, there is the continuing deployment of the Soviet SS-9 intercontinental ballistic missile which can carry a warhead of up to 25 megatons. And as far as we can see at this time, such a missile would have only one military use—to erode our Minuteman deterrent capability.

At the same time, we are faced with a rapid growth in the Soviet nuclear powered submarine fleet, comparable to our Polaris. Soviet submarine-launched missiles pose a grave threat to our bomber force by cutting the time in which our forces could react to a Soviet first strike.

If these threats materialize, we would be left to rely primarily on our nuclear submarines for our retaliatory force. This is a formidable force and one which we are confi-

STATEMENT ABOUT PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON AIRPORTS AND AIRWAYS

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent message on air transportation addresses itself squarely to one of the most vexing problems of modern society. In our airplanes and airports, we see, as clearly as anywhere in contemporary America, the two-edged results of our technological progress. Designed to bring speed and pleasure and efficiency and simplicity to our lives, air transportation has also brought with it a host of new frustrations and complexities and delays and dangers.

dent is safe now from detection and destruction by the Soviets. But we can be sure they are working on ways to counter Polaris. It would be unwise to rely on any single component of our nuclear force to ensure our survival—and it has long been our policy not to do so.

Neither do we believe that Safeguard erodes the possibility of fruitful negotiations for arms control. First, merely by responding to the recent Soviet developments which I have described, we are serving notice that we are prepared to take the necessary steps to ensure our security. Secondly, by responding with a defensive system designed so that it shall not escalate the arms race, we have served notice on them that we seek the kind of stability which could be achieved in an arms control agreement.

I am sure this audience is aware that the Defense Department has requested approval of Congress to locate one of our Safeguard installations near Grand Forks Air Base. I believe that it is essential that, not just the immediate situation, not just the cost in dollars, but the long-range threat which I have discussed be very seriously considered in any public debate over the deployment of Safeguard. I know the voice of the Legion will be powerful in speaking out on a matter so essential to our security and perhaps to our national survival.

However important it may be, protection for our missiles is not the most fundamental purpose of our national defense structure. Basically, ultimately, the defense establishment must be concerned with saving the lives of our citizens. This is where civil defense fits into the national security structure.

Civil defense is the major element in our national defense program which is solely and directly concerned with saving lives in a nuclear attack. President Nixon touched on this very point when he announced a determination to deploy Safeguard. In response to a question at his March 14 news conference, the President reminded the press that he had ordered a study of the shelter program, and I quote, "to see what we can do there to minimize American casualties." End of quote.

What is our civil defense capability right now?

If the Soviets should strike today, millions of Americans could be killed by the blast and fire effects of the attack. But tens of millions more would survive blast and fire and face the hazard of radioactive fallout. Our present civil defense system—based on a system of public fallout shelters supplemented by home shelter—could save these millions of Americans—and what I am talking about is the lifethread of our Nation.

Furthermore, fallout protection for our population can be purchased at such low cost, in terms of today's defense expenditures, that it would be difficult to explain why the Nation should not take this simple, inexpensive, logical step toward giving our people a maximum chance to survive in a nuclear war.

We've got to look on civil defense as the low-cost insurance we take out, as a Nation, to guard against the perhaps improbable, but certainly not impossible event of nuclear war or nuclear accident.

We must not accept the premise advanced by some, that because fallout shelters will not save people from blast and fire, we should abandon efforts to save those millions whose lives can be saved by such pragmatic and inexpensive civil defense measures. We do not abandon our fire departments because firemen are sometimes unable to save burning buildings, and we should not allow the national civil defense effort to be degraded by "all or nothing at all" demands.

In the short time during which the national civil defense program has been my responsibility, I have not absorbed all of its many and complex details, but one of the

principles we must follow has become immediately apparent to me. The program must be carried out by a close partnership of the Federal, State and local governments, working with private institutions, the schools, industry, commerce and voluntary service organizations such as the Legion.

From personal experience, I know how loyally the Legion has supported the national civil defense program before Congress and other national leadership groups, and at the local level.

As National Commander in 1967, I sent letters to each one of the 17,000 Post Commanders in the United States, calling on them to support local civil defense shelter plans. I saw the 1967 convention reaffirm our concern for civil defense and specifically ask Departments, Districts and Posts to urge building owners of qualified buildings to cooperate by licensing their structures as public shelters. At the same time, the convention called on Congress to restore funds cut from the civil defense budget.

More importantly, Legionnaires at the Post level have made significant contributions of time and energy to local civil defense projects such as licensing and stocking public shelters. I earnestly hope for the continued cooperation and assistance of The American Legion in the complex tasks that lie ahead.

As a Governor, I became well aware of the role of civil defense in natural disaster. I have been impressed by the reports that came into the Pentagon about civil defense action in Ward County to evacuate, feed and shelter the victims of the April floods. I intend to be continually alert to see how our efforts to help local civil defense prepare for nuclear emergencies can provide better benefits in readiness to cope with natural disasters.

I am hopeful that more can be done by the Federal Government and perhaps by my agency, to aid communities threatened or struck by floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, forest fires and other peacetime catastrophes. Upon taking the office of National Director, I was naturally curious to get a first hand report on the status of civil defense in my home state. I have learned that the shelter surveys of the Office of Civil Defense turned up excellent results in North Dakota. This county of Grand Forks, for example, provides more than enough approved public shelter space for its population.

In the rural areas of the State, OCD's home shelter survey indicated that significant shelter exists in homes with basements to make up for deficits in large, public shelter space. And our Community Shelter Planning program is well under way in the state to explain to every citizen what to do and where to go in a nuclear attack emergency or, in other words, to make sure that shelter is used effectively if it is ever needed.

Not all of our States and communities are so fortunate. For some time to come, the Nation will face a shortage of shelter space because not all the spaces found are located where they are needed. We find an overabundance of space in downtown areas and shortages in the suburban and rural areas of the Nation.

OCD is attacking this problem through intensive research and development of low-cost shelter design techniques and through a constant appeal to builders and architects to plan for shelter areas in new building projects. In our budget for Fiscal Year 1970, we have requested Congress for authority to make small payments to building owners based on the extra expense they may incur in providing shelter in their buildings. We hope for an increase in our financial contributions to the States and localities to help them meet the rising costs of local programs.

We will continue to build up our national warning capability, to help in the establishment of emergency operating centers for government officials and to provide improved

training and professional development programs for local civil defense personnel.

I have said that this is a most perilous age. This is all the more true because none of us likes to think about the prospect of nuclear war. Some of us tend to hope that if we don't look at it, it will go away. Others will argue that our resources are too limited to afford the defenses that we need.

I believe that any potential aggressor must be made to understand that we will not rely on speculation and wishful thinking alone to deter an attack.

If we were to chart the facts about Soviet weapons development alongside of our own steps in this field in the past few years, I believe we would find a definitely ascending curve on the Soviet side compared with a stationary, if not descending curve in our own development effort. Coming at this point in time, Safeguard represents a minimum, nonprovocative, essential step to preserve a reasonable balance between the great nuclear powers.

To those who argue that America's resources are too limited to support an adequate defense and carry on our vital domestic programs, I can only say that the modern history of the United States has been mainly the story of a nation superbly capable of marshalling resources to meet a severe threat or an actual emergency. I think I need only point to the landing in Normandy 25 years ago this month to recall the sacrifices we are capable of in defense of our country.

Let me say, in conclusion, that while we must be realistic about the facts of nuclear life, we need not be pessimistic. There is hope for meaningful negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union to place some limitations on arms development.

I believe, however, that we must exercise great patience and negotiate from a position of strength. I further believe that this administration has the leadership and the vision and the dedication needed to improve the chances for peace, to make this a safer world for us and our children. I ask you to give our President and all our leaders your full support to achieve this goal.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., SHERIFF IMPROVES POLICE IMAGE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Dale Carson of Jacksonville, Fla., is one of our Nation's outstanding law-enforcement officials. A former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Sheriff Carson has introduced a "police youth patrol," which will help bridge the gap between young people and police officers.

Sheriff Carson is attacking the generation gap and he seeks to give the youth of Jacksonville an important outlet for communication and discussion with adults. I applaud this idea of a "police youth patrol," and commend to your attention an editorial from the June 17, 1969, Jacksonville Journal, which I insert in the Record at this point:

YOUTH PATROL GOOD IDEA

Sheriff Dale Carson's proposed Police Youth Patrol is an imaginative idea that should pay off.

Police-community relations are of concern in nearly every major city these days.

Law enforcement officers are often bitterly accused of unappealing assaults on personal freedoms and human dignity and as often stoutly defended as the sole remaining bul-

wark against a threatening tide that would sweep the nation to eternal perdition.

Neither image is entirely true, of course.

Police are human, like the rest of us. Their patience is often sorely tried and sometimes they are overzealous in the performance of their duties. They make mistakes.

But for the most part they are men trying to do a difficult job as best they know. Their responsibilities are great and the debt most of us owe to them is correspondingly large.

They are not enemies of society or even of individuals within it—or not the law-abiding ones, at least.

They are certainly not the tools of repressive government—out to break the back of any legitimate, peaceful dissent or protest movement.

Carson's plan, which calls for a close association between individual youths and policemen who are going about the business of performing their duties, should help to correct the distortions in the image.

His big problem will be in persuading those who have the most inaccurate image that they need to participate. Most of them probably will be firmly convinced that they are completely justified in thinking of policemen as pigs and that the whole idea is to somehow brainwash them.

If he can succeed in this, however, the experience will straighten out a lot of thinking.

"I am of the opinion," the sheriff said, "that if the young people could see that we spend more than 90 percent of our time helping people and less than 10 per cent of our time arresting people they would have a clearer understanding of our position in society."

We are of the same opinion. And we wish the sheriff well in his undertaking.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. EDWARD F.
McMANUS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise my colleagues of a well-deserved and outstanding honor that was recently bestowed on one of my constituents, Mrs. Edward F. McManus of Palmer, Mass.

Recently she was selected as one of only four high school teachers from across the Nation to receive a Distinguished Secondary School Teaching award at Harvard University.

In writing to advise Mrs. McManus of her selection Dean Fred L. Glimp wrote:

You were nominated for this honor by Thomas Francis Rooney of the Class of 1969, and you were warmly supported in this nomination by your school administration and associates. The Harvard Faculty Committee responsible for selecting the recipients of the awards judged you to be representative of the finest traditions of your profession.

In receiving the award which included a generous cash payment, Mrs. McManus received the following citation:

MARY McMANUS

Mary McManus, housewife, mother, inspired teacher, first citizen of Palmer, Mass. Her intellectual standard is rigorous; her range of sympathies, extraordinary. Knowing the power of both the oral and the written word, she has shown countless young people how great literature may enrich their lives.

My colleagues will note that, in addition to praising Mrs. McManus' teaching

skills, Harvard also took note of her outstanding citizenship. I am in a position to confirm that appraisal. Although I take some partisan pride in her active participation in the Democratic town committee, it must also be noted that she has long been a trustee of the Palmer Public Library. Further, since the recent tragic fire in Palmer with its drastic effects on employment and the general economy, Mrs. McManus has been a driving force in the recently formed Overall Economic Development Committee of Palmer that is doing a great deal to revitalize that community.

And so, Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues can see why I take such pride in her accomplishments. Mary McManus is not only an outstanding teacher; she is truly the "First Citizen of Palmer."

I insert in the RECORD at this point a recent story in the Springfield Union about Mrs. McManus' achievement.

PALMER ENGLISH TEACHER TO GET HARVARD AWARD

PALMER.—Mrs. Mary McManus, English department head at Palmer High School, will be one of four teachers from across the country to receive a distinguished secondary school teaching award at Harvard University.

She was chosen by the Harvard faculty committee as representative of the finest traditions of the teaching profession.

Mrs. McManus was nominated by Thomas F. Rooney, an alumnus of Palmer High and a senior at Harvard. Mrs. McManus was his English teacher during his high school years.

The award will be presented to Mrs. McManus June 11 at a reception and dinner in the Harvard Faculty Club. She will be recipient of a certificate of award, together with a check for \$1200. She also will be invited to attend the Harvard commencement exercises June 12.

Mrs. McManus has taught at Palmer High since September of 1956 and was made English department head March 1, 1964. Before coming to Palmer, she spent five years teaching Latin and English at Warren High School.

CIVIL DEFENSE MEETS BUDGET
DISASTER

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received from my district a number of letters taking bitter and even violent exception to the cuts made by the Bureau of the Budget on Civil Defense funds for fiscal year 1970.

Some of these letters were from old friends of mine, men whose opinions I value and respect.

One letter which I insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks illustrates why the funding proposed by the Bureau of the Budget—approximately \$75.3 million, or 15 percent more than has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee—is insufficient to maintain an on-going program in Arizona at even the level of fiscal year 1969. It would not permit inclusion of any of a number of local governments in Arizona that wish to join in the civil defense program and would probably result in a

reduction in the level of civil defense activities by municipalities, towns, and counties that have been in the program for years.

Let me quote just a few lines from this letter to illustrate how these people feel about the cut in civil defense money:

In the area of supplies, you will note that, again, 1963 offered the top funding in this area. There are many items of equipment that are absolutely and completely necessary for efficient operation during a catastrophe. True, many of these items can be used from day to day; i.e., mobile radio equipment, mobile warning systems, search and rescue equipment, etc., but almost invariably these items will not be acquired by any small political subdivision or entity because they are not absolutely essential for day-to-day use. The plain fact is that they can be done without in normal operations of cities and counties, but the day that disaster strikes, the lack of these items will cause tremendous loss of life.

Referring only to so-called matching funds, I am assured that \$1 of Federal matching funds for civil defense may generate as much as \$10 in State and local funds and services devoted to the same purpose.

I have the greatest respect for the capable and very hard-working members of the Committee on Appropriations. However, I must confess that I find myself at a loss to understand the reason for the continued reduction in funds for the National, State, and local civil defense programs.

The letter referred to follows:

ARIZONA CIVIL DEFENSE AND
DISASTER ASSOCIATION,
Prescott, Ariz., April 22, 1969.

Congressman SAM STEIGER,
126 Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: Reference is made to the letter of 8 April 1969 from Paul Rosenblatt and the enclosure therein.

Specifically, I should like to take violent exception to this enclosure which was in the form of a letter directed to you from one Joseph Laitin, Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. To say that this is one of the most inane, naive, and just plain stupid letters that I have ever had the misfortune to read, is putting it mildly. This letter not only answers nothing but presents only a small portion of the problem. If you view the overall picture, this letter in itself answers very clearly and points up the exact problems which I have brought to your attention in previous correspondence.

Let's take the letter step by step. First, let us look at the funding in the table contained in this letter. If you will look at the Personnel and Administrative Expenses, you will note that the funding in 1968-69 and proposed funding for 1970 is approximately a 5% increase. This does not cover by any manner or means the increment raises that are generally granted for cost of living increases. It also leaves no room for increased Civil Defense activity and does not even permit the adoption of Civil Defense budgets by political entities that have heretofore not been tied to Civil Defense activity. For instance, right here in Yavapai County there are several cities that are looking to increase their Civil Defense activity as part of their constitutional and charter directives. These cities can expect no funding from the Personnel and Administrative Expenses under the present budget.

Right at this time, instead of expanding Civil Defense activity, the State Office of Civil Defense and Emergency Planning is looking to means to curtail the program due

to lack of funding. A priority system is being established that will offer first, funding to joint City-County operations, followed by County operations, City operations, etc. There is simply no way, with today's increased costs, that even the Personnel and Administrative present level can be continued. There should be at least a 15% increase in Personnel and Administrative Expense in the budget.

Next, we move to Emergency Operations Centers. These are essential for adequate direction and control in the event of any emergency or disaster, nuclear or otherwise. Maximum funding for these was reported in 1963 as in the letter. Nevertheless, there was sufficient funding in 1967-68 to continue the program as more states, cities and counties recognized the need for Emergency Operations Centers, either through experience or through other means, and they continued to be developed. Such was the case in Papapai County. Our experience in the disaster period of 1967 clearly indicated the absolute necessity for an Emergency Operations Center in the Verde Valley. We proceeded to develop this center along the guidelines established by the Office of Civil Defense and it was funded accordingly by the county with the anticipation of matching funds as indicated by members of the Office of Civil Defense Region 7 during predevelopment conferences. When the first phase of the operation was completed we found that there was no funding available for the completion of the project. The entire development was dependent upon the Federal Funding as provided in the Civil Defense Act. With the reduction of the budget in 1969 by more than 50%, we were left "holding the bag." Such has been the case in many other states, counties and cities throughout the country.

Under the present proposed budget for fiscal year 1970 there is no relief in sight. Many programs will have to be dropped. This, we feel, is a complete disservice to the public and will leave them virtually defenseless in the event of nuclear catastrophe.

In the area of supplies, you will note that, again, 1963 offered the top funding in this area. There are many items of equipment that are absolutely and completely necessary for efficient operation during a catastrophe. True, many of these items can be used from day to day; i.e., mobile radio equipment, mobile warning systems, search and rescue equipment, etc., but almost invariably these items will not be acquired by any small political subdivision or entity because they are not absolutely essential for day to day use. The plain fact is that they can be done without in normal operations of cities and counties, but the day that disaster strikes, the lack of these items will cause tremendous loss of life. Furthermore, this program alone was the Heart of the Civil Defense Operation. To be basic, it attracted City Councils and Boards of Supervisors to extend their Civil Defense operations because it meant the acquisition of equipment that ordinarily would be unobtainable. A small part of this program was the acquisition of surplus property on a matching fund basis. This has been totally discontinued.

The statement in Mr. Laitin's letter regarding a grant of \$3,000,000 to a single state or county in one year is totally irrelevant and has no bearing on any facts contained within any of our correspondence. It is readily apparent that he did not read or perhaps did not understand the simple language of our letter. We merely mentioned that \$3,000,000 of State, City, and County funds will go unused in fiscal year 1969 because appropriated as matching funds for Federal matching funds in like amount. This amount covered the entire United States, not one state, as Mr. Laitin stated.

The balance of Mr. Laitin's letter is just so much "gobbledygook" and it says absolutely nothing. We can find no relationship between the ABM System and attempts on

the part of Civil Defense to assure national survival of the people of this nation.

Again, we say that this letter is a perfect example of the double-talk of Government in attempting to do a "snow job" and avoid rocking the boat.

Our only comment on page 2 of this letter is to state that the third sentence in paragraph three "While Civil Defense budgets have been reduced, we believe they are sufficient to provide for a creditable Civil Defense program." is totally without foundation. The Civil Defense program is crippled; it is staggering, and it will collapse unless Congress and the President of the United States take steps quickly and forcibly to prevent it. Civil Defense, under present world conditions, is the only certain means available at our command which will assure maximum survival in the event of nuclear holocaust.

With respect to Mr. Laitin's comments on the staffing of the Federal Civil Defense, we again draw to your attention the fact that the personnel levels are not consistent with the present administration of the program. At regional levels, the personnel generally are approving programs for which there is no funding or disapproving programs which have merit. All such approval or disapproval is granted after the particular situation has been thoroughly studied at state level. It is at state level that the approval or disapproval should come. These are the people that are concerned with the problems and the great mass of governmental directions in the form of directives, guides, pamphlets, etc., can do little or nothing to change the situation as it exists at the state and local level. Many of these people perform functions that have already been researched by state staffs; hence the duplication of effort. Furthermore, nine times out of ten, it is the people at state level who influence the people at Federal level to approve projects that are not only needed but necessary for a complete Civil Defense program.

In closing, I should like to clearly state that in no way do we concur with the final sentence of Mr. Laitin's letter. The information furnished does not, in any way, satisfy your constituents, the people of the State of Arizona, and I am not talking for myself alone but for the members of the Arizona State Civil Defense and Disaster Association. We are alarmed and concerned at the situation and fully expect you and the other elected representatives to the Congress of the United States from the State of Arizona to do everything within their power to alleviate this situation before it becomes another "lost cause."

It would be appreciated if you would contact Paul Fannin, Barry Goldwater, John Rhodes and Mo Udall and furnish them with copies of this letter.

Thank you for your continued interest and cooperation. It is sincerely hoped that something will be done to correct the inadequacy in the Civil Defense program prior to the final adoption of the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAMS H. BEERS,
President.

AHEPA YOUTHS TO PROMOTE U.S. FRIENDSHIP WITH GREECE

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—has initiated many commendable projects and

programs promoting friendly relationships between the people of the United States and the people of Greece. Since its establishment in 1922, the Order of AHEPA has been cited many times by our Government for its contributions in the field of international affairs. The fraternity now has 780 local chapters and auxiliaries located in the United States, Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, and Greece.

This summer, the Order of AHEPA is offering two programs through which young Americans will have the opportunity to establish lasting friendships with the youths of Greece while steeping themselves in the traditions of Western civilization. I would like to bring these two excellent projects to the attention of my colleagues, for under these programs, 244 American high school students will travel and study in Greece, visiting many sites of archeological, historical, religious, and cultural significance.

One hundred of these students have been awarded scholarships under the AHEPA-Anatolia College summer in Greece scholarship program. These students will attend 6 weeks of classes at the Anatolia College of Salonika, which is an American school supported by American contributions. They will study the Greek language, history, heritage, and modern institutions; they will also take weekend field trips to sites such as Phillipi and Mount Olympus. In addition, these youthful ambassadors of American friendship will live in Greek homes for 5 days, learning the ways of Greek living while conveying our good wishes and strengthening the strong ties between the American and Greek peoples. Their stay in Greece will end with a tour of Athens and a number of Greece's historic cities and isles.

The AHEPA-Anatolia program proved to be so popular that the AHEPA youth summer in Greece program was established to bring 144 additional American students to the cradle of western civilization. These youths will spend 5 weeks in the vicinity of Athens and will benefit from many study and sightseeing programs.

I would like to commend the AHEPA Educational Foundation and AHEPA's supreme president, Gus Cherevas, for their dedicated work in establishing these two programs. I would also like to congratulate the 244 students, who are members of the Orders of the Sons of Pericles and the Maids of Athens, for their academic records which entitled them to be selected for these activities. I wish them all a pleasant and interesting summer.

A BILL TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

HON. EDWARD JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill amending

the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to make needed changes in the authority to incorporate class I base plans in Federal milk marketing orders.

This legislation has the strong support of the Nation's dairy farmers.

The present authority has been used for a class I base plan in only one marketing area. This one base plan is in dire need of revision, which can only be accomplished under the proposed legislative authority. Moreover, dairy farmers in other marketing areas are desirous of developing base plans, but cannot do so until the revised legislation is enacted.

My bill, H.R. 11853, would revise the authority requested by representatives of the National Milk Producers Federation, which speaks for the Nation's dairy farmers.

First, the bill removes the termination date. It takes time to develop a plan. Dairy farmers are reluctant to develop a plan which may be terminated even before it is put into operation. To operate to best advantage under such a base plan, many farmers would adjust their farming operations. This they cannot do for a period limited by a termination date.

Also, the bill improves the methods under which new producers may obtain bases and allows established producers to share equitably in the benefits of market growth.

This bill would authorize the use of histories of marketings by dairy farmers, not limited to a single period of time, so that bases can be updated. New producers would be able to obtain bases in a fair manner and thereafter participate in the same manner as established producers.

The bill also provides for the reduction of bases to producers who fail to deliver milk allocated to them in proportion to the share of sales, for their benefit.

These changes are needed to allow dairy farmers to develop base plans, which are consistent with their needs.

The purpose of a base plan authorized by this bill is to enable farmers to know just how much milk they can market and receive a price for it closely related to the class I—fluid milk—price. By knowing this, they can plan production. This prevents the artificial buildup of milk production by a farmer in order to obtain a maximum size base.

The base plan applies only to the dis-

tribution of money among dairy farmers supplying Federal milk marketing orders, and involves no cost to the Government.

It took nearly 2 years to put the first base plan into operation under the original base plan legislation. Because of the time required to set up such a plan, it is important that this legislation be passed as soon as possible.

WORLD TRADE OPPORTUNITIES

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the United Nations development program report of 1968, and an article in the May 5, 1969, issue of International Commerce by John L. Malone. This material gives an example of the valuable role of the United Nations, in cooperation with private American firms, in speeding the process of economic growth in the underdeveloped nations. The material follows:

WORLD TRADE OPPORTUNITIES—UNDP APPROVED PROGRAMS OFFER GOOD PROSPECTS FOR ELIGIBLE U.S. BUSINESSMEN

(By John L. Malone)

The Governing Council of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) recently approved a record number of new development programs. Projects approved at this session include many large-scale pre-investment prospects involving the training of specialists in research and economic planning in agriculture, industry, public utilities, housing, health and sanitation education, building and physical planning, social welfare, public administration and other economic services; mineral, water, land, fishery and various natural resources surveys.

Projects approved at the last session, which was held in January, as well as future UNDP projects for developing countries are carried out by the United Nations and 14 other participating and executing agencies.

Firms interested in availing themselves of these potential opportunities under the auspices of the UNDP should, after reviewing data contained in a narrative summary available from International Liaison and Trade Opportunities (ILTO) Staff, BDSA-541, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230, direct their inquiries to the relevant executing agency (this summary is known as Stage 2).

A list of the participating and executing agencies and their addresses follow:

UN/United Nations—Director, United Na-

tions Technical Co-Operation Office, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, New York, N.Y. 10017.

ILO/International Labour Organization—Chief, Field Department, International Labour Organization, 154 Rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

FAO/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Assistant Director General, Programme and Budget, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome, Italy.

UNESCO/United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—Director, Bureau of Relations with International Organizations and Programmes, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Place de Fontenay, Paris, VIIe, France

ICAO/International Civil Aviation Organization—Director, Technical Assistance Bureau, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Aviation Bldg., 1080 University St., Montreal 3, Canada.

WHO/World Health Organization—Deputy Director-General, World Health Organization, 20, Avenue Appia, Geneva, Switzerland.

IBRD/International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—Projects Department, Development Services, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 1818 H St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20453.

ITU/International Telecommunication Union—Chief, Technical Co-operation Department, International Telecommunications Union, Place des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland.

WMO/World Meteorological Organization—Chief, Technical Co-operation Division, World Meteorological Organization, 41, Avenue Gueiseppe Motta, Geneva, Switzerland.

IAEA/International Atomic Energy Agency—Deputy Director-General for Technical Assistance, International Atomic Energy Agency, Kaerntnerring 11, Vienna 1, Austria.

UNIDO/United Nations Industrial Development Organization—Director, Technical Cooperation Division, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, Felder Laws, Felder Strasse, Vienna, Austria.

UPU/Universal Postal Union—Schoshaldenstrasse 46, Berne 3000, Switzerland.

IMCO/Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization—22 Berners St., London, W.1, England.

IADB/Inter-American Development Bank—1818 H St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20453.

ADB/African Development Bank—Abidjan, Ivory Coast.

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (SPECIAL FUND)

Total U.S. contract awards in 1968 within the total U.N.D.P. program:

Total contracts..... 14
Amount awarded..... \$3,789,000

Cumulative total contracts awarded to U.S. contractors, including 1968:

Total contracts..... 80
Amount awarded..... \$16,506,000

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (SPECIAL FUND)

AMERICAN FIRMS AWARDED SUBCONTRACT, WITH TOTAL COST OF AWARDED CONTRACT, COUNTRY AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION (1968 CONTRACTS ONLY)

Headquarters (country) and name of contractor	Cost of contract (U.S. dollars)	Location, name, and agency of project	Headquarters (country) and name of contractor	Cost of contract (U.S. dollars)	Location, name, and agency of project
United States:			United States—Continued		
Battelle Institute.....	65,000	Pakistan: Pre-Investment Studies for the Promotion of the Fertilizer and Petrochemical Industries (UNIDO).	Geophysical Service Inc.....	480,000	Trinidad and Tobago: Seismic Survey in the Marine Area between Trinidad and Tobago (U.N.).
Louis Berger, Inc. (in association with KAMPASX, Denmark).	1,625,000	Indonesia: Highway Assistance and Transport Co-ordination Study (IBRD).	Geoscience.....	170,000	Poland: Sub-Surface Exploration for Potassium Salts (U.N.).
Development and Resources Corp.	479,000	Afghanistan: Khnduz—Kkanabad Irrigation Feasibility Study (FAO).	GTS Corp.....	37,800	India: Institute for Petroleum Exploration Dehra Dun (Phase II) (U.N.).
Ellicott Madi Corp.....	94,500	Yugoslavia: Pilot Land Reclamation Project on the Lower Neretva (FAO).	National Lead Co.....	3,000	Bolivia: Centre for Petroleum Development Santa Cruz (U.N.).
Fairbanks Morse International Inc.	406,300	Romania: Establishment and Operation of Pilot Irrigation Stations in the Danube Plain (FAO).	Roscoe Moss Co.....	13,400	Bolivia: Feasibility Study and Demonstration of Agro-Industrial Development in the Abapo-Izzag Region (FAO).
			Stanford Research Institute.....	296,400	Regional (Africa): Survey of Transport Studies in Africa (IBRD).

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (SPECIAL FUND)—Continued

AMERICAN FIRMS AWARDED SUBCONTRACT, WITH TOTAL COST OF AWARDED CONTRACT, COUNTRY AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION (1968 CONTRACTS ONLY)—Continued

Headquarters (country) and name of contractor	Cost of contract (U.S. dollars)	Location, name, and agency of project	Headquarters (country) and name of contractor	Cost of contract (U.S. dollars)	Location, name, and agency of project
United States—Continued			United States—Continued		
Theodore Riedeburg Associates	30,000	Rwanda: Pilot Plant for Industrialization and Pyrethrum Production, Mukingo (UNIDO).	U.S. Air Force	40,000	Regional (Americas): Eradication of the Mediterranean Fruit Fly (IAEA).
Tuoluene Corp.	48,300	Guatemala: Pre-Investment Study on Forestry Development (FAO).			

MAJOR ORDERS FOR SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT AND CONTRACTS AWARDED TO U.S. FIRMS, INCLUDING NAME OF SUPPLIER AND TOTAL COST OF CONTRACT AWARD

Country and name of supplier	Cost of order (U.S. dollars)	Description of equipment	Country and name of supplier	Cost of order (U.S. dollars)	Description of equipment
United States:			United States—Continued		
Acker Drill	17,284	Drilling equipment.	Scott-Engineering Sciences	34,386	Thermodynamics and refrigeration training equipment.
American Coldset	14,073	Do.	Singer Co.	10,850	Spectrum analyser.
Ann Arbor Instrument Works Inc.	14,413	Machine-tool dynamometer.	Soiltest Inc.	10,365	Engineering laboratory equipment.
Jarrel Ash Co.	36,598	Atomic absorption spectrometer.	Speedstar Division	17,312	Drilling equipment.
Beckman Instruments	40,560	Spectrophotometer.	Sprague & Henwood	39,314	Wireline equipment.
Bendix International	31,195	Instruments.	Tektronix Inc.	10,282	Oscilloscopes and accessories.
Bisset Berman Corp.	10,053	Fishing equipment.	Uniflow Manufacturing Co.	15,123	Freezing plant.
Carrier International Ltd.	17,704	Air-conditioning equipment.	Victoreen Instrument Co.	15,672	Ionization chamber.
Cenco	12,968	Physics laboratory equipment.	Westinghouse Air Brake Co.	55,214	Drilling equipment.
Chrysler Corp.	50,090	Vehicles; boats.	Fisher Scientific Co.	22,817	Chemical laboratory equipment.
Collins Radio Co.	11,193	Telecommunication equipment.	Fort Motor Co.	27,231	Vehicles; drilling equipment.
Deere & Co.	38,209	Agricultural machinery.	Fortune Electronic	83,148	Photographic equipment.
Digital Equipment Corp.	52,500	Data processing equipment.	General Electric	10,799	Dynamometer.
Denver Equipment	10,970	Gyratory crusher.	General International Export	19,545	Engineering laboratory equipment.
Dukane Corp.	13,792	Language laboratory.	General Motors	60,617	Vehicles.
Eastman Kodak Co.	12,214	Microfile equipment.	General Precision System Inc.	12,216	Aircraft.
Export Oil Field	32,512	Drilling equipment.	Geophysical Instrument	39,938	Geophysical equipment.
E. J. Longyear	11,313	Do.	W. & L. Gurley	11,763	Hydrological instruments.
Marine Construction & Design Co.	22,278	Fishing equipment.	Halliburton Co.	17,709	Autoclave.
Motorola Communications International Inc.	11,314	Telecommunication equipment.	Haver-Lockhart Labs.	14,844	Clinical and surgical equipment.
Owens Illinois	24,698	Laboratory equipment.	IBM	708,108	Electronic data processing.
Perkin-Elmer	11,679	Gas chromatograph.	Jeep, pickups	33,397	Vehicles.
Pensalt Chemical	13,306	Freeze dryer.	Kaiser Jeep International Corp.	31,200	Do.
Picker International Corp.	42,659	X-Ray diffraction and fluorescent equipment.	Kay-Fries Chemicals, Inc.	10,200	Torula yeast.
Prater Pulverizer Co.	28,163	Agricultural machinery.	Lab Cage, Inc.	11,366	Laboratory cages and accessories.
Radio Research	20,482	Mobile radar.	Leopold & Stevens	32,904	Hydrological equipment.
Raytheon Inc.	104,140	Radar parts.	Lewis Refrigeration	13,125	Laboratory freezing equipment
Sabin St. Germain	19,741	Testing machine.	Leyland Motor Co.	62,486	Vehicles.

HEARINGS ON STUDENTS FOR A
DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Internal Security for the past 3 months has been investigating intensively the revolutionary nature and activities of the Students for a Democratic Society and is presently conducting its second hearing, the first basically on activities at Georgetown University here in Washington, the second on Kent State University at Kent, Ohio.

This morning Dr. Robert I. White, president of Kent State, reiterated a point which has come up time and time again with regard to campus disorders.

Dr. White testified that the SDS made its initial attempt to disrupt the normal processes of the university on November 13, 1968. He commented:

After several days of propagandizing, they were successful in forming a pre-planned and much hoped for (i.e., on the part of S.D.S.) coalition with the Black United Students (B.U.S.). The focal point of their combined efforts was the disruption of an Oakland Police recruiting visit.

He continued:

While the recruiting activity was temporarily disrupted and while campus tensions were on the fringe of large scale disorder for several days, it should be noted that all stu-

dents desiring to be interviewed did so, that there were no serious outbreaks of violence, that there was no destruction of University property. After this initial confrontation, much to the credit of B.U.S., they proceeded without alliance and pursued their grievances in an orderly and constructive manner.

It was Dr. White's next sentence which has been the thread which showed up in the Georgetown hearing and again today in the Kent State hearing. His comment was:

Unfortunately, some aspects of the Oakland Police confrontation were distorted in the public press.

This concerns me a great deal for, as you know, one of the Nation's, indeed, the world's leading schools of journalism, that of the University of Missouri, is located at Columbia in my district. Just a few days ago, one of the eminent members of that faculty, Dr. John C. Merrill, whose recent book, *The Elite Press*, is getting international attention, chanced to speak at Marymount College in nearby Alexandria, Va.

He made this comment:

Minority and eccentric views and news get disproportionate coverage. I think what we have presently is a "reality" gap. The press' picture of what's going on is quite different from what's really going on.

Dr. Merrill continued:

It is quite natural that there is a credibility gap, and it is not all the government's fault. The press bears responsibility for much of it. The American people can't tell from the press what the majority of campus students and faculty are thinking and doing.

But we know every time an SDSer picks up a picket sign or sits outside a dean's office.

Much of what the press reports may be part of what's going on, but it gives the wrong emphasis or picture. It may be truth but is not the whole truth, or even an attempt at a balanced truth.

Dr. Merrill's comment bolsters what I have long contended—and I am glad to see the universities, especially my own alma mater, and our academic journalists speak up on the matter. One of the great needs of the press and the country is for a more balanced perspective in the reporting of campus violence.

Dr. Merrill believes the press presents a fragmented, crazy-quilt view of the world, playing up negative aspects. He says the mass media need not be trapped into using anything because it is "news." I could not agree with him more.

Dr. Merrill, billing his remarks to Marymount students under the title, "The Press and Social Upheaval," he judged that the press is being used by loud, active minority groups and is presenting the atypical to make it appear as the typical. He described it thus:

The press naturally tends to overstress the sensational, noisy, atypical, loud, colorful, unusual. This usually means the minority activities in society.

The press, he says, allows itself to be used by skilled propagandists, extremists, bigots, and revolutionaries—and it is the latter with which I, as chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, am

particularly concerned. Dr. Merrill explained:

These propagandists know the press feeds on sensation, the lurid and the irresponsible statement and act. They are playing the press like a master musician plays a piano.

The press' role in reporting upheavals, Dr. Merrill said, "was good quantitatively but not qualitatively." Correlative to this, he made this point:

News executives can always select—in effect they define news by what they select. If they don't use a story about 30 students sitting in front of a dean's office, in a sense it is not news.

He believes further—and I can only concur—that overplay of riots and demonstrations is contagious.

"Too much coverage of explosive but isolated incidents simply spreads them," he declared:

A TV program can make it look as if the entire student body and faculty are behind SDS, for instance, when actually there are perhaps only 100 out of 15,000.

There is no doubt in my mind that expectation of media coverage affects events. Some events are even called off when no news media are present.

He asserted that TV cameras are no more "objective" than newspaper or magazine reporters. He continued:

TV generally is far more dangerous to social stability than the press. It is more dramatic, more selective, more superficial, more stimulative, more action-filled. It is less complete, less interpretive, less fair. Television makes a pretty poor showing generally as a complete news medium. It's really an entertainment medium and is geared to that purpose.

Dr. Merrill said he was not exonerating newspapers:

They make a pretty poor showing, generally. They still are more interested in scoops, even when TV is sure to beat them. They still present an undigested, unsynthesized version of reality. They give snippets—bits and pieces—of news and views.

Dr. Merrill said minority extreme groups trying to destroy and disrupt society need to be put in proper perspective and exposed by mass media. He specifically mentioned SDS, which he referred to as Students for the Demolition of Society.

He asserted that the mass media currently are contributing to the social upheaval "by giving loud, atypical, dangerous persons TV and press space—thereby saying, in effect—

These are important people. Generally they are simply paranoid persons, would-be or actual authoritarians feeding off publicity and notoriety.

Professor Merrill also accused the mass media of helping to "create" a generation gap through playing up differences, of perpetuating an aura of suspense, promise of worse things to come, and by "legitimizing revolution as what is bound to happen."

Dr. Merrill concluded that social upheaval can be quite dangerous to the whole society unless channeled into non-violent, peaceful dialog, and democratic solutions.

"The mass media must concern themselves with consequences to society—and even to themselves—of the extreme elements," he said:

In these days of social upheaval, the mass media are not doing a good job in reporting or giving meaning to it all. They must do better or their days are numbered.

The mass media had better wake up before they create a monster that will tear apart our whole social fabric, including the mass media.

Dr. Merrill's warning is not one to be taken lightly. In light of the testimony and facts which have come before the Committee on Internal Security, in view of the tragic reports of campus disorders which have blotted the campuses across this country, I hope the mass media do wake up before this monster is created, or if it is already created, before it moves out to grasp our entire society within its maw.

There is one real ray of hope in all this. I understand Dr. Merrill was given an ovation by the students at Marymount College who heard him. This gives me great hope. I hope the other great schools of journalism throughout this country give Dr. Merrill's words and advice the attention they deserve.

RULES FOR REVOLUTION

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, paraphrasing Santayana we know that those who ignore the lessons of history are destined to relive its errors. A retired friend of mine forwarded the enclosure entitled "Rules for Revolution" as a reprint from "New World News" in February 1946. Along with his letter he stated in part:

The attached article "Rules for Revolution" was printed in February 1946. Perhaps the United States Supreme Court either does not accept these basic tactics or is revolutionary itself!

I strongly recommend that Members, and the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, review this and note the startling conclusion of the path we tread as we neglect history's lesson. I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

RULES FOR REVOLUTION

On a dark night in May, 1919, two lorries rumbled across a bridge and on into the town of Dusseldorf. Among the dozen rowdy, singing "Tommies" apparently headed for a gay evening were two representatives of the Allied military intelligence. These men had traced a wave of indiscipline, mutiny, and murder among the troops to the local headquarters of a revolutionary organization established in the town.

Pretending to be drunk, they brushed by the sentries and arrested the ringleaders—a group of 13 men and women seated at a long table.

In the course of the raid the Allied officers emptied the contents of the safe. One of the documents found in it contained a specific outline of "Rules for Bringing About a Revolution." It is reprinted here to show the strategy of materialistic revolution, and how personal attitudes and habits of living affect the affairs of nations:

"A. Corrupt the young. Get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex.

Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

"B. Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

"1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays, and other trivialities.

"2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

"3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding these latter up to ridicule, obloquy, and contempt.

"4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

"5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

"6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.

"7. By specious arguments cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged work, ruggedness.

"C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless."—From New World News, Feb. 1946.

FBI CITES RECORD ON KING WIRETAP

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, during recent months we have heard considerable controversy about reported Government wiretapping of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., with disputed versions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's authorization for such action. The record has now been set straight and a detailed accounting given of the events which preceded authorization by the Attorney General for the FBI action.

I place in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of June 19, setting forth specific details on authorization of the wiretap in question.

The Star article states these disclosures "climaxed a long smoldering controversy over the role of the FBI." The article should also serve to end the controversy and any further irresponsible reporting on the subject.

FBI Director Hoover has documented his account of the record and the record now speaks for itself.

The Star article follows:

KING WIRETAP CALLED R.F.K.'S IDEA—HOOVER ASSERTS MEMO TO FBI CITED CONCERN OVER MARXISM

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Wiretapping of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s telephone was proposed to the FBI by then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in June, 1963, and authorized by him in writing later that year, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told The Star today.

Hoover revealed the contents of two memorandums in one of which Kennedy expressed concern about possible infiltration of the race issue by Marxists and spoke of allegations that the Negro leader was closely associated with Marxist ideas and followers.

That memorandum to Hoover, dated June, 1963, was written by Courtney Evans, then assistant director of the FBI and liaison man with the Justice Department. It reported the substance of a conversation Evans had just had with Kennedy in which the Attorney General asked about the feasibility of installing electronic devices on King's telephones. King headed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

CONCERNED ABOUT ALLEGATIONS

Kennedy, according to the Evans memo, was concerned about reports that King was a student of Marxism, that he was associating with a New York attorney with known Communist connections, but that he did not openly espouse Marxism because of his religious beliefs. The Evans memorandum indicated Kennedy wanted to know if it was technically feasible to use electronic devices to prove or disprove these allegations.

The Evans memo said Evans replied to Kennedy that King was a man who traveled almost constantly and that it was extremely difficult to use wiretaps effectively in such cases.

Hoover told The Star that FBI officials also informed Kennedy at that time that they doubted the advisability of undertaking electronic surveillance of Dr. King because of possible political repercussions.

However, the second memorandum cited by Hoover shows that on October 7, 1963, the FBI chief reported to Kennedy that it was then technically feasible to apply wiretaps to King's telephones at two places, one of them at an unnamed location in New York.

That memorandum constituted the FBI's request for authority to proceed with the wiretap proposed by Kennedy four months before. The document bears in the lower left-hand corner the signature, "Robert F. Kennedy," and under the name the date "10-10-63."

Hoover did not indicate to The Star when the surveillance was started but said the taps were discontinued on April 30, 1965. At that time Nicholas Katzenbach was serving as Attorney General.

Asked about the results of the electronic surveillance today, Hoover declined comment.

The FBI director told The Star: "I have never authorized installation of technical electronic devices without written authority of the Attorney General."

Today's disclosures climaxed a long smoldering controversy over the role of the FBI, a subordinate bureau of the Justice Department, in using wiretaps or other electronic devices in investigative matters. The matter came to a head Sunday when Carl Rowan, a columnist for The Star, charged that the FBI had no authority to wiretap Dr. King's conversations. He quoted former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who succeeded Katzenbach, as saying "the implication that people thought Dr. King was a security threat is outrageous."

The Rowan charges prompted Associate FBI Director Clyde A. Tolson to write to Rowan early this week defending legality of the King wiretaps.

"For your information," Tolson said in his letter, "the wiretap on Martin Luther King, Jr., was specifically approved in advance in writing by the late attorney general of the United States, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy."

Tolson added that the monitoring device was "strictly in the field of internal security and therefore was within the provision laid down by the President of the United States."

Evans, now a Washington lawyer, was en route to Puerto Rico today and could not be reached for comment. However, Tuesday night Evans said he had no recollection of whether a wiretap authorization directed at King had ever been involved in his discussion with Kennedy.

Aides to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., said today he would have no comment on Hoover's disclosure.

Friends of Robert Kennedy had suggested in recent days that, during 1964, in the period after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the attorney general's interest in some of his official affairs had flagged. However, the assassination came nearly six weeks after Robert Kennedy signed the authorization for the King wiretap.

Hoover and Kennedy, after the latter became a New York senator, accused each other of being responsible for use of hidden microphones in investigations.

Evans figured in that controversy when Kennedy made public a February, 1966, letter to him from Evans which made the point that the use of hidden microphones was not Kennedy's responsibility but suggested he may have directly approved the use of wiretaps on phones. That letter said the FBI sent national security wiretap requests to Kennedy for approval.

It is reliably reported that Kennedy was reminded by the FBI that it still had in its files the authorizations signed by him as Attorney General for telephonic wiretaps. However, Hoover did not disclose at that time any names of persons under wiretap surveillance with Kennedy's approval.

At that stage, Kennedy and Hoover broke off the public exchange of charges as if by mutual consent. This was regarded partly as due to Kennedy's realization that his signed authorizations were still in FBI files, partly to the FBI's desire not to have special attention drawn to its investigative techniques nor to engage in a battle with the Kennedy forces that could have political overtones.

The Justice Department on Tuesday declined a direct answer when asked for documentation of Tolson's contention in his letter to Rowan. But earlier this month, a Justice Department spokesman said Hoover was "accurate in every respect" in his repeated statements that all wiretaps were being authorized in advance and in writing by the Attorney General during the timespan of the controversy.

A Justice department spokesman, asked today if Attorney General John N. Mitchell had given Hoover permission to discuss the contents of secret documents of the King wiretapping, replied simply, "no comment."

However, the spokesman recalled that the attorney general had declined to authorize disclosures in court of the basic authority for the wiretapping. Such disclosures had been demanded by defense lawyers in the Houston draft evasion hearing for former boxing champion Cassius Clay. It was during that hearing that the King wiretapping was officially revealed for the first time.

FLIGHT

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 11, I had the privilege of participating in ceremonies at the University of North Carolina Morehead Planetarium. The planetarium, which has previously distinguished itself as the site of U.S. astronaut training in celestial navigation under the able direction of Mr. A. F. Jenzano, was the site of an extraordinary sight and sound show entitled "Flight." This mixed-media blend of creativity and technical ability presents the evolution of man's intrigue with flying and his experiences in achieving contact with the outer atmosphere.

Under the brilliant direction of Capt. Normal D. Sauvage, U.S. Air Force, a

university staff of 18, through the cooperation of approximately 50 companies, individuals, departments, and foundations, used slides, movie film clips, live TV, narration, music, and live dancers to take the audience through a 1 hour, smartly paced, smooth running, substantive, sensitive, historical experience. His artistic prowess was shown throughout the production in his imaginative and effective treatment of contrasting media.

The show will not be limited to the Fourth District. It has been graciously invited to Vienna, Austria, for the Third International Planetarium Director's Conference for a July 11 performance.

Lt. Gov. H. Patrick Taylor, Jr., served as honorary chairman of "Flight," which is dedicated to the memory of Mrs. Estes Kefauver, the great and gallant lady who as the first Adviser on Fine Arts for the U.S. Department of State, implemented and directed the art in the Embassies program which brought new dignity and dimension to American visual arts, especially as an important factor in international relations.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ANTI-ABM PETITION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, an event of significance occurred Friday, June 6, when members of the Federal Employees for a Democratic Society presented Congress with a petition signed by 1,731 Federal employees opposed to the anti-ballistic-missile system.

Five Congressmen and two representatives of other Congressmen received the petitions and joined in praise of the courage of the employees signing the petition and in support of their position.

It took great courage for Federal employees to take such a stand, but Federal employees do not lose their rights of citizenship, including the right to petition, by becoming Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the statement of the petitioning Federal employees for inclusion in the RECORD as follows:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ANTI-ABM PETITION

Traditionally federal employees have been a conspicuously silent group. Many believe it to be inappropriate to speak out on politically sensitive issues, in view of their official positions. Others recall the McCarthy era and live in fear of jeopardizing their jobs or their next promotion. I am here this morning to tell you that this timidity must come to an end and is coming to an end.

Federal Employees for a Democratic Society (FEDS), in its efforts against the Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM), directly represents approximately 2,000 federal employees who have, thus far, signed the FEDS sponsored petition to Congress opposing the deployment of the ABM. The petition states: There is no convincing evidence that the ABM system will reduce the threat of nuclear destruction; instead, its construction may well accelerate the nuclear arms race, making eventual disarmament impossible. The Administration has failed to rebut the considerable body of evidence developed

within the scientific community indicating that this system is of doubtful reliability and utility and is not necessary to defend the United States from nuclear attack. There is a danger that the military-industrial complex is urging deployment of the ABM system to serve its own interests rather than the national welfare. This is the type of danger against which President Eisenhower warned.

We call upon Congress to begin to shift the nation's resources from the machinery of war to the solution of complex domestic social problems. We believe that poverty, hunger, racial tension, crime and environmental pollution are the most serious and immediate threats to our national security.

As the petition indicates, FEDS efforts on this issue transcend the goal of just defeating the ABM. We are asking for a thorough re-structuring of our national budget to meet the needs of a rapidly deteriorating American society. The ABM is an outstanding symbol of the kinds of decisions this nation is faced with. There are an estimated 22 million Americans living in poverty, about 10 million of these are suffering from malnutrition. The drop-out rate in our public schools system is 28 percent, and in many of our urban areas the rate approaches 50 percent. Our higher education system is facing possible total destruction, mainly because it considers the needs of the military-industrial complex while ignoring the educational needs of our youth. Air pollution is reaching lethal quantities because having clean air conflicts with the profit motive. The nation's Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and Indians continue to be treated as second class citizens.

These are only a few of the major domestic problems facing us today, but they alone pose a greater threat to our national security than all our real or potential foreign enemies. For the past 20 years we have been committed to military overkill, which has squandered an intolerable portion of our human and economic resources. We must now make the commitment to build a better society for all, not a stronger military.

We believe that defeating the ABM could mean the beginning of a realization that a spiraling nuclear arms race can benefit no one; the beginning of a realization that serious domestic ills must be given the highest priority.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John M. Yancey, professor of psychology at Elizabethtown College in my congressional district, was interviewed concerning the poverty program by our evening newspaper, the Lancaster New Era. I feel some of his comments are worthy of being placed in the RECORD and shared with others. Excerpts from the newspaper article follow:

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

The war on poverty is failing because it gives financial rewards to people who spurn ambition, and it penalizes ambitious people who try to better their lot in life.

This is one of the views of John M. Yancey, professor of psychology at Elizabethtown College and coauthor of the controversial *Poverty in the Garden Spot* report that was published in 1966.

"The war on poverty needs to be reversed," Professor Yancey says. "Both nationally and locally, it should be revised to reward those

who make a genuine effort to improve themselves and to adopt the values of the people who are taxed to pay for poverty programs.

"For those who refuse to hold jobs or who resist efforts at self-improvement, the anti-poverty program should include a penalty system," he said.

Yancey is convinced that the majority of the poor in Lancaster County could do better—except that they don't know how to go about it; that existing welfare systems are set up so as to discourage them from going about it as they must.

The key to continuing failure of the war on poverty at federal, state, and local levels, Professor Yancey believes, lies in the segregation of society into the poor and the affluent.

"There are some middle class who are poor," he observed, "and there are some lower class who are not poor."

"It is not a problem of economics. It is that the lower class is different. They have different attitudes on how our world should operate," he continued.

"We are trying to solve this class problem by giving the lower class money. Rather we should tell them that if we give them money they first should learn how to save money. They should learn to change their attitudes and values," Yancey said.

Yancey complains that poverty programs today are based on need, not on behavior.

"I think middle class people would be willing to support programs more than in the past," Yancey said, "If they could see the results they want to see. I think business and industry want to see behavior changing and I think they would support programs to a far greater degree than now if they could see the changes."

"People seem to have no understanding of how our resources are developed; how we get food to eat; how we get houses built."

"Someone has to work," he went on.

"It is not all in Washington where Congress can open a storehouse and put it in a truck and deliver it."

"In OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity and Community Action Program), Social Security, Medicare and the many charitable agencies," Yancey said, "I don't see anything that pretends to say to people that they will get help only so long as they start behaving the way I want them to behave."

"All of the welfare programs," Yancey says, "have shaped people in patterns of dependency. Now is the time to try to shape these people in the pattern of the good old get up and go. . . . Shape them this way until they get out of poverty then cut it off."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 486

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution by the city of Gardena, Calif., urging the creation of a Presidential commission between the United States and Mexico to help control the flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs between our two countries.

This resolution asks the President to set up a joint commission with the Mexican Government as Congressman DICK HANNA and I proposed in House Joint Resolution 486.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and that of many people in California that President Nixon will take the necessary steps to

set up such a commission. This is especially important because all of the evidence indicates that use of narcotics is now increasing throughout the country. Recent notice has been given to estimates that perhaps as high as 35 percent of students in our college campuses on occasion used marihuana.

I am including in the RECORD a copy of the resolution by the city of Gardena and a copy of the bill we have introduced:

RESOLUTION OF GARDENA, CALIF., CITY COUNCIL

Whereas, the continuing increase in the use of narcotics and dangerous drugs by the minors in our country not only constitutes a major problem to society, but presents an extreme danger to the user, as well; and

Whereas, it is believed that the most effective way to stop the illicit traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs into our communities is to cut off the supply at its source, and that there should be established a joint presidential commission between the United States and Mexico to undertake an action program to control the flow of narcotics between the two countries; and

Whereas, on the 24th day of April, 1969, the South Bay Councilmen's Association passed and adopted its Resolution No. 10, recommending and urging the creation of a commission to control the flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the City Council of the City of Gardena, California, does hereby endorse said resolution of the South Bay Councilmen's Association and urge the creation of such a commission in an effort to halt the illicit flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs between the two countries; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of State William P. Rogers; to Attorney General John N. Mitchell; to Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch; to United States Senators Alan Cranston and George Murphy; to Congressman Glenn M. Anderson; and to the member cities of the South Bay Councilmen's Association.

Attest:

RUTH F. MORGAN,
Deputy City Clerk of the City of
Gardena, Calif.

H.J. RES. 486

Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico

Whereas Mexico is the primary source of supply for narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs brought into the southwestern part of the United States; and

Whereas these narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs are subsequently distributed throughout the United States; and

Whereas 100 per centum of the marihuana seized by the enforcement officials in the southwestern part of the United States comes from Mexico; and

Whereas the smuggling of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs into the United States poses the largest single problem for collectors of the customs and for the Federal courts in the southwestern part of the United States; and

Whereas the use of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs by juveniles has greatly increased due to the easy accessibility of such drugs from Mexico; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President

is requested to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between said countries.

SUNSET ECLIPSES DDT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, *Sunset* magazine, a fine Western publication, this week took another responsible step in the public interest by banning advertising for DDT and five other insecticides which hold their potency for years.

The magazine also plans a major article telling consumers of safer substitutes and it will revise its garden books to bring them in line with new findings.

Sunset is to be commended for these actions. All of us everywhere seem to be acquiring DDT in our systems as it and similar products work themselves to every part of the globe. There are those who argue that it hasn't been proven that accumulation of DDT is bad for us. But I have yet to hear of some responsible study showing it is good for us. If I have my "druthers" when I dine I will skip the DDT, thank you.

Following is the text of the *Sunset* announcement:

SUNSET MAGAZINE MOVES AGAINST DDT AND FIVE OTHER INSECTICIDES

MENLO PARK, CALIF.—*Sunset* Magazine announced this week an immediate ban on accepting advertising for products containing DDT and five other insecticides, and is revising all of its *Sunset* gardening books to recommend substitute products, according to Lane Magazine & Book Company president, L. W. (Bill) Lane, Jr.

The move came after a continuing concern and a six-month intensive study convinced the magazine's gardening staff and management that damage to wildlife and the eventual possibility of harm to humans is far too great to offset the product advantages for use in home gardens.

The announcement is especially significant in view of the fact that *Sunset* currently carries more insecticide and pest-control advertising than any other non-farm magazine in the country.

Lane also announced that the magazine will publish a comprehensive report on the subject in its August issue, listing 19 acceptable substitute products for use around the home and recommended methods for getting rid of present supplies of the insecticides. He emphasized that many of the substitute products have been included in recent and all current printings of *Sunset* publications. The magazine's ban on product advertising goes into effect with the same August issue, which is the first issue going to press following the announcement.

Sunset's garden editor Joseph F. Williamson said that research and checking with all responsible authorities convinces him that the new restrictions imposed by the California Department of Agriculture are a step in the right direction, but that more controls are needed.

Sunset's decision not to accept advertising precedes the January 1, 1970, ban ordered by the State of California directive on only two insecticides—DDT and DDD.

Three other states—Arizona, Wisconsin, and Michigan—have passed or proposed legislation to control the use of DDT and related chemicals.

The *Sunset* article will also recommend that four other insecticides immediately be taken off the market for home gardening—aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, and toxaphene. They are also included in the ingredients not acceptable for *Sunset* advertising. Williamson explains that the major problem with these stems from what scientists call "nondegradability." Other kinds of insecticides "break down" or change into harmless substances within hours or days after application. These retain their chemical potency, wherever nature may take them, for years after application.

Williamson reports that manufacturers are actively cooperating in the drive to market substitute products that offer the benefits of insect control without the hazards of DDT and its related compounds. Some have voluntarily eliminated DDT products from their lines. Nevertheless, according to a *Sunset* survey of retail outlets, it still is currently contained in 35 products in the Western garden supply market.

Scientists report that certain forms of wildlife (California brown pelicans, peregrine falcons, bald eagles, and Dungeness crabs, to name a few) have taken enough DDT into their systems to make many adults no longer capable of reproducing, thus threatening their species with extinction.

Lane noted that not accepting certain categories of advertising is not new to *Sunset*. The publication, with a circulation of close to one million in Western America, has a long list of products that it does not accept in its advertising pages. "In the case of tobacco and hard liquor, we dropped advertising of such products 25 years ago," Lane said, "not because we set ourselves up as crusaders, but because we felt they didn't fit in the atmosphere of our family-oriented magazine. But in the case of insecticides, our readers expect us to be authorities; we can't very well accept advertising for products we would not endorse or recommend in our editorial pages."

In addition to publishing *Sunset* Magazine, the company is a major book publisher. Melvin B. Lane, publisher of *Sunset* Books, reports that revisions already are being made on all of the firm's garden books to conform with the new findings on insecticides. New printings are underway and will be completed by Fall. The company publishes nearly a half million garden books a year. Sales of its top seller, *The Western Garden Book*, have exceeded 1.3 million copies since first published.

EXCERPTS FROM FLAG DAY ADDRESS, MACARTHUR MEMORIAL, NORFOLK, VA., JUNE 14, 1969, BY ALF J. MAPP, JR.

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 14, 1969, I had the opportunity to participate in Flag Day ceremonies at the Douglas MacArthur Memorial in Norfolk, Va. At that time, I was much moved by remarks made by Prof. Alf J. Mapp, Jr., who is on the faculty at Old Dominion College. Mr. Mapp emphasized the great danger in America of the diversity that is alienating us one from another. His comments seemed so pertinent that I would like to place them in the RECORD for the benefit of all Mem-

bers and those who read this journal. Mr. Mapp's message deserves the attention of all of us. It follows:

EXCERPTS FROM FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY PROF. ALF J. MAPP, JR.

If the flag to which we pay tribute today is to remain the symbol of a vital and virile force among the nations, we must see that our historic source of strength does not become our fatal weakness. We have often gloried in the rich variety of cultures that have contributed to our land and have boasted of the diversity that has made us strong. And properly so! But this diversity is now threatened by a paradox. We Americans are great organizers and we have turned our genius for organization to the task of organizing our diversity. One of the great blessings of diversity has been the climate that it afforded for individualism. But individualism is now assailed by organized diversity. The individual is beset with appeals to think and act in conformity with a majority of his ethnic group, or economic group, or occupational group, or else be branded a traitor to his class.

This same tendency to line people up under a banner of narrow dedication is evident even in the realm of political ideology. We are no longer building a diversified nation where the attributes of one group complement another; we are in danger of fragmentizing the nation into groups spending their strength in savage in-fighting. Too many people have abdicated the power of individual decision in exchange for comfortable surrender to doctrinaire liberalism or doctrinaire conservatism. They never have the painful task of deciding a vital question on its merits. Having uncompromisingly labeled themselves, they know at once how to label everything else. In many cases they belong to organizations prepared to tell them how they—as good conservatives—should think about every issue that confronts them as citizens. On acquiring a life membership a man might almost as well give his proxy on the great questions of his lifetime. On those questions where the lines between conservatism and liberalism might be blurred even in the eyes of the most doctrinaire, the reliable computer might be called into service to determine where a man's allegiance lies.

An organization notifies its members that a legislator voted "wrong" 80% of the time. Another organization notifies its members that the same man voted "right" 75% of the time. The "rightness" or "wrongness," of course, depends upon the extent of conformity to the program of the group issuing the statement. The man who is concerned only with the estimate of the group to which he belongs has his decision made for him and also enjoys the comforting assurance of being "right."

Space age survival requires spacious thinking. There is no safety in scurrying retreat into the narrow warrens of organized conformity. If Americans do not reassert their right to think as individuals, the stripes in that flag in which we glory today will represent a stratification destructive of national unity. But if we have the courage and the energy to reassert our hard-won privilege of decision making, the starry blue firmament that also adorns it will proclaim before the whole world the measure of our aspirations for ourselves and for all mankind.

UPDATING OUR FISHING FLEET

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation which would

amend the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act. This legislation will offer fishermen a 50-percent Government subsidy for the purchase of any American-made fishing vessel. In addition, it will authorize low interest loans for the remainder of the purchase price. A further aspect is an authorization for the administration to accept as trade-in, existing vessels used by the American fishing industry with the requirement that these vessels not be allowed to compete with the new vessels in the fishing industry.

Our fishing fleet is in dire need of updating and without this subsidy American fishermen are unable to replace their out-of-date vessels with modern equipment.

Mr. Speaker, we must update our fishing fleet and I propose this legislation as a vehicle for this modernization.

OBSCENE TELEPHONE CALLS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed an advertisement which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues regarding obscene telephone calls.

General Telephone & Electronics points out in its ad that they have worked and developed a system so that a person who is harassed by obscene telephone calls can take steps which might lead to the capture of the caller.

I would like to commend General Telephone & Electronics for the work they are doing in the field. I think this is one important way industry can and is helping to aid in enforcing the law which we passed last year.

At this time I would like to include in the RECORD the text of the advertisement:

A WARNING TO PEOPLE WHO MAKE OBSCENE PHONE CALLS

You're sick. Not clever, but sick.

Because the calls you make aren't jokes. They're crimes. By local law and now, by Federal law.

Congress has just recently passed a bill that can fine you and send you to prison for 6 months if you're caught and convicted.

And you will be. Because now the odds are on our side, not yours.

We can say that because as General Telephone—the second largest telephone operating company in the country—we know what's being done about you.

Although we don't have it throughout our entire system yet, today's special telephone equipment can not only trace back and identify your phone from the receiving party's end; it can also identify any number you call from your end.

And don't think you can beat it by keeping your call short, either.

Because it can also prevent you from disconnecting. As long as the party you call doesn't hang up, the line will remain open. No matter what you do.

And while they keep the line open, they can make another call. To us.

Then there's the work being done on the voice print—an electronic picture of the human voice.

If yours is taken, it's as good as getting your fingerprints. That's how distinctive your voice is. No matter how good you are at disguising it.

And if all that isn't enough to stop you, remember this the next time you get the urge to call:

We haven't told you everything.
GENERAL TELEPHONE & ELECTRONICS.

MIRV SEEN ADDING TO MAD MOMENTUM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary contentions of those of us who have expressed concern over the development by the United States and the Soviet Union of a new generation of weapons systems characterized by the use of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles—MIRV—is that testing of these weapons might jeopardize planned United States-Soviet arms control talks. The Communist party newspaper, Pravda, and the Soviet foreign affairs monthly, Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn, have recently published Soviet reactions to the Nixon administration's missile program, making specific reference to the development of MIRV. A report from the New York Times summarizing these Soviet statements follows.

In addition, a most interesting analysis by Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern of the growing debate over MIRV testing by the United States appeared in the June 22 edition of the Washington Post. I feel certain that the Members of the Congress and many readers of the RECORD will find this analysis enlightening.

Finally, the New York Times has recently published two thought-provoking editorials on the question of MIRV testing which also appear below:

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1969]
PRAVDA VOICES SOVIET DISPLEASURE WITH UNITED STATES OVER MISSILE POLICIES AND DELAYS ON ARMS-CONTROL TALKS

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Moscow, June 10.—The Communist party newspaper Pravda today underlined Soviet displeasure with the Nixon Administration's missile program and its delay in beginning strategic arms-control talks with the Soviet Union.

An article by Boris G. Strelnikov, the newspaper's Washington correspondent, was the latest in a number of Soviet commentaries indicating dissatisfaction with the apparent desire of the United States to proceed with new defensive and offensive missile systems, and with the failure to set a date for the start of arms-control talks.

A commentary in the current issue of Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn, a foreign affairs monthly, said that development of the Safeguard antimissile system the MIRV offensive system could only complicate future Soviet-American negotiations.

MIRV is the acronym for multiple, independently targetable re-entry vehicle.

"The development of these defensive and offensive systems would lead to a qualitative new step in the nuclear arms race and would add billions to the already large and burdensome military expenditures," the commentary said.

"It would open the way to further aggravation of international tensions, first of all in the mutual relations between the two most powerful world powers, the United States and the Soviet Union," it added.

"It would strengthen the mutual distrust between states and would make more complicated the already difficult negotiations on disarmament," the commentary continued. "The destructive force of nuclear rockets would be raised to an unparalleled level."

The Pravda article, apparently reflecting current Soviet thinking, said the Nixon Administration seems to believe that development of new arms systems would be "a trump card" for future negotiations with the Soviet Union.

"In other words, some in the United States would like to start the dialogue from a position of strength," Mr. Strelnikov said, "If this Pentagon thesis, which is incompatible with improving Soviet-American relations would be approved, it would be a great miscalculation for the United States," he added.

"Practice has shown long ago that any attempts to negotiate with the Soviet Union from a position of strength would doom the talks to failure in advance," Mr. Strelnikov said.

Most Western diplomats here believe that Moscow decided last year to go ahead with arms-control talks with the United States on the assumption that a rough balance of power existed between the two nations.

The Soviet Union now appears to be saying that if the United States begins preparations for large-scale deployment of new weapon systems, this could upset the balance of forces.

So far, the comments in the Soviet press have not ruled out the start of negotiations, but the delay by the United States on deciding on a time for the talks has been criticized.

Pravda said that the United States "has still not taken any practical steps" to begin the talks, which were to have begun last fall. They were postponed in the tense period following the invasion of Czechoslovakia by five Warsaw Pact nations led by the Soviet Union.

"At first it was said in Washington that the United States would be ready to enter into negotiations this spring," said Pravda. "Then they began to talk about the summer and now about the fall."

The article took no notice of a statement last week by Secretary of State William P. Rogers that he still believed the talks would start this summer.

There has been an effort among Russians, expressed privately by diplomats and publicly by the press, to disabuse the United States of the thought that Moscow feels itself under pressure to begin arms-control talks.

Some observers have argued that the Soviet Union wants arms reductions to be able to allocate additional resources to its civilian economy. The Pravda article rejected this viewpoint.

It said that Washington was making "a miscalculation" if it thought that the Soviet Union was more interested than the United States in starting negotiations. It said that some Americans, believing this "miscalculation," were talking about the forthcoming talks as "a sort of market where the American side will check the price for any agreement."

Pravda criticized Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, saying he was carrying out "anti-Soviet propaganda in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 22, 1969]

MIRV SEEN ADDING TO "MAD MOMENTUM"

(By Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern)

In the euphemistic phrasing of the war business, the new gadget is called a "bus." Its passengers are little warheads that could be dropped off "with a very nice area effect," as the Pentagon puts it, at such places in the Soviet Union as Minsk and Tomsk.

The official acronym is "MIRV" (as in Mervin). The letters stand for "multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle." They are rapidly replacing "ABM" as the symbolic focus of the arms control debate in the United States.

To many scientists and politicians, MIRV is the newest and most deadly accelerator of "the mad momentum of nuclear armaments." It insures, Sen. John Sherman Cooper told the Senate last week, that the United States and the Soviet Union can, in a single stroke, "multiply the number of deliverable nuclear warheads in the world by a factor of 3 to 10."

To the managers of the Pentagon, MIRV offers one of the best hopes for slowing down the arms race. It is, in their view, a trump card in the forthcoming arms negotiations with the Soviet Union. If the Soviets agree to abandon efforts to defend their cities against American missiles, then the United States could agree, the Defense Department suggests, to abandon or limit the deployment of MIRV.

President Nixon hinted as much Thursday when he said he is willing to talk with the Russians about a MIRV moratorium.

Actually the first indication of the Administration's negotiating flexibility on MIRV came nearly three months ago in a little-noticed exchange between Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard and Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.).

Gore asked: "Do you have any doubt that it is our intention to replace the Polaris with the Poseidon?"

Packard's response was: "It is our intention, Mr. Chairman, unless we conclude some agreements that would dictate otherwise."

Pentagon officials have some suggestions as to the general terms of such an agreement.

"If they tell us they are not going to defend their cities," said one spokesman, "we'll lose a lot of interest in MIRV. Since its purpose is to penetrate Russian cities' defenses, MIRV is negotiable."

Authoritative officials speak of a formula under which both sides would freeze the number of offensive missile sites and move into "thin" antiballistic missile systems. "That would, in effect, be disarmament," in the view of one Pentagon expert.

A more modest step, as some see it, would be a mere mutual freeze on the number of delivery vehicles, or buses. "If they freeze their delivery vehicles they can MIRV up to the kazoo and they would have no first strike," an official said.

This means however, that each side would have to make the worst assumptions about how much megatonnage lies in the silos of the prospective enemy.

It could still be a prescription for further arms stockpiling by both the Soviet Union and United States.

As with all of the scenarios on nuclear war and its probabilities, MIRV has created deep divisions in both the scientific and political communities in the United States. It suggests to some that American war planners are seeking a "first-strike" capability against the Soviet Union. It suggests to others that the Defense Department is a sucker for gadgets, that it will buy any new weapon that comes along, irrespective of need. It suggests to still others that the Nixon Administration is not serious about arms control.

The view from the Pentagon on these issues is both reassuring and confusing. It is based on the promise that security is, in effect, found in insecurity, that the best hedge against a nuclear war is, in Robert McNamara's words, "the certainty of suicide to the aggressor." That is what is meant by the "balance of terror."

That balance, the Pentagon maintains, could be upset by the United States in only two ways—an infallible system of defense (ABM) protecting the country from

"suicide" or an infallible system of offense to destroy virtually all Soviet weapons in a sneak attack.

MIRV has been called, by its critics, the forerunner to that kind of "first-strike" offensive system. But the Defense Department rejects the argument.

The main reason offered is that MIRV's warheads are too small and too inaccurate for use against Russian missile silos. The MIRV "bus" to be installed on the new Minuteman III missile, according to Defense officials, will carry from two to three 200-kiloton warheads. The "bus" on the new Poseidon submarine missile will carry up to 15 warheads of about 50 kilotons each (the Hiroshima bomb was 20 kilotons).

In order for a 200-kiloton warhead to have a 70 per cent chance of knocking out a silo, it would have to land no farther than 200 yards away; a 50-kiloton warhead would have to land no more than 140 yards away.

This kind of accuracy, says the Pentagon, is not possible today nor in the foreseeable future; the best that can be done now is to guide a warhead to within about 440 yards of its target.

That is close enough to kill a target—a silo, for example—when large weapons are used, such as the 1-megaton warheads currently installed in Minuteman and Polaris. But it is too far away for smaller warheads to be effective.

Thus, MIRV's only present usefulness, its promoters insist, would be against "soft" targets such as cities.

There is general, although not unanimous, agreement in the scientific community that this description of MIRV's limitations is essentially correct.

But the Pentagon itself has cast doubt on this presumption by the conflicting statements it has issued. Although it now insists that MIRV is ineffective against silos, it took precisely the opposite view in January, 1968 when it put out a statement saying that "each new MIRV warhead will be aimed individually and will be far more accurate than any previous or existing warhead. They will be far better suited for destruction of hardened enemy missile sites than any existing missile warheads."

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird implied the same thing when he told Congress in March of this year that he planned to spend \$12.5 million to improve the Poseidon guidance system and thereby make it more effective against "hardened" targets, meaning missile silos.

Statements of this kind have alarmed many scientists, such as Wolfgang Panofsky, the Stanford physicist who was a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1959 to 1964 and chairman of its panel on defense.

"They (such statements) are essentially threatening to the Soviets," Panofsky said, "and are technically wrong . . . From Laird's statement the Russians could not help but draw the worst possible judgment (about MIRV) . . . My own view is that this generation of MIRV is not a first-strike threat to the Russians. The verbiage that has gone with it is more of a threat than the technical side."

The "technical side," however, continues to bother MIRV critics such as Dr. Leonard Rodburg, a physicist at the University of Maryland. There may be, Rodburg says, limitations on MIRV's accuracy today. But there is no scientific barrier to far greater accuracy in the relatively near future, he believes. The work of such guidance experts as Dr. Charles Draper of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology may make it possible fairly soon to put a small MIRV warhead almost "on the silo door," Rodburg says. "With that kind of accuracy," he said, "you could destroy a silo with a satchel charge."

Whatever the implications of the Pentagon's conflicting descriptions of MIRV's mis-

sion, the present policy is to stress the limitations of the weapon. Dr. Roland Herbst, the Defense Department's deputy director of research, said last week that pinpoint accuracy for MIRV may be achieved "at some time in the future" but it is "not in the neighborhood at this moment."

Military pressure to develop MIRV began as early as 1962. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara at first said "no" to the new weapon. His reasoning was that the United States could already kill as many targets as it wanted to without going into MIRV deployment.

But at that time there were also military intelligence readings that the Russians were building an ABM system around Moscow. It turned out afterwards that what intelligence originally proclaimed to be ABM defenses were actually anti-aircraft installations to guard against advanced American bombers that McNamara never deployed.

The Pentagon debated two alternatives to the Soviet ABM. One was the use of penetration aids such as chaff and decoys for offensive missiles. The second was MIRV.

The first course was dropped on grounds that effective radar could distinguish incoming warheads from decoys and shoot them down—an argument that, ironically, opponents of the U.S. ABM used and Pentagon scientists dismissed. MIRV proved highly attractive to the military.

It promised a capability to hit more targets without violating McNamara's self-imposed freeze on the number of delivery vehicles. "MIRV was the best route to numbers," was one Pentagon spokesman's way of putting it.

And so, in an atmosphere of supersecrecy, the Defense Department began developing MIRV. No one mentioned the awesome acronym publicly until 1965 when a Pentagon official made reference to it at a press background session.

Pentagon newsmen were so astonished at the disclosure that they went back to their briefer and asked if he had really intended to let MIRV out of the bag. Everyone agreed to delete the reference to the new weapon system.

It was almost two more years before MIRV surfaced publicly. But it was overshadowed in the strategic weapons debate by the ABM.

MIRV's development as a "city-busting" weapon is now continuing on a schedule that calls for the first warheads to be installed on two nuclear submarines in January, 1971. If the development is carried out as planned it will cost, according to present estimates, about \$17 billion—\$7 billion for Poseidon, \$10 billion for Minuteman III.

At present there are no clear answers to where the Russians stand on MIRV development. Last fall they tested the SS-9 missile with three huge warheads—presumably five megatons each. Whether these were guided war heads or simply gravity bombs, such as the Polaris A-3 missile has carried since 1962, is uncertain.

But no expert disputes the possibility that the Russians could quickly bring their MIRV technology abreast of the United States.

If both sides then proceeded to full-scale MIRV programs, their nuclear arsenals would increase enormously. The United States today possesses approximately 2350 strategic warheads, as against about 1100 for the Soviet Union. By MIRVing, the American arsenal could be raised to 8766 warheads with no increase in the number of delivery vehicles; the Russian arsenal could be raised to 5150.

This prospect is not disturbing to the Pentagon at the present time. The military reasoning is that both sides still would be left without a first-strike capability.

Disarmament proponents are less sanguine. They see MIRV's development as simply another useless step in the "mad mo-

mentum" of the arms race, a step that, if nothing else, would divert billions needlessly to weapons that neither side requires.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1969]
MORATORIUM ON MIRV

The biggest challenge that confronts the National Security Council in its discussion this week and next of negotiating tactics for the impending Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks is to find a way to get the Soviet Union to call off its test program for multiple warheads (MIRVs).

But Mr. Kosygin, like Mr. Nixon, obviously is not a "unilateral disarmar." One way to entice Mr. Kosygin into a MIRV test suspension would be to offer to suspend American MIRV tests—or even actually to suspend them with the announcement that they would not be resumed so long as the Soviet Union refrained from testing its multiple warheads.

This is precisely what a bipartisan group in the Congress has proposed in resolutions introduced on their behalf by Representative Jonathan Bingham, Democrat of New York, and Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican of New Jersey. The Administration has thus far failed to respond.

Instead, American MIRV tests continue. Secretary Rogers insisted last week that the tests would not injure chances for agreement with Moscow on missile curbs. But, when pressed on this by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he conceded that it would raise "new problems of inspection." Once MIRV is deployed, it could be subjected to arms control only if there is a degree of on-site inspection that the United States itself would have difficulty accepting, not to mention the Soviet Union.

The irony is that Soviet MIRVs, fitted atop the big SS-9 missile, could become a threat to the American deterrent. Each SS-9 could carry three five-megaton warheads, each of which, with an accuracy of a quarter of a mile, could destroy a Minuteman silo. But the first generation of American MIRVs, fitted atop Poseidon and Minuteman III missiles, would be too small with present accuracies to be used against underground Soviet missiles.

The United States already has enough offensive missiles to absorb a Soviet first strike and, in retaliating, to destroy the Soviet Union many times over. Yet it is preparing to increase its number of anticity missiles with MIRV, presumably to saturate a heavy Soviet antiballistic missile system which Moscow no longer is deploying. In so doing, it is encouraging the Soviet Union to deploy MIRVs that constitute a counterforce threat.

The madness of the missile race stands forth clearly in these facts. The Administration evidently is too much the prisoner of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to take the essential step of seeking a MIRV test moratorium. Early Congressional passage of the Bingham and Case resolutions would appear to be the only way to stimulate this vital step.

[From the New York Times]

MR. NIXON AND MIRV

No decision Richard Nixon will face as President is likely to be more momentous than the decision he faces within the next few days on the proposal to suspend the flight-testing of MIRV multiple-warhead missiles. Mr. Nixon yesterday described this proposal as "constructive" and said he would favor it if the Soviet Union would agree to do the same. But his attack on a "unilateral" suspension (of tests only the United States is now conducting) and his statement that this move must be part of an arms control agreement (which may take years to negotiate) confuse the issue.

Immediate suspension of MIRV tests is essential to keep the door open for a strategic arms agreement with the Soviet Union that

would freeze the existing nuclear balance, head off further escalation of the missile race and assure security to both sides. Continued testing for even a few more weeks threatens to take the world past a point of no return into an expensive and dangerous new round in the missile race. It promises a five-fold multiplication of nuclear delivery vehicles in the American strategic missile forces—from 1,700 to about 8,000, an expansion that the Soviet Union would doubtless match. Even if limits on Soviet and American missile strength were later to be set at these higher levels, an era of nuclear nervousness would be almost sure to replace the present situation of stable mutual deterrence.

The bipartisan resolution introduced this week by Senator Brooke of Massachusetts and 40 other Senators urging the President to seek an immediate moratorium with the Soviet Union indicates a growing realization in Congress that MIRV testing is now the main governor on the arms race. It is more urgent than the issues that have dominated the missile debate in recent months, such as the Safeguard antiballistic missile (ABM) system, or the Soviet offensive SS-9 missiles and defensive ABM deployments.

These systems can be fully discussed in the approaching strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union. They take years to build and there is time to negotiate cut-offs long before their expansion will significantly affect the nuclear balance. Moreover, they can be monitored easily by reconnaissance satellite without on-site inspection. MIRV is a wholly different matter.

The United States already has staged fourteen full-systems flight tests of silo-based Minuteman III and submarine-launched Poseidon missiles carrying from three to twelve MIRV warheads. The first two of 31 Polaris submarines to be refitted at great expense for the big, MIRV-tipped Poseidon missiles already had gone into drydock for that purpose.

The Johnson Administration proceeded on schedule with MIRV flight-tests last August after advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff that two years would be required to test to operational confidence. Within two months, it was thought, missile talks with the Soviet Union would be under way to halt MIRV and other aspects of the arms race. But the Soviet-American talks were delayed three months by Czechoslovakia, then another seven months so far by the determination of the Nixon Administration to re-examine the strategic balance and the American negotiating position at leisure.

Meanwhile, the American MIRV tests have moved much faster than the Pentagon originally indicated and operational confidence may now be reached in a matter of weeks, if the tests continue—a year ahead of schedule. Continuation of the testing this summer thus threatens to carry the world irrevocably into the MIRV era. MIRV can only be headed off in the test stage, since tests can be detected with relative assurance. Once deployed, MIRV can only be detected by on-site inspection more intrusive than even the United States, not to mention the Soviet Union, would be likely to accept. Satellite cameras cannot tell whether a missile is carrying one or ten warheads.

The American national interest lies overwhelmingly in heading off Soviet MIRV tests before they begin or, at least, before they get very far. The best way to achieve that would be suspension of American tests so long as the Soviet Union refrains from testing as well. An alternative would be an immediate approach to Moscow for a jointly announced test moratorium now. Postponement of this approach until the overall strategic arms talks begin in August—or, even worse, until agreement is reached there—would risk the true security interests of the United States and the world.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH COUNCIL RESOLVES TO END INVOLVEMENT WITH BANKS EXTENDING CREDIT TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Episcopal Church Council, through several resolutions, has taken action to end its involvement with banks participating in the consortium credit to the Republic of South Africa if those banks renew that credit, as scheduled, early next year.

I commend the council's action, and include the text of the resolutions herewith:

RESOLUTIONS PERTAINING TO THE CHURCH'S INVESTMENTS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA AS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Resolved, That the Executive and Finance Committee, on behalf of the Executive Council, examine and apply, in relation to the investments of the said Executive Council in companies and banks doing business in southern Africa, the following criteria:

(a) Is the bank or business making credit available to or doing business in southern Africa, especially including South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and/or Mozambique?

(b) If so, how significant is this involvement in the economy of the southern African country?

(c) If the involvement is significant, what is the effect in promoting such things as:

Education of Africans; Development of family life; Labor-management relations and the collective bargaining process; Increased skills of the African labor force and integration into higher levels of leadership; Equalization of wage scales, pension provisions and social security; Hospitalization and other benefits; Breaking down of the pass law system and other restrictions;

And be it further

Resolved, That, wherever the answers to criteria (a) and (b) are positive, the decision as to whether the Council invest and/or deposit the Church's fund or continue to invest and/or deposit in such companies and banks be dependent on how positive is the answer to criterion (c); and be it further

Resolved, That, nonetheless, where feasible in promoting the welfare or education of all the people of southern Africa without regard to race, the Council consider investments in such companies or banks promoting such projects.

Resolved, That the Executive Council direct the Executive and Finance Committee to consult with the banks in which the said Council has deposits or investments, and which are members of the consortium extending credit to the government of South Africa; and that, unless the said Executive and Finance Committee concludes that the involvement of the said banks is positive in respect to helping to promote the activities listed in Section (C) of Resolution I, the Treasurer be directed to terminate the Council's involvement with such banks within a reasonable period of time.

Resolved, That the Executive Council report its action on the above Resolutions to the Committee on Trust Funds and request them to examine their investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines and request that the Committee report its actions to the Council as soon as possible.

Resolved, That the Executive Council shall report its action on the above resolutions to the dioceses and parishes and request them

to examine their own investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines. To accomplish this the Council shall send the resolutions to the dioceses along with appropriate background materials and request the dioceses to draw these actions and materials to the attention of the parishes and other groups in their jurisdictions in the implementation of the 1967 General Convention's "Resolution on Apartheid."

Resolved, That this Executive and Finance Committee does not conclude that the involvement of the banks participating in the Consortium Credit to the Republic of South Africa is positive in respect of helping to promote the activities listed below:

Education of Africans; Development of family life; Labor-Management relations and the collective bargaining process; Increased skills of the African labor force and integration into higher levels of leadership; Equalization of wage scales, pension provisions and social security; Hospitalization and other benefits; Breaking down of the pass law system and other restrictions

and therefore directs the Treasurer of the Executive Council to terminate the involvement of this Council with the said banks (except overseas missionary accounts, and those only until other media of exchange can be found); and be it further

Resolved, That with respect to any bank participating in the Consortium, this action by the Executive and Finance Committee shall take effect immediately after the next annual renewal date of the line of credit in question, provided that such bank shall continue its participation in such line of credit thereafter; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive and Finance Committee offer all assistance in its power which may aid the banks to understand the significance of the proposed action in the eyes of this Church and the profound concern which led to it.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial which appeared in the Delaware County Mirror of Stamford, N.Y., on June 18, 1969, on the observance of National Dairy Month. Representing as I do a dairy producing area, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House membership the great nutritional value of milk and other dairy products.

The article follows:

DAIRY MONTH

We are observing National Dairy Month and judging by the interest shown by readers and advertisers in our own Four-County Area, it's a time for paying real tribute to the entire dairy industry from producers right on through to the processors, distributors, manufacturers, sales people and consumers.

In this region interest naturally centers on the dairy producer.

In the dairy farms nestled in our valley and the surrounding area we have a lasting and solid treasure. It is worth keeping and strengthening.

That is what makes National Dairy Month more than just another in a long series of catch phrases where we are concerned.

With New York state ranking second in milk production in the entire nation, it is not surprising that for most farmers in this

area milk provides the principal source of income.

Now one of the biggest industries in the United States, dairying is dependent upon the public consumption of milk and its by-products for continued prosperity. But this is only one reason why we should all use these essential foods. Milk provides a prime source of vitamins and minerals needed for the healthy development of youngsters and the well-being of adults.

Comparatively inexpensive on a basis of value received, milk is one of the soundest investments for the family food dollar. It is to the advantage of all that so many of our area farms have been converted to the production of this health-giving food.

In the interest of the area economy, as well as from a standpoint of good nutrition, milk is vitally important to all of us. The more of it we consume the more we help ourselves in more ways than one.

THE GUIDELINES RACKET: CONSPIRACY OF CIVIL RIGHTS AGENCIES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, to those who have observed and followed the guidelines manipulations—it eventually becomes quite apparent that there is a working relationship between HEW and the Justice Department. These bureaucrats operate by force, half-truths and deception to move the American people toward the desired goals and stated purposes of the minority which plots the course of our country.

The American people are more and more observing that when provisions of law enacted by the Congress do not conform to the desires of the conspirators, the law is simply ignored, or rewritten as "guidelines." Who are the criminals—those people who may disobey the illegal guidelines, or those bureaucrats who write the guidelines in defiance of the law?

Mr. Benjamin Ginzburg, a retired civil servant and informed patriot of Arlington, Va., has prepared an excellent memorandum on what he terms the "Guidelines Racket", which I include following my remarks, accompanied by a newsclipping from the New York Times of May 31 referred to in his memorandum.

The articles follow:

MEMORANDUM ON THE "GUIDELINES RACKET"

(By Benjamin Ginzburg)

I am a retired civil servant, whose last post was that of Research Director for the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I have devoted some of my leisure to testifying before Congressional committees on public issues (e.g., I testified against the confirmation of the Abe Fortas as Chief Justice) and to protesting abuses of power (when I come across such things) by government agencies. In March and April of this year I came across linked abuses by 1) the Equal Employment Opportunity agencies, 2) Office of Civil Rights of HEW, and 3) the Housing Assistance branch of HUD. In all three cases, the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was being invoked in support of policies that not only were not author-

ized by that law, but were in several cases specifically forbidden. Since all this was being done under cover of the authorization by the Civil Rights Act that the various agencies may develop guidelines or interpretations of the substantive provisions, I baptized the linked abuses as the "guidelines racket."

Here is some of the evidence about the linked abuses. At the end of March, Senator Dirksen protested to a Senate committee that the Equal Employment Opportunity agencies were harassing businessmen by seeking to impose Negro employment quotas—something which the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically forbids. Most of the press omitted the reference to employment quotas and merely reported Dirksen's complaint about the harassment of businessmen—a complaint which they proceeded to dismiss as motivated by the Senator's desire to protect employment discrimination. Since I knew from personal acquaintance with the experience of one firm that there was substance behind the Dirksen complaint, I wrote letters to the New York Times and Washington Star taking them to task for their attacks on Dirksen. Neither letter was published.

In the last week of March, the press reported that the Office of Civil Rights of HEW issued orders to the heads of state college systems with a past history of segregation (Pennsylvania and Maryland, among others) directing them to desegregate their colleges under penalty of forfeiting all Federal financial assistance. I was aroused by a startling passage in the desegregation orders. The passage reads: ". . . to fulfill the purposes and intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it is not sufficient to maintain a non-discriminatory admissions policy if the student population continues to reflect the former racial identification of that institution." The reason why I was startled by this passage was that I had just finished reading the text of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and found that it defined "desegregation" as nondiscrimination in the assignment or admission of pupils or students. That act also prohibits the assignment of students in order to overcome racial imbalance. I wondered therefore how the order could be implemented—how the racial identifiability of a predominantly Negro or a predominantly white college could be overcome—without running afoul of the law. Shortly after the orders were issued, the Star carried a story about the perplexity of the Maryland educators, with one of them coming up with a "Rube Goldberg" proposal for the state to grant scholarships to Negroes good only in predominantly white colleges and scholarships to whites good only in predominantly Negro colleges!

On April 20 I came upon tell-tale evidence that the Department of Housing and Urban Development was also among the agencies abusing the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The evidence came in the course of an article by Ben Gilbert in the Washington Post praising the Regency House project for the elderly poor and urging that it be put through without delay. The Regency House is a luxury apartment house with air conditioning and a swimming pool situated in the high income area of upper Connecticut Avenue. Under the plan, which barring last-minute legal difficulties has now been signed, sealed and delivered, families of elderly poor will occupy apartments in this house and pay about one third of the commercial rents charged to present occupants. Gilbert, using official sources, defined the new policy adopted by HUD requiring the location of public housing projects in high income areas as follows:

"Nearly a year ago, Don Hummel, then HUD assistant administrator for renewal and housing assistance, told local housing authorities to do what they could to locate public housing outside the ghettos, in ac-

cordance with the nondiscrimination requirements of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. [Emphasis my own] Hummel pointed to a 1967 low-rent housing manual directing authorities to select sites "which will afford the greatest opportunity for inclusion of eligible applicants of all groups regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, thereby affording members of minority groups an opportunity to locate outside of areas of concentration of their own minority group."

The low-rent housing manual is supposed to function as a set of guidelines for the application of the provisions of Title VI with regard to nondiscrimination in public housing projects. But what are the housing provisions of Title VI? They are included in a general paragraph reading as follows:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

In my simple mind I could not help wondering about the magic that derives the Ben Gilbert paragraph, with all its tortuous formulations, from the simple language of Title VI.

A friend of mine, a retired government lawyer, suggested that I might be able to clear up my difficulties in understanding the policies of these various agencies by asking them for the legal opinions (that is to say, opinions of their own counsel) on the basis of which the policies which I am complaining of were adopted. I realized that in the case of the Equal Employment agencies the policies complained of were probably not put in writing, but in the case of the other two agencies (HEW and HUD) I followed my friend's suggestion and wrote letters on April 22 asking for the respective legal opinions justifying the policies I was questioning.

To date I have not received a satisfactory answer from either agency, but as a result of correspondence, conversation and research my worst fears have been confirmed. We are in the presence of a conspiracy by civil rights agencies to frustrate the will of Congress and carry out policies pushed by minority group agitators—policies which are doctrinaire and destructive of the welfare of the nation as a whole, including the welfare of the minorities.

To begin with HUD, I addressed my letter of April 22 to Secretary Romney. Under date of May 5, Assistant Secretary Lawrence M. Cox replied that "the Secretary has asked me to reply, and I shall do so shortly." On May 26 he wrote to Congressman Brodyhill (whose assistance I had requested) assuring him that a detailed reply was being prepared for me. I am still waiting for that reply, but I learned in conversation (June 2) with Mr. Notti, of his office, some of the reasons for the delay. He told me that the adoption of the new site policy for public housing projects was not preceded by a legal opinion justifying the policy from the point of view of legal authority, but that the lawyers had simply cooperated with other officials in drawing it up. For this reason, he explained, it was necessary to prepare a legal justification from scratch in answer to my inquiry, and this required careful preparation and clearance, particularly in view of the fact that it was expected that I would publicize the agency reply. I wrote Mr. Cox yesterday expressing my amazement at the novel development in government, whereby the administrators of a great agency embark on a policy without a written statement of the legal authority therefor. I thought it was on a par with trying to run a business without possessing a fire insurance policy.

From HEW I received a reply dated May 22 and signed by one Burton Taylor, civil rights specialist. The letter simply asserted the proposition for which I wanted a reasoned proof—to wit, that "under Title VI

of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, state college systems which had previously segregated components must take steps to eliminate the racial identifiability of institutions within the system if a nondiscriminatory admissions policy has not had this result." The letter appended three court case references, and it turned out that the one court case which dealt with education on the college level rejected the demand that colleges have to take steps to eliminate racial identifiability, in addition to maintaining a nondiscriminatory admissions policy. This decision has been affirmed by the Supreme Court (over the objection of Justice Douglas).

The fact that HEW was taking a position in advance of what the Supreme Court is willing to accept and is being "more Catholic than the pope" led me to delve into the mysterious relationship between HEW's Civil Rights Office (which is charged to withhold funds from school boards not meeting the desegregation requirements specified in the Civil Rights Act) and the Department of Justice (which brings and stimulates suits to further interpret and apply the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision of 1954). I found unexpected help in a New York Times front page article on May 31, which while lauding the work of the two agencies explained how they cooperated.

The Times article describes the cooperation between the two agencies under the Democrats and indicates that the Nixon Administration proposes to intensify the cooperation. "Under the Democrats," the article declares, "these two approaches by the two departments were used as parallel devices. Frequently, when a requirement for desegregation was made stiffer by the Health, Education and Welfare Department, the Federal courts, under the prodding of Justice Department officials and other civil rights lawyers, would stiffen their requirements to conform to the new desegregation standards. It worked the other way, too, with the Health, Education and Welfare Department using a new court standard as leverage to gain acceptance of a similar change in its own guidelines."

The last statement is a bit of a euphemism, for the evidence is that the HEW uses a court decision not for the purpose of catching up but for the purpose of staking out new ground in advance of the court decision which it hopes to get the Supreme Court (via collusion with the Justice Department) to accept later on. But what stands out in the Times article is the admitted (and even boasted of) fact that the HEW operates on a progressive interpretation of the definitions and standards set down in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In other words, it operates by the procedure of tightening the screws after the public has become accustomed to a degree of pressure.

There is of course nothing wrong with Congress writing a law that goes into effect in specified stages. But the fact remains that Congress did not write such a law in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For a bureaucratic agency to interpret a specific statute progressively—calculating each time what they think they can get away with—is an unspeakable outrage on the American people. Never mind that the Supreme Court has succumbed to the vagaries of a progressive interpretation of its original decision in the *Brown* case of 1954. (The Supreme Court problem will have to be dealt with at the proper time.) Supreme Court decisions applying (as in the *Green* case) "higher standards of desegregation" in court cases brought before it do not legitimize—in my opinion—the higher standards used by HEW in administering its responsibilities under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If Congress has chosen that funds should be cut off from school boards and institutions which do not meet the standard of desegregation defined as nondiscrimination, that standard should

remain the standard for cutting off funds regardless of what the Supreme Court does in court cases brought under the *Brown* decision.

Still less can HEW use Supreme Court decisions on public schools as authority for what it wants to do in the case of colleges. It cannot count on future decisions of the Supreme Court to legitimize its grab for power, particularly when the facts are that in its own court cases the Supreme Court has rejected that HEW standard.

If we combine the revelation that HEW uses a progressive interpretation of the law with the confession by HUD that it operates without a legal justification of its new policies, the picture we get is a truly alarming one. The Executive Department gets Congress to pass a law, and it accepts provisions that it does not like. But the next day it sticks the law into its pocket, and carries out policies which violate the law. This is a corruption of democratic government that is far more serious and far more dangerous than the mere monetary corruption of a few officials. This is a corruption that turns a government of laws into a government of invisible men, and turns our democracy into a dictatorship.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1969]

INTEGRATION PLAN WOULD JOIN WORK OF TWO U.S. AGENCIES—HEALTH AIDES WEIGH ACTION WITH JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ON THE NATION'S SCHOOLS—EFFICIENCY IS THE AIM—CASES INVOLVING CUTOFFS OF FEDERAL FUNDS WOULD BE LINKED WITH LAWSUITS

WASHINGTON, May 30.—The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is studying a plan that it says will desegregate schools more efficiently and smoothly in both the North and the South.

Under the proposal the Health, Education and Welfare Department and the Justice Department would work together with the Federal courts.

The plan, which has been discussed for several weeks and has been the source of some press speculation, would differ markedly in a procedural way from the approach used by the Johnson Administration.

Whether it would result in a substantive difference—that is, in more or less desegregation—is difficult to estimate.

EXERCISING TWO LEVERAGES

Under the present system, the Justice Department, acting on a citizen's complaint, can bring a lawsuit against a school district to force the district to remove racial barriers, or to speed their removal if desegregation seems to be lagging.

In another part of Washington, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare attacks segregation with a different weapon. It can, and in many cases has, cut off Federal funds to school districts that are found to be violating the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by maintaining racial discrimination.

All the districts that have lost funds are in the South. The Nixon Administration has said it will move against Northern segregation, but that is in early stages.

COMPLEMENTARY ACTION

Under the Democrats, these two approaches by the two departments were used as parallel devices. Frequently, when a requirement for desegregation was made stiffer by the Health, Education and Welfare Department, the Federal courts, under the prodding of Justice Department officials and other civil rights lawyers, would stiffen their requirements to conform to the new desegregation standards.

It worked the other way, too, with the Health, Education and Welfare Department using a new court standard as leverage to gain acceptance of a similar change in its own guidelines.

Some Republicans, noting the continuing turmoil and uncertainty surrounding school

desegregation, have decided that this two-headed approach in the executive branch can be improved upon.

They believe the operation will run more smoothly if the two departments work together on the same cases instead of each pursuing its own.

The Health, Education and Welfare plan is mainly the work of Robert H. Finch, Secretary of the department, and such top associates as Leon Panetta, head of the agency's Office for Civil Rights. Under it, the Justice Department would bring a suit against a district or a group of districts and the Health, Education and Welfare Department would be prepared to cut off funds for those districts if they did not comply with the resulting court order to desegregate.

The Justice Department, for its part, would be prepared to file suits against other districts whose funds had been cut off by the health agency and that had simply accepted the loss as the price of keeping segregation.

The Justice Department might be especially helpful in bringing suits against districts with Negro majorities. These have been the most difficult for the Health, Education and Welfare Department to deal with.

BEING TESTED IN CAROLINA

The cooperative approach is being tested in a South Carolina case now pending before a four-judge Federal Court panel.

Twenty-two South Carolina districts with token integration in schools were taken to court in an effort to speed their desegregation. The plaintiffs were individual Negroes in some cases and the Justice Department in others.

The four judges on March 31 ordered the 22 districts to work with Health, Education and Welfare experts to draft acceptable desegregation plans. They had 30 days to produce the plans, but that deadline was extended.

The judges said on March 31 that they would approve any plan agreed to by the defendants and the education department unless the plaintiff—an individual or the Justice Department, as the case might be—should persuade the court that the plan did not meet constitutional standards.

PLAN FROM AGENCY

For districts that did not agree to a plan, the Health, Education and Welfare Department was to submit a plan on the district's behalf.

Officials of the department argue that this approach, or some variation of it, would prevent the discrepancies that sometimes now exist between those districts operating under the department's compliance plans and those operating under court-ordered plans.

They concede that the block suit approach as in South Carolina, may be an ideal procedure but difficult to fulfill. The Justice Department is short of men and money in its Civil Rights Division, and filing suits on such a vast basis would require much of both.

LAW AND ORDER

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, during his tenure as Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Ramsey Clark did little to create a sense of urgency for action to meet the serious breakdown in law and order in so many areas of our country. Now that he is out of Government, Mr. Clark has gratuitously called for the re-

tirement of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

While Attorney General Mr. Clark quite obviously was privy to the procedures governing the use of electronic surveillances by the Federal Bureau of Investigation allowed only with the full approval of the Attorney General. Yet, when Mr. Clark had some power as Attorney General to hasten the retirement of Mr. Hoover, he apparently did not exercise it. Under the circumstances no creditability can be given Mr. Clark's call for Mr. Hoover's retirement, nor should it be.

In the absence of Mr. Clark as Attorney General we have seen an upsurge in zeal to enforce existing laws against crime and civil disorders, which were mounting when he was the chief law enforcement officer of the land. In Washington, D.C., where bank robberies under Clark were almost a daily occurrence, we have seen a dramatic change with bank robberies, now a rarity.

Mr. Hoover, the great Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, needs no defense, but I could not let Mr. Clark's bogus call for his retirement go unchallenged.

MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE REMARKS OF HON. JAMES D. HITTLE, AS- SISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR MANPOWER AND RE- SERVE AFFAIRS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the names that will live forever in the memory of all Americans, one of the hallowed names of our tradition, is Belleau Wood, where, in the fateful summer of 1918, Americans fought one of the decisive battles of World War I. For the Memorial Day service this year at the Belleau Wood Cemetery at Chateau Thierry, France, the guest speaker was the exceptionally articulate Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Honorable James D. Hittle.

In his address, Assistant Secretary Hittle vividly recreates the importance of that memorable battle and reminds us once again not only of the great sacrifices Americans have made to the freedom of France, but also the great contribution that Frenchmen once made to the freedom of America. He says that the bond between France and the United States was forged in combat and is for all eternity.

I urge all my colleagues to read this moving address, which follows:

REMARKS BY HON. JAMES D. HITTLE

Ladies and Gentlemen: Today we are gathered in remembrance of those who have fought in the defense of freedom. Such a memorial service as this is good in many ways. It is good because, in the hectic pace of today's life, there is a tendency even by the most well-meaning, to forget things that are more important than the problems of the

moment. We are all too often forgetful of the fact that the good things we have—our freedom, our way of life, are not so much the products of our own efforts as they are the heritage which has been passed to us by those whom we remember with this memorial service.

These things that make France and America great are in many ways the peculiar attributes and possessions of our Nations and, in a sense, of the free world. What we enjoy and accept as almost routine and commonplace are the objects of envy by those who do not have them.

Oppression has always had as its prime target the destruction of freedom. The reason is simple—oppression can never conquer while an example of freedom still exists by which the oppressed can gauge the nature of the tyranny that has engulfed them.

This freedom, which above all else is the foremost feature of our governmental institutions and beliefs, has been assailed and attacked by oppressors. We enjoy this beneficence because those whom we pause to remember today, fought and died so that we could live as we do.

This memorial service is an opportunity for remembering many things—achieved and preserved by suffering, bravery, God-fearing and God-trusting determination; that those who brought forth our independence on the bloody field of battle lit the torch of freedom which has been handed down from generation to generation of our departed comrades; that each generation of veterans has manned the shell-torn ramparts of freedom, holding high that torch.

Thus, this is a memorial service for remembering, for reverent recollection, for realistic reflection.

We remember that month of mortal suspense of June 1918. The Imperial German Armies had commenced their fourth offensive and were on the road and marching for the capital of France.

We remember that moment of history when the American troops were committed for the first time under American command.

We remember that it was in these now-quiet woods where one of histories' most vicious and decisive battles was fought. It was here in Belleau Wood where the enemy and the defenders of freedom both knew they would find the strategic key that opened or locked the door to Paris.

We remember that far more was at stake than these woods which are only about one mile square. At issue were the lives of brave men, the fate of Paris, the fate of France, and in a real sense—the fate of freedom.

We remember that it was in these strategic and historic woods that the German Imperial Forces massed on 16 June 1918, and that nine days later, on June 25th the United States Army and Marines were able to report: "The hills are entirely ours."

We remember the tremendous and tragic cost of that decisive and necessary victory. Almost a thousand Americans were killed and over three thousand wounded. And, as the smoke of battle cleared, as the ebbing gunfire was lost in echoes rolling across the shell-torn French countryside, as the stretcher-bearers brought in the wounded and dead, this ground was transformed by the ordeal of combat into hallowed shrine at which we now reverently gather.

Before the bitter conflict of World War I was over, the thousands of Americans who died in the battles of Belleau Wood and in Marne Valley during the fateful Summer of 1918, were joined in eternal rest by the thousands of other Americans who fought shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers of France and our other Allies in the common defense of a common freedom.

We remember, those who died that freedom might live. Here that sacrifice was made by the young men who came to France because here was where freedom was threatened. Each who marched toward the sound

of enemy guns has enshrined himself forever on the honor roll of freedom. Young men like:

Corporal Bert Evert Ames, Croix de Guerre, from the farmland of Kansas;

Private William F. Bell, Croix de Guerre, from New York;

Corporal Robert A. Burhans, Croix de Guerre, from Michigan;

Navy Gunner Walter R. Cornell, Distinguished Service Cross, from Illinois; and

Corporal William Hanson, Distinguished Service Cross, from Oregon.

These young men were but a few of the thousands who found eternal rest where they paid the supreme price for our freedom.

We remember, also, that once again, in World War II, oppression challenged freedom. And, once again, American young men left their homes, their pleasant land, and their loved ones. Once again, they stood shoulder to shoulder with the French in defense of the freedom in which French and Americans have long been united.

We remember, by honoring these fallen of World Wars I and II, the lamentable lesson of history—that each generation in its time must be willing and ready to continue, with utmost determination, the struggle to preserve our independence and freedom. This, in essence, is at once the heritage, the responsibility, and the task which has been passed to us, and which we must pass on as intact and secure as we received it.

And, something else that we must remember is this: On this Memorial Day, while we are honoring the American dead who fell in defense of freedom in France, Americans are honoring and remembering Frenchmen who fell to bring freedom to America.

We must never forget that were it not for the support of the French nation and the sacrifice of French fighting men, America would not have become a free and independent nation.

It was George Washington and our other Revolutionary leaders who realized that we must have help from France to win our freedom. It was in February of 1778 that Benjamin Franklin, our first ambassador to France, signed, on behalf of the United States, the Treaty of Alliance with France. That Treaty bound our two nations together in our struggle for freedom.

That Alliance was more than a casual diplomatic nicety. France delivered the military support America so direly needed. The French assistance to George Washington's Army is an inspiring story and it should be told frequently.

It is the story of seven first-line regiments of the French Army that came to America. It is the story of the skillful generalship of one of Europe's most able commanders, Count Rochambeau.

It is the story of how this eminent French General willingly subordinated himself to George Washington and served our cause of freedom ably and loyally.

It is the story of French Regulars with whom Rochambeau and Lafayette marched southward along the Atlantic seaboard to the fateful battle of Yorktown. There, fighting bravely alongside Washington's Continentals, the soldiers of France helped us gain our independence.

It is the story of a French Fleet under Admiral De Grasse, who at that critical moment of history engaged the British Fleet and sent it scudding northward. It is the story of how this naval battle, beyond sight of the Virginia capes, in which a French Fleet under a French Admiral, without a single American soldier present, sealed the fate of the Imperial British Forces in Yorktown and assured victory for French and American arms in our Revolutionary War.

On the historic battleground of Yorktown, there is a monument. On that monument are inscribed the names of the soldiers of France

who fought and died there to help bring freedom to America. Among them are these sons of France:

Privates Etienne Cortois, Antoine Francois, and Joseph Desmont of the Bourbonnais Regiment;

Privates Jean Francois Aimont, Nicolas Bourden, and Jacques Antoine Chatillori of the Agenois Regiment;

Privates Jean Bidot, Andre Carar, and Sidet Castail of the Touraine Regiment; and

Captain Jean De Sireul of the Gatinais Regiment.

Americans today reverently remember and honor these and the other brave sons of France who left their homeland, their pleasant fields, and their loved ones. Not only are their names enshrined on the solemn monument of Yorktown; their names are etched deeply into the hearts of all who love freedom.

And so at this memorial service, we remember the gallant French and American fighting men who have done their duty and marched on, leaving to us both the heritage of freedom they created and preserved, and the responsibilities of its stewardship. The spirit that characterized this memorial service is eloquent proof that the memory and reverence for our departed French and American heroes is not just for a day but for the ages.

By your presence here today you have demonstrated again the eternal truth that the memory of those who fought the good fight cannot die.

You have demonstrated, also, that between France and America there is a bond—

Forged in combat.

Tempered in the crucible of conflict, Sanctified by blood shed in the defense of freedom.

A bond of French-American fraternity that is for eternity.

AN OLD-FASHIONED MOTHER

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure this week to meet a choice constituent on her first visit to Washington. She is Mrs. Alta Cutler Rust from Vernal, Utah. I think Mrs. Rust and her family are so modest that the people of Utah should know something of their accomplishments.

Eighteen years ago her husband died suddenly and left her with five sons, ages 5 to 14. Mrs. Rust, who was a graduate nurse, immediately took up nursing in the hospital, and has made a wonderful home for her boys and has instilled in them the principles that have made America great.

Richard Dilworth, her oldest son, has his Ph. D. from the University of Wisconsin and is on the faculty at the University of North Carolina. He is a young man with great promise who has his feet squarely on the ground in the face of the present discontent and dissent on the campuses. The next son is David, who is also a schoolteacher. He teaches in his home town of Vernal. His degree is from Brigham Young University. Joseph, the third son, graduated toward the top of his class in law school from the University of Utah 2 years ago. The fourth son, Harold, is a graduate of the Air Force

Academy. As a matter of fact, Harold graduated first in his class from the Academy. The youngest son, Marvin, still has a few months to go before he receives his degree from Brigham Young University.

All five sons are devout L.D.S. church members and have been married in the Temple. Four of the sons have been on missions for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. The fourth son, Harold, was L.D.S. Servicemen's Group Leader at the Air Force Academy and is going on to special training for the Defense Department. Three of the boys are Eagle Scouts.

These young men believe in the old-fashioned virtues of making their own way, of hard work, and of upholding the institutions which have made our country great. This is a family to whom adversity has been a challenge. I am very proud of Mrs. Rust.

WELFARE MOTHERS IN ACTION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently my attention was brought to an editorial entitled "Welfare Mothers in Action." The conduct of the mothers at the national conference of social welfare would definitely not win friends nor favorably influence people. Actions such as those recounted built antagonism toward recipients.

I submit this editorial for your perusal.

WELFARE MOTHERS IN ACTION

(By Thurman Sensing)

Some of the ugliness and moral cowardice on the national scene these days is almost beyond belief. Certainly, it is hard to believe what happened at the recent National Conference of Social Welfare in Washington. Yet it did happen.

The Washington Post was handicapped in its reporting of the shocking events at the conference, for much of what was said could not be printed in a family newspaper.

The 5,000 social workers who gathered in the capital for their annual meeting were subjected to a stream of four-letter obscenities. Members of welfare "rights" organizations jumped on the stage and took over the microphones. They shouted vile words at the audience of social workers. These workers were called "racist pigs" and members of the "white imperialistic oppressive society." Such terms were mild compared to other words and phrases employed. The Washington Post referred to "obscene" demands made by the welfare mothers.

But that wasn't all. When one of the captive audience attempted to lead a mass walk-out from the conference room a human chain of welfare mothers blocked the exits. Dr. George A. Wiley, head of the welfare protesters, declared nobody was going to leave until thousands of dollars were anted up for more of the poor to attend the national conference by getting contributions. With that, plastic ice buckets were passed around for financial contributions.

The Post reported that it was necessary for the temporary ballroom dividing wall to be removed in order for the delegates to the conference to escape.

This unspeakably crude and insulting session was not the last, however. Wiley and his

welfare mothers carried out other interruptions of the proceedings during the remaining days of the conference. Unscheduled speakers, who broke into the meeting, included black social workers, Puerto Ricans, an Indian and a young woman who shrieked that she was a former mental patient and an ex-drug addict.

The social workers apparently were stunned by the experience. One of them told a reporter: "I said to myself this couldn't happen to US."

As shocking as the behavior of the welfare mothers, was the craven attitude of the outgoing president, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who also is president of the National Council of Churches. He didn't order the silencing or removal of the welfare mothers who shouted obscenities at the delegates. On the contrary, against the advice of some of his board members, he refused to stop anyone from speaking. When the time came to turn over the presidential gavel to the incoming president, Dr. Flemming bragged "I did not use this gavel once this week—I didn't think it was appropriate."

The public has no idea of what the delegates thought of Dr. Flemming's toleration of obscenity-shouting disruptionists. But many Americans familiar with the story of these shocking events in Washington must be sickened by Dr. Flemming's attitude. The country simply cannot afford mental confusion or moral leniency in confrontations with barbarians. This is what America really faces today, and which was manifested at the social workers conference in Washington—barbarism.

Educated men and women who refuse to apply the remedies of law and order when confronted by savage behavior, as in the case of the welfare mothers at Washington, are exposing the nation to rule by barbarians.

It is a mistake to think of barbarism and savagery as features of the ancient past or remote jungle areas. Even the most advanced societies can be exposed to primitivism within. The methods used by the welfare "rights" organizations are manifestations of this primitivism. In New York City, members of welfare "rights" have attacked city welfare officers, broken furniture and upset files—all because they weren't getting the size relief payments they demanded. Toleration of this kind of violent behavior is impossible if America is to remain a civilized country. Some people, like Dr. Flemming, apparently regard toleration as the ultimate virtue, but it is obvious from the ugly events of our time that excessive toleration is a major evil. It opens the door to the worst excesses in human behavior.

It is time for all Americans to view toleration in perspective and to insist that the organizations to which they belong adopt a get-tough policy with respect to disruptionists.

LITTLE PEOPLE HURT AGAIN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I, as so many other legislators, businessmen, and people of all walks of life, was concerned and shocked by the recent full percentage increase of the prime interest rate from 7½ to 8½ percent. I am heartened that the Banking and Currency Committee is currently holding hearings regarding the spiraling rise of interest rates and I think that the following editorial from the Nutley, N.J., Sun hits the nail on the head when it states that "Little People Are Hurt Again":

LITTLE PEOPLE HURT AGAIN

(By Frank A. Orechio)

The recent increase in the prime interest rate to 8½% is bad news for all of us little people who have to work for a living and on occasion find it necessary to finance capital improvements in business and the numerous items that ambitious home owners buy to make them feel they are sharing a piece of the technological progress of the Twentieth Century.

Interest on automobile loans must now go higher. Interest on home repair loans will cost more. Interest on loans for the purchase of furniture and various kitchen appliances will make these purchases cost more.

There is nothing anyone buys on time today that wouldn't cost more than it did before the interest hike.

We hear Washington politicians talking about ways and means to keep down inflation. We hear Washington officials talking about maintaining the surtax on the income tax in order to control inflation.

Nothing in the field of economics has happened in recent months more devastating to the pocketbook of the little man than the outrageous increase in the interest rate.

It is time a meaningful investigation of this problem is conducted at our state and national levels. The policy of uncontrolled interest rate rises cannot be endured by people who already are over-burdened and are finding it difficult to make ends meet.

Is there one legislator willing to take on the burden of protecting the little man against the financial lobbies? We hope so.

SPORTS READY TO COLLECT ON PAY TV

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post carried the headline "Sports Set To Collect on Pay TV." Because of the significant impact that pay television may have on the American public, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that article appear in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Most people think that pay TV, now authorized under Federal Communications Commission action, would merely supplement their present free television programming.

The fact is pay television would soon be the sole outlet for much of the most widely viewed programming which is freely available today.

Pay television interests naturally will look toward the purchase of broadcast rights of the most popular events, since these would provide them the greatest revenue.

A subscriber base of only 16 percent of the television homes in this country paying only \$2 per week would generate approximately \$1 billion for the pay television licensees. The tremendous economic power could then be wielded to outbid existing free television networks for the biggest drawing events. This same strategy could apply to recent movies and entertainment programming highlighting the big-name stars.

An argument offered by the pay TV advocates is that programming on free television would be supplemented by pay

television. The truth is that it would be supplanted instead of supplemented.

In this time of grave concern over the lack of communication between the different segments of our society, it should be noted that, according to the fourth report and order of the FCC, approximately 30 percent of all families in the United States could not afford to subscribe to pay TV.

Further, as the top-rated programs are siphoned off free television by pay TV, those public service programs and news shows which depend on the financial support from other programming would be eliminated.

Congressional responsibility is being tested by the FCC. I urge my colleagues to join in an effort to block this ridiculous scheme. It is this body which will bear the brunt of that charge should we defer to the FCC. Gentlemen, I suggest in the strongest terms that we will be rightly accused of being derelict in our duty if we let an administrative agency foist pay TV on the American public.

The text of the Washington Post article follows:

SPORTS READY TO COLLECT ON PAY TV

The prospect of a bountiful new source of revenue for sports came closer to realization following the Federal Communications Commission order yesterday permitting the start of pay television.

There are legal, technical and other obstacles to be overcome before the householder will be asked to pay for his television fare, but Dick Bailey Sr., president of the Hughes Sports Network, said, "It is coming, there is no use fighting it."

Art Modell, president of the National Football League, said, "I believe it is 'way, 'way off for pro football. We're married to free TV, except for a special game or two. I could understand pay TV in an area which has been blacked out of free TV during post-season games."

Harry Markson, director of boxing for Madison Square Garden, said, "We will be most interested in the developments of pay TV."

The Garden recently contracted to show 125 sports events on community antenna television over a one-year period, including all the games of the New York Knickerbockers and New York Rangers.

Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn could not be reached for comment.

Pro football already has made provisions for pay TV in the merger agreement between the two leagues which takes full effect in 1970.

With most stadiums already playing to capacity crowds and negotiations for regular Sunday game telecasts reaching the choking price, pro football recently went to prime-time Monday night telecasts for 1970 to raise an extra \$8 million in revenue.

At the time of the merger between the American and National football leagues, in 1966, owner Ralph Wilson of the Buffalo Bills estimated that pay television of the Super Bowl could mean \$25 million to \$30 million in revenue for a game that now brings in \$2.5 million from free TV.

"Wilson is probably right," president Bailey of the Hughes Sports Network said yesterday. "If I had not sold this network to Howard Hughes, I know I would be going into pay TV now instead of bucking the three conventional networks."

"Only Mr. Hughes can say what we will do now. He makes the decisions."

Bailey revealed that the Hughes network bid on the 13 Monday night telecasts for 1970, which went to the American Broadcasting Co.

"We did not bid lower than ABC," Bailey said. "There were other circumstances."

Bailey added, "There is a new era coming and a lot of people will be scrambling to get into it. Free TV will have to worry about losing sports to pay TV."

But not for two years because sports events regularly shown on free TV cannot make the switch to pay TV until that much time has elapsed under the projected regulations.

COOK COUNTY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS PATROL, INC.

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, most people are against crime, but few are willing to try to do something constructive about the problem. Among those who are trying to help the police in their efforts to prevent crime and to apprehend those who commit crimes are the members of the Cook County Emergency Communications Patrol, Inc.

This nonprofit organization, which has headquarters in Melrose Park, in my district, is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. It is composed of volunteers whose main objective is to assist law enforcement agencies. Its director, Robert Ruge, received the American Legion's Award for Law and Order this year.

Through the use of its citizens band radios, the emergency communications patrol has helped reduce vandalism in the schools. Radio equipped cars patrol the various school districts, the base station of the patrol being located in the police station.

Mr. Speaker, having received permission to extend my remarks, I submit an article in which the organization discusses its program. My colleagues will, I am sure, agree with me that it is better to cooperate with the police, as these public-spirited citizens are doing, than to hamper and harass them, as altogether too many irresponsible people are doing.

The article follows:

THE CITIZEN, COMMUNICATIONS, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

This article is written so you, the public, will understand your responsibility to your fellow man. This title was chosen because it is felt that these are just three of the things that would make this country safer. With the rising crime in our country today, citizens need to help each other in any way that they can. Every time a crime is committed you, the public, take it upon yourselves to blame the law enforcement agencies when in reality had you, the public, remembered your responsibility to communicate with the proper authorities, many of these crimes could have been prevented. For the abovementioned reasons, a group of concerned citizens formed an organization to act as an extra pair of eyes and ears for our law enforcement agencies.

This organization realizes that one of the most important means of assisting our law enforcement agencies is communications. There are three ways that we can communicate with our law enforcement agencies: the telephone, appear in person, or, in our case, the two way radio (citizens band radio).

It is the object of our organization to assist all law enforcement agencies as well as

the public. We have, within our organization, people, from all walks of life, who are willing to try to make our nation safe at all times.

Please help our law enforcement agencies by communicating with them if you see any suspicious or unlawful acts. Don't turn your backs on someone in need, because some day that someone might be you.

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a newspaper in my district, the Stevens Point Daily Journal, published an editorial which I believe sums up the feelings of a good many American people and a good many GI's. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

The more than 50 Americans who died in the recent assault on "Hamburger Hill" in South Vietnam must have believed they were fighting for something. Men do not fight that well without a purpose.

"Hamburger Hill" is officially considered an American victory. The hill was taken, and enemy forces withdrew after sustaining heavy casualties.

But somehow it is difficult to rejoice. Only in this topsy-turvy war could a tragedy of the magnitude of "Hamburger Hill" be billed as a victory. The fact is that those men may have died needlessly. A week after their sacrifices, American forces abandoned the hill.

Either the objective had military value or it did not. If it was worth taking, it is now worth occupying. If it was not strategically or tactically vital, the sacrifices were not justified.

Maj. Gen. Melvin Zais shed light on the subject when he said that the only importance of "Hamburger Hill" was that enemy forces occupied it. He added that his mission was to destroy those forces.

In a few words, General Zais has given an insight into what is wrong with the conduct of the war in Vietnam. We no longer measure progress by the number of strategic positions captured, the amount of territory taken from the enemy, or the extent to which we destroy his supplies and deny him the ability to wage war. We now measure it in terms of the number of enemy soldiers killed.

In previous wars, killing was incidental to the achievements of the war's objectives. Review the brilliant strategies of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in World War II. He did not waste men. He bombed the enemy stronghold at Weewak, in New Guinea, apparently attempting to soften the defenses in preparation for a major landing of troops there. But instead he by-passed Weewak and sent his forces against lightly-defended Hollandia, farther up the coast, sealing off the enemy's strength at Weewak and avoiding the murderous sacrifice of lives that would have resulted in a frontal assault on that bastion.

Next he diverted attention to the strategic importance of the island of Palau as the next target, and he started to soften that stronghold. But there was no landing on Palau; the troops instead established a beachhead on Leyte, in the Philippines, where the enemy's capacity to resist was comparatively weak.

In the war going on today in Vietnam, America seeks not to win, but only not to lose, and killing seems to have become an end in itself. Body counts of enemy dead seems to have replaced traditional standards of judging military success.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION FOR MINERS SOUGHT

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will in the next few weeks consider health and safety legislation to protect this Nation's coal miners. This legislation is a very necessary step in an industry that once again has become a vigorous competitor in supplying power to the Nation's industrial plants and to its homes.

There are other measures that must accompany coal mine health and safety legislation. One of these measures, H.R. 8789, is under consideration now in the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The purpose of this bill is to grant workmen's compensation to the men injured in the mines who have not been covered by State workmen's compensation laws because of injuries prior to passage of such laws.

This effort is being carried out in conjunction with efforts at the State level to improve existing State workmen's compensation statutes. The following letter is part of this effort. It comes from the president of a labor organization charged with the protection of the interests of the vast majority of coal miners in our Nation. The United Mine Workers of America has by long years of experience in protecting the rights of miners developed an unparalleled expertise in the field of compensation and this letter deserves the careful attention of every Member of the House. The letter follows:

MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE RECENTLY ENACTED "BLACK LUNG" COMPENSATION LAW SOUGHT

DEAR GOVERNOR MOORE: The last regular session of the West Virginia legislature passed a bill which provided compensation payments for the victims of coal workers' pneumoconiosis, or as it is more commonly termed, "black lung." The legislation as finally enacted, however, fell far short of what we believe coal miners suffering from black lung should receive. This is the reason I have urged that you include in the call for the upcoming extraordinary session of the legislature an item relating to the workmen's compensation as it pertains to coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

I now reiterate my request that you include the subject of black lung in your call. If you do this we intend to ask the legislature to strengthen the section of the West Virginia workmen's compensation law dealing with coal workers' pneumoconiosis in the following way:

1. We want a redefinition of the term "occupational pneumoconiosis" which would eliminate any specific reference to X-ray diagnosis. In our view, occupational pneumoconiosis is a disease of the lungs caused by the inhalation of minute particles of dust resulting from coal mining.

2. We would like a broadened "presumption" clause which would provide for the presumption of black lung where the employe has been exposed to the hazards caused by coal dust for a period of five years during the ten years preceding the date of his last exposure and where the employe has sustained a respiratory disability. Of course, we recognize that the presumption could be rebutted by the industry.

3. We would like to extend the period during which a man can reopen his coal workers' pneumoconiosis claim after receipt of the last payment under a permanent disability award from one year to five years. We do this because black lung is a progressive disease and it is apparent to us that the one-year limitation, as it is currently written, is too short to fully cover the individual's case.

4. We would like an amendment to the current statute so that the permanent disability from occupational pneumoconiosis will be related to the employee's ability to perform his usual occupation.

5. We feel in all justice the coal miner deserves the same medical benefits when he has contracted black lung as are payable to victims of industrial accidents—and we want him to receive them. Black lung is an occupational hazard and we can see no reason why its victims should not be entitled to medical care.

6. We would like to change the time limitations for the filing of claims for black lung so that they may be filed within three years from the date of the last exposure, or one year from the date when the miner first learns that he has contracted black lung, whichever last occurs. Because black lung is a progressive disease and is so insidious in the way it develops in the lungs of a coal miner, we firmly believe that the miner should have the maximum latitude on the time period in which he must file to secure compensation.

7. The present medical boards have not been able to keep pace with the number of claims pending. We feel that serious consideration should be given to procedures which will shorten the time required for board action, either within the two-board structure or by a significant change in that structure if such a change is more feasible.

8. Finally, we believe the code should be amended to permit a civil action by the employe in the event of an accident where the cause of the accident was gross negligence on the part of the employer.

I earnestly believe that the foregoing amendments will go far toward strengthening the compensation bill in West Virginia and will be highly beneficial to the coal miners in your state.

Your favorable consideration of our request is urgently sought and will be very greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

REVERENCE FOR THE LAW

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, we all are aware that there are many problems and controversies about the right of protest and dissent in this Nation today. The bounds of protest and dissent, and how they fit in with our laws and institutions of society is something that has been discussed in many different viewpoints since this Nation was founded.

There are so many different viewpoints and so many different ideas on this subject, that I often wonder if our young people can sift through the maze of information and take out the basic facts for a background on this subject.

Judge James F. Niehoff of the Nassau County District Court from my home

county recently write an article in a local club publication that explained the basic facts. Judge Niehoff in his article, "Reverence for the Law" covers this complex topic in such a simple and concise manner, that anybody can understand what is involved and grasp the legal concepts. For those people who find themselves at a loss, when asked to explain the matter of what dissent and protest is about, I urge them to read Judge Niehoff's piece. At this point, I insert Judge Niehoff's article:

REVERENCE FOR THE LAW

The struggle for equal justice under law and the preservation of the dignity and liberty of the individual has been of paramount concern to Americans. This Nation has grown from 13 small colonies into the greatest democracy in the history of the world because the overwhelming majority of our people have observed the law steadfastly and faithfully.

Despite the fact that today Americans enjoy greater freedom than ever before we are told by certain dissidents in our midst that our society is so intrinsically evil that it must be altered drastically even smashed—and that unlawful means including violence is justified to accomplish such goal. Right thinking men and women of all races and creeds shun such views. They recognize that responsible protest has a vital place in our well ordered system of government and is entitled to constitutional protection. However, disobedience of the law, mob rule, and violence do not constitute "responsible protest". The right to protest does not confer upon the protestor a license to infringe upon the liberties of others. Nor does the right to protest confer upon the protestor a license to choose the laws he will obey and those he will disobey. Government as we know it could not survive for a day if it permitted any group to obey only those laws with which it agreed. And, surely it is manifest that violence breeds corresponding violence, with an end result of anarchy. History teaches us that anarchy leads to a strong government—even a dictatorship.

If we hope to pass on to future generations the American heritage of justice and liberty it will be necessary for us to demonstrate our reverence for the law in the days that lie ahead.

McCAFFREY HONORED FOR 25 YEARS SERVICE AS WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to take this opportunity to join many of my colleagues in honoring our good friend, Joe McCaffrey at WMAL-TV on 25 years service as a Washington correspondent.

Most of us agree, I feel sure, that Joe McCaffrey knows more about what is happening at the Capitol than almost any other man, and that he reports the events here with complete fairness and impartiality.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Joe on 25 years of outstanding service and to wish him many more years of success in his field.

LEARNING DISABILITIES, PART 2—THE DISTURBED CHILD IN THE CLASSROOM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted an article in the RECORD outlining the general definitions of learning disabilities in children.

The Subcommittee on Education will soon be holding hearings on legislation to mitigate the special problems of children afflicted with learning disabilities. One of the purposes of this legislation is to provide teachers in classrooms with the skills and tools to reach these children.

Following is an article written by a teacher who has encountered disturbed and disruptive children in her classes. Emotional disruption can be one symptom of a learning disabled child. Mrs. Katharine F. Tift, the article's author, was formerly an educational therapist with the Hillcrest Children's Center here in the Nation's Capital. Her suggestions are helpful to teachers and it is our hope that the legislation we will soon take up in our subcommittee will provide further suggestions and methods for teachers who encounter learning disabled children on a regular basis in their classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Tift's article from the NEA Journal of March 1968 follows: THE DISTURBED CHILD IN THE CLASSROOM (Katharine F. Tift, teacher of English and civics, Kensington Junior High School, Montgomery County, Md.)

If you are assigned a student whose daily action foul up the learning climate in your classroom, you must have feelings of frustration, and even of fury, at times. The purpose of this article is, first, to reassure you that you are not inadequate because you wish the child would disappear forever and, second, to suggest specific ways for dealing with problems which arise because he does not disappear.

One note of clarification: If the comments which follow seem overly simple, it is because emotional illness is overly complex. Little attempt will be made here to analyze the causes of emotional disorder; rather, the goal is to provide practical suggestions for dealing with those surface behaviors which disrupt your classroom.

Try to visualize a "typical" disturbed child. DC is a ten-year-old whose social behavior much of the time is at a three-year-old level. The minute your back is turned he runs his pencil across a neighbor's worksheet, he dips water from the fishbowl into the clay barrel, or he shoves and trips others without warning. He keeps you on edge because of his destructive actions but masters just enough subject matter and conforms just enough to your demands to keep you from telling your principal: "Either he goes or I do." (You can't ask to have him transferred; the other teachers have DC's too!)

When you first get such a student, a useful step is to check with other staff members who have come in contact with him. Does your school counselor have a case record for him? Did other teachers find your DC disruptive in their group situations?

If the answers are No, put aside this article and, instead, ask a peer whom you trust

to visit your classroom for a day. Tell him to observe your responses to the youngster, rather than vice versa. If your friend's findings lead you to seek guidance for yourself, be thankful for the experience! As you acquire insights into your own feelings, everyone—especially you—will be the winner.

Once you feel confident, however, that you are not largely responsible for this "enemy" action in your classroom, take the next step of acquainting yourself with the general nature of DC's disease. What is emotional disturbance? Where does it come from? In what different ways does it manifest itself? For meaningful answers to these questions, try the following activities:

1. See the motion picture, *David and Lisa*. (Your principal might arrange a showing for his whole staff.)

2. Visit an accredited school for emotionally disturbed children. (Observe there for a day and talk with different staff members.)

3. Read at least one book which deals with the emotionally disturbed child in the classroom. (In my opinion, one of the best texts to date is *Conflict in the Classroom: The Education of Emotionally Disturbed Children*, edited by Long, Morse, and Newman, Wadsworth, 1965.)

As you follow up these suggestions, you will become increasingly aware that the behavior which angers you is a signal of an illness, just as red spots are a signal of measles. You will understand that a disturbed child does not have a disease of destroying property or hurting people; these are but symptoms of his emotional disorder. And you will be reassured, once again, that you are not responsible for his illness.

The completion of step one (ascertaining that you'll be part of the solution, not the cause of the problem) and step two (becoming aware that emotional illness has deep environmental roots, that it is very complex, and that you alone won't "cure" it) frees you to ask the constructive "How can I help this DC and thus help all of us in the group?" instead of the defensive "Why is he doing this to me?"

For a third positive step, read about the following classroom situations, imagining yourself as the teacher in each of the three.

Situation number one: As you sit with a reading circle, you see the children stop reading and begin to stare across the room at DC, who is drawing pictures on the floor with chalk.

Your response to help DC goes something like this. You say clearly, for all to hear, "DC, I'm unhappy because my reading students are looking at your pictures instead of at their books. Tim [Tim is a dependable "normal"] will you help DC erase the chalk from the floor and then you and he may carry some books to the library for me."

COMMENTS

1. DC is relieved because (a) his unacceptable behavior was clearly defined, and (b) provisions were made enabling him to stop the behavior.

2. Tim experiences an ego boost. He has helped another human, and thus his concept of self-worth is enhanced.

3. Other class members feel secure; DC's behavior did not take their teacher from them.

4. You enhance your self-concept by dealing constructively with a challenging situation.

Question: But DC had unmet needs! Shouldn't he have been allowed to work them out on the floor with the chalk? The pictures weren't hurting anything!

Answer: Nonsense. DC's behavior was destroying the learning climate in your classroom. Furthermore, if DC had been permitted to continue unchecked, he would have experienced progressive feelings of:

Guilt ("Teacher is mad at me, I'm bad.")

Panic ("Help! I'm losing control!")

Anger ("Why won't someone stop me?")

Situation number two: DC keeps interrupting a small discussion group. You feel the

children's annoyance at him, and this intensifies your own impatience with his behavior.

You let the tone of your voice, as well as your words, communicate the group indignation. "DC, you're butting in and taking other people's turns. I don't like to have you take over while I'm talking! Now, I want you to get the cards box so we can help you take turns. Okay?"

You know from experience that your students all enjoy this game. The card box referred to holds about 50 blank 3 x 2 cards. Each person receives the same agreed-upon number of cards, and every time a student speaks he must put one of his cards back in the box. When someone's cards are used up, he cannot talk until everyone else's cards are gone. (The students learn through trial-and-error how many times they are willing to permit DC to speak, and thus commit themselves to speaking.)

COMMENTS

1. DC is grateful that his unacceptable behavior was identified with honest directness. (A disturbed child cannot tolerate a honey-sweet. "Let's not do that anymore," laded out through clenched teeth. It comes through to him as, "I'm pretending to like you, but only because I'm afraid of my real thoughts. I wish you'd drop dead.") The other students are also grateful because your acknowledgment of resentment allows them to feel comfortable with, instead of guilty about, their anger toward him.

2. Again you've given prompt assistance with impulse control, involving other group members. By playing a game that structures "equal rights," the pupils have a pleasurable as well as constructive role in helping their classmate.

3. You feel better and better. As you involve everyone in helping DC, it becomes "our" class instead of "my" class. A family bond begins to evolve.

Question: But DC is getting extra attention. Is that fair?

Answer: Who said life is fair? An emotionally ill person is a dependent person and requires extra attention. Don't you, as an adult, pay extra taxes to provide for patients in prisons and mental hospitals?

Situation number three: DC refuses to do a written assignment at his desk.

Withdrawal behavior presents a special challenge. Your first response might well be to hypothesize why he is refusing:

Too short an attention span? Call on a dependable pupil: "Jill, here is my stopwatch. Would you see how long it takes DC to complete his worksheet? DC, see if you can finish it before ten minutes are up."

He just can't do the work? "DC, I want you to do at least the first sentence now. I'll sit here and help you with it."

He simply won't do the work? "DC, I'm sorry you aren't ready to write today. Maybe tomorrow you'll be able to." (Coaxing or pleading will only reinforce the behavior you wish would go away.)

Comment: Of course there's a chance that none of these approaches will work. If he shows total resistance, keep your cool and retreat for awhile.

Question: But doesn't that mean he wins?

Answer: Wins? Who declared war? This child is not attacking you; he is just protecting himself from real or imagined danger.

Question: Well, after I've retreated for awhile, should I try again to get him involved?

Answer: Of course. Does a doctor make out a single prescription, and then abandon his patient if it doesn't work?

In the above three incidents, you responded differently to different problems, but your approach each time included:

1. Stating clearly to the child what his inappropriate behavior consisted of

2. Identifying your own feelings about this behavior

3. Providing a supportive structure for a change of behavior

4. Using, whenever appropriate, the participation of other students in this supportive structure.

Incorporating these basic steps, you can deal with a variety of disruptive classroom situations. DC could be a girl instead of a boy, of course. (While statistically we have more disturbed boys than girls, how many giggly girls disrupt a lesson because they were brought up as "first a female" while they heard their brothers challenged to be "serious students" first of all?)

Or instead of being age 10, DC could be 4 or 14. (Although he may be emotionally ill, a high school student must have mastered a fair amount of impulse control to survive in that structure.) Also, DC's behavior could take the form of repression of hostile feelings rather than expression of them. (A silent resister can sometimes hold up group effort more effectively than the loud-mouthed extrovert.)

(One unhelpful situation which has not been discussed is what to do when a number of DC's are placed in your already overcrowded classroom. In my opinion, you'll have to give up. The only question is how you go about throwing in the sponge.)

In the foregoing discussion, our disturbed child was compartmentalized as though he were much different from his peers. In reality, no clear line can be drawn between "healthy" behavior and that which isn't so healthy. Each of our students moves up and down his own continuum of neurotic responses which he employs to master a particular environment at a particular time. But the disturbed child makes compulsive responses which occur day after day and which interfere regularly with classroom goals.

While there are constructive ways to cope with a DC, such as those suggested above, as long as a teacher is asked to contain sick psyches while he teaches subject matter, he will have cause for deep frustration. Happily, there is help on the horizon in addition to that which may be available to your school system from experts in special education. One form this help is taking is the study carrel, with CAI (computer assisted instruction). R. Louis Bright of the U.S. Office of Education predicts that within another decade "almost the entire academic portion of instruction will be on an individualized basis in most schools."

If this forecast becomes fact—and if subject matter is fed into machines, to be reached for by each learner as he becomes ready to assimilate it—DC's behavior will no longer stop other pupils from getting academic instruction.

No longer will you, the teacher, face the dilemma of "his needs or theirs?" Rather, with the help of educational technology, you will have added time for those caring relationships which every human hungers for and which bring to him a sense of self-worth. You will have more time, through small-group encounters, to help each of your students experience individual growth by making important contributions to the needs of others.

CADETTE SCOUTS TOUR NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1969, Cadette Scouts No. 928 of Lawrence Township, Ind., came to the Capital for a 4-day trip to learn as much as possible in that time about what goes on in Washington, and to see the things of historical

value which are so numerous in the District. The girls went on a tour of the White House, the FBI, the Smithsonian, the National Art Gallery, the National Archives, and saw the monuments and many other cultural and historical sights. I showed them the floor of the House of Representatives, and they had breakfast in the Speaker's Dining Room.

The leaders of the group were Mrs. Terrence Sewell, Mrs. Ezio Baseggio, Mrs. Thomas Pease, and Mrs. Joseph Mattingly. The girls that came to Washington were: Connie Barker, Maria Baseggio, Penny Berry, Peggy Conner, Cindy Ewing, Barbara Elliot, Janeen Hayes, Bonnie Herin, Kathy Mattingly, Denise Pauli, Andy Pease, Kittie Reid, Carla Sewell, Debbie Thompson, Vickie Vanderpool, Marilyn Wells, Leslie Wimmenauer, and Jane Myers.

The leader's son, Craig Sewell, has shown himself to be a scholar and an athlete at Lawrence Central High School. As a member of the National Honor Society, it is no surprise that Craig is going to attend Harvard College in the fall. He won the Lion's Award Scholarship of \$200 as the outstanding athlete for breaking the record for the butterfly for the swimming team. I want to congratulate Craig for his success, and wish him well at Harvard.

FOURTH DISTRICT SCHOLARSHIP TRIP

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the service clubs of my congressional district have long expressed an active interest in the young people of their communities. This has been evidenced in many ways. One program, in particular, deserves special mention and I am proud to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

On Sunday, June 22, eight rising high school seniors arrived in Washington from Greenville, Spartanburg, and Laurens Counties for the second leg of the newly initiated Fourth District scholarship trip.

This trip, sponsored by local service clubs, is designed to give outstanding students from my district an opportunity to tour the Nation's Capital for 4 days and observe all facets of our Government in action. The agenda on this trip includes such activities as a Peace Corps briefing, attendance at both sessions of Congress, meetings with officers of the House and Members of both Houses, and a tour of the Supreme Court.

These young people are all deserving students selected on the basis of outstanding scholarship, leadership, and participation in school activities.

Through the financial sponsorship of various service clubs, two trips from the Fourth District were made possible. These sponsors in the Fourth District are certainly to be commended for their efforts and support in this regard for they have recognized the importance of training our young leaders and stimulat-

ing their interest in, and knowledge of, governmental processes.

The students participating in this second trip and their sponsors are as follows: Patricia Bennett, a student at Beck High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Bennett, sponsored by the Greenville Rotary Club; Anita Bowles, of J. F. Byrnes High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Bowles, sponsored jointly by the Greer Kiwanis and Greer Exchange Clubs; Mary Washington, a student at Gray Court-Owings High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. M. Washington, sponsored by Watts Mill; William Adair, student at Clinton High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. Forest Adair, sponsored by the Clinton Lions Club; Barry Gray, of Pacolet High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. Elston Gray, sponsored by the Pacolet Lions and the Ruritan Club; Clarence Hammond, a student at Sterling High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Hammond, sponsored by the Greenville Rotary Club; Lewis Cason, a student at J. L. Mann High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bill Cason, sponsored by the Pleasantburg Rotary; and Bill King, a student at Travelers Rest High School, son of Dr. and Mrs. Joe M. King, sponsored by the Travelers Rest Lions Club.

On their behalf, and on behalf of the people of the Fourth District, I wish to thank all the organizations, schools, and individual people who have contributed to making the Fourth District scholarship trip a reality.

REEVALUATION OF EAST-WEST TRADE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the free nations of the world coordinated their efforts to preserve and extend the areas of freedom as well as the Communist nations do in advancing their policy of tyranny, perhaps more human beings would be enjoying their God-given rights today. A good case in contrast is the war in Vietnam in which the United States and its allies defend the South Vietnamese against a Communist takeover while the Communist regimes are alined with Ho Chi Minh.

At the recent World Communist Conference the Communist regimes implemented their support by issuing an appeal to all workers to boycott supplies bound for U.S. troops in South Vietnam. As a Reuters dispatch in the Chicago Tribune of June 11 points out, the boycott idea was first put forth at an international Communist-sponsored labor union meeting in Moscow last summer.

Here in the United States one organization which has used the boycott approach but against the Soviet Union has been the International Longshoremen's Association and for many years has refused to handle Soviet goods. According to a New York Times article of June 2, for the first time in many years a Russian ship with a Russian cargo is on schedule to land cargo at an American

port. We therefore have the ludicrous policy, if the Times account is true, of extending the red carpet to a nation which has been the chief supporter of the enemy in Vietnam by supplying planes, antiaircraft equipment and other armaments. The insanity of our policy is all too apparent when we remember the toll in American lives which recently surpassed the over 33,000 battle deaths we suffered in Korea.

To complicate matters further, a Senate subcommittee recently voted to liberalize controls on U.S. exports to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries of Europe. This was in contradiction to the administration's recent policy against a slackening of restrictions in East-West trade.

It seems to me that now is the appropriate time to push for the establishment of a House select committee to review the complex issue of East-West trade. During the last Congress over 120 Members of the House introduced this legislation which, unfortunately, did not get out of committee. I am again this year introducing similar legislation which, it is hoped, will receive favorable action and which could, if enacted, reevaluate our policy in this all-important area.

I insert the text of the legislation, along with the above-mentioned newspaper items, in the RECORD at this point: [From the Chicago Tribune, June 11, 1969]

BOYCOTT GI SUPPLIES, REDS ASK

Moscow, June 10.—The Kremlin-sponsored World Communist conference today unanimously adopted an appeal to all workers to boycott supplies bound for United States troops in South Viet Nam.

The 75-nation conference, in its fifth day, issued the call in a document giving full support to North Vietnamese and Viet Cong proposals toward ending the Viet Nam war.

Neither North Viet Nam nor the South Vietnamese Communists, who have remained neutral in the China-Russia dispute, have sent delegations to the conference.

WORKED OUT WITH HANOI

Conference spokesman said the document was worked out in conjunction with "our Vietnamese comrades," and that an East German delegation has gone to Hanoi for this purpose.

The boycott appeal was first made at an international communist-sponsored labor union meeting here last summer.

The document adopted today congratulated the Vietnamese Communists on their "historic successes scored in the struggle against United States imperialism," and support the communist position at the Paris peace talks.

PUT END TO INVOLVEMENT

It demanded that "Thailand, New Zealand, Australia, and the South Korean puppet regime, as well as the German Federal Republic and Japan, put an end to their overt or disguised involvement in the United States aggression in Viet Nam."

The document set July 20, anniversary of the signing of the 1962 Geneva agreements on peace in Indo-China, as a day of international solidarity with the Vietnamese Communists.

The conference heard a speech from the head of the Cuban observer mission to the conference, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez.

DETAILS NOT DISCLOSED

No details of his speech were given, but sources believe he may have answered pointed remarks from Wladyslaw Gomułka, Polish leader, that guerrilla warfare, while

right for some parties under some conditions, could not be turned into a rule, for the world revolutionary movement.

The chilly relationship between Cuba and Russia has appeared to thaw in recent months, and observers said Rodriguez' speech could be an indication of how far this trend has progressed.

Cuba had refused to participate in preparation for the conference and only at the last moment decided to send an observer delegation.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1969]

SOVIET GOODS ENTER DESPITE I.L.A. BAN

(By George Horne)

Some Soviet commercial shipments are probably entering East Coast ports despite an embargo imposed by the International Longshoremen's Association, which has a rigid anti-Communist policy, according to the head of the union.

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the I.L.A. has reported the "discovery" of Russian goods arriving here in containers from West Europe.

There is no official Government policy against Russian ships or Russian goods carried in ships of other nations, but for many years the militant dock union has refused to handle any Soviet goods.

Mr. Gleason said last week that to avoid the I.L.A. ban on such cargoes, the Soviet Union was known to be sending merchandise to Rotterdam, where it is packed in containers, which are becoming standard packaging for ocean commerce.

"We have already caught some of it, and when we find such cargo we simply put it back in the container and refuse to let it land," he said.

Mr. Gleason was commenting on a report that for the first time in many years, a Russian ship with a Russian cargo is on schedule to land cargo at an American port. She is to sail from a Siberian port for Portland, Ore., some time this month.

The vessel will probably have no trouble landing her cargo, since longshoremen of the big union on the West Coast, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, has an open policy on Communist cargoes.

The ship, the Orsha, is scheduled to carry a shipment of titanium to the Oregon port. It will be the first big Russian cargo to come to this country in many years.

According to shipping records, the last large Russian cargo in the Port of New York arrived in 1950. It became the subject of a State Crime Commission inquiry.

Investigating conditions on the then crime-ridden waterfront, the commission heard testimony in 1952 of a big shipment of Russian furs, valued at more than \$3-million. The I.L.A. refused to handle them and for a while the two ships that had brought them stood idle at a dock in Elizabeth, N.J.

However, after the ships had sailed, it was discovered that the cargo had been secretly unloaded during the night.

A fur merchant explained to investigators that he had been called to a secret meeting with two minor officials of an I.L.A. local in New Jersey. As representative of the various importers awaiting the furs, he paid the two men \$70,000 as a bribe, and the fur shipments were brought ashore.

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1969]

HOUSE UNIT BACKS EASED RED TRADE—OVER- RULES NIXON'S POLICY—FAVORS RELAXED CONTROLS

(By Edwin L. Dale Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—A Senate subcommittee voted by 8 to 2 today to override President Nixon's recommendations and approve a liberalization of controls on United States exports to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries of Europe.

Three Republicans joined five Democrats

to approve a major modification of the Export Control Law, which expires June 30 and will be extended in one form or another. The Administration had asked for a simple extension of the present law, which has been interpreted strictly to limit exports of hundreds of categories of goods to Communist countries.

The bill approved by the subcommittee today leaves considerable discretion in the hands of the President and does not guarantee significant liberalization of controls. But, if enacted, it would represent a clear expression of Congressional sentiment and would be expected to bring a change in the way controls are administered.

OUTLOOK IS UNCERTAIN

The full Banking Committee is expected to give its approval of the bill, or a very similar one, on Friday. But the situation in the House is less certain.

The bill would abolish the requirement that 50 per cent of any agricultural products sold to European Communist countries be shipped in American-flag vessels.

It would also permit the President to limit exports only in cases where they have military significance. He can now cut off goods that contribute to the "economic potential" of a Communist country.

The bill would apparently end the present practice under which export licenses to some Communist countries are granted more liberally than to others, but it would allow the President to continue a total ban on trade.

A motive behind the Senate drive toward liberalization of controls has been complaints of American business concerns that they are being denied profitable sales at the expense of competitors in Western Europe and Japan.

H. RES. 847

Whereas Americans are being killed in Southeast Asia and the peace of all free nations is threatened by the Communist war of aggression in Vietnam, by the explosive division of world interests in the Middle East, and by the activation of cold war fronts in Latin America; and

Whereas the United States has no territorial ambitions and seeks only to remain free and strengthen oppressed peoples in their determination to work out their own destinies within the whole family of man; and

Whereas there is a need to determine the impact that East-West trade has on the national interest and international commitments of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full, complete study and investigation of:

The impact of East-West trade on the productivity and capability of nations which directly or indirectly supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any Communist faction within any nation in Latin America, or elsewhere with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance;

The extent of the participation of international organizations, institutions, groups, or financial arrangements such as guaranteed credits, with which the United States is associated, in aiding nations that supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any Communist faction within any nation in Latin America, or elsewhere with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance;

The effectiveness of United States laws, regulations, commitments, and policies governing trade with and aid to nations which

directly or indirectly supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any Communist faction within any nation in Latin America, or elsewhere with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

MARGARET MYER, WASHINGTON
CORRESPONDENT FOR DALLAS
TIMES HERALD, REPORTS ON HER
VISIT TO SOVIET UNION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Miss Margaret Myer, correspondent in Washington, D.C., for the Dallas Times Herald, has recently returned from a trip to the Soviet Union and other satellite countries in Eastern Europe. She has reported on this trip in a series of articles, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include her article for June 19 in which I believe she has included a most significant statement which I would like to set forth here in my introduction:

Space exploration is, without question, the best thing America has going for it in the Soviet Union and, next to freedom, the best thing going in the satellite countries.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—To return to the United States from three weeks in East Europe and find business executives for peace in Vietnam picketing in front of the White House and poor people's campaigners picketing in front of the Department of Health Education is a rude reminder that better housing, better food, better clothing and freedom of expression do not a paradise make.

That reminder can, in effect, be found among Americans one encounters in a tour of the Soviet satellites.

Two young adult men from Ohio seemed almost angry that they had not been confronted during four days in Leningrad by any display of anti-American feeling over Vietnam.

They were unimpressed, at the same time, by interest they could have elicited from Russians in another American endeavor—the space shot.

Apollo 10 was aloft at the time and, had they asked, they would have learned that al-

most any Russian they were liable to meet could tell them of the progress of the "American cosmonauts."

This was not because Russians were glued to television sets watching live color telecasts from the moon. They weren't. The pictures were not available to them (although they were available and avidly followed in Poland a few days later). The Russians had sufficient interest that they were following American exploration in space via brief accounts in their newspapers and on radio.

Space exploration is, without question, the best thing America has going for it in the Soviet Union and, next to freedom, the best thing going in the satellite countries.

No western thriller (the television series *Bonanza* is a big hit in Poland) grips the people as does the courage and bravery of men who explore the unknown with only the little-understood technology of scientists to assure their safe return.

The two Americans from Youngstown, Ohio, thought "the money could be used for better things."

"Sending men to the moon," they complained with disgust, "when we should be concentrating on getting men out of Vietnam."

Maybe they are right. Sen. Edward Kennedy has expressed something of the same attitude.

It is true that American presence in Vietnam is dimly regarded in East Europe. Soviet citizens seem convinced our presence there is imperialist aggression (they do not taunt visitors with the subject but will give an impression when asked). Soviet satellite citizens view American involvement in Southeast Asia as folly.

Persons in Poland and Hungary expressed the opinion that the Vietnamese do not know the value of freedom and America is wasting itself in a thankless endeavor.

America is still regarded in East Europe as the fountain of freedom. One gets the impression that East Europeans follow the space shots not only because of the drama that surrounds each launching but also because of the competition they represent between America and the Soviet Union.

The United States has, wisely, shared its accomplishments in space with the world. Every daring feat reflects credit on the Nation. But, something more is involved. The bravery of the astronauts has a universal appeal that cuts through the strictures of national boundaries.

Sen. Kennedy and the two young men from Youngstown, Ohio, may be right but they haven't been talking to the man from England who said of the success of Apollo 10:

"It gives us all hope."

THE "ESTABLISHMENT" IS DEFENDED

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, everyday as we read our papers, listen to the radio, or watch television we are confronted with reports of trouble and turmoil on our campuses—students rioting and shouting and making demands about everything. We are easily led to believe these trouble-makers and dissenters are in the majority. We do not see or hear much about the "young silent generation," the students who are earnestly going about the business of working and learning and

preparing themselves to meet the challenge of tomorrow. All over this Nation they are graduating by the thousands from high schools and colleges. I thank God for them. They will be the backbone of our country, they will accept the responsibilities of citizenship, and they will continue to achieve and accomplish the things that will keep this Nation great.

An example of one of these fine young people is Robb Holmes, a senior at Griffin High School in Griffin, Ga. He was the winner of the Georgia Power Co.'s annual Jack McDonough Editorial Award which is presented to the writer of the best editorial on free enterprise published in a Georgia high school newspaper. Robb Holmes received a \$500 scholarship to the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism, a bronze plaque, and a portable electric typewriter. It is a pleasure for me to bring his editorial to the attention of my colleagues as reprinted in the *Forest Blade* of Swainsboro, Ga.

[From the *Forest Blade*, June 11, 1969]

THE "ESTABLISHMENT" IS DEFENDED

Great American Tradition of today; protest. Protest the establishment. Few are willing to defend the establishment today.

Protest is valuable. It is probably necessary in a democracy. But what of the establishment? What is the establishment? The establishment is many things, and there are many things to be considered before one speaks out against the establishment as a whole.

Just where does one go to learn about the establishment? Students of the establishment are few. Therefore, it would seem natural that textbooks on the establishment would be few, but this is not so. There are thousands of them printed daily in the United States. Millions of people read them every day and take them for granted. They are the newspapers.

Buy a newspaper. Sit down and read it. On the front page you will probably find a story on the war in Vietnam. There may also be a story on demonstration protesting our involvement in Vietnam. If the demonstration was violent or destructive, the police certainly dispersed it, or attempted to, and arrested the leaders. If, however, it was peaceful, the demonstrators were allowed to continue exercising on their basic Constitutional rights.

Look on the inside pages of your newspaper. Read the ads; the advertisements for many competitive products and services, competitively priced. Look at the choice you have as to what to buy, and try to imagine a country, where there are few of those basic freedoms, and coincidentally, where there is no competition among businesses.

Read the editorials. Maybe you'll read a scattering indictment of an administration proposal for a tax increase, or something equally popular.

As you read you may ask, "What kind of government is this, anyway?"

(This is not a statement on the military establishment. Like many others, I view the war with mixed feelings; partially for, somewhat against, but mainly bewildered and not understanding. Nor is this a statement on the social establishment or longstanding injustices. This is a statement on what kind of government this is.)

This is a democracy. One of its oldest and most essential elements is the free enterprise system, and that's part of the establishment.

Take a look at those who favor the abolition of free enterprise. They are almost invariably failures, in most cases by their own fault, for under the free enterprise system

each individual controls his destiny to a greater extent than under any other system.

That is why free enterprise is almost necessary to a democracy. Abolish free enterprise and the government decides the success or failure of the businessman, the individual. When the government controls the individual's fate, it quite effectively controls his entire life—including his vote. Suddenly opposition to the government in power almost vanishes. There being no opposition to the state, the government in power becomes self-perpetuating and democracy becomes a cruel farce.

Granted, democracy, along with free enterprise, is frequently confusing, often infuriating, and the decisions made by the people are sometimes as bad as those made by a despotic ruler. But when compared to other existing forms of government, democracy looks very, very good.

Of course, free enterprise is not exactly necessary to a democracy. There are such things as socialist democracies—for a little while, anyway. Usually in such governments, half of the establishment eventually falls. Either socialism falls to free enterprise or democracy falls to tyranny. Unfortunately, the latter is usually the case.

Last year Czechoslovakia came very near to establishing an effective and humane socialist democracy. If the Czechoslovaks had not been betrayed by their supposed allies, their experiment might have succeeded. We'll never know.

As it is, we do know this:

Although there are many forms of government and many different economic systems, only one combination has been found to be practical and to approach in any way having the interests of humanity at heart. That is the combination of democracy and free enterprise, the basis of American government.

Many parts of the American establishment need to undergo drastic change. Even our economics could stand much improvement. But these facts in no way justify or recommend junking the entire system.

The American system is certainly no paradise, but a better system has yet to show itself. Until one does we would do well to work within the framework of the existing system. This is free enterprise: you may work and attempt to make something of yourself, or you may never attempt to do anything, never do anything—and then, of course, blame your failure on the establishment.

TITLE IX: A NEW DIMENSION IN FOREIGN AID—IV

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, other obstacles to carrying out the congressional mandate in title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act are found in the State Department, in shortcomings in academic literature on modernization, and in some resistance in host countries. Professor Schott spells out these external obstacles, as follows:

OBSTACLES OUTSIDE THE AGENCY

Owing to the broad policy implications of Title IX, its implementation also meets with a number of formidable obstacles outside the framework of the Agency proper. Not the least of these has been the obstructionism of the State Department. Many Foreign Service Officers view Title IX either as a bureaucratic encroachment on their own prerogatives in the field of overseas political analysis,

or as a significant threat to important U.S. short-term interests in the LDCs. To the extent Title IX broadens A.I.D.'s responsibilities, it must also, however, broaden the Department's. Yet, constrained by their representational responsibilities and the *status quoism* of traditional diplomacy, the State Department cannot be enthusiastic about a mandate that associates the U.S. Government with a cause that, to the uniformed or pernicious, can be described as a kind of overt C.I.A. operation.

Although recognizing Title IX implementation as an operational responsibility of A.I.D., State Department officials tend to view it as far too delicate a mandate to entrust to an Agency presumed to be unattuned to the subtleties of international diplomacy. The result is disastrous to Title IX: as it is an A.I.D. mandate, State feels no responsibility to respond to it; as it affects U.S. foreign policy, it is primarily a State Department concern and ought not to be A.I.D.'s. In consequence, State tends to take a negative posture towards any explicit attempt by A.I.D. to implement it. And given the present concept of the Country Team and Ambassadorial responsibility for all aspects of the U.S. presence in a particular country, this negativist posture can be effectively enforced.

An inherent conflict can exist between the development activities of A.I.D. and the representational role of State. This becomes particularly evident if one chooses the broader construction of Title IX. To holders of this view, Title IX was intended to counter previous foreign aid programs seen to shore up existing regimes and reinforce the present holders of social and political power in aid-recipient countries; it was designed to cause U.S. foreign aid, on the contrary, to seek the dispersal of political power and to support the forces of responsible social and political change. Such a construction of Title IX is understandably anathema to many State Department officials, particularly if those primarily responsible for implementing this mandate are to be the narrow-gauged agricultural technicians and the "apolitical" macro-economists who constitute the stereotypical A.I.D. officials.

This is not to say, however, that if State Department officials would only take a more positive view of Title IX, the Department would be appropriately organized and staffed to provide the guidance and coordination which Title IX's implementation requires. Unfortunately, the contrary is the case; just as A.I.D. is today improperly staffed to pursue Title IX objectives, so is the Department. The "change in approach" which the HFAC suggested might be required of A.I.D. will also be required of State—for the formulation of appropriate policies toward individual LDCs, for the analysis of long-run social, economic, and political forces in LDCs, and for the coordination of all appropriate U.S. foreign policy instruments as they may bear on the implementation of Title IX.¹¹

A second major external obstacle faced by A.I.D. is the paucity of operationally-useful knowledge about the processes of social and political modernization. Despite the unabating flow of academic works with "polit-

ical development" in their titles, their reading is a discouraging exercise for anyone interested in devising activities which may significantly contribute to these processes. So painful a labor becomes even more disagreeable if the reader dares seek in such literature operationally useful criteria by which to measure the success of relevant assistant efforts. Hiding behind the facade of academic respectability and the desire for methodological perfection, many academicians who might otherwise lend a hand in this important work deign not to do so. Rather, they have concentrated upon describing and explaining the operations of existing political systems to the exclusion of developing concepts and techniques for improving them. Without their assistance, however, the "operator"—lacking basic information and prescriptive commentary—either flounders, doggedly persists in the convenient ways of the past, or throws up his hands in despair. Unless ways can be devised to enlist the scholarly community in operational problems and to make existing knowledge available to the operator in terminology he can understand and utilize, a sophisticated approach to Title IX's implementation will prove appreciably more difficult.¹²

Presumed or actual host country sensitivity to direct U.S. Government activity in the field of political development constitutes another major obstacle. For those who believe that a U.S. foreign aid program should avoid political development activities, this becomes an effective argument against even broaching the subject with friendly governments. The signatories to the Charter of Punta del Este, for instance, may have declared their interest in achieving "broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty." But, regrettably, this can scarcely be considered a compelling counter-argument: the Alliance may be seen as an abysmal failure precisely on this score, if one has the temerity to appraise its progress after but seven dismal years. Far from living up to their professed interest in the "democratization" of their states, the parties to the Alliance have, in general, refused to consider this aspect of the Charter as a meaningful prescription, just as the United States has been reluctant to press for relevant reforms.

It should be unnecessary here to dwell on the supporting argument that the implementation of Title IX involves "interference in the internal affairs" of sovereign states. Yet it is remarkable how often this argument is employed. Suffice it to say that in a world so highly interdependent as today, this whole line of reasoning is woefully obsolete. Non-interference has become a practical impossibility; indeed, one interferes by not interfering. The relevant questions concern the type, magnitude and duration of the interference, not the interference itself. Besides this, of course, is the fact that foreign aid programs are cooperative undertakings agreed to by host-governments (however much arm-twisting is often erroneously reputed to be involved) and that no more "interference" could conceivably be foreseen by implementing Title IX than has already been effected

by many of A.I.D.'s rural development activities and counter-insurgency programs.

All of A.I.D.'s current economic undertakings, however, cannot help but have profound social and political ramifications in aid-recipient countries. It is Title IX's argument that the U.S. interest will be served not only by anticipating such consequences of its programs before blindly undertaking them but also by taking these consequences systematically into account when programming its foreign aid activities. In so doing, however, A.I.D. becomes *ipso facto* engaged in the business of political development.¹³

It is obvious that individual aid-recipients are unresponsive to certain economic development activities; so are they likely to be respecting political development activities. Yet it is reprehensible to generalize from the particular and assume that all political development activities will prove equally resented everywhere; it also demonstrates a rather perverse understanding of Title IX and the field of political development. Two points need here only be made: First, the spectrum of potential political development activities is extraordinarily broad, ranging from locating a road or similar capital project so as to contribute to national integration to the provision of direct assistance to particular "modernizing" political parties. Within such a spectrum, it would be difficult not to find a way to "do" political development in any given aid-recipient country if only the interest of operators was aroused and the perspicacity of knowledgeable advisers was employed. Secondly, and closely allied to this point, is the fact that implementing Title IX in a particular country may entail doing nothing at all, e.g., when an increase in popular participation could prove counter-productive given the level of that country's institutional development, or when any form of aid through whatever U.S. instrumentality would likely contribute to the perpetuation of an intolerably undemocratic regime or the maintenance of a closed socio-economic elite. As long as Title IX is not so narrowly defined as to insist upon the encouragement of particular types of institutions having rigidly defined characteristics or so broadly defined as to be utterly meaningless, there are a wide range of realistic options available to U.S. foreign aid administrators for responding significantly to Title IX. The major problem is more one of determining relative priorities among available alternatives than of identifying the alternatives themselves.

SALUTES TO SIERRA LEONE AND JORDAN

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

A SALUTE TO SIERRA LEONE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1961, the former British colony of Sierra Leone attained her independence. At this point, I would like to salute the progress of Sierra Leone, and extend my best wishes for a continuing prosperous and successful future for the nation.

¹³ It is argued by many in A.I.D. that Title IX's implementation should be confined only to so indirect an approach as this. Such a position enables A.I.D. to remain an agency concerned exclusively with economic development, although permitting economic analyses and project evaluations to be infused at various stages of the programing process with social and political development considerations.

¹¹ Title IX, to be an effective stimulant of a new approach in foreign aid, must be associated with the activities of other governmental agencies with significant overseas responsibilities—particularly the Defense Department, the Peace Corps and the United States Information Agency. To make certain that all these agencies undertake compatible and mutually reinforcing developmental activities in individual countries must be the responsibility of the State Department, if only because it is now normally expected to perform this role, and because no other agency currently exists which is capable of doing so.

¹² The problem, of course, lies not alone with the aloof academician. His aloofness has been encouraged by inordinately tight government research budgets (except as available to the Defense Department), the unnecessarily bureaucratic administrative and security requirements imposed upon those performing government-sponsored research, the extraordinarily haphazard and inept determination of research priorities by government officials, and the sometimes sarcastic references by A.I.D. and other bureaucrats to the "irrelevance" of contract research to the decision-making process and actual overseas operations.

Sierra Leone is situated in the tropical area of West Africa, a region noted for its wet rainy climate and its lush vegetation. A large part of the population is made up of the Mende, the Limba, and other tribal peoples. An equally important part of the population is the descendants of the freed slaves for whom the colony was originally founded. In fact, the spirit of the colony's founding is reflected in the name of the capital, Freetown.

Despite their diverse backgrounds, the Sierra Leoneans have been able to work together for their nation. One of the positive legacies of the colonial period was the educational system, which provided a well-educated manpower pool for the nation to draw on in the development process. The educational system is being further expanded, and increasing numbers of Sierra Leoneans are now able to make important contributions to their nation's development. The University College at Fourah Bay is known throughout Africa, and has been important and successful in the education and training of Sierra Leoneans.

The economy is expanding quite rapidly. There are rich resources of iron ore now being developed. The exports of this ore, especially to Japan, are creating an important source of revenue. Also of great potential are the rutilite-titanium ore—deposits, currently being developed by a group of American and European interests. Sierra Leone has most of the world's high-grade deposits of this mineral, which is used in the making of many modern alloys. There has been an increase in foreign investment in Sierra Leone, and tourism is on the rise. The tourist industry has been greatly helped by the construction of new facilities, especially at some of the beach areas, which are reputed to be the loveliest beach areas in West Africa. Another great aid to the development of Sierra Leone is the port at Freetown; it is the finest natural harbor in the West African area, with good, modern dock facilities. Sierra Leone's economic development is well on its way toward the goal of modernization.

Sierra Leone learned the art of responsible self-government from her British mentors; she has demonstrated a capacity to manage her own affairs. This has been a great aid in her continuing forward progress. I wish to congratulate Sierra Leone on her progress since 1961, and am happy to extend my greetings to one of the newest and most successful members of the "family of nations."

A TRIBUTE TO JORDAN

Mr. Speaker, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan received her independence in March 1946, after years of struggle and frustration. The modern Jordan was created out of the area known as the Kingdom of Trans-Jordan. The area west of the Jordan River, known as the West Bank, was controlled by Arab forces during the fighting, and became part of the new Kingdom of Jordan. The West Bank, which included parts of the historic city of Jerusalem, tended to be more developed in economic and manpower terms than the eastern side of the King-

dom. However, the two areas of the new Kingdom fitted together well, and Jordan's development after 1950 has been impressive.

The gross domestic product, one indicator of economic development, rose from a 1954 level of 51 million dinars to a 1964 level of 140 million dinars. This great increase reflects many things—the stability of the nation under the rule of King Hussein, the increase in the level of tourism, the relatively large amounts of foreign aid that have been available, and the earnings sent home by Jordanians employed in other areas. Light industries such as woolen mills and phosphate mining have also been developed, with great success.

The economy has been able to continue and in some instances, prosper, despite the severe disruptions created by the June war of 1967. The war caused many serious problems for Jordan, not only economic, but also political and social. At this point, Jordan's major concerns are, naturally, those problems, for example the refugee problem, which stem from the June war. But despite the problems, Jordan is more than holding its own. For example, in Amman, the capital city, there is a building boom, and the retail businesses are thriving.

A very large measure of credit is due to King Hussein. Jordan, under his rule, has become a remarkably stable nation; this stability has no doubt contributed greatly to the forward progress of the nation. Hussein's diplomatic efforts over the years have insured the availability of relatively large amounts of foreign aid and foreign good will. Hussein's stature throughout Jordan and the Arab world has served well as a unifying force for the nation. Perhaps Hussein's major contribution to his nation has been the many efforts he has made on the behalf of peace in the often troubled Middle East area. His efforts as peacemaker are, indeed, worthy of gratitude by the rest of the world. I take this opportunity to salute both the King and his nation on their progress and success in creating a nation. I am pleased to extend my best wishes to Jordan in her development efforts, and wish her a stable and happy future.

DUBUQUE, IOWA, TAKES LEAD IN LOCAL PLANNING-PROGRAMMING-BUDGETING

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House today a pilot planning-programming-budgeting program underway in Dubuque, Iowa, which has significant implications for improved economy and efficiency in local programs, not just in Dubuque, but in all Iowa communities and cities of similar size throughout the country.

The project, which was developed through the initiative of a creative city government in Dubuque, is being fi-

nanced in part by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with the State's share absorbed by the community itself.

The objective of the program is to develop a model fiscal management system in Dubuque, which can then be made available for other cities, counties, and school systems in Iowa, with the ultimate objective of a uniform budgeting system for all units of government in the State.

All of us in this House are very much aware that, as the functions of government at every level—city, State, and Federal—have expanded to meet the demands of the citizens each serves, efficiency and economy of government operations has suffered.

As a member of the House Government Operations Committee and a sponsor of legislation to bring about executive and legislative reorganization, I am deeply concerned about these trends and strongly feel that this should be a matter of priority attention for the 91st Congress.

The project in Dubuque represents such an effort at the local level, and deserves our attention and commendation as well as the support it already has received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the State.

Recently, the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald carried an article by Tom McDougall, explaining in more detail the PPB system, and under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Members of this body:

[From the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald, June 8, 1969]

PPB: A NEW WORD AROUND CITY HALL THESE DAYS

(By Tom McDougall)

PPB will be a big word in Dubuque after this summer.

It stands for Planning-Programming-Budgeting, and as the name implies it is a system of budgeting that goes far beyond the listing of expenditures.

You won't hear many Dubuquers, even those who are close to that sort of thing, talking with authority on PPB. At least not yet.

Nor will you find any books on it at the Carnegie-Stout Public Library. Look a little and you will find some obscure government publications devoted to it, and you will find that books have indeed been written about it. But you won't find them here.

But PPB is coming to Dubuque, and with it should come a major reform of the city's financing system.

In a nutshell, PPB is an information-gathering system that will list all the functions of the city not only according to the cost of each as is now done, but also according to the objectives each hopes to achieve and with alternate ways to achieve the same objectives.

A PPB program involves five steps:

1. Specify the objectives of each program.
2. Analyze its output—that is, the degree to which it achieves its objective.
3. Measure total costs of the program, not just for one year but for several years ahead as well.
4. List and analyze alternate ways of achieving the objectives, together with the cost of each alternative.
5. Establish the program in a systematic way.

PPB has been in use for several years now in many departments of the federal government, notably the Defense Department, and it has both its critics and its admirers.

The critics say it has the potential to lull decision makers into accepting bad programs

by attempting to change political facts into numbers.

Even PPB supporters admit that this is a possible pitfall. They stress that PPB does not do away with political decisions, but only makes it easier to follow the right course of action once the decision is made.

A PPB study has already been underway for about two weeks to switch Dubuque over to the new system.

It is the first such study conducted in Iowa, and its results will be applicable to other cities, counties or school boards that wish to use it. Because of this, the League of Iowa Municipalities has taken on the sponsorship of the study and has obtained a \$40,000 Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant to pay half its cost.

The city is paying the remaining \$40,000 of the cost.

Baxter, McDonald and Co., a managerial consulting firm from Berkeley, Calif., has already been hired to do the study and its consultants have been popping in and out of City Hall for the past two weeks.

A secondhand portable class-room that soon will be moved in next to City Hall will serve as the firm's headquarters when school is out in the Western Dubuque Community School District, but until then the consultants will continue squeezing in their work in whatever space they can find.

Allen Baxter, the founder and president of the nine-man firm, is among the consultants in Dubuque.

Baxter, a tall loquacious man, was a philosophy professor at the University of California before starting into the consulting business 10 years ago. The firm's eight other consultants have specialties ranging from engineering to accounting, for Baxter, McDonald and Co. specializes in solving all manner of managerial problems.

The firm attained its reputation for the PPB angle of its work after a study it conducted in California analyzing the financial aspect of intergovernmental relations.

That a philosopher—albeit one whose field delved especially into economic philosophies—should lead a PPB study is not so surprising as it may sound.

For despite the financial connotation of PPB and its ultimate tendency to contain numbers, especially those preceded by dollar signs, it is not entirely an accounting procedure.

It goes beyond that—certainly into the fields of political decision-making, and perhaps so far as to touch philosophy itself.

Basically it is an information-gathering system, enabling city officials to gather all known relevant facts on a particular subject and to sort them in meaningful ways.

The prime elements of PPB are, firstly, objectives and, secondly, alternative methods by which the objectives can be met. (PPB users prefer the word "trade-offs" to "alternatives" but essentially they mean the same.)

Basically PPB provides a format within which decision-makers can define their objectives specifically, then list the combined and alternative methods by which the objectives can be reached, together with estimated costs of each.

With this information at hand the decision-makers—in Dubuque's case the City Council, the city manager and the department heads—can quickly determine which objectives they wish to obtain and which methods will attain them in the most economical or the most effective way.

A certain amount of this type of data is already used in decision-making and always has been, but not in an organized way.

We have a foggy idea of our objectives—usually much foggier than we think—and we realize that one method could cost more or less than another, but we have no format in which to arrange these random thoughts.

We are especially vague on our objectives. Baxter explained that in their simplest terms

objectives should be aimed at seeking either maximums or minimums. For example, a program could be aimed at minimizing expenses, or at maximizing profit, or at maximizing public knowledge, and so forth.

He then asked this reporter what the objective is for, say, the Police Department.

"To minimize crime," this reporter answered smugly.

"Well," Baxter answered "what about the policemen who are called out to save a cat caught up in a tree?"

The answer? There is no specific answer as yet, and that's one of the things the study is all about. It will help each city department head to define precisely what his objectives are, a task that can involve some real soul-searching.

This step is only the first of PPB, but in itself it can have an immense effect. When specific objectives are known it will become clear immediately whether they are being attained, or whether they are even worthwhile.

Baxter stresses, however, that it is not he or his colleagues who will define the objectives; this will have to come from the individual involved. His task is to show how to arrive at usable objectives and how best to list ways of carrying them out.

This point is important, he stresses, because it brings out the fact that PPB in itself is no guarantee of success. A properly developed PPB approach can show the best way to achieve an objective, but if the objective itself is bad then the resulting course of action will remain bad despite PPB.

He gave as an example a hypothetical military decision. If the objective were, say, to drop a certain tonnage of bombs on a given area of North Vietnam for a minimum cost, PPB could probably show the most efficient way of doing it. But whether it is right to drop the bombs in the first place—that is, whether the objective is sound—is a decision of another sort.

In other words, PPB will not do away with political decisions and it will not eliminate the possibility that the hypotheses behind those directions may be unsound.

But once the decision has been made to pursue an objective it can show the best way to carry it out. It can also, by the very act of spotlighting the objective, reveal the flaws in it and therefore guide decision makers away from bad objectives.

Once an objective has been defined the next step is to list ways in which it is to be carried out. Under the PPB concept the list should be as complete and far-reaching as possible and should take in as much as possible not only what the city is doing but what the county, the schools and private organizations are doing.

Under the hypothetical heading of health, then, would go not only the work of the City Health Department but also that of other departments—the Building Department's housing inspections for instance—and of other agencies such as the schools' free lunch programs, the activities of the city's three hospitals and so forth.

Once all the data, or as much as can be gathered, is listed, administrators can tell at a glance exactly what the city is doing to meet the objectives—in this case, to keep its citizens healthy—and how much it is costing for each phase of the objective.

Once this is done there can be added to the list whatever alternative ways can be used to meet the same objective and the projected costs for each.

Obviously, with such a wealth of data at his fingertips an administrator will find it much simpler to make the correct decisions for meeting objectives. It will also point out most of the flaws there are in the traditional means of meeting the objectives, thereby making them easy to eliminate.

Baxter is quick to point out again, though that PPB will not make the decisions. That

is still the job of the administrators and the politicians. But PPB is a data gathering system that will enable leaders to see what the effects, economic or otherwise, of those decisions will be.

Once the first PPB plan is drawn up with its sets of forms and instructions, city officials themselves will be able to take it over, merely updating each category of information as needed.

But the first set of PPB data will be drawn by the consultants. They will both draw the blank forms and fill them in with information they glean from the city, the county and other agencies.

Once the plan is drawn up its skeleton will be made available for other cities, counties or school systems in Iowa so they too can switch over.

Hopefully, the result of this will be something the state government has hoped to see for some time: A uniform budgeting system for all units of government in Iowa. With such a uniform system comparing data from one city with that of another will no longer be like comparing apples and oranges because the facts from each will be tabulated in essentially the same format.

HOOSIER STATE BANK OF HAMMOND, IND., REFUSES TO RAISE INTEREST RATES

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John F. Wilhelm, president of the Hoosier State Bank in Hammond, Ind., is contacting the banks in northwest Indiana in an effort to oppose the large eastern bank combinations who have raised the prime interest rate.

Older Members of the House remember when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury under three Presidents in the 1920's. Secretary Mellon's high-interest policy helped dry up buying power for millions of working people and was a major cause in bringing on the Great Depression of the early 1930's. Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, during the first months of the Eisenhower administration raised interest rates several times and it aided in bringing on three smaller depressions in the 1950's.

I congratulate President John Wilhelm, of the Hoosier State Bank in Hammond, Ind., in his drive to maintain a lower interest policy and thus protect buying power, building expansion, and help preserve our prosperity.

I am hereby submitting an article from the June 17 Gary, Ind., Post Tribune which includes excerpts from President Wilhelm's letter which was received in my office last week:

AREA BANKER TELLS MADDEN INTEREST TO STAY SAME HERE

WASHINGTON.—Hoosiers are battling the big banks' boost of prime interest rates to 8½ per cent.

What appears to be a trend among smaller banks to stand fast against the higher rates has reached the attention of Congress, particularly the House Banking and Currency Committee, which will hold hearings on the escalation later this week.

Heading the hold-fast brigade is the Hoosier State Bank of Hammond, whose

president, John F. Wilhelm, wrote U.S. Rep. Ray J. Madden, D-Gary:

"I have discussed this matter with the majority of banks in Lake County, and I think you can rest assured that we have no intention of following the New York banks' example."

Wilhelm is expected to be invited by the committee to express his views on the matter.

Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., committee chairman, announced the hearing will start Thursday afternoon. Treasury Secretary David Kennedy, Attorney General John Mitchell and a representative of the Federal Reserve have been called to testify.

On Friday, the banks which raised their rates will explain why to the committee. The committee already has summoned six of the big banks.

They are Bankers Trust of New York, First National Bank of New York, Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago and Riggs National Bank of Washington.

On Saturday or Monday, the banks—such as Hoosier State—who have decided not to raise rates, will be asked as witnesses. Their views are more in accord with that of Patman and his committee.

Wilhelm, in his letter to Madden, said he was "very upset" with the turn of events which has caused the prime interest rate increase.

"I want you to know personally that the Hoosier State Bank will not raise its rates because of this temporary situation," he said.

Wilhelm said he wanted to make a few things clear to "Mr. Patman and his group."

"It seems," he said, "that they would have the nation believe that the commercial banks, each and every one of us, is ready to start 'socking' our customers the top dollar for their money. You could also jump to the conclusion that the banking industry is having a 'merry old time.' This is not true."

THE BANKERS' DILEMMA— INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the increase in prime interest rates from 7½ to 8½ percent by many large banks, application of truth-in-lending regulations, prospects for stronger Federal legislation over lending institutions, and information on bank robberies were among topics discussed by Irvine H. Sprague, Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, at a banking industry meeting in Milwaukee recently.

Sprague, whose home is Stockton, Calif., was a member of the White House staff prior to his appointment to the Board of Directors of FDIC last year. Previously he had served as deputy director of the California Department of Finance for 4 years and was my administrative assistant slightly more than 6 years.

His remarks before the Wisconsin Bankers Association on June 17 were of particular interest because of the great public attention focused on activities of the banking industry.

I commend to your attention two news articles describing Director Sprague's address. The first article appeared June 18

in the Milwaukee Sentinel and was entitled: "Bankers Told Image Fading." The second, published in the June 18 edition of American Banker, was: "FDIC Analyzing Bank Crime Data in Effort To Implement Effective Protection Program." They follow:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, June 18, 1969]

BANKERS TOLD IMAGE FADING

(By Ray Kenney)

The recent prime interest rate increase has tarnished the banking industry's image in congress and will affect banking bills now in the legislative hopper, members of the Wisconsin Bankers Association were told Tuesday.

Irvine H. Sprague, a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., Washington, D.C., and a former member of President Johnson's White House staff, tossed away his text at a WBA convention session at the Pfister hotel here and told state bankers some things that many of them didn't want to hear.

There is no possibility of a delay in truth in lending regulations, despite appeals from many banks that "We're not ready" for the July 1 implementation of the regulations.

New advertising regulations, scheduled for release later in the day Tuesday to eliminate "substantial abuses," will be "tough."

One bank holding companies will be subject to "a fairly strong bill this fall."

Congress is "extremely interested" in the bankers' decision to boost prime interest rates from 7½ to 8½% in an historic and unprecedented move last week.

Many bankers feel, according to the FDIC official, that the criticism will blow over.

"I don't read it that way," said Sprague, who has acted as a congressional liaison man, in one capacity or another, for 16 years.

When he first was named to a six year term on the FDIC's three member board of directors last July, Sprague said, congressmen used to ask, "How are you getting along with your banker friends?"

Last weekend, at a cocktail party, he added, the question was reworded to, "How are you getting along with your greedy banker friends?"

"I think that's indicative," he told several hundred WBA members. "The congressmen tell me that bankers are very smart . . . they ought to be able to find a way to hold interest rates down."

"I think what I am really saying is that the image of the banking industry is going down hill a little bit and it's going to affect you when legislation you are interested in comes aboard. Make no mistake about that," Sprague said.

In the area of one bank holding companies, and the possibility of approval of Rep. Patman's bill to bar them, Sprague said the issue apparently will reach the house floor. However, he said, compromises may have to be reached.

"I think we'll see a fairly strong bill this fall," he said. "Jurisdiction (over the one bank holding companies) probably will go to the federal reserve, and, I think, we'll probably see a grandfather clause, and some definition of what a bank really is," he said.

He indicated that the First National City Corp., the New York holding company built around the First National City Bank of New York, would not have backed away from the acquisition of the Chubb Corp., American agents for a British insurance group, if Citycorp did not also believe the measure restricting the operation of one bank holding companies would not be a strongly worded measure. Citycorp backed away from the acquisition of Chubb Corp. last week in the face of justice department objections.

Sprague had been scheduled to speak on the new bank protection act, which requires

banks to implement extensive security policies and procedures.

Statistical data presently is being fed into FDIC computers and will be circulated among the nation's bankers, he reported. The early statistics are too general to permit conclusions, he pointed out.

For example, he said, Wisconsin banks are way below the emerging average for photo surveillance equipment, and below the average number of security guards, but the state also is below the national average for bank robberies.

"I sort of wish I hadn't asked for the figures," Sprague shrugged.

Banks must file written security programs with the FDIC by July 15, he warned. The agency "is more concerned with the spirit of the law than the letter of the law," he added.

"We're not trying to make things more difficult for you, we are trying to make it difficult for robbers and burglars."

[From the American Banker, June 18, 1969]

FDIC ANALYZING BANK CRIME DATA IN EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE PROTECTION PROGRAM

MILWAUKEE.—As part of a review of the effectiveness of the Bank Protection Act of 1968, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. has undertaken what it calls "the first methodical effort to analyze cause and effect in bank crimes in this country."

Addressing the 78th annual convention of the Wisconsin Bankers Association at the Pfister Hotel and Tower, Irvine H. Sprague, a director of the FDIC, said that from reports received from banks, "we hope to pinpoint areas of high crime incidence; to isolate the factors that make a banking office vulnerable to crime and those that protect it."

The FDIC is analyzing statistics gleaned from reports on bank crimes committed during the past five years as required under regulations implementing the bank protection laws.

"Until we do know more about the cause and effect of bank robbery, the rule of common sense is the best guide we have to protecting a bank office," he declared. "Some banks that do not now have them obviously need alarm systems. All banks should have 'bait' money. Many more banks probably should have cameras installed—simply because they are in high crime areas."

Mr. Sprague said that, starting next month, FDIC examiners will make compliance checks "a regular part of their examinations."

Some requirements of the law will be mandatory "in about a month—with July 15 the deadline for completion of a written security program for each banking office."

By Jan. 1, 1979, he said, vault lights, bait money, bullet-resistant shields for walk-up or drive-in teller cages and other items will be mandatory.

In cases where a bank security officer has chosen not to install cameras or other devices, "the examiner will want to look at a statement of reasons for that decision and at the names of the law enforcement people who were consulted," he asserted.

"For the first year this procedure will be as new to the examiners as it is to you," he told the bankers. "They are not going to expect perfection."

Mr. Sprague said the examiners "will be looking for signs that you are making both an effort and reasonable progress toward making your bank and the people who work in it and use it safer."

The FDIC officer told the delegates: "I think you will find that the spirit of this law is going to be as important to us in this first year as the letter of it."

"We do not expect to eliminate bank robbery or burglary in 12 months. But if we have not reduced it by the end of 1970, we will be turning to the information we are now collecting in an effort to determine why.

If our approach is not working, we will modify it."

In other action, delegates passed a resolution supporting extension of the 10% surtax as an anti-inflationary measure and urging establishment of a banking school—similar to the Midwest Banking Institute of the University of Minnesota—at Morris, Wis., through the University of Wisconsin.

The convention ends Wednesday.

PRESIDIO: CLEMENCY DENIED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, I wrote to Army Secretary Stanley Resor and urged that he follow the example of Navy Secretary John H. Chafee in relieving those involved in the *Pueblo* incident of the possibility of any disciplinary action, and that he, Secretary Resor, act immediately with similar compassion in directing that the mutiny charges against the 27 Presidio prisoners be dropped. It is important to note that my recommendation was not simply that no disciplinary action be taken, but rather that the mutiny charges be dropped, for certainly the charge of mutiny is a severe one ordinarily reserved for graver or seditious acts and not the kind of infractions which took place in this case.

I now have a response from Secretary Resor who seems to be content in letting "the orderly review process" go forward and to let this black mark in our Nation's history of military justice remain.

Secretary Resor seemingly is in agreement with the Judge Advocate General's decision in reducing the confinement portion of the imposed sentences to 2 years for three of the defendants. This step the Secretary labels as "a matter of clemency preliminary to the appellate review of the convictions and the sentences."

In his letter, the Secretary continued:

I do not believe that any additional clemency action is justified at this time.

I find it a bit difficult to agree that a 2-year prison sentence for this kind of act comes under the clemency umbrella. A majority of the Presidio defendants have recently been sentenced to only 6 months. What kind of rationale supports sentences that have varied from 6 months to 15 years for precisely the same offense?

I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of my May 8, 1969, letter and a copy of Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor's response of June 21, 1969:

MAY 8, 1969.

HON. STANLEY RESOR,
Secretary of the Army,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RESOR: I very much appreciate receiving a letter on March 26 from your General Counsel, Mr. Jordan, who enclosed a comprehensive fact sheet concerning the Presidio trials. I am sure that you have monitored the continuing trials and are prepared to see that justice is done in these matters.

I would, however, like to call to your attention how speedily Navy Secretary John H. Chafee acted on May 6 when, upon receiving the recommendations of the court of inquiry charged with the responsibility of investigating the *Pueblo* incident, he overruled the court of inquiry and announced that no disciplinary action will be taken against anyone involved. He could have awaited the outcome of the court martial which would have ensued and let the matter work its way up the military trial calendar until it reached him and then exercised clemency. If he had done that, think of the months and perhaps years of trial and tribulation which everyone involved would have had to suffer.

Surely, the powers vested in Navy Secretary Chafee do not exceed those vested in you with respect to the Presidio incident. I urge you to direct that all pending mutiny charges be dropped and to remit or suspend all unexecuted portions of any sentence as a matter of clemency.

I believe that you would be rendering a great service to the young men involved and to the country at large if in your wisdom you emulated the very charitable act of Navy Secretary John H. Chafee.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: I have carefully considered your letter of May 8, 1969 in which you cite the decision of Secretary Chafee in rejecting disciplinary action against members of the Navy involved in the *Pueblo* incident. You have suggested that I extend clemency to the men known as the "Presidio 27" by directing that all pending mutiny charges be dropped and that all unexecuted portions of any sentences be remitted or suspended.

By all accounts, there is abundant evidence that those involved in the Presidio incident deliberately defied the stockade authorities and refused to end their sit-down and return to their places of duty. These facts provided a clear legal basis for preferring some court-martial charges against them and for the convening authority, the Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, to convene courts-martial for trial of the charges without the prior approval of any superior authority.

Whether it was an over-reaction to charge the prisoners with mutiny has been the subject of a debate which probably will continue for some time. The sentences imposed in the trials of the first three men to be convicted have also been criticized as excessive. I support the action of The Judge Advocate General in reducing the confinement portion of those sentences to two years, as a matter of clemency preliminary to appellate review of the convictions and the sentences.

I do not believe that any additional clemency action is justified at this time. The records of the initial trials are now being studied by a Board of Review. This initial appellate review could result in the mutiny charges being reduced to a lesser offense, followed by a further reduction of the sentence. The Board of Review may also consider, with regard to the appropriateness of sentences, results of the mutiny trial recently concluded at Fort Ord, in which the most severe sentence to confinement, after a conviction of mutiny, was 15 months, and two defendants were convicted of lesser included offenses. As you are aware, the cases are also subject to final review by the Court of Military Appeals.

The cases are being handled strictly in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In the review, the rights of the accused will be fully protected and all mitigating circumstances

will be fully considered. Accordingly, I see no reason at this time to intervene in this orderly review process.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army.

COLUMBUS, IND.-BASED ARVIN INDUSTRIES IS CELEBRATING ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this year, Arvin Industries, one of the country's foremost manufacturers of automotive components, electronic products, electrical appliances, and architectural products, is celebrating its golden anniversary.

The growth of this industry, based in Columbus, Ind., is a success story with few parallels. Now listed among the 500 largest U.S. industrial corporations, it had its beginning 50 years ago with three founder-employees, each of whom invested his future, his talent, and \$3,000 of his treasure.

Today, the firm has subsidiaries in 16 U.S. cities, as well as in Hong Kong and in Tokyo. A work force of some 8,000 men and women turned out products which last year sold for more than \$147 million.

This kind of success just does not happen. It comes about because of the dedication and the hard work of many people—people who have faith in the firm, in the free enterprise system, and in the United States.

Because I know so many people in the Arvin family, it is a special pleasure for me to join so many friends of Arvin Industries around the world in wishing the firm continued success.

I wish to submit at this time an excellent article incorporating the remarks of Arvin's top executives at a recent shareholder's meeting in Columbus.

The account, written by George Thomas, business news editor of the Columbus Republic, reads as follows:

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY: FIFTY YEARS FORWARD
WITH ARVIN

(By George Thomas)

"Fifty Years Forward" is the theme of the golden anniversary this year of Arvin Industries here, and it was only appropriate that shareholders attending the company's annual meeting Thursday at Donner center not only be given an insight into the industry's future but also a look into its past.

Eugene I. Anderson and James K. Baker, executive vice-presidents, shared remarks directed at the company's future while T. Earl Robinson, vice-president of finance and treasurer, gave a presentation of Arvin's history.

Mr. Robinson, who joined the company in 1928 at Indianapolis, traced the history of Arvin back to Jan. 1, 1919, when it was founded as the Indianapolis Air Pump company by the late Quintin G. Noblitt, the late Frank H. Sparks, and Albert G. Redmond, now retired and living in Lansing, Mich.

Mr. Robinson told how the three men started the company with a \$3,000 investment in a building rented for \$10 a month. The first year's production, he said, was near-

ly 40,000 tire pumps. Sales amounted to \$60,000, and the profit approximately \$10,000.

Later in his talk with the use of color slides, Mr. Robinson explained how the company grew from one small rented room in 1919 to operations today in 20 cities, in nine states and two foreign countries.

From a total of 720 square feet of floor space the first year, he said the company expanded to 665,000 square feet in 1945 and today has approximately 3,400,000 square feet in all of its facilities.

In the neighborhood of sales, he said that from the \$60,000 in 1919 the company's sales volume had grown to \$167,477,000 at the end of 1968, and net earnings for the firm over the 49-year period had risen from \$10,000 to \$6,543,000 after taxes for 1968.

Starting out as the Indianapolis Air Pump company, the firm was incorporated as the Indianapolis Pump and Tube company in 1921, Mr. Robinson said. The name was changed to Noblitt-Sparks Industries, Inc., in 1927, and continued under that banner until 1950 when it became as it is now known today—Arvin Industries, Inc.

Mr. Robinson dwelled at length on the early leaders of the company and their accomplishments. Besides the founders, they included Glenn W. Thompson, now chairman of the board who has been with the company 45 years; Eldo H. Stonecipher, now president of Arvin who has been with the company 37 years; Harlan Foulke, vice-president and secretary who has been with Arvin 43 years, and Richard Arvin, whose name the company's products now bear.

Diversification of products manufactured by the company started in the fall of 1920, according to Mr. Robinson, when Mr. Arvin came to the partnership with some patent claims he owned on an automobile heater. The Indianapolis Air Pump company built the heaters which were sold to the Arvin Heater company, another partnership that did the distributing. A year later the Indianapolis Air Pump company bought out Mr. Arvin, Mr. Robinson said.

Other products in those early years, he said, were Arvin hotair heaters, Arvin coaster wagons, Arvin hot-water heaters and the Noblitt electric water heater that was tried as a new product in 1930.

Because of operating costs the electric water heater wasn't feasible at the time, but from this apparent failure, Mr. Robinson said, came a product, a fan-forced electric room heater, in 1931 that has been an outstanding product of the company ever since.

His talk included how the company established a plant in Greenwood in 1923 and plants at Columbus and Seymour in 1925, and then moving of the general offices to Columbus in 1931.

Other highlights mentioned by Mr. Robinson were the company's entrance into the field of manufacturing other automotive parts such as the famed Arvin muffler, the work of its sale force in securing automotive business and government contracts during the second world war.

"In spite of the tremendous progress that was achieved during the past 50 years," Mr. Robinson said, "I am certain that the growth in the next 50 years is going to demonstrate how well these about whom I have talked have built, by this company setting such a blistering pace that the growth of the first 50 years will seem puny by comparison."

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Baker said they felt that Arvin's corporate growth and improvement must of necessity evolve from a corporate plan, and that such a plan should extend a minimum of five years into the future.

They said the 5-year plan will indicate direction of corporate growth, it will indicate rate or speed of the identified directional growth, it will include a method for the evaluation of the effectiveness of growth,

and it will possess adequate flexibility to permit change in the plan to accommodate technological, political, social and economic changes of the future.

Their presentation followed an introduction by Mr. Stonecipher, who said that most of the company's efforts are based on plans for the future. "Management can do nothing about the past," he said, "but the experiences in the past can guide in the future."

Reflecting on the past 50 years, he said, "We have had 50 years of success, and they were successful or we wouldn't be here today."

CONSERVATION OF LONG ISLAND SOUND

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a bed of concrete; or a closed-off salt water lake; or a highly polluted victim of raw sewage; or a graveyard for fish killed by thermal pollution; or a place of natural beauty ruined by a patchwork of bridges.

These are obviously undesirable, yet possible, descriptions of the future of Long Island Sound.

I do not seek to unduly scare boaters, swimmers, fishermen, and those who admire the natural beauty of the Sound.

But this resource is in danger of destruction as a result of unplanned development and too little cooperation between the State and local governments surrounding Long Island Sound. In an era when environmental concern is rising rapidly the Sound has been the stepchild of progress and we must prevent its unnecessary destruction.

The Sound is, of course, an unusually large body of water so accessible to a metropolitan area. Its 1,299 square miles makes it more than twice as large as Puget Sound and 50 percent larger than Cape Cod.

The benefits of Long Island Sound are many: It is a beautiful product of nature; it is a vital transportation link in the Northeast; it is an excellent recreation spot attracting thousands of boaters and millions of swimmers on both sides of the Sound; it is an ideal fishing ground for sport and commercial fishermen and yields plentiful amounts of shellfish; it is a welcome, peaceful haven for thousands of commuters who turn to the Sound on weekends as a respite from the workday world.

The Third Congressional District includes the entire shoreline of the Sound in Nassau County. Included in this area are Little Neck Bay, Manhasset Bay, Hempstead Harbor, Oyster Bay, and Cold Spring Harbor. Thus my interest in conserving the Sound and its shoreline and providing for their planned development consistent with ecological needs.

The legislation that Senator Ribicoff and I shall introduce today is not designed to impede constructive progress. Rather we seek an Intergovernmental Commission to provide for the cooperation of all appropriate governmental bodies in studying the Sound and its

shoreline and recommending what steps might be taken to protect it from the ravages of master builders, polluters, and others who would rob us of this resource.

This legislation is an extension of a bill I introduced in the past and I wish to thank Senator Ribicoff for his active interest in this matter.

SCANNING THE ARTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, a recent column in the Kansas City Star, "Scanning the Arts," by Henry C. Haskell, is a most thoughtful summary of some of the arguments for adequate support of the arts and humanities.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Kansas City Star, May 4, 1969]

SCANNING THE ARTS

(By Henry C. Haskell)

Somewhat less than four years ago—on September 29, 1965, to be exact—President Johnson signed into law a bill establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. That action was hailed at the time as a major development in the formulation of public policy. And there was much rejoicing among those who felt that here, finally, our federal government had accorded belated recognition to one of the most important fields of human activity. Alas, as anybody familiar with the ways of government should have foreseen, the battle was far from won.

Since then, Congress has actually appropriated the munificent total of 32 million dollars for various programs under this project, plus an additional 4 million in matching funds and another 4 million to cover administrative costs. In the last fiscal year, alone, Washington spent more than 5 billion dollars on furthering the natural and social sciences, with nearly 95 per cent of that amount going to basic and applied research on behalf of the former. The support assigned to the arts and humanities still represented less than 1 per cent of this imposing aggregate.

Such comparative figures, of course, can be misleading. Adequate research in the nuclear, biological and space sciences tends, by its very nature, to be enormously expensive, as against the funding required to carry on corresponding work in the humanistic area. It may also be argued that as a nation, we've had far longer experience in backing our scientists. Of necessity, the two "endowments" (one for the arts, the other for the humanities) which comprise this particular national foundation have had to proceed at the start largely on an experimental basis.

Moreover, not only have the various current crises in American society focused attention on what scientific research is able to contribute, but the achievements of such research can be readily perceived, whereas the impact of investment in the arts and humanities is likely to be deferred. We're an impatient people, no doubt, who put great store on quick and easily discernible results. Nevertheless, admitting all these circumstances, it still seems to me hard to justify the apparent reluctance with which Congress has been moving to underwrite its 1965 decision.

For clarity, let's erase the artificial distinc-

tion made between the arts and the humanities in the original legislation. They're a single ball of wax, even if there was a mechanical convenience in separating them for administrative purposes. So, let's talk about the whole humanistic operation as embracing the arts, in addition to such disciplines as history, archaeology, anthropology, literature, philosophy and jurisprudence, which are traditionally assigned to the humanities. I'd include the social sciences among them. But that may be a more controversial position.

In the protracted struggle to secure recognition for the humanities as worthy of direct national assistance (of the sort already granted the natural sciences), many compelling arguments were advanced by some of our most distinguished citizens. It was pointed out how seriously we'd lagged in this respect. It was noted how great an imbalance had gradually been created by the neglect of humanistic studies in our recent concentration on the spectacular potentialities of scientific research. To control the vast physical forces we were unleashing, it was contended, we urgently needed to know more about ourselves and about the lessons of the past, as they bear on the present and future of mankind.

Evidently, our legislators were sufficiently convinced, in principle, to *authorize* such an endeavor. But only just, in the face of so many other demands, they've given its implementation thus far an exceedingly low priority. (Having been previously chastened, the two endowments are now seeking combined program appropriations of no more than 13 million for fiscal 1970.)

My own impression is that the case for beefing up the humanities today is, if anything, even stronger than it was in 1965. We're confronted by a growing value crisis in Western society. As perhaps never before, young Americans are questioning many of the basic assumptions their elders had taken for granted. The more militant among them, especially on college and university campuses, exhibit signs of rejecting these earlier accepted premises *in toto*. Yet if some of us in the older generation complain that they're acting recklessly, without troubling first to become knowledgeable about our common heritage, how deeply have we, ourselves, examined it?

A spirit of alienation is abroad in the land, not limited to any one age group or any one race. Protests—and confrontations—multi-

ply. Some of them appear contradictory. Others seem curiously trivial. And it's often contended that most of them are primarily concerned with dissent, as such; that they don't add up to a constructive alternative which can then be backed by responsible action. These are the typical symptoms of a society in the process of being torn from its accustomed mooring. But what's to replace those norms that are being so widely challenged?

One major function of the humanities, I take it, is to provide a solid base for change, so that we don't in our haste simply repeat follies of the past which experience has demonstrated can lead to disappointment or worse. With honorable exceptions, how many contemporary humanists have been performing that function? How many have allowed themselves to become beguiled by pseudo-scientific attitudes, as the fashion of the moment, or have turned increasingly career-oriented, at the expense of transmitting a humanistic vision from one generation to the next?

Is it possible that over the last half century or more the humanities in America have emerged as more and more of an esoteric study for specialists and that we may now be paying the price for this trend in a widespread feeling that they have no practical application to our daily lives? As I see it, in essence the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was set up to help correct that dangerous misapprehension. Thirteen million dollars won't go far. But at least it's something about which we can write our congressmen.

STUDENTS WHO DO NOT MAKE HEADLINES

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in this day of dissension, disinterest, and disloyalty, it is refreshing to learn of a group of college students who still believe college is a place of learning, growing, and serving.

I salute, and I believe Congress will salute, the students at Thiel College in Greenville, Pa. These students may be called squares and scornfully labeled as not very hep. The loudmouthed, be-whiskered few that take over, refuse to learn, to grow, or to serve, cannot understand that they will only get out of life what they put into it. If they sow discontent, they will harvest discontent. If they sow disrespect, they will harvest disrespect. If they practice power and violence, they will reap the same. The laws of nature being what they are, for bad seeds sown one can expect more thistles and thorns than the fruits of good will.

The students at Thiel College represent, not the minority, but in fact the great majority of children. Left alone they can and will make their grievances known, they always have. They will do what needs to be done whenever and wherever the need is known.

The following editorial sums up the case for the Thiel College so very well:

STUDENTS WHO DO NOT MAKE HEADLINES

It's high time somebody investigated the unconventional behavior of students at tiny Thiel College in Greenville, Pa.

A group of Phi Theta Phi fraternity brothers staked a walkathon through more than a dozen nearby communities and raised \$1,630 which they donated to Children's Hospital in nearby Pittsburgh.

The Chi Omega sorority sisters have adopted a Navajo Indian girl in New Mexico and contribute to her support. At Christmas time they sing carols at the St. Paul Home for the Aging.

Thiel students raised almost \$1,000 for college-related charities and the local Community Chest. They are regular donors at the Greenville Hospital Blood Bank.

Each week a group of Thiel students visits St. Paul Children's Home to tutor orphans. The Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity house is the scene of an annual Christmas party for these youngsters.

Students teach Sunday evening parish classes at St. Michael's Church. In the summer they paint, repair and do odd jobs in Greenville community centers to help create a better atmosphere for local youngsters.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 25, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Maj. Walter Kennedy, divisional secretary, Indiana headquarters, the Salvation Army, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Gracious and Eternal God, Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting.

We bow our heads and our hearts before Thee in grateful adoration, for Thou art a great God and worthy of our praise. We give Thee thanks for men and women who are dedicated to public service.

Awaken all of us gathered in this Chamber this day to our need of Thee that our talents and energies may be used to meet the great needs of our country and of the world.

Create within us a divine discontent so that we are dissatisfied with life as it is. Give us wisdom to continue with dignity and confidence to enact laws based

upon the great principles laid down by our Founding Fathers.

We further pray, O Heavenly Father, that You will give Your continued strength to the President, to his Cabinet, and to the Congress of our beloved United States.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 24, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in

relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar under "New Report."