EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESOLUTION OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF SOUTH CAROLINA WHICH SUPPORTS DEPLOYMENT OF THE ABM SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is reassuring to note that more and more Americans everyday are expressing their support of the President's proposal to deploy the ABM Safeguard system. There are many organizations that have reached the same conclusion after evaluating the increasing Soviet threat.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to announce that the Disabled American Veterans of South Carolina have strongly endorsed deployment of the ABM. The public is beginning to realize that the growth of the Soviet nuclear threat was kept from them by the past administration. They were not told that the Soviets were getting ahead of the United States in ICBM's until this administration revealed the actual facts which some of us have been advocating for sometime.

I would like to quote one significant part of the resolution adopted by the South Carolina's Disabled Veterans organization:

> Between the years 1962 and 1965 the Soviets have increased their nuclear striking power 300 percent, while the United States was decreasing its nuclear striking power by 50 percent.

I congratulate my friends in South Carolina for not being willing to risk our security. They recognize this dangerous threat. The ABM is a minimal defensive measure that is vital to our survival.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas since World War II the communists have done little that would indicate that they truly desire peaceful coexistence; and

Whereas between the years 1962 and 1965 the Soviets have increased their nuclear striking power 300 percent, while the United States was decreasing its nuclear striking power by 50 percent; and

Whereas it is reported that the Soviet Union has more than 200 nuclear missiles aimed at the United States of multi-megaton destructive power; and

Whereas informed sources advise that the Soviets have surpassed the United States in numbers of land-based inter-continental ballistic missiles and are continuing to deploy ICBM's at a more rapid rate; and

Whereas the Soviets are building a Polaris-type submarine fleet at such a rate that they are expected to surpass the United States in the next five years; and

Whereas the Soviet Union now has a defensive missile of its own; and

Whereas Communist China is following the same pattern of nuclear development as that of the Russians; and

Whereas the past eight years have seen the United States move from a vast superiority in military might to a position that leaves our nation so vulnerable as to endanger the survival of the Free World; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans, Department of South Carolina, in convention assembled this seventh day of June, 1969, does hereby unanimously commend the President of the United States for proposing the development of an anti-ballistic missile system to protect our homes and does hereby urge that the Congress of the United States implement the proposed missile defensive system, and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to The President of the United States, to all members of the South Carolina delegation in Congress and to National Headquarters, Disabled American Veterans, for appropriate action by the National Convention.

PAUL H. GREER,
Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of South Carolina.

DAIRY MONTH

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the month of June is probably best known as the month of weddings. It is, however, also noted by many as "National Dairy Month." In this connection, Mr. William Petersen, of Davenport, Iowa, recently discussed the problems and new developments in the dairy industry in a guest editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat.

TRENDS IN DAIRY FARMING

Mr. and Mrs. William Petersen, R. R. 2, Davenport, are co-chairmen of the Scott County Dairy Promotion Committee for 1969. They have been working with eight other couples and representatives of the dairy handlers and processors in preparation for the 10th annual Dairy Day, June 13. The Petersens farm 380 acres near Davenport and milk 26 Holsteins. Their children include William, 16, Cynthia, 13, and David, 10, who assist in the farming operation.

June is Dairy Month, a time to emphasize the promotion of the dairy industry and perhaps to reflect on the stake dairying plays in our economic growth and well-being.

According to ancient records, man was milking cows as early as 9000 B.C. Since then, the cow has become known as the "Foster Mother of the Human Race" and her contribution to humanity, milk, is still considered nature's most nearly perfect food, a highly nutritious combination of proteins, carbohydrates, minerals and vitamins.

As one might well expect a lot of milk has flowed since that time, and changes in dairying have been phenomenal.

From the time the cow was towed behind the prairie schooner, heading west, on through the 1940s, most farms had at least a few milk cows and dairying played an important part in the livelihood of the farm family. But since that period, the number of farms with dairy cows has been declining steadily. In 1968 we had 569,000 milk cows in Iowa, down 39,000 from the previous year.

One reason for many men quitting the dairy business is the inability to obtain dependable help. Many youth today do not have the inclination to work long hours with a twice a day routine of milking, 365 days a year. They can find easier work with better pay at other employment.

Another reason is the high investment cost of updating the dairy operation. A bare minimum of capital investment for a modern milking-parlor and free-stall operation would be in the $30,000 range. This could easily run $50,000 or more depending on type of facilities, number and type of silos and other equipment.

Because of these factors it can be expected that small side-line dairy operations will continue to phase out as the farmer finds better alternatives, such as switching to grain farming, other livestock enterprises requiring less labor, and employment off the farm.

Factors determining who will be the dairymen of the future include a dedication and love of dairy animals by the dairyman, and a desire to improve on the genetic potential of the dairy cow. It takes a special kind of man to meet these requirements, and once he has committed himself to this cause, the high investment cost requires that he make this his life work, as some of the facilities, such as the milking parlor, can not be utilized for any other purpose.

The type of land also plays an important role in dairying. Hilly, marginal land is best suited to forage production and cows can utilize large quantities of forage and convert it into milk efficiently.

An adequate labor force also enters the picture. The farmer with sufficient family labor, such as a father-son partnership, definitely has an advantage over a dairyman depending on hired help, which is nearly impossible to obtain.

So as dairy farms become fewer the remaining ones become larger, this trend is expected to continue and some observers feel that most herds will be in the 60 to 100 cow size. The larger herds are made possible through the introduction of automation in the feeding and forage handling operation from the field to the feed bunk. New machines are continually being developed to increase efficiency and quality of the feed and forage that we have to provide for the herd.

In the case of handling bales, conveyers are available to move bales to any spot in the mow and dump them. Some balers can be equipped with kickers which throw the bales directly into the wagon, eliminating one man from loading.

With chopped hay or silage, self-unloading wagons are available to move large volumes of forage with less hand labor.

Silo unloaders bring the forage out of storage and drop it into automatic feed bunks.

In the milking operation itself, milking-parlors are becoming more numerous and popular. These make it possible to handle more cows in less time, with less walking and hand labor. The milk flows in a stainless steel or glass pipe-line to the stainless-steel bulk-tank, where it is stored for every other day pickup. Clean-up operations in the parlor are faster and easier.

Changes also are taking place in dairy cow housing. Free-stalls are replacing the old stall barns and loose-housing. In some setups the herd is housed in total confinement with environment control. For manure handling, slot-floors sometimes are used with liquid manure pits underneath. This eliminates a dairy chore and makes it possible to haul the waste when time and field conditions are suitable.

There no doubt will be many more changes. But one thing will not change. The cow must be milked twice a day, 365 days a year, and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

someone—the dairy-farmer—has to be on deck to do it. All these new facilities and electro-brained gadgets help him, but he must still be there to supervise the operation. In the busy season, his day will be dawn to dusk.

LOVE LETTER TO IDAHO

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Idahoans know that our State is something special. From its lush, green farmlands to its rugged, alpine mountains and lakes, Idaho is a place of spectacular beauty. Her people are open and friendly. Her cities are clean.

Because Idahoans know what our State is like, we are always more than pleased when others discover it for themselves.

Recently, Dan Valentine, a columnist for the Salt Lake Tribune, rediscovered Idaho. He summed up his impressions in a "Love Letter to Idaho." Idahoans, he said, "have a wonderful product. It sells itself."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Dan Valentine's column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NOTHING SERIOUS

(By Dan Valentine)

The gem State: This is my annual love letter to Idaho.

At the risk of peeving Utah boosters and at the risk of making Wyoming and Nevada readers a little miffed, I try to write one column each year about the beauty and the flavor of the Gem State.

I recently made a 500-mile trek through Idaho . . . across the lush farm lands, past the rolling green hills . . . The Idaho streams were frothing in their own special way . . . and the Idaho sky was as clear and blue as ever . . .

And the people were friendly.

Idaho people have a special brand of friendliness. They are honest, open and smiling.

As a state, Idaho has a lot going for it. It ranges from the farmlands to the mountains in the north . . . It has woods and snow and timber and fish and deer . . . and just about anything else you'd want.

And the Idaho air is extra breathable . . . It lacks the pollution taint of much of the air these days.

Much of Idaho is beautiful . . . all of it is pleasing.

Idaho has one of the prettiest state songs—"Here We Have Idaho"—of all the 50 states. Even to a stranger, it sends a tingle up the spine when it is sung by proud Idahoans.

Idaho people don't beat the publicity tomtoms like some states. They allow the land to speak for itself. Unlike Texas, they feel no need for bragging.

They know they have a wonderful product. It sells itself.

Along the route of my recent Idaho jaunt, I picked up some interesting Idaho nuggets, some little-known scraps of knowledge about the fabulous state.

Such as:

No less than 72 different varieties of gems and precious stones can be found within Idaho's borders—the gem wealth of Idaho is second only to that of Africa, the experts say . . .

Idaho is a good cow state, too. At last count, there were 156,000 producing cows in Idaho, giving an average of 9,300 pounds of milk annually.

Idaho's State Capitol in Boise is one of the most impressive in the West. It was patterned after the Capitol in Washington, D.C., and is built of marble from Alaska and Vermont . . . One of the highlights of the Capitol is a statue of George Washington—carved from an Idaho Ponderosa pine tree.

There is nothing dry about the state of Idaho (except some of the humor of its citizens). It has water coming out of its beautiful ears. All told, there are more than 35,000 miles of gushing, rushing streams and rivers within the borders of the state—and no less than 2,000 lakes.

Idaho is famous for its lakes. Lake Coeur d'Alene is regarded by experts as one of the five most beautiful lakes in the entire world. Largest Idaho lake, boasting 180 square miles of surface, is Lake Pend Oreille.

Water is one of Idaho's most important products—more than 3 million acres of Idaho's lush farmland is irrigated . . . Idahoans love the water. There are more than 32,000 outboard motors in the state . . .

Idaho is a sportsman's paradise. Idaho fish practically leap out of the stream onto a waiting hook (if you can believe the stories around the Salmon River) . . . and it is very hard, indeed, for a hunter who knows his business not to get a deer in season.

Last year, Idaho hunters bagged 70,000 deer . . . and no less than 15,000 elk . . .

Idaho potatoes, of course, are the best in the world—and command premium prices from shoppers all over the nation.

Idaho! Its women are beautiful, its mountains tall . . . the hills are green, its rivers clean . . .

And its skies are always extra blue.

A very nice state to have as a neighbor.

CUTS OF ESSENTIAL FEDERAL FUNDS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a letter I sent in response to a constituent's wire regarding the cuts of essential Federal funds:

JULY 1, 1969.

ALFRED J. HOLZMAN,
Redevelopment authority,
New Kensington, Pa.

DEAR AL: Your telegram points out a very serious problem we are facing in Congress.

As far as we know, there is no less revenue coming in this year than there was last year. In fact, all indications point to increased revenue from the taxes we now have.

Last year, we were asked to pass a 10% surtax. The revenue from this tax was earmarked for Vietnam needs. This year, we are told the war is being phased out and many of the troops will be home before Christmas. It is also our understanding that our inventory material will be sufficient to carry us through this period.

Even in view of this, we are still being bludgeoned by the economists within the Administration into re-enacting the surtax, which last year produced a surplus of 4½ billion dollars.

The question before us is how can we be asked to support this legislation when the President is determined to cut back on social reforms, education needs and community services and requirements. Incidentally, last year we only received some Republican support for the surtax by writing in a stipulation that President Johnson cut his spending by $6 billion, making a net gain of 3 billion. This year we find ourselves with the same tax and no corresponding cut by Congress.

You will note that the cuts so far proposed have been in education, anti-poverty programs, water pollution, and urban and rural developments and rehabilitation funds.

We are experiencing the most politically oriented budget juggling since I started in government 36 years ago. Like any other normal legislator, I refrained from criticizing the Administration since the President was elected by the people on his platform. I believe he is entitled to do that which he believes is right, and that which is in keeping with his pledges, and presumed desires of the people. Time is running out for this position to be maintained.

We are definitely given a promise by "Candidate" Nixon that the surtax would and should be removed. Yesterday, in the last five minutes of debate, a personal letter from President Nixon was read. It threatened the people and the Congress of dire results if the Congress did not pass the tax. He said this would give the Administration money to keep our domestic programs going. Two hundred and five of us did not believe him; two hundred and ten did. Even with the full power of the Democratic leadership lending a hand, the victors were only able to muster a 5 vote majority.

Today I will be on the House floor to make a privileged one minute speech calling upon the Democratic leadership to have the President make his position clear on programs, such as yours, before a vote of confidence is given him by passing the tax bill in the Senate.

I always have and will continue to talk about the double standard in politics. Some excuse it and say that it has always been here; but some of us believe that this is no excuse.

The American people are not to be hoodwinked by the rule of this Administration. Believe me, Al, you will note from the record that I have been bipartisan in this matter, and have not criticized or thrown any blockage into the President's wishes. Now, unless the President spells out what he wants to do and how he intends to do it, I will become a critic in order that the people may hear the other side of a story not now being portrayed by the news media.

The political situation is very simple. The big plum next year is control over the House and Senate. The plan, of course, is an old one, but it has worked before. Cuts will be made this year and taxes will be maintained this year; next year cuts will be restored, and the surtax will be dropped and the people will forget this years injury for next year's ball. Politicians know it is not the performance or keeping of promises that keep a man in office: it is the making of new promises that gets him elected.

I can only say to you that when legislation to restore cuts reaches the floor, it is probably the toughest assignment to fulfill. I will, however, keep trying.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

A NATIONAL POLL FAVORING ABM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of Congress, the American people and the press

to a nationwide poll which shows that 84 percent of all Americans support an ABM system. The Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N.J., which conducted this poll is a leading independent research organization. I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator HUGH SCOTT, who released this information to let the Congress and America know how the voters feel about our country's security.

Mr. President, this poll reveals that only a bare 8 percent of 200 million Americans feel that the ABM is not necessary. The 84 percent for the ABM is overwhelming evidence of what the American people want, and I commend their wisdom. As President Nixon said:

If we do too much, it will cost us our money; if we do too little it will cost us our lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the information and the results of this favorable poll which was published in a page advertisement of the Washington Post on June 30, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT OF ALL AMERICANS SUPPORT AN ABM SYSTEM

(National poll conducted by Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J.)

A nationwide opinion poll representing adults throughout the continental United States reveals overwhelming support for a U.S. Anti-Ballistic Missile defense system . . . Only 8% believe that no ABM system is needed.

This revealing poll, conducted by a leading independent research organization, Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N.J., covered a representative cross-section of the nation. According to the survey, released by U.S. Senator Hugh Scott, 84 per cent of all Americans (Democrats, Republicans and Independents) agree that the U.S. should have an ABM system. What's more, almost three-fourths (73%) of the public want Congress to approve President Nixon's specific safeguard ABM system.

Here is how America responded:

1. "Do you think the United States should have some sort of ABM defense system, or should not?"

[In percent]

Total public:	
Yes, should	84
No, should not	8
No opinion	8

2. "President Nixon has come out for a limited ABM system—called the Safeguard System—which is supposed to protect our ability to strike back at an attacker. Do you think Congress should approve this system, or should not?"

[In percent]

Total public:	
Yes, should approve	73
No, should not approve	10
Depends	3
No opinion	14

3. "As far as you know, does Russia already have some ABM's in place and ready to use?"

[In percent]

Total public:	
Yes	63
No	3
Not yet, but will	1
Don't know	33

Now, for the first time we are hearing the real voice of America . . . and not what the noisy 10 percent, opposed to the plan, would like Congress and the country to believe!

The overwhelming support of the ABM proposal and the desire of the voters to have Congress enact such legislation have been obscured by the clamor of a minority. An organized campaign of letter writing to Congress, directed by a small group of militant opponents, has created an erroneous impression. The real voice of America is not being heard! Largely through the activities of these organizations, representing the attitudes of the 10 per cent opposed to the plan, Congressional mail is running against the Safeguard program. Obviously a severe information gap exists! It is time for Americans to speak up!

Now you know the facts—become an active member of the 84% majority—let your voice be heard!

Write today! Don't put it off! We need a flood of majority mail to offset the mail of the organized minority. If you don't act now it may be too late! So the minute you stop reading this ad—pick up your pen and write your Senator and Congressman!

HOW WILL PRESIDENT NIXON'S SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM PROTECT US . . . WHAT WILL IT COST?

It is not necessary to understand all the scientific facts about the ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missile) System. What is important for you to know is what it will do to deter nuclear war between the super-powers.

In the northern part of the United States we have Minuteman sites. There are underground silos where we keep our advanced nuclear strike arsenal—ready for launching in case of attack. The Safeguard ABM System is a system to protect our Minuteman sites from being blown up by an enemy's initial missile assault. In case of enemy attack, our radar would spot the incoming missiles and our ABM's would be launched to seek them out and explode them high in the atmosphere. That would mean that we would still have our Minuteman force virtually intact and ready to launch against the enemy!

Since the Russians already have deployed their own ABM system—giving protection to their strike force—it would seem suicidal for the U.S. not to start on a system at once!

What will the Safeguard ABM System cost? There's been a lot of reckless talk on this subject. What President Nixon is asking for is a system that will cost less than 2% of our defense budget (or about $6.00 per U.S. citizen yearly) . . . a small price to pay for such vital protection for our country.

Remember these two vital points: (1) The Safeguard program will contribute significantly to the deterrence of nuclear war and (2) it will contribute significantly to meaningful arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

WHERE DOES AMERICA REALLY STAND IN THE NUCLEAR BALANCE OF POWER?

During the "Cuban Crisis" of 1962, Russian nuclear missiles were aimed at the U.S. President Kennedy's ability to maintain world peace came at a time when the U.S. held a vast nuclear advantage. This advantage no longer exists.

By the end of this year the Kremlin will have deployed as many land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) as we will have—*or more*—and with a substantially greater megatonnage.

The truth is: The Soviet Union has developed and tested a 60-megaton bomb; it is the only nation to possess a terror weapon of this size.

The truth is: The Soviet Union is the only nation to have built and installed ICBM's of the SS-9 size (with 1,000 times the yield of the Hiroshima bomb) and to be testing multiple warheads on it.

The truth is: The Soviet Union has developed and tested a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System (FOBS), a first-strike-oriented weapon; it is the only nation to have available such an orbital weapon.

The truth is: The Soviet Union—in 1962—test fired an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) against an incoming nuclear-armed missile; it is the only nation to have conducted such a test.

The truth is: The Soviet Union acted first to deploy ABM's and has already installed 60 ABM launchers, and is testing an improved model . . . Whereas the United States has not yet deployed ABM's of any kind.

Faced with threats like these our Presidents have continually emphasized the necessity for a strong nuclear defense:

Richard M. Nixon: "If we do too much (with the Safeguard ABM system) it will cost us our money; if we do too little it will cost us our lives."

John F. Kennedy: "First . . . we must take immediate steps to protect our present nuclear striking force from surprise attack."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Our nuclear weapons and our ability to employ them constitute the most effective deterrent to an attack on the free nations."

We believe:

1. That the President with all of our nation's military, scientific and intelligence skills at his disposal is best equipped to evaluate the need for this protection.

2. That as long as Soviet Russia has the capability to annihilate us with nuclear missiles no step that will protect our country can be prudently delayed.

3. That very soon Red China will have a nuclear missile capacity and that both the Soviet Union and the United States will want protection against it.

4. That peace can be obtained and maintained only if it is coupled with security.

5. That an American missile defense capability will make our negotiating posture more flexible in arms talks and improve the prospect for meaningful arms limitations.

Organizing committee: William J. Casey, Chairman; George Champion, Leo M. Cherne, William Elmer, Cy Laughter, Barry T. Leithead, Morris I. Leibman, Clare Boothe Luce, Vince Lombardi, John A. Mulcahy. William J. O'Hara, secretary.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS, CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH SECURITY

Alan K. Abner, Las Vegas, Nevada.
Robert H. Abplanalp, Yonkers, New York.
William M. Acker, Jr., Birmingham, Alabama.
Albert B. Adelman, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Mike Allred, University, Mississippi.
Hoyt Ammidon, Manhattan, New York.
Carl B. Anderson, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Louis R. Aragon, San Bernadino, Calif.
Fred F. Auerbach, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Henry Avery, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Louis B. Bach, Chicago, Illinois.
Everett C. Bailey, Burlington, Vermont.
Russell M. Baird, Chicago, Illinois.
Louis Balfour, Attleboro, Mass.
Edward Ball, Jacksonville, Florida.
Mrs. Marie Baker, Goffstown, New Hampshire.
Murray Baron, Manhattan, New York.
Ford Bartlett, Syosset, New York.
Mr. and Mrs. Vane Quentin Bates, Jr., Littleton, Colorado.
Orson Bean, Manhattan, New York.
Travis Beeson, Camden, Arkansas.
Karl R. Bendetsen, Manhattan, New York.
B. E. Bensinger, Chicago, Illinois.
John J. Bergen, Manhattan, New York.
Loren M. Berry, Dayton, Ohio.
A. Bersted, Elgin, Illinois.
Theodore M. Black, Roslyn, New York.
Gerhard D. Bleicken, Boston, Mass.
Elmer Bobst, Morris Plains, N.J.
Fred Bohen, Des Moines, Iowa.
William B. Bowder, Chicago, Illinois.
Alvin O. Bramstedt, Anchorage, Alaska.
Edward F. Breslin, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
John W. Bricker, Columbus, Ohio.
Peter Campbell Brown, Manhattan, New York.
Raymond Brown, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

Mackintosh Brown, Denver, Colorado.
John S. Bugas, Southfield, Michigan.
D. Bruce Burns, Manhattan, New York.
W. Sherman Burns, Manhattan, New York.
Courtney Burton, Cleveland, Ohio.
Francis X. Busch, Wetumpka, Alabama.
John Butler, Honolulu, Hawaii.
C. Douglas Cairns, Burlington, Vermont.
Ernest N. Calhoun, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Roy Campanella, Manhattan, New York.
John Campbell, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
Robert F. Carney, Manhattan, New York.
Mrs. Wesley Castles, Helena, Montana.
Bill Carter, Newport, Delaware.
George Champion, Manhattan, New York.
Owen R. Cheatham, Manhattan, New York.
Leo M. Cherne, Manhattan, New York.
Gordon S. Clinton, Seattle, Washington.
Harry M. Clor, Gambier, Ohio.
Nathan M. Cohen, Chicago, Illinois.
Dr. David S. Collier, Chicago, Illinois.
J. D. Stetson Coleman, Chicago, Illinois.
Donald J. Colen, Manhattan, New York.
Milton M. Colton, North Hollywood, Calif.
Martin J. Condon, Memphis, Tennessee.
John V. Connorton, Manhattan, New York.
Nicholas J. Constantine, Chicago, Illinois.
John E. Corette, Butte, Montana.
William C. Croft, Chicago, Illinois.
David R. Cudlip, Jamaica, New York.
Daniel J. Cullen, Manhattan, N.Y.
Robert A. Curley, Evanston, Illinois.
Francis L. Dale, Cincinnati, Ohio.
John H. Daniels, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Justin Dart, Los Angeles, California.
Paul Davies, Manhattan, New York.
William L. Day, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Gordon Dean, Washington, D.C.
Eberhard P. Deutsch, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Russell De Young, Akron, Ohio.
Til Dieterle, West Los Angeles, Calif.
James Drury, Universal City, Calif.
Jack J. Early, Mitchell, South Dakota.
George S. Eccles, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Dr. Inez Edding, Columbia, S.C.
Tom Elam, Union City, Tennessee.
William M. Elmer, Owensboro, Kentucky.
Christopher Emmet, Manhattan, New York.
G. C. Engbrecht, Fox River Grove, Ill.
Thomas B. Evans, Jr., Wilmington, Delaware.
Thomas W. Evans, Manhattan, New York.
Bayard Ewing, Providence, R.I.
William Ewing, Manhattan, New York.
W. E. Fay, Joliet, Illinois.
Paul E. Feffer, Manhattan, New York.
William Fenton, Memphis, Tennessee.
Herbert P. Field, Sarasota, Florida.
James A. Fitzpatrick, Plattsburg, New York.
Horace C. Flanigan, Manhattan, New York.
Lewis Flinders, Salt Lake City, Utah.
John Simon Fluor, Los Angeles, California.
Robert Fluor, Los Angeles, California.
J. Clifford Folger, Washington, D.C.
J. Russell Forgan, Manhattan, New York.
Richard A. Forsythe, Chicago, Illinois.
John Francisco, Skokie, Illinois.
S. E. Freund, St. Louis, Missouri.
J. Arthur Friedlund, Jr., Chicago, Illinois.
Roy M. Frisby, Wilmette, Illinois.
G. Keith Funston, Manhattan, New York.
Joseph F. Gagliardi, White Plains, New York.
Robert W. Galvin, Franklin Park, Illinois.
Mrs. James Rae Garniel, Denver, Colorado.
Edward H. Gauer, San Francisco, Calif.
George F. Getz, Jr., Chicago, Illinois.
Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, Manhattan, New York.
Gerald Gidwitz, Chicago, Illinois.
John T. Gilbride, Manhattan, New York.
Harold V. Gleason, Franklin Square, N.Y.
Alan S. Golboro, Chicago, Illinois.
Grady Gore, Washington, D.C.
Clifford L. Gorsuch, Washington, D.C.
J. Melvin Godson, Phoenix, Arizona.
Newell Gough, Jr., Helena, Montana.
Coleen Gray, Los Angeles, California.
John D. Gray, Chicago, Illinois.
Mrs. Robert Gunderson, Rapid City, S.D.
H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., Boston, Mass.
Leonard W. Hall, Garden City, New York.
Harvey M. Hament, Old Brookville, N.Y.
Lionel Hampton, Manhattan, New York.
John W. Hanes, Manhattan, New York.
John W. Hanes, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Erling J. Hansen, Barrington, Illinois.
Edward P. Harding, Portland, Maine.
Fred L. Hartley, Los Angeles, California.
Albert Harutunian, Jr., San Diego, California.
Ellison L. Hazard, Manhattan, New York.
John R. Helm, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Richard L. Herman, Omaha, Nebraska.
George Tim Herrmann, Chicago, Illinois.
Christian Herter, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Hildergarde, Manhattan, New York.
George L. Hinman, Manhattan, New York.
Paul C. Hodge, Chicago, Illinois.
James R. Holland, Boston, Mass.
Jack K. Horton, Los Angeles, California.
Bryan Houston, Manhattan, New York.
Walter Hoving, Manhattan, New York.
Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, Old Westbury, N.Y.
Arthur Hug, Garden City, New York.
Herbert Humphreys, Memphis, Tennessee.
William H. Hunt, Portland, Oregon.
Melvin H. Jacobs, Chicago, Illinois.
William D. James, Jr., Chicago, Illinois.
Glen L. Jermstad, North Little Rock, Ark.
W. G. Jernigan, Lake Forest, Illinois.
Sam H. Jones, Lake Charles, La.
Elaine Joyce, Los Angeles, California.
Thomas M. Joyce, Boston, Mass.
Robert H. Horwitz, Gambier, Ohio.
Donald M. Kendall, Manhattan, New York.
Paul T. Kessler, Jr., Chicago, Illinois.
Martin Kilpatrick, Atlanta, Georgia.
Mrs. Edwin M. Kirby, Penacook, New Hamp.
Walter K. Koch, Denver, Colorado.
Harold Lachman, Chicago, Illinois.
Lawrence H. Landry, Anchorage, Alaska.
Edwin H. Lane, Altavista, Virginia.
William S. Lasdon, Manhattan, New York.
Bernard J. Lasker, Manhattan, New York.
Thomas H. Latimer, Chicago, Illinois.
Edward J. Lawler, Memphis, Tennessee.
Ernest W. Lefever, Chevy Chase, Maryland.
Morris I. Leibman, Chicago, Illinois.
Barry T. Leithead, Manhattan, New York.
J. Preston Levis, Toledo, Ohio.
Gustave L. Levy, Manhattan, New York.
E. Crosby Lewis, Columbia, S.C.
Hobart Lewis, Pleasantville, N.Y.
Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Richmond, Virginia.
C. Preston Locker, Anchorage, Alaska.
Carl M. Loeb, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Vincent T. Lombardi, Washington, D.C.
Guy Lombardo, Freeport, New York.
Mrs. Oswald Lord, Manhattan, New York.
The Honorable Clare Booth Luce, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Edgar F. Luckenbach, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Malcom A. MacIntyre, Manhattan, New York.
John A. McCone, Los Angeles, California.
C. P. McCormick, Jr., Baltimore, Maryland.
Thomas J. McDowell, Cleveland, Ohio.
Neil McElroy, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Frank C. P. McGlinn, Philadelphia, Pa.
Francis J. McGuire, Chicago, Illinois.
J. G. McKay, Miami, Florida.
The Honorable Martin B. McKneally, M.C., Washington, D.C.
B. F. McLaurin, Manhattan, New York.
Holt McPherson, High Point, N.C.
David Mahoney, Manhattan, New York.
Colin Male, North Hollywood, Calif.
Philip Mann, Chicago, Illinois.
Ralph Marcarelli, New Haven, Connecticut.
Don E. Marsh, Yorktown, Indiana.
David H. Marx, Manhattan, New York.
Edward D. Martz, Sr., Chicago, Illinois.
Howard G. Mayer, Chicago, Illinois.
Anthony L. Michel, Chicago, Illinois.
Frank P. Middleton, Phoenix, Arizona.
John W. Mikos, Sarasota, Florida.
Jeremiah Milbank, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Roger Milliken, Spartanburg, S.C.
John Michum, Van Nuys, California.
Frank A. Mieko, Arlington Heights, Ill.
V. H. Monette, Smithfield, Virginia.
Arch Monson, Jr., San Francisco, Calif.
George G. Montgomery, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Margaret Moore, Indianapolis, Indiana.
William Moore, Tucson, Arizona.
Alfred J. Moran, New Orleans, La.
Edwin A. Morris, Greensboro, N.C.
Clinton Morrison, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Robert Moses, Manhattan, New York.
Walter H. Moses, Chicago, Illinois.
John Mosler, Manhattan, New York.
Dr. George Fox Mott, Washington, D.C.
Henry T. Mudd, Los Angeles, California.
John A. Mulcahy, Manhattan, New York.
Dean William, Hughes Mulligan, Manhattan, New York.
Robert D. Murphy, Manhattan, New York.
Ken Murray, Beverly Hills, Calif.
Murray the K, Manhattan, New York.
Leonard J. Nadasdy, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
John Nance, Old Brookville, N.Y.
Aksel Nielsen, Denver, Colorado.
Louis B. Nichols, Leesburg, Virginia.
Edward Nicholson, Denver, Colorado.
Jack D. Noyes, Barrington, Illinois.
James W. Nugent, Providence, R.I.
Parry O'Brien, Encino, California.
Alton Ochsner, New Orleans, La.
John D. O'Connor, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.
John M. Olin, Manhattan, New York.
R. Bruce Oliver, Boston, Mass.
William L. Pallot, Miami, Florida.
Thomas A. Pappas, Athens, Greece.
Noster Parker, Houston, Texas.
Robert H. Parsley, Houston, Texas.
Thomas F. Patton, Cleveland, Ohio.
Herbert A. Payne, Manhattan, New York.
Lewis M. Peristein, Shirley, Mass.
Michael E. Phenner, Chicago, Illinois.
Martin Philipsborn, Jr., Chicago, Illinois.
Frank A. Plummer, Montgomery, Alabama.
Martin Poliner, Manhattan, New York.
Robert B. Post, Cleveland, Ohio.
Lewis F. Powell, Richmond, Virginia.
Samuel J. Powers, Jr., Miami, Florida.
H. Irving Pratt, Manhattan, New York.
Herman P. Pressier, Houston, Texas.
Edwin J. Putzell, Jr., St. Louis, Missouri.
Raymond E. Reed, Boston, Mass.
William H. Rentschler, Chicago, Illinois.
Walter M. Ringer, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Clifford Roberts, Manhattan, New York.
Roy Roberts, Los Angeles, California.
John W. Rollins, Wilmington, Delaware.
John A. Roosevelt, Manhattan, New York.
Fuller M. Rothschild, Los Angeles, California.
Max L. Rowe, River Forest, Illinois.
Adolf Rust, Manhasset, New York.
Robert M. Royalty, Atlanta, Georgia.
Charles B. Ryan, Jackson, Mississippi.
Richard M. Scaife, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Fred Schoellkopf IV, Buffalo, New York.
Armund J. Schoen, Chicago, Illinois.
Walter Schwimmer, Chicago, Illinois.
Benjamin H. Swig, San Francisco, Calif.
J. G. Senor, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.
John S. Sensenbrenner, Neenah, Wisconsin.
John M. Shaheen, Manhattan, New York.
Charles E. Shearer, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana.
Robert F. Six, Los Angeles, California.
Rushton W. Skakel, Manhattan, New York.
Spyros P. Skouras, Manhattan, New York.
James E. Smith, Jr., Kearney, Nebraska.
Roy Smith, Killeen, Texas.
Willis Smith, Jr., Raleigh, North Carolina.
Edward H. Smoot, Fort Smith, Arkansas.
Robert Snodgrass, Atlanta, Georgia.
Tom Snyder, Wichita, Kansas.
Leonard Spacek, Chicago, Illinois.
Olive Spann, Chapman, Alabama.
James M. Spiro, Chicago, Illinois.
H. E. Sponseller, Jr., Greenville, S.C.
Mansfield D. Sprague, Washington, D.C.

Edward J. Stack, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.
Mrs. John H. Stambough, Nashville, Tennessee.
Dr. Gerald L. Steibel, Manhattan, New York.
W. Clement Stone, Chicago, Illinois.
Lewis L. Strauss, Washington, D.C.
John Sutro, San Francisco, California.
L. Treat Taylor, Lake Forest, Illinois.
John Teim, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Dean Terrill, Chicago, Illinois.
Charles Thomas, Corona del Mar., Calif.
Edwin J. Thomas, Akron, Ohio.
Rupert C. Thompson, Jr., Providence, Rhode Island.
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Thurber, Charlotte, Vermont.
Donna H. Tibbertts, Bangor, Maine.
Edward McL. Tittmann, Manhattan, New York.
Meldrim Tomson, Orford, New Hampshire.
Harry Torizyner, Manhattan, New York.
Jacques Torizyner, Manhattan, New York.
Frank N. Trager, Manhattan, New York.
Arthur G. Trudeau, Washington, D.C.
Eugene F. Trumble, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Mrs. Sam Turner, Tulsa, Oklahoma.
Holmes Tuttle, Los Angeles, California.
Norman R. Tyre, Hollywood, California.
David Van Alstyne, Jr., Manhattan, New York.
Walter E. Van der Waag, E. Williston, New York.
Joseph Virdone, East Hills, New York.
Harry Von Zell, Los Angeles, California.
Richard L. Walker, Columbia, S.C.
Donald W. Whitehead, Boston, Mass.
W. W. Whiteman, Jr., Oklahoma City, Okla.
Mac Wildman, Chicago, Illinois.
Richard E. Wiley, Northbrook, Illinois.
King Wilkin, Napa, California.
W. Walter Williams. Seattle, Washington.
Thomas Workman, Columbus, Ohio.
Nelson Works, Manhattan, New York.
Jackson A. Wright, Columbia, Missouri.
Thomas O. Young, Pierre, South Dakota.
Stanley R. Zax, Beverly Hills, California.
Russell Ziegler, Manhattan, New York.

COMMUNIST SUMMIT TRYING TO PICK UP PIECES

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine last week carried an exceptionally informative cover story, "Communist Summit Trying To Pick Up Pieces." The associate editor responsible in large measure for this report is the son of a constituent of mine and I am proud to share in his pride.

Time Publisher James R. Shepley describes in a foreword how this story came about and I would like to include that as well as Mr. David B. Tinnin's story:

A LETTER FROM THE PUBLISHER

(By James R. Shepley)

Associate Editor David B. Tinnin spent three weeks last month traveling through Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union before tackling the job of writing this week's cover story on the state of world Communism. Tinnin's tour amounted to a cram course in the style and strains of life in the East bloc. To his surprise, the biggest payoff came during a cocktail party in Bucharest. There he overheard a Communist official say that copies of a detailed secret document spelling out the agenda for the summit meeting in Moscow had been sent to party central committees all over the world. Tinnin quickly sent a cable informing the Time-Life News Service, urging correspondents working on the cover to be alert for any opportunity to examine the document. One correspondent eventually succeeded.

In Moscow, Bureau Chief Jerrold Schecter was one of four American newsmen who were allowed to look at the meeting hall. To help Schecter with the preparations, Rome Bureau Chief James Bell flew to Russia—on the same Aeroflot plane with members of the Italian delegation. Washington Correspondent Gregory Wierzynski talked with Government officials, foreign diplomats and academic experts. From Hong Kong, Correspondent Bruce Nelan sent an analysis of the Sino-Soviet split. Other Time bureaus throughout the world also weighed in with reports. In addition to Writer Tinnin, the New York staff that worked on the cover included Senior Editor Jason McManus, Researchers Sara Collins and Hanne Meister.

COMMUNISM: A HOUSE DIVIDED, A FAITH FRAGMENTED

St. George's Hall in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow remains a magnificent monument to the glories of the Czars, a sculpted hymn to Russia's historic national interests. The only concession to the Communist era is a giant painting of Lenin in the antechamber. Inside the hall itself, huge chandeliers illumine white marble wall plaques celebrating the knights who won fame and honor in the Czarist army; shaped in stucco are Russian victories from the 15th to the 19th century. It was amid those trappings last week that the Soviet Union, in quest of another, far more difficult victory, assembled some 300 leaders of 75 Communist parties from around the world for the third postwar summit meeting in the history of the Communist movement.

According to the official program, the leaders had come to consider "the most urgent question of our time—the tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle at the present stage and the unity of action of Communist and workers' parties, of all anti-imperialist forces." But the participants knew the real purpose of the meeting. Alarmed by divisions and defiance within Communism, the Soviet Union was out to salvage as much as possible of its once uncontested primacy over the movement.

The task that the Kremlin had undertaken in convening the summit was formidable. There was considerable suspicion that the conference, expected to last two or three weeks, would turn out to be a debacle for the Soviets. Never has the Communist movement been in greater disarray. Once the undisputed fountainhead of Communism, Moscow has seen many parties grow distant and independent and others turn violently against Soviet primacy. It is not too much to say that the Russians can now command unquestioning obedience only in those countries where their soldiers can enforce it.

HEIRS OF LENIN

As TIME Correspondent Jerrold Schecter filed on the eve of the conference: "The issue is no longer unity. It is finding the lowest common denominator on which there can be limited agreement in the world Communist movement. Observers in Moscow believe that the meeting, and how it is carried off, holds the key to the success or failure of the current Kremlin leadership. Faced with a border war with China, the Soviet Union today must defend its national interests at the same time that it tries to justify them under the banner of 'proletarian internationalism.' In Eastern Europe, the invasion of Czechoslovakia has polarized the struggle for economic and political reform within the Communist movement. The diversity of Communist parties, the lack of relevance of the doctrine to specific problems, and the internal pressures—economic, military and political—within the Soviet Union have raised the question: What is Communism today? Some Kremlinologists suggest that the best way to seek an answer is to view the Soviet Union as a latter-day empire seeking to maintain its sway."

Many of Moscow's guests were unabashedly reluctant about their presence, and ready to resist any Soviet attempt to railroad unpalatable resolutions through the assembly. Over the conference hung the shadow of Russia's intervention in Czechoslovakia—a shadow that even the presence of a docile Czechoslovak delegation led by new Party First Secretary Gustav Husák was unlikely to dispel. Still echoing were the gunshots exchanged by Soviet and Chinese soldiers along the Ussuri River. Then there were the ghosts at the banquet, the men who had refused to come: China's Mao Tse-tung, North Viet Nam's Ho Chi Minh, Yugoslavia's Josip Broz Tito, Cuba's Fidel Castro. They are the most famous figures of contemporary Communism; their stature, by any measure, dwarfs Russia's present leadership.

Soviet Party Boss Leonid Brezhnev and his co-ruler, Premier Aleksei Kosygin, obviously decided that the summit, for all its perils, was worth the gamble. In the complicated mystique of Communism, the right of the Soviet leaders to rule, in their empire and at home, is intimately linked to their ability to command the obedience and fealty of Communists abroad.

Their legitimacy derives from their role as custodians of the Communist faith. One important measure of their stewardship is the maintenance of Moscow's primacy as the leader of world Communism. The Soviet leaders need a successful conference to prove to their own people that they are indeed the legitimate heirs of Lenin. "To justify one-party rule," says Kremlinologist Victor Zorza, "you must have an international sanction." The Soviet leaders also need the international endorsement to reassert their primacy within Eastern Europe. For all these reasons, Leo Labedz, editor of *Survey*, a London quarterly on Communist affairs, calls the conference an attempt to find "an ideological fig leaf" to cover Russia's own self-interest. None of this, of course, would be so brazenly expressed in St. George's Hall in the days ahead.

The Soviets made careful housekeeping preparations for the conference. In the Kremlin gardens, the beds of long-stemmed tulips and multicolored pansies were especially neatly tended, and squads of plain-clothes security agents checked passes and guided the delegates to the huge hall. For several days, Brezhnev, Kosygin and other ranking officials shuttled to Moscow's four airports welcoming arriving delegations. For trusted comrades like East Germany's Walter Ulbricht and Mongolia's Yumzhagin Tsedenbal, there were Slavic smacks on the cheek. There were no kisses for the arriving Rumanians. Brezhnev proffered a perfunctory hand to Rumania's independent-minded President and Party Boss Nicolae Ceausescu, who has often opposed Soviet plans.

CHINESE CRITICISM

The Italians, widely billed as most likely to make trouble, had a hard trip. Their crowded Aeroflot Il-62 from Rome was inexplicably delayed several hours. Announcements over the plane's public-address system were made in Russian, English, French and German—but not Italian. Someone asked Enrico Berlinguer, who led the delegation in place of ailing Luigi Longo, what he thought of the linguistic lapse. "It's their airline," he shrugged. On his arrival in Moscow, Berlinguer was met with a handshake by a second-level Soviet official, then hustled off to the Sovietskaya Hotel.

At the opening session, Brezhnev sat at the center of the long table of delegates in St. George's Hall, serenely sipping Borzhomi

mineral water. Kosygin buried his head in conversation. Party Ideologue Mikhail Suslov, the man most responsible for the organization of the summit, fidgeted, tapping his red pencil. In his opening speech, Brezhnev merely exhorted the foreign comrades to close ranks behind the Soviet Union because "the attention of the whole world is now focused on this hall." The pooling of Communist "efforts was and remains an important condition of success in the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle." On that jargon-laden, altruistic note, the deliberations began. The tone changed quickly; the jargon remained, but the altruism gave way to acrimony.

That the summit was taking place at all was no small achievement for the Russians. As long ago as 1962, Nikita Khrushchev had conceived the idea of convening the leaders of the world Communist parties. Already China was vigorously contesting Russia's claim to primacy and hitting the Kremlin where it hurt—on points of theology. On one level, Khrushchev's espousal of the principle of "peaceful coexistence" with the capitalist nations was a sellout, said Peking's theoreticians; his emphasis on more consumer goods for ordinary Russians was "revisionism" of the kind that could only destroy the spartan muscle that a revolutionary society needed. One good charge of heresy deserved another, Khrushchev felt, and his aim was nothing less than a Communist Council of Trent to read the Chinese out of the world movement, excommunicate them from the Red fraternity. But what really mattered was Mao's demand that Russia's immense military and economic power should be used not merely to further Soviet national interests but to promote the cause of world revolution. The Soviets' power should be shared, Mao said, with other Communist nations, notably China, so that they might build up their own strength and challenge the imperialist forces—even at the risk of war.

PRAGUE DETOUR

Other Communist parties wanted no part of the Sino-Soviet quarrel, and Khrushchev never got his summit before he was ousted in 1964. His successors, Brezhnev and Kosygin, shelved the conference plan while they tried to effect a reconciliation with China. After Mao rejected their overtures and embarked on the Cultural Revolution, whose xenophobic excesses alienated much of his earlier support among other Communist countries, the Soviets sensed that the proper psychological moment had come to summon the comrades to Moscow.

The initial preparatory meeting, held in Budapest in February 1968, ended on an ominous note as the Rumanians, on orders from Ceausescu, walked out because they were criticized for not following the Soviet line of condemning Israel. An infinitely greater disruption came a few months later, when the forces of five Warsaw Pact nations, led by the Soviet Union, crashed into Czechoslovakia. Russia only outraged the majority of foreign Communists by stamping out a liberal experiment with which they sympathized and one that could have helped them win votes in the free world. At the same time, Russia once again ground under the tank treads one of Communism's dearest dogmas: Socialism brings everlasting peace among Socialist nations.

Foreign Communist reaction was an indication of both the Soviet Union's waning authority and the villany of the deed. Twelve years earlier, in the much bloodier suppression of the Hungarian uprising, nearly every Communist Party in the world had supported the Soviet action. This time every major foreign party expressed disapproval, ranging from violent protest (Italy, Sweden, Yugoslavia) to distaste tempered by expediency (France and Cuba). Even Rumania, a member of the Warsaw Pact, though it did not take part in the invasion, censured the action. Only insignificant parties that depend on the Soviet dole (such as those in the U.S. and most in Latin America and the Middle East) endorsed the move.

Because of the uproar, the conference, originally set for November 1968, had to be rescheduled for May 1969; it was then postponed again to last week. One indication of the magnitude of the disagreement was the formulation of the working document for the conference. At Soviet instigation, a joint draft was drawn up by a committee of eight parties and submitted to a preparatory session attended by 65 parties in Budapest last February. Other parties offered some 300 amendments, at least 100 of which were incorporated in the text. In order to hold a conference at all, the Soviets had to scratch out the old claim, reaffirmed by the 1960 world conference, that they were the leaders of the world Communist movement. Further, they had to delete any critical reference to China or any wording that could be construed as approval of the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

SOCIALIST COMMONWEALTH

Despite their exclusion from the agenda, it was plain that China and Czechoslovakia were the real issues at the conference. On both, the Russians had tried to cover their positions in advance. Moscow propagandists a month ago performed their own unilateral excommunication of China by pronouncing that Mao's party now had "nothing in common with international Communism" and was merely the apparatus of a "military clique" ruling China and masquerading as Communists. Since the shooting on the Ussuri River last March, the Russians have been trying to enlist the sympathy of foreign parties and the world by saying that Russia is not only defending its Far Eastern borders but also holding back the Maoist yellow peril that threatens humanity. For the Russians, who have so long regarded themselves as the providers of aid and arms to other Communist countries, the response has been deeply disappointing. Requests for token military units or even observers to come to Siberia to join the Red Army in its vigil on the long, lonely border have reportedly been refused. No other Communists want to be caught in the thrashings of the two giants.

Besides a condemnation of China, Russia has something else that it would dearly love to extract from the delegates. That is an endorsement of the principle of limited sovereignty as expressed in the Brezhnev Doctrine. As a justification for the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet party boss last November expounded a new policy asserting that members of the Socialist Commonwealth have the right to intervene in the affairs of another member whenever the purity and primacy of socialism are endangered in that country. Foreign Communists who feel most threatened by the policy, notably the Rumanians and Yugoslavs, fear that the Soviets will use the doctrine not only to keep any socialist country from defecting to the Western camp, but also to enforce their own brand of politcial orthodoxy. As *Lumea*, the Rumanian foreign-news weekly, declared: "Limited sovereignty makes no more sense than limited honesty."

Aware of the opposition, the Soviets enlisted support for the doctrine from its first victims. Shortly before leaving for Moscow, Czechoslovak Party First Secretary Gustav Husák, who in April replaced Alexander Dubcek, declared that "anti-Communist and anti-Soviet instigations" had justified the intervention of Czechoslovakia's Warsaw Pact neighbors. In Moscow, Husák, accompanied by new hard-line officials who only the week before had accomplished a purge of most of the prominent liberals on the Czechoslovak Central Committee, pleaded with the Italians and other foreign Communists not to discuss the Czechoslovakia issue in the conference.

His request was likely to go unhonored, if for no other reason than that the Italian Communists, who have great hopes for doing well in the next general elections, fear the influence that the Brezhnev Doctrine would have on Italian voters. They can foresee their opponents' campaign slogan: "Put the Communists in power and the Red Army will keep them there!"

FIRST CONTROVERSY

The conference had hardly got under way when the ground rules were shattered and the fumes of controversy began to leak to the outside world. The opening speaker on the second day was a delegate from Paraguay, who launched an attack on the Chinese. The first nasty epithet was scarcely out of his mouth before Rumania's Ceausescu was scribbling a reply on the notepad in front of him and demanding the floor. The Rumanians had made clear that they would attend the summit only on the understanding that the internal affairs of any Communist Party, present or absent, would not be discussed.

When the Paraguayan finished, Ceausescu broke in to issue a blunt, 500-word warning that the discussion was taking an unwelcome and unwise turn. "To our regret, in today's speech by the representative of the Communist Party of Paraguay, attacks and condemnations were included against one party that is not attending the conference. We consider that if other parties follow this procedure, this will lead to a course fraught with danger for the success of our conference," he said. Undeterred, Polish First Secretary Wladyslaw Gomulka resumed the Soviet-orchestrated attacks on the Chinese: "The principles of internationalism have been betrayed by the present leaders of the Communist Party of China, who have, from positions of anti-Soviet nationalism and great-power chauvinism, violated the solidarity of the international Communist movement."

The next day Brezhnev added the Soviet voice to the anti-Chinese chorus. In a bitter speech the Soviet party boss warned that the Chinese were preparing to start a war and charged that "the damage caused by the breakaway activities of Peking to the Common cause of Communists cannot be underestimated." Said he: "The practical activities of Peking in the international arena more and more convince us of the fact that China has actually broken with proletarian internationalism and lost its class Socialist content." It sounded as if the Soviets had decided after all to press on with their original plans to excommunicate the Chinese from the movement. But such a move was certain to lead in the conference to heated debates and perhaps even walkouts and further divisions within world Communism.

As a myth and a generalized faith, Marxism has proved remarkably durable, partly because it has been interpreted and stretched so broadly that widely different political movements can and do invoke it (*see* TIME ESSAY, *page 35*). In its specific applications, the faith is hopelessly split. Within little more than a decade, Communism has undergone a great schism (Moscow *v.* Peking), experienced an abortive reformation (Dubcek's Czechoslovakia), and developed a plethora of protestant sects (Yugoslavia and Rumania, among others). The once vaunted and feared unity of Communism has shattered into a bewildering, quarrelsome, logic- and dogma-defying set of parties.

Mirroring the larger schisms within Communism, the individual parties have divided, subdivided and often split into opposing parties. The Australian and Israeli Communists are divided into two parties. The Swedes, Indians, and Greeks all are split three ways. Labedz has propounded a rule that Communist politics "are complicated in inverse proportion to the party's impor-

tance in the country"; thus the Ceylonese Communists, who number only 2,300, have proliferated into eight discernible factions.

THE FOUR VARIANTS

In the squabbling, all sense is turned upside down. By any measure, Yugoslavia is as "revisionist" as a Red state can be; yet China, keeper of the purist faith, is now making some indirect conciliatory gestures toward Tito. Even though China branded the Dubcek regime revisionist, it condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Out of the welter of cross-currents, at least four principal variants of Communism are alive in the world today. They are 1) Soviet Communism, 2) Maoism, 3) Castroism and 4) reformist Communism as it occurs in two subvariants; Western Communist parties out of power and ruling parties within the Red world.

Soviet Communism is now among the world's most conservative systems. Its overriding theme is the preservation of the status quo within the Soviet sphere of influence. Watering down Leninist eschatology, Soviet Communism no longer believes in an inevitable violent clash with capitalism and has shown in practice that the worldwide revolution is the least of its concerns. Soviet Communism has long been called "bureaucratic dictatorship," and the description is apt. A party-controlled bureaucratic bossism pervades every area of life, with stultifying results. Art and literature must conform to the precepts of "socialist realism," that means they must provide didactic uplift about Communism. There are few civil rights for individuals. Dissent from party and government is severely punished. Even so, a small band of dissenters continues to protest against the growing repression.

On the economic front, limited innovation, such as the introduction of a form of the profit motive and expansion of managerial authority, is being attempted to improve output and efficiency. But Soviet-style Communists resist any thoroughgoing reform for fear that economic liberalization might spill over into social and political areas. Soviet Communism remains in command throughout most of Eastern Europe, constitutes the major influence on the French party, and controls a number of minor "pocket parties" such as the one in the U.S. and nearly all of the small Middle Eastern and Latin American parties.

Maoism, the antithesis, is wildly revolutionary in word if not in deed. It is also highly emotional. A modern echo of classic Chinese opera, Maoism whines in shrill hyperbole. Rigidly doctrinaire, Chinese Communism retains the traditional belief that a clash with capitalism is inevitable; it calls for wars of national liberation throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America. Mao, who immodestly considers himself a Communist innovator on a par with Marx and Lenin, sees the development of world revolution as a repetition of the strategy used by the Chinese Communists to achieve power in 1949. At that time, mass peasant armies surrounded the cities where the government held power, and finally seized them. Mao envisions the peasant masses of the underdeveloped world encircling and ultimately conquering the industrial nations. As the Cultural Revolution illustrated, Maoism within China glorifies perpetual revolution to enable the party to avoid the barnacles of bureaucracy that have encrusted Soviet Communism.

Mao did succeed in destroying the bureaucratic system, but it is an open question whether he can now create an alternative system through which he can govern China and promote its industrialization. At present, he must rely largely on the army to help him run the country. Outside China, Maoism commands the allegiance of only one ruling party, in Albania, and a handful of insignificant parties (including those in New Zealand, Burma, Thailand). But Maoist factions and splinter parties exist in many countries, and Mao has become a hero to the New Left.

Castroism is essentially romantic, evoking the image of the lone defiant man, bristling with *machismo*, who dares to shake his fist at the citadel of capitalism. Castro competes with Mao in dedication to fomenting revolution. Like Mao, he generalizes from his own success when he and a small band of guerrillas from the Sierra Maestra were able to take power. But unlike Mao, Castro contends that not a mass party, but a handful of armed intellectuals is sufficient to spark revolution among the Latin American peasantry. Bragging that he would turn the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of South America, Castro hoped to export revolution to all of Latin America. Indeed, twelve governments have accused him of exporting subversion and supplying arms to guerrillas in their countries; nowhere did he score a real success. In 1967, his dream of victory was punctured by the Bolivian army bullets that killed Che Guevara, his longtime aide and strategist. In the wake of Che's death, Fidel slowed down his revolutionary activity, and his threat to Latin America began to wane. One reason was that local Communists regarded Castro as a competitor and did not help his guerrillas. Also, Russia was not sympathetic to Castro's calls for drastic action. Its strategy calls for a *via pacifica* in Latin America. The Soviets hope that local conditions, abetted by U.S. blunders, will play into their scheme of things. At present, their great hope is for making serious inroads in Peru, where the nationalistic military junta is pointedly turning to the Soviets to step up its feud with the U.S. over the American-owned International Petroleum Company. Though Castroism has caused fewer factions in Communism than the other currents, Fidel remains an important influence and a hero to many of the world's youth.

Reformism exists in the Communist parties and of both the West, where they are out of power, and Eastern Europe, where they are in power. Best exemplified in the West by the Italian Communist Party, the reformist strain is rational and reassuring. According to their pronouncements, the reformers aim to do what Alexander Dubcek attempted: to give Socialism a human face. The reformers reflect the trend toward *embourgeoisement* of the party members. Recognizing that voters are no longer gripped by old revolutionary slogans and that today's prosperous workers are more interested in Mercedes-Benz than Marx, many Communists have changed their tactics. Accepting the rules of the political game in their countries, the reformers vow to seek power only by legal means. If they ever get into it, they promise, they will reform the society, not violently tear it down. They will, so they say, respect civil rights and freedom of the press while bringing about a more equitable distribution of wealth. Some Western European reformers even envisage allowing political opposition. It is a notion that outrages orthodox Communists, who insist above all on the paramount control of the party.

Among the ruling Communist parties, the reformist showcase is the Yugoslavia of Joseph Broz Tito, Communism's first heretic. There is far more freedom of expression and action in Yugoslavia than in any other country of Eastern Euope. Newsstands and bookshops offer Yugoslavs easy access to Western publications without fear of reprisals. There is, of course, censorship; certain books, like Milovan Djilas' works, are not available, and the press is controlled. Yugoslavs, if they can afford it, can travel abroad freely, in the East or West. Conversly, Westerners, whether tourists, businessmen or journalists, gain ready admission to Yugoslavia. By scrapping Communism's harshest dictates, the Yugoslavs have created a thriving market-oriented Socialist economy in which the workers share profits and managerial responsibility.

All this is a far cry from the days of Lenin and Stalin, when Moscow was truly the capital of the world revolution. Housed in a dingy building just across the street from the Kremlin, the Comintern ran a shadowy, tightly organized network of agents and conspirators who carried Moscow's orders to parties far and near. In those days, the first duty of a Communist anywhere in the world was to support the Soviet Union. Stalin said: "A revolutionary is one who without arguments, unconditionally, openly and honestly is ready to defend and strengthen the U.S.S.R."

The Russians still spend billions of dollars annually in furthering the Communist cause abroad. The bulk of the money goes for arms for North Viet Nam and oil for Cuba, which are items that advance Soviet diplomatic aims. The U.S.S.R. until recently supplied one-fifth of the Italian party's $10 million budget, helps the Indians financially, subsidizes the illegal party of West Germany and supports the Latin American parties. Danish Communist leaders get three free suits a year made in East Germany, and some parties get a rake-off on whatever trade or tourism their countries do with the Soviet Union.

Central Committee Secretary Konstantin Katushev is in charge of relations with ruling Communist parties, while Boris Ponomarev attends to the affairs of the nonruling parties, and both are busy all year long as hosts or traveling salesmen. Their emissaries try to influence developments within the parties. After Luigi Longo's strong stand against the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Embassy in Rome distributed a pamphlet criticizing the Italian party leader—and cut back on aid to the Italians.

Russia might have done better in maintaining its leadership of the Communist world if the Soviet model were more attractive. Despite the Soviets' excellence in weaponry, space, aeronautics and many other scientific pursuits, they have failed to build either an effective, well-balanced economy or a pleasing life style. Soviet economic weakness is, in fact, a major reason that the Russians must use force in order to keep their grip on Eastern Europe. The Eastern European countries badly need outside aid in order to overhaul and modernize their industries. Since the Soviets cannot provide the aid without harming their own economic plans, the Eastern Europeans want to seek technical and financial assistance from the West. Fearing that economic ties with the West might loosen political allegiance, the Soviets oppose such links. One manifestation of the Soviets' attitude is their denunciation of the West's attempts to "build bridges" of tourism, culture and trade to Eastern Europe.

On a global scale, Russia's reliance on force and authoritarianism hurts its role as a Communist leader. Partly for that very reason, the movement's fission has proved to be a downright political advantage to many Communist parties. The image of Communism's being run by an alien despotism in Moscow has faded to a great extent as individual parties have become more independent. The French party for years cringed under Socialist Guy Mollet's indictment that "the Communists are not of the Left but of the East"; by asserting a moderate amount of independence, the French Communists have gained a new respectability in French political life. The Italian party, which is the largest European Communist Party outside the East bloc, which is likely to share power in an Italian government sooner rather than later, stresses its independence of the Soviet way of doing things. Long the lepers of Finnish politics, Communists now participate in the coalition government in Helsinki. By campaigning on an independent

platform, Indian Communists have gained power through free elections; they now head coalition Cabinets in the states of Keral and West Bengal. One reason that the Communists are the fastest-growing political party in Japan is that they refuse to identify with either Peking or Moscow, insisting on the priority of their own interests over those of Russia and China.

Except in Southeast Asia and parts of Latin America and West Germany, public fear of Communism has noticeably declined. The change in the public climate offers an opportunity to the reformist parties. If they actually do achieve power through elections, the test for the reformists will be to show that Communism can indeed be the liberating, uplifting force that Marx envisioned and not the tyranny that the Soviets and Chinese made it. To judge from all past evidence, it would be dangerous and foolhardy for any Western voter to bet his liberty in the expectation that this will ever happen. But if it did, would Communism still be Communism?

LEGACY OF MOSCOW

In a way, that question is really what the Moscow summit is all about, though perhaps none of those present in St. George's Hall would frame their purpose in such a transparent way. Certainly not Brezhnev, Kosygin and the other Russian hosts. Judging by the initial head-on assault against China, they have cast aside the promises made to many of the delegations and are determined to wrench from the parties the long sought writ of excommunication against Mao Tse-tung. It seems a reckless act, and having embarked on it, the Soviet leaders have little more to lose by also demanding from the conference an endorsement of the Brezhnev Doctrine—and gaining expiation for their invasion of Czechoslovakia.

That, too, would be reckless, for on neither China nor Czechoslovakia are the Russians likely to have their way at the conference. Communism has existed too long, embraced too many diverse peoples, adapted to too many local needs and seen too many second- and third-generation visions for the monolith ever to be reassembled again. The descendants of the 1917 Revolution are mutants, dedicated to making Communism—their Communism—safe in a world of diversity. It is disturbing that the men in the Kremlin do not understand that, or cannot accept it. In demanding that the parties of the world fall into line, they are virtually guaranteeing that the legacy of Moscow, 1969, will be a Communist world more at odds than ever before.

CRANSTON LEADS SOFTBALL CLUB TO CRUSHING DEFEAT

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, when I sought election to this august body, I knew well that being a U.S. Senator would be an arduous task. But I had no concept of the magnitude of the challenge until my staff and I took the field last week in our first Senate softball game.

The details of this inglorious episode were reported by an erstwhile sports reporter for the McClatchy newspapers, Michael Green, and printed in the Modesto Bee.

I ask unanimous consent to have the story printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Modesto (Calif.) Bee, June 25, 1969]

CRANSTON LEADS SOFTBALL CLUB TO CRUSHING DEFEAT

(By Michael Green)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., whose heroes include Broadway Joe Namath ("What a blow to clean living," he chortles) led his office softball team to a crushing loss here last night.

It was the first game of the season for Alan's Angels. It was very nearly the last. They were whipped 12–3 in seven innings by Fulbright's Dissenters, captained by the Arkansas Democrat who heads the dissenters in the Senate as well.

Cranstons' team, however, claimed a "moral victory."

"It could have been 12–0," beamed a shapely secretary who had graced but scarcely defended second base for the Angels.

"You know, Ted Kennedy flies in professional baseball players from Boston for these office games," a teammate whispered. "If we could just figure out how he gets away with it . . ."

Despite the staggering loss, Cranston led his team with "style". He showed up for the game an hour late. That was saying more than for the rest of his team, most of whom showed up after the game was over—four tall, muscular figures with brawny forearms and one short, powerful press secretary.

Cranston arrived wearing track shoes.

"I'm really a long distance runner," he explained.

"Your late!" cried Fulbright, who graciously did not invoke a vague rule that a team forfeits if its senator fails to appear. He didn't need to.

"We carefully followed the map you gave our team," Cranston said, looking like a man holding a bill of sale for the Washington Monument who has suddenly become older and wiser.

"Oh, you got lost?" Fulbright cried, his cocked head sporting a smile of delicious enjoyment. "What's the matter, you don't know your way around yet, boy? You been around six months now and you don't know your way around yet? Eh? Eh?

Cranston replied with a calm, deliberate stride to the batter's box.

"Easy out! Easy out!" jeered a pimple-faced stock clerk playing shortstop for the Dissenters.

The pitcher wound up.

"Hold on now," Fulbright drawled. Slowly, he slipped off his dark blue Foreign Relations Committee Chairman suit coat to the admiring murmurs of his office staff.

They broke into cheers as he donned a blue baseball cap. When he slowly ambled out to the mound with a sort of salty, contemptuous swagger, even Cranston, whose mind had wandered to pending legislation in Congress during the long wait in the batter's box, looked up and took notice.

"Go, Alan!" an Angel shouted.

A silence fell across the humid field. The two teams waited tensely, sweltering under the gray, overcast, early-evening sky.

Fulbright swiveled slightly and lobbed a high, wide pitch lazily past the batter's box.

Cranston let it pass.

His team cheered wildly.

They cheered even more ecstatically when he hit an unimpressive ground ball that bounced through the waiting arms of the first baseman, good for a two-base hit.

But the other Angel batters weren't up to Cranston's performance. The wily Fulbright licked his lips and swallowed them in a shut-out.

"You're losing," he informed Cranston when the score stood at 9–3.

Cranston nodded. He decided to get in some running practice for a track meet he's entering in San Diego on the 4th of July weekend. As his team lost another inning, his tiny figure could be seen jogging away from the field in the distance. By the time he jogged back, it was all over.

Fulbright led his victorious team off the field to a celebration dinner at the Hawk and Dove restaurant.

Cranston, taking off his track shoes and laughing, expansively, shouted to his team, "Nobody goes home before dark! Practice! Practice!

What style.

What a blow to clean living.

EDUARDO MONDLANE: A MARTYR FOR MOZAMBIQUE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for human liberty and freedom is far bigger than any one man. Yet, throughout history, individuals have emerged who so passionately brought the human spirit to that struggle that their names have become synonymous with freedom itself. To over 30 million politically exploited Africans in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, and South Africa, Eduardo Mondlane was such a man.

Born the son of a Tonga tribal chief in the remote bush country of Mozambique, Mondlane rose to academic heights in the United States earning a B.A. from Oberlin College and an M.A. and Ph. D. from Northwestern University. He became a brilliant United Nations spokesman and leader before returning to his own homeland to lead the heroic, though still incomplete, struggle for his people's liberation. It was with a sense of shock and irreparable loss that the world learned of his assassination earlier this year.

We in this country are all too aware of the senselessness and inhumanity of the politics of violence. But, as Robert Kennedy reminded us after the world lost Martin Luther King:

No martyr's cause has ever been stilled by his assassin's bullet.

And so it is with Eduardo Mondlane. Though his own contributions and his own humanity are irreplaceable, the struggle he so nobly led goes ever on. It is with great admiration for a great human adventurer that I submit for insertion into the RECORD the following article on Eduardo Mondlane from the March/April issue of Africa Report:

A MARTYR FOR MOZAMBIQUE

(By John A. Marcum)

At age 10, Eduardo Mondlane was still an unschooled goat herder in the remote bush country of Mozambique's Limpopo Valley. Some 32 years later, by then an internationally respected educator, Dr. Mondlane took the improbable step of renouncing the ease and security of an academic career in the

United States for the risks and rigors of leadership in an African revolution. A sunny, didactic man who relished intellectual debate, he decided to put his booming voice and irrepressible energy into organizing a political and military struggle for the independence of his homeland. Just how successful he made the difficult transition from professor of anthropology to revolutionary may now be deduced from the chill words of the *Financial Times'* commentary on Portuguese reactions to his assassination in Dar es Salaam on February 3: "That Lisbon is overjoyed by Mondlane's death is an understatement."

Eduardo had known for a long time that he was a likely target for assassination. The July 1966 murder in Zambia of Jaime Sigauke, another top official of the Frente de Libertacão de Mocambique (Frelimo), had been interpreted by the Frelimo leadership as a signal that liberation movements with only thin layers of educated leadership could be emasculated by assassination. Writing of Sigauke's murder reportedly by a Portuguese "friend"), John de St. Jorre of *The Observer* (London) had concluded: "The killing was a salutary lesson to Frelimo and, I believe, the first time that the Portuguese have resorted to anything as daring and cold-blooded as this. It is a measure of how seriously they are taking Frelimo these days: the movement evidently now warrants General Delgado-type operations—political killings by Portuguese agents in foreign countries." More recently, just six weeks before Mondlane's death, Frelimo's deputy military commander, Samuel Kankombe, was shot dead by an unidentified assassin near Tanzania's southern port of Mtwara. In addition to these somber indirect warnings, Monlane received regular and direct threats to his own life from a variety of sources, African as well as Portuguese. The recognized need for maximum security precautions conflicted, however, with a naturally open life style that made him a tragically easy target.

Born on June 20, 1920, Eduardo Chivambo Mondlane was the son of a Tonga chief and the sole member of his large family to receive a primary education. This he owed to the vision of a "very determined and persistent" mother. (See "Conversation with Eduardo Mondlane," by Helen Kitchen, *Africa Report*, November 1967, p. 31.) Once launched, Eduardo took advantage of every possibility available to him to extend his educational experience. The colonial school system was European-oriented and offered little scope for a bright African, so he moved through the open doors of a series of Protestant institutions: a Swiss primary school, an American Methodist agricultural school (where he learned English), and then a Swiss secondary school in South Africa's Transvaal. In 1948, he was admitted to Witwatersrand University in Johannesburg—the first African from Mozambique to enter a South African university. This was one of many pioneer undertakings in his lifetime that would bring him into direct confrontation with socio-political forces hostile to his ambition and effervescence.

In 1949, some 15 days before the examinations at the end of his second year, Mondlane was found to be an unwanted "foreign native" in a white university, and his student permit was cancelled. Returned to Lourenco Marques in Mozambique, he was promptly arrested and interrogated because of his role there in the organization of a local student group (Nucleo dos Estudantes de Mocambique) critical of Portuguese colonial and racial policies. In June 1950, however, the authorities allowed him to go to Portugal to enter the University of Lisbon on a scholarship arranged through Protestant channels and the Phelps Stokes Fund in New York

After a year of harassment by the Portuguese secret police (PIDE) in Lisbon, where he was one of some 25 Africans in the university's student body of about 3,000, Mondlane asked that his scholarship be transferred to the United States. He entered Oberlin College in Ohio in September 1951, at age 31. Supplementing his scholarship by summer work, he thrived academically in his characteristic manner, received his BA from Oberlin in 1953, and went on to do graduate work in sociology and anthropology under the late Professor Melville Herskovits at Northwestern University, where he earned both an MA and a PhD. The significance of these achievements may be better appreciated if it is recalled that as few as 10 of the nearly six million Africans in Mozambique in 1955 were attending academic high schools (*liceus*), and slightly more than 200 were enrolled in technical schools and seminaries.

In 1957, as he was preparing his doctoral dissertion on "Role Conflict in Intergroup Relations," Mondlane joined the secretariat of the United Nations as a member of the research section of the Trusteeship Council. While working for the United Nations, he later recounted, he turned down various offers of academic positions in Portugal, because he considered these offers to be motivated by a desire to remove him from the East River's den of anti-colonialism.

In early 1961, Eduardo went to Africa as part of a United Nations team that supervised a plebiscite to determine the future of the British Cameroons. Taking advantage of his legitimate presence in Africa and his status as a United Nations employee, Mondlane took his American wife, Janet, to visit Mozambique—his last "legal" entry into the country. He later recalled the welcome he received after an 11-year absence: "As hard as they tried, the police could not keep the people from me, thousands of people asked me to organize a national movement. I was well known because of my education, my time in jail, my UN job, and, I suppose, because I had married a white woman."

The year 1961 was a heady one for Africa, and Mondlane was caught up in the new sense of urgency. A series of violent encounters earlier in the year has marked the official beginning of a state of rebellion in Angola, the huge Portuguese colonial holding in the Western side of the continent. When Tanganyika's independence in December made physical access to northern Mozambique possible. Mondlane's intermediate step was to resign from the UN and take a politically permissive post teaching in the East African program at Syracuse University. From this base, he lectured to university, church and other groups throughout the United States on the subject of Portuguese colonialism. In June 1962, he took the final plunge and flew to Dar es Salaam, where he worked to bring fractious groups of Mozambican nationalists into a single liberation front. He was promptly named president of the resulting Frente de Libertâçao de Moçambique.

While working at the United Nations, Mondlane had cooperated with American Protestants and other groups and private individuals to funnel scholarship funds to African students in Mozambique who wanted to attend secondary schools. Similarly, he made education one of the priority concerns of Frelimo, having created a Mozambiqus Institute in Dar es Salaam to receive refugee students, obtain scholarships, and ultimately to develop a new Mozambique primary and secondary school curriculum. Meanwhile, in the face of Portugal's intransigence on the principle of self-determination, Frelimo began sending volunteers for military training to Algeria and the United Arab Republic, as well as to camps within Tanzania. By September 1964, a small cadré of 250 trained men was ready to launch initial guerrilla operations in the north.

In the beginning, Mondlane was hopeful of getting American assistance in persuading Portugal to grant self-government to Mozambique. He found a particularly sympathetic listener in Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. The United States should realistically accept, Mondlane told the late President's brother, that Portuguese rule in Africa was bound to collapse. "The needs of the liberation forces are many," he told Kennedy, "but none is so great as a change in United States policy toward Portuguese colonialism. Friends of freedom and democracy throughout the world cannot comprehend why the United States does not move to the forefront in this struggle for freedom. It is inconceivable to us that the United States must remain silent and secretive to placate Portugal."

Even before President John F. Kennedy's death, however, Washington had given in to what Mondlane (and also Theodore Sorensen) subsequently termed "diplomatic blackmail." When Lisbon threatened to deny the United States use of air and naval bases in the Azores, they pointed out, Washington changed its censorious tone, declined to vote with African and Asian states in support of a proposed UN arms embargo designed to force Lisbon to negotiate with African nationalists, and continued to provide military assistance to Portugal under the terms of its NATO commitments. Private American support for Mondlane's cause also proved to be vulnerable to Lisbon's displeasure. In late 1964, the Portuguese subsidiary of the Ford Motor Company, Ford-Lusitania, announced in Lisbon that the Ford Foundation had promised to consult the Salazar government on future grants relating to Portuguese Africa; subsequently, the foundation withdrew its financial support of the Mozambique Institute. (Some of the costs of this project were taken over by the World Council of Churches in Geneva.)

Although Mondlane stridently denounced American and NATO ties with Portugal in striving to protect his own revolutionary credibility, American journalists persistently embarrassed him within his own movement by describing him as a staunchly pro-American "moderate" living in a luxurious villa (it was not) in Dar es Salaam. Equally simplistically, they portrayed Frelimo Vice-President Uria T. Somango, a former Protestant minister from Beira, as "pro-Chinese," and party foreign secretary Marcelino dos Santos as "pro-Soviet." A press bent upon analyzing everything in terms of attitudes toward or alliances with communist powers failed to consider the possibility that these three men could be working together as a team both "loyal" and plausible in the African context, subordinating ideological and personal differences to the overriding goal of national independence.

In spite of the American albatross, Mondlane managed to survive the intrigues of exile politics and retained party leadership until his death. Under his presidency, Frelimo was built into a solid, if heterogeneous, organization. With funds and training from the Organization of African Unity's Liberation Committee as well as from Soviet, Chinese, and Scandinavian sources, the party's political and military apparatus expanded rapidly. By early 1969, several thousand guerrillas were operating in wide areas of northern Mozambique and had entered the Tete district, not far from the Cabora Bassa site where a huge hydroelectric and irrigation dam is to be built on the Zambezi River. Tanzania remained a firm friend to Mondlane and host to Frelimo's exiled leadership. And with the new, more temperate, if not more liberal Lisbon government of Marcello Caetano succeeding that of the stricken strongman, António Salazar, Eduardo was able to greet 1969 with even more than his normal measure of optimism.

Four years after fighting had begun, however, Mondlane could not and did not promise that victory was within sight. Instead, he talked to Frelimo cadres of a prolonged, costly campaign of political education and guerrilla insurgency against numerically and technically superior Portuguese forces. The resulting frustration and impatience developed into an open challenge to his policies early in 1968, under the leadership of a mili-

tant and bitter African priest who had escaped from central Mozambique the previous year. Father Mateus Gwenjere tended to identify all Portuguese (whites) with colonial repression and took strong exception to Frelimo's policy of multiracialism—a policy which permitted mulattoes and Goans to assume positions of party leadership and even tolerated anti-Salazarist Portuguese in teaching positions at the Mozambique Institute. Influenced by Gwenjere—and, according to some reports, by a desire to avoid a stint of obligatory military service—students at the Mozambique Institute went on strike in March 1968. Frelimo had to close down the Institute, and the Tanzanian Government expelled from the country all of the European teachers on the staff. In May, an attack by some 20 dissidents on party headquarters resulted in the death of one official and intervention by Tanzanian police.

Despite these manifestations of dissidence, Eduardo Mondlane was re-elected to the presidency by an overwhelming majority at a party congress held with rather spectacular advance publicity inside the Niassa district of northern Mozambique in July. Attended and reported by outside observers, including the widely published British writer Basil Davidson, the congress gave a new luster of revolutionary legitimacy to Frelimo. It also worried the Portuguese, who reportedly discovered (and bombed) the site of the congress only after it had been safely adjourned.

The assassination of Mondlane deprived Frelimo of a leader who could work across ideological, racial, and regional lines and command a broad range of support among Mozambique nationalists. Frelimo lost a leader who enjoyed the vital confidence of Tanzania's President Julius Nyerere and who gave to the Mozambique revolution a nationalist image that no amount of rhetoric from Lisbon could transform into communist conspiracy. And Mondlane's pioneering role in education and international politics gave him a prestige throughout the world that no successor could soon match.

Without prejudging the results of inquiries underway, a few assessments and predictions seem warranted. First, Mondlane's death will resolve nothing. African insurgency is likely to continue as long as Lisbon denies Africans self-rule. And new leadership will emerge, whether that of a veteran nationalist such as acting president Uria Simango or new personalities thrown up by the growing ranks of youthful, educated party militants. Second, if the investigations do not succeed in establishing responsibility for the murder, debilitating suspicions and morale problems are likely to complicate the issue of political succession and party cohesion. If a power struggle should develop reflecting Sino-Soviet competition for influence in southern Africa, Frei Imo could be seriously weakened. Third, the assassination is likely to have more than a passing effect in both Tanzania and Zambia. These two states are host to a wide assortment of liberation movements whose internecine quarrel or propensity to provoke retaliatory acts by nettled white regimes in southern Africa are creating a growing threat to local security. The bomb that ended Mondlane's life might just as easily have exploded in the bustling Chinese restaurant where he frequently expounded, argued, and laughed over lunch with friends, journalists, and colleagues as in the private residence where he regularly sought a quiet place to deal with nagging piles of paperwork and correspondence.

Whoever took Mondlane's life, the only obvious beneficiaries from the murder are the Portuguese and their Rhodesian and South African allies. The effect upon African nationalists inside Mozambique may be presumed to have been demoralizing, at least in the short term. And with Mondlane gone, it is now even less likely than before that the new administration of President Nixon will develop a policy more congenial to the aims of southern African nationalists.

Without the traumatizing experience of a televised funeral to set forth the man and his cause, few Americans could be expected to recognize the meaning for them of this tragic death in distant East Africa. Yet just as Martin Luther King represented a fragile and beleaguered bridge between blacks and whites within America, Eduardo Mondlane constituted an irreplaceable link between African nationalists and those Americans who wished to avoid total rupture with the revolutionary leadership of over 30 million white-ruled Africans in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, and South Africa.

When the American Ambassador to Portugal, Admiral George Anderson, visited Angola and Mozambique in 1964 and praised Portuguese colonial achievements, Mondlane issued a rueful warning from Dar es Salaam. He said that the admiral's remarks led him to conclude that the United States "cannot identify itself with our ideals for self-determination and independence." Mozambique nationalists might thus assume, he mused, that "when our people finally rise to take up arms against Portuguese imperialism, the United States of America, like the Republic of South Africa, will intervene against us in support of Portugal." In so predicting, he probably hoped to dissuade. It remains for those Americans who fear his prophecy, but wish to honor his life, to prove him wrong. If efforts to change American policy are doomed to fail, perhaps all that is left for those who respected Dr. Mondlane and his cause is to work to prepare the American public to expect, understand, and live with the massive hostility of southern Africans that can be the only logical result of protracted American military, economic, and technological support for an oppressive status quo.

TWO GREAT LABOR LEADERS, TWO GREAT AMERICANS: ROY SIEMILLER AND MATTHEW DEMORE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Saturday night, June 28, 1969, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers paid tribute to two men who have been instrumental in advancing the cause of the workingman in America—Roy Siemiller and Matthew DeMore.

The tribute was paid as Mr. Siemiller retired as international president of the Machinists and Mr. DeMore retired as general secretary-treasurer of the IAM, one of the Nation's largest and most important trade unions.

The International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers under the leadership of Mr. Siemiller and Mr. DeMore has grown to include over 1 million workers. It is a large union and it is a fast-growing union, for its membership extends into some of the most advanced technological industries in the Nation. And these are some of our fastest-growing industries.

During the 4 years Mr. Siemiller served as president of the machinists, he very ably represented the members and demonstrated time and time again his ability as the advocate for their causes. Mr. Siemiller stood firm against many pressures in order to secure for the members of the IAM increased security and better working conditions.

In addition to improving the lot of members of his own union, Mr. Siemiller, like many other great union leaders of this Nation, supported and actively worked for programs and legislation to improve the life of the poor, the underprivileged, the elderly.

Mr. Siemiller's actions demonstrated once again that as the living and working conditions of the working men and women improve, as the quality of life for the needy improves, the Nation is strengthened and every American benefits.

Mr. DeMore has been a strong right arm for Mr. Siemiller these past years. He has worked to strengthen the IAM, to make it a greater force in the trade union councils, not just of America, but of the world. He has been instrumental in aiding in the growing prominence of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Mr. President, I believe the best testimony to the devotion of these two gentlemen to helping their fellowman is in their plans for retirement.

Retirement for Mr. Siemiller and Mr. DeMore will be time to continue to work for their fellow countrymen.

Mr. Siemiller will serve as the liaison man of the AFL–CIO to the JOBS program of the National Alliance of Businessmen. Mr. DeMore is now serving as vice president of the National Association of Senior Citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the program of the banquet along with the remarks of Mr. Paul Burnsky, IAM Grand Lodge representative, and of William W. Winpisinger, general vice president of the IAM, made at the retirement banquet for Mr. Roy Siemiller and Mr. Matthew DeMore be printed in the Extensions of Remarks today.

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

P. L. (ROY) SIEMILLER, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT 1965–1969, AND MATTHEW DEMORE, GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER 1965–1969—A TRIBUTE FROM THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS AFL–CIO, JUNE 28, 1969, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PROGRAM

Presiding: Floyd E. Smith, *International President-Elect.*

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Higgins, *National Catholic Welfare Conference.*

The National Anthems—*"The Star Spangled Banner,"* and *"Oh Canada":* Barbara Noel.

Music: Gene Donati.

Remarks: William W. Winpisinger, *General Vice President;* Paul J. Burnsky, *Grand Lodge Representative.*

Address: I. W. Abel, *President, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO.*

Presentations: L. Ross Mathews, *General Vice President.*

Responses: Matthew DeMore, *General Secretary-Treasurer;* P. L. Siemiller, *International President.*

Benediction: Rev. W. Gerald Flinn, *Grand Lodge Representative.*

Dancing until 12:30.

REMARKS BY PAUL BURNSKY

On the tenth floor of the Machinists Building—in a small lobby outside the Executive Council Room—there are pictures of the men who have served as International Presidents of the Machinists Union since 1888.

There is old Tom Talbot—the founding father—with his full and luxurious beard and his eyes stern with strength and character.

There is James J. Creamer and John O'Day—the personification of 1890's propriety—flowing mustaches and all.

There is big Jim O'Connell—plain, proud and practical—the man who gave the Machinists Union its early tradition of bread and butter unionism.

There is William Johnston—bald, eagle-eyed and imbued with the idealism of grass roots populism.

There is Arthur Wharton—who somehow managed to hold our union together through the worst depression in our nation's history.

There is Harvey Brown—who many people still remember as one of the toughest, stubbornest, and stormiest characters of his time.

There is Al Hayes—who was President for 16 years—who not only led our union with rare eloquence and inspiration—but who played a key role in bringing about greater unification and higher standards of ethical conduct in the American labor movement.

These are the men who led our union—through good times and bad—in the years of the past.

Each of these men left their own indelible mark—their own imprint of character and personality on this unique organization that is known today as the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Each was a working man—a man who rose from the ranks on the strength of his own character and the breadth of his own ability.

Each had something to bring.

Each had something to give.

Some were more successful than others but it can fairly be said that none gave the Machinists Union less than the best that was in them.

And because they did, each is rightfully honored in the annals of our organization.

Tonight we are here because we are preparing to open a new chapter in the pages of the Machinists Union.

In about 48 hours a new International President and a new General Secretary-Treasurer will be sworn in and the incumbents, Roy Siemiller and Matt DeMore, will become—like those who have gone before them—a part of our union's history.

Like all the others who have gone before they too will leave a legacy to those who follow.

Four years ago—when Roy Siemiller stood where Floyd Smith now stands—he knew he would have but one term to serve as International President.

After 17 years as a general vice president—preceded by 10 years as a grand lodge representative he came to the International Presidency in the twilight of his career.

This meant that he had to move fast—that he had to preside over what he called "An administration in a hurry."

At a time when most men are beginning to slow down Roy Siemiller went into high speed.

The years of his administration—the four years that will be known in the records of our union as the Siemiller years—have been as fast, furious, and frantic as any other four years in our history.

They have been years in which the Fighting Machinists have more than lived up to this time-honored name.

As the nationally syndicated labor columnist, Victor Riesel, has pointed out, Roy Siemiller has led more dramatic and significant strikes in four years than John L. Lewis did in a decade.

As a result of his militance Roy has become what is known as a "controversial figure."

He has made a lot of people mad.

He has infuriated management, frustrated cabinet members, aggravated senators, enraged congressmen and irritated Presidents.

After four years of public scrutiny he is still a puzzle to the press.

They don't quite know how to characterize him.

While one reporter says he is "rough-cut and soft-spoken" another says he is "blunt and outspoken."

Time Magazine says he is "Craggy . . . and steel-hard" but the *Washington News* says he is "Tall and well-dressed."

The Wall Street Journal says he "is as subtle as a bass drum" but *Life Magazine* says, "He is just a straight ahead guy."

Whatever the press may say—or others may think—one rather astute commentator has noted—and I quote—"His members love him—for he is the dynamic symbol of their kind of trade unionism." *Unquote.*

It isn't surprising that Roy Siemiller accurately reflects the sentiments of the working people.

In his heart he has never forgotten the long journey he had to travel from a dirt farm in Gothenberg, Nebraska to the 10th floor of the Machinists Building in Washington, D.C.

He has never forgotten what it is like for a man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.

When he was little more than a boy he was out earning his own way in life.

He has never forgotten the hard years—the years he knocked about as a news boy, bowling pin setter, shoe shine boy, and messenger boy.

Neither has he forgotten when he—as a young machinist apprentice—had to work nine hours a day for 11 cents an hour.

And out of these memories has come this man who has devoted his life to the union cause.

It is not easy to adequately and accurately sum up the contributions and the career of a man as complex as Roy Siemiller.

Recently, however, the Institute of Collective Bargaining and Group Relations did about as well as anyone could.

In recognition of Roy's long service in the labor movement they presented him with a special citation.

And since I think it is particularly appropriate I would like to read it.

In the words of the Institute "Paul Leroy Siemiller is a man who:

"Has given a life of unstinting service to the American labor movement and thereby the American people;

"Has advanced the cause of working people everywhere with unswerving dedication;

"Has proven himself the devoted servant and leader of thousands of American workers;

"Has proven himself worthy in every crisis of the trust these workers have reposed in him;

"Has been a living example of courage and probity for the American labor movement and labor throughout the world;

"Has by his life's work made collective bargaining a firmer bulwark of our American system of democracy."

That is the citation of the Institute of Collective Bargaining and Group Relations.

Roy Siemiller has received many honors and awards in his life.

But I have read this particular citation because I think it is an especially apt description of the legacy he leaves to his union and his country.

For the Machinists Union the Siemiller years are drawing to a close.

But for Roy Siemiller himself the years of action and enjoyment are far from over.

In fact as Roy gets ready to close the book on his career in the IAM he is already preparing to open a new chapter in a new book.

At the personal request of George Meany he is going to serve as the AFL–CIO's liaison man to the JOBS Program of the National Alliance of Business.

Though we might think that his years of service have earned him a right to rest and relax Roy is like an old fire horse who smells smoke.

He sees before him a new challenge—and a new opportunity.

So it doesn't look like there is going to be any rocking chair or sunset years in Roy's future—at least not for quite a while.

But wherever Roy Siemiller goes—whatever he does—he will carry with him the affection, the respect, and the gratitude of a million IAM members.

No man *deserves* it more.

No man could *wish* for more.

REMARKS BY WILLIAM W. WINPISINGER

On the 5th of April in the year 1903 in the section of east side Cleveland, known as "Little Italy" a child was born to Domenico and Carmela DeMore. He was the fourth of their eight children and it is recorded that he was born with a full head of hair and a fat little belly.

They named him Matteo. And it was agreed by all the paesanos that no bambino in the history of Little Italy ever possessed a more bountiful and powerful pair of lungs.

It is said that when little Matteo let out a howl—chianti glasses were shattered and the fog horns on Lake Erie fell silent.

Time passed and the infant grew into a child. In those days a child was expected to do a man's work. And so when Matt was 9 years old he set out to make use of his mighty lungs. In the true Horatio Alger tradition he started out by selling newspapers on the streets of east side Cleveland. Some say Matt was a fine little newspaper boy. Others contend that the manner in which he boomed forth the headlines was little more than a disturbance of the peace. Time passed. The seasons changed. And when Matt had reached the ripe maturity of 11 years he embarked on a new career. On the basis of his unusual executive ability he was offered an important executive position as a part-time clerk in a local emporium known as Paleusky's Hardware Store.

To his tasks he devoted the dedication, the zip and the zeal for which he has long since become noted. Day after day he "pusha-da-cart, up and down the aisle—all the time singing 'Santa Lucia,' 'O Sole Mio' and all four parts of the Quartet from Rigoletto." Who knows to what heights of business or the opera our hero might have ascended had not fate—in the form of the local nickelodean—intervened. To put it mildly, Matt in those early days of the silent cinema, was a movie nut. He especially loved the Saturday afternoon serials that once upon a time kept youngsters returning—week after week—to witness the harrowing Perils of Pauline and other feats of daring.

Matt wanted to go to the movies—along with all the other kids. But he didn't want to spend his own hard-earned cash. So he resorted to a technique that is time honored in the mercantile establishments of our great land. Somehow—as he would be walking from customer to cash register—an occasional nickel would slip almost miraculously out of his hand and into his pocket.

Old Mr. Paleusky, the owner, was sorely tried. Time after time he'd fire the young lad. But time after time he'd rehire him the following morning. And Saturday after Saturday day there was our hero—rooting for the good guys and booing the bad guys at the old Venice Theater on the east side of Cleveland.

Thus did Matt forge on in life. He attended East High School. And in the long annals of that venerable institution of secondary education seldom has there been a less studious

student. It is recorded that he was more often absent than present. And finally the authorities requested that he make his absence permanent.

By now Matt was 16 years of age. And like millions of other lusty American youths he determined to follow the advice and counsel of Horace Greeley—who some years earlier had said "Go west, young man". And so, armed with a bag full of salami sandwiches he set off for the wild and woolly West—traveling all the way from Cleveland, Ohio to the wide open spaces of Detroit, Michigan. There on the old Michigan Central Railroad—with his uncle as his boss—he went to work as a blacksmith's helper.

In the heat of the furnace and the hammering of the forge Matt pondered many philosophic questions—like, "What the hell am I doing here?" Unable to devise an answer of sufficient metaphysical satisfaction he bid the West good-bye and hightailed it back to Little Italy.

And it was at this point that romance came into his life. He fell madly in love with a tiny-dark-eyed beauty named Mary Teresa Bacha. And so once more he changed careers. He accepted—as the saying goes—a position as a maintenance machinist with the Electric Vacuum Cleaner Company. He received a magnificent wage—40c an hour. With an income like this it didn't take him long—not more than a couple of years to save enough money to buy a wedding ring for his Mary Teresa. On October 27, 1923 they were joined in holy wedlock. The 20 year old Matt was now a man. As a man he immediately and happily set out to carry on the ancient and honorable traditions of the DeMore family. In the original Italian form DeMore means "of love". And so it was with love that he and Mary started to produce a fine crop of bambinos of their own. First came the girls—Dorothy, Marie and Delores. And Matt began to think that perhaps he was the last of the DeMores. But he kept at the job like the true journeyman he is until finally Matt II came along to carry on the family name. But even that wasn't quite final. There was still Alice to be heard from.

With all those small and hungry mouths to be fed—Matt met a reversal of fate and fortune when—in the cold and damp of the machine shop he developed a form of rheumatism which he called "a pain in the neck."

And so he had to find another way to support his growing brood. He became a motorman for the Cleveland Railway System. How well he remembers those happy days when he was Matt, the happy trolley man, merrily ringing his motorman's bell up and down the Old Woodhill Station-105th Street Line. That's when he joined his first union—The Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, Division 268.

But then came the Great Depression. And being low on the seniority list Matt could no longer earn enough as a motorman to buy pasta for all the hungry little DeMores. Again fate intervened. His old boss at the Electric Vacuum Cleaner Company—Louie Siefert—asked him to come back as a maintenance machinist. Matt did. And he joined an independent, so-called union known by the fancy and high-sounding title of the Mechanics Education Society of America. After hitting the bricks in two unsuccessful strikes Matt and his co-workers in the tool room and maintenance department came to the brilliant conclusion that an educational society ain't no substitute for a union.

Thus, it came to pass in the summer of 1935—in the 32nd year of his life—that Matt DeMore became a true blue, bonafide card-carrying dues-paying, faithful and fearless member of the International Association of Machinists. He was one of the original organizers and founders of IAM Lodge 439.

At that time the IAM was a far different—and certainly a far smaller—organization than it is today. It had no more than 70,000 members in all of the United States and Canada. When Card Number 95708—which is Matt's card number—was issued, District 54 had about 4,000 members.

Obviously, both Matt and the Machinists had no place to go but up. And that's exactly where they have been headed ever since. Possessed of the only human voice in captivity that can be heard from Cleveland to Toledo without the aid of electronic devices Matt met the primary pre-requisite of a union business representative. He could be heard above the tumult and shouting of the union hall. He could be heard over the hubub of a union convention. More important he could even be heard through the screams of anguish at the bargaining table.

When Matt spoke people listened. And when people listened they found he always had something to say. And so, through the passing years Matt DeMore, the kid from Little Italy—became President and Directing Business Representative of District 54. He became Secretary of the IAM Law Committee—which he served for 20 years—longer than any other man in the history of our union. In 1961 he became General Vice President and was posted to the Northeastern Territory. A few months later—when someone asked his opinion as a mid-westerner of all those sharpies in New York—he replied—both loud and clear—"I wish we had a hell of a lot more just like them." Not only did Matt love New York but it has been rumored that New York loved him. Had he stayed there he would probably be known today as "Broadway Matt" but instead he was recalled to the Grand Lodge to serve first as a Resident Vice President and later General Secretary Treasurer.

Recently Matt received a delightful letter from an old comrade-in-arms, a retired Business Representative from District 15 in New York named Joe Long.

Brother Long congratulated Matt on entering a new world where clocks and calendars are obsolete. In this new world, he said, "you will abandon conformity, eat when you are hungry, sleep when you are tired, go where you want, dress as you please and spend a great deal of time pushing a shopping cart."

It sounds like an ideal existence. But in addition to pushing a shopping cart Matt will also be pushing for the welfare and well-being of his fellow members of the National Council of Senior Citizens. As of July 1, he will be serving as a Vice President for that organization. We are happy to note that even retirement will not still his booming voice.

This, then, is a brief summarization of the times and tribulations of Matt DeMore. And though I have made a few joking and exaggerated comments along the way I know—and you know—that he has served The Machinists Union with dignity—and the labor movement with distinction. As he nears the end of his long and illustrious career I am pleased to note that he will end up just as he started out—with a full head of hair and a fat little belly.

Like a lot of the leaders of labor who were tough enough to survive the battles of the 30's Matt has shed his blood in the fight for the working man. There was a time—many years ago—when he rushed instinctively to the defense of one of his picket captains who was being pushed around by the police. Matt, being a bit of a hothead found himself on the wrong end of a police club.

He recalls that just a split second before his head was busted wide open he heard one of the policemen snarl, "This is for you, Matt." That time he ended up in a hospital. Tonight we again say—in the words of that long-forgotten Cleveland cop:

"This is for you, Matt."

But tonight instead of a hospital, you—Matt DeMore—end up secure and beloved in the hearts of your union brothers, your family and your fellow men.

GENERATION GAP

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the "generation gap" in recent months. While I am not convinced that the so-called gap is more pronounced or awesome or visible today than at any other time in this century, it persists as it always has and must be understood.

Roadsters, raccoon coats, bathtub gin, and goldfish swallowing are out—beads and beards and social protest are in—and the hardy homesteaders who built cabins on the plains and farmed with horses and broke the ice in the wash basin at 4 a.m. have been replaced by the good citizens of our generation who can remember the ravages of climate unchecked by proper conservation measures, the steel-wheeled tractors that shook our kidneys, the sobering times of our youth in the 1930's and beyond.

We are outraged sometimes, as were our fathers before us, for approximately the same reasons.

But wait—some 3 million young men serve honorably today in our Armed Forces, and some 200 of them die each week and the war goes on to what we all hope will be a negotiated settlement without resort to more widespread war.

A total war effort, such as this Nation experienced in World War II, carries an emotional explosion with it—every red-blooded American joins in the cause "till it's over over there."

A limited war effort, such as we endure in Vietnam and endured in Korea in the past decade, calls forth the full measure of devotion—a willingness to make the supreme sacrifice—from each soldier and sailor. It requires that measure of devotion until "some future time" when the political process can come to terms with a foreign policy that has turned sour—a foreign policy that many of its prime architects from the previous administration now declare to be in serious error.

There are those who say that such limited wars, coupling savage fighting with self-imposed restraint in weapon employment and manpower deployment, require a sophistication, dedication, and perseverance which was unknown in earlier, simpler times. Perhaps they are right.

There are those young people who have not measured up to the degree of commitment required in these difficult times. But remember, always remember, those who quietly serve in uniform abroad and those who diligently study more exhaustive curricula than ever before imposed in higher education.

Remember those who volunteer for the VISTA and the Peace Corps, those who work within the system for peace and relaxation of tension at home, for little pay and even less recognition.

We deplore those who escape to Canada or Sweden in evasion of the draft. Perhaps the only time in our history when the situation was worse was in the American Revolution—or perhaps the

War Between the States. Those, too, were difficult times. But then, as now, the deserters were a small and pitiful minority.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the St. Marys, Kans., Star on the generation gap.

This thoughtful editorial concludes with a message that all of us should pause to consider.

[From the St. Marys (Kans.) Star, June 26, 1969]

GENERATION GAP

One can better understand the gap (if a gap exists) between the generations when he recalls that those under 30 have never been tempered in the fires of depression, drouth, and global war, which deeply influenced the lives of their elders.

Try to explain to a teenager what it was like to work for a dollar a day, if you could find work. Tell your son that 50 cents would finance a Saturday night date with all of the trimmings; he will be tolerant but he won't believe you.

Explain to a person under 30 what it was like in the dry years when dust filled the air and drifted like snow along the fence rows; when meat animals were shot in the pastures while millions of Americans were really hungry.

Explain, if you can, the wave of patriotism which engulfed the country after Pearl Harbor, when thousands of young men, impatient of the draft, lined up at the recruiting stations and a draft evader was considered to be less than a man.

It's difficult for my generation to comprehend that these remarkable events, so important in the molding of our ideas and values, mean absolutely nothing to the young men and women of the present day.

Those under 30 have never known other than affluent times. There have always been jobs available if they were inclined to work. A college education which was a rare and precious thing in the thirties, is within the reach of any who have the ability and desire.

The wars the present youngsters remember have never commanded a total national effort or presented a clear-cut objective. Although very real and very deadly, they have failed to sound a great clarion call for young Americans to rally to the defense of their country.

Understanding is a two-way street and while we may rightfully expect more respect on the part of the young, yet we owe them more understanding than we normally give. This is a generation which was reared in entirely different circumstances. We can condemn the young for scornfully accepting the fruits of our labors, but we must listen when they argue that affluence has purchased neither peace nor happiness.

PRESIDENT NIXON BREAKS DEADLOCK ON SMALL RECLAMATION FUNDS

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Nixon for the decision he made on June 23, 1969, to end the 3-year deadlock that has stalled the funding of small reclamation projects. The President's decision is good news to the thousands of farmers who are in need of small projects and the benefits they provide. For 3 years now, these farmers have had to forego the development of small projects they have needed.

This decision now makes possible the funding of small reclamation projects that were halted because of the freeze.

The deadlock came about in 1966 when President Johnson issued an Executive order that prohibited the Bureau of Reclamation from seeking appropriations for new small reclamation project loans. President Johnson thought the provisions of section 4–D of the Small Reclamation Projects Act were contrary to the doctrine of separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

The objection raised by President Johnson had been raised by the Eisenhower administration and was settled to the satisfaction of President Eisenhower in 1956, at the inception of the program.

The small reclamation program has worked wonderfully since 1956, and in 1965 Congress extended the program and authorized an additional $100 million in appropriations. At that time, President Johnson did not raise his question on the separation of powers.

President Johnson's freeze directly affected eight small reclamation projects throughout the country and prevented many others from being developed. The Buttonwillow Improvement District in Kern County, Calif., was one of the projects directly hit by the freeze.

I congratulate President Nixon for recognizing that a grave situation existed and for taking the necessary action to correct it. His action is in agreement with the type of solution I have sought and worked for since the freeze became effective.

LT. COL. CHARLES E. WOODS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, one of my most important functions is to assist servicemen and their families in their dealings with the Armed Forces. This is an even more vital responsibility at a time when we have so many servicemen involved in armed conflict. In this respect, I have had the opportunity to work with liaison officers in all branches of the service and have been impressed with the assistance these officers have rendered me and, in turn, my constituents.

I would like to take this opportunity to publicly express my gratitude to a liaison officer who has been of invaluable assistance to me in my dealings with the U.S. Air Force.

For the past year and a half, Lt. Col. Charles E. Woods has served as congressional liaison officer for the State of Michigan as well as the States of Kansas, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. Colonel Woods' knowledge of Air Force policy and procedure has been instrumental in the expeditious handling of Air Force cases. His interest, not only in the cases for which he is responsible, but also in legislation which affects Air Force personnel has been most helpful to me—especially since there are two Air Force bases located in my congressional district.

Receiving his commission in 1950, Colonel Woods' Air Force career has been exemplary. Just prior to his assignment to the Congressional Liaison Office at the Pentagon, Colonel Woods was squadron operations officer of the 433d Tactical Fighter Squadron in Udorn, Thailand. On July 11, Colonel Woods will be leaving the Pentagon to attend the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Fort McNair.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Colonel Woods for his outstanding service and to wish him continued success in his Air Force career.

FTC COMMISSIONER MARY GARDINER JONES CITES TREMENDOUS COOPERATION BY BUSINESS IN PREPARING FOR TRUTH IN LENDING

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us who had a part in the drafting of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 knew that between the time of enactment of this far-reaching legislation on May 29, 1968, and the effective date of the disclosure requirements of the truth in lending title of the act on July 1, 1969, there would be a tremendous task in alerting businessmen to the provisions of the law and of the regulations. Even at this late date, calls and letters are coming into many congressional offices from constituents asking if the law applies to their businesses and what they should do in order to make sure they are in compliance.

Undoubtedly, the first days' or weeks' operations under the Truth in Lending Act will be marked with some confusion, particularly among very small business firms, in providing their customers with the required information on the dollars-and-cents costs of all charges which are part of a residential real estate, or consumer loan or consumer credit sale, and with the proper figure in each instance for the "annual percentage rate of the finance charge."

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has done a truly remarkable job in writing regulation Z spelling out the requirements of the Truth in Lending Act and interpreting its many provisions. The other agencies of the Government which share enforcement responsibilities under the Truth in Lending Act have all been diligent in getting the necessary information to the lending and credit-granting firms under their administrative jurisdiction, particularly the Federal Trade Commission, which will have the greatest share of this enforcement and administrative responsibility.

I was particularly interested, therefore, in reading a recent address by Federal Trade Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones on the scope of this preparatory work, and the fine cooperation which was

given by trade associations, better business bureaus, chambers of commerce, and other business groups in advising their own members and also nonmember firms on the necessary details of compliance with this landmark piece of legislation.

In a talk on Monday, June 23, before the International Consumer Credit Association's 57th annual conference, held in Pittsburgh, Pa., Miss Jones described this cooperative effort by business and government and said:

You can see why I find the past few months' joint activities so exciting. I cannot recall a comparable occasion since World War II when business and government have so completely shared and carried out a common objective.

THE DAWN OF "Z-DAY," AND 10 A.M.

In testimony last March before my Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Vice Chairman J. L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve, who headed the Board's task force in drafting and promulgating regulation Z, predicted that "Z-Day," as he described July 1, will "dawn bright and clear" in view of the tremendous effort which had gone into the preparation for the start of truth in lending operations.

This prompted me to say to Mr. Robertson:

I think your statement is excellent and we appreciate having it. If I were to be critical of anything in it, it would be your optimism in predicting that Z-day, as you call July 1, "will dawn bright and clear." True, it might dawn that way, but I am wondering what 10 a.m. will be like, when the TV and appliance salesmen, and the furniture credit offices, and the savings and loan executives and the others who will have to put Truth in Lending into effect that day, start filling in the forms and begin for the first time to give their customers the kind of information which has almost never been given before.

Let's hope it is not chaotic. But I think that what you are doing in trying to get the information out to every credit firm will be extremely useful and helpful. But there will still be those who haven't gotten the word, so to speak, and there will be suspicious customers also who are sure they are not getting all the information or protection they feel the law is supposed to give them.

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN CONSUMER CREDIT PROBLEMS

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested, as I was, in the discussion of administrative and enforcement and educational problems relating to truth in lending made by Federal Trade Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones in her speech on June 23 before the International Consumer Credit Association, an organization whose headquarters are in St. Louis, and I submit it herewith, as part of my remarks, as follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN CONSUMER CREDIT PROBLEMS

(Address by Mary Gardiner Jones)

You have taken as the general theme of your conference this year "The Consumer Credit Industry on Trial". I think an appropriate subtitle might be "Industry Self-Regulation on Trial."

Business and government are deeply involved in working together on a truly cooperative basis to achieve full and complete compliance with the Consumer Credit Protection Act due to go into effect on July 1st. Ultimate achievement of the long range objectives of the Act will depend on a continuation of this joint government-business cooperation and on a sustained and effective program of self-regulation by the consumer credit industry.

Yet, recent criticism levelled at the broadcast industry's self-regulation of cigarette advertising—or apparent lack of it—may result in casting a general pall on the public confidence in industry self-regulation attempts. It also may create a backlash for business-government relations. The timing of this cigarette controversy is unfortunate—or perhaps it is fortunate. Perhaps it serves as a reminder to all of us that the road to public responsibility and to the development of effective and creative business-government relationships is long and arduous and even rocky at times and that it demands from both business and government a special effort and the building of mutual trust and respect.

Unless business and government genuinely appreciate the need for closer relationships in the context of their own self-interest, then it is far better for business and government to go their separate ways—and even to treat each other as adversaries. I do not suggest such a bleak—and what I regard as truly bankrupt course of action. Indeed my feeling is that it is the record of industry associations like yours which demonstrates that entire industries have a clear view of both their personal, i.e. business responsibilities and their public responsibilities, that they appreciate the indivisibility of these responsibilities in many areas and that they understand that working with government on those problems which are of mutual concern not only works but makes good business sense and good public sense as well.

Recent polls and studies of students' reactions to business indicate quite clearly that businessmen more than other institution—educational, non-profit or governmental—earn the highest respect of the nation's young people for their intelligence, competence and progressiveness. Business comes in for criticism by these young people, however, when it comes to matters of social responsibility and exercise of disproportionate power. In part, this attitude on the part of the students surveyed may still be a product of the stereotype of the businessman which they have built in their minds from many sources and which is hard to dislodge regardless of how unreal it may be. In part it undoubtedly also comes from insufficient information about what many businesses are doing. But in part I am sure that it also derives from a vision of what the businessman and the large corporation can and should be doing in society today which is not yet part of the businessman's conventional wisdom. Young people today, as I read them, are not asking us to change the basic economic facts of life. They are looking at us to see if we are reexamining how we are responding to and implementing these basic facts of life. They are looking to see if we are aware of the limitations of our past performance in today's world with its very different needs and of the serious economic inequalities which persist in our society as a result of too blind adherence to traditional policies and practices which have worked well in the past, but which seem outdated today. I suspect much of the young people's vision of what the corporate role could be is both valid and feasible and indeed is in fact being played by individual businesses throughout our nation.

So despite its acknowledged performance and contributions to the public welfare, business like government and every other established institution in today's volatile and exciting society is on trial. Yet it is a trial which we should welcome because we are in a unique position to dictate—and I use the word advisably—the outcome of the battle. It is our day-to-day actions which will determine whether as businessmen, and for my part as a government official, we can make our social and economic system work for the needs of people as they exist in 1970 and beyond even though these needs are perceived very differently today from the way they have been perceived in the past.

You have asked me to address myself to the specific topic of Business and Government in the Consumer Credit Industry. I suspect ten years ago the topic might have been framed as a queston: Business or Government in the Consumer Credit Industry? Two years ago, it might have been formulated as Business-Government Relations. But we have come a long way in the last decade and even in the last year. We know that it is not Business-Government Relations as such with which we are concerned. We know that our relationship is no longer a goal in itself but simply an essential means of tackling some of the problems which must be solved if the society we believe in so deeply can ever really become a reality for everyone. We also know that our respective roles vis-a-vis your industry are no longer an either-or proposition.

Ten years ago I think we would probably have agreed that almost every facet of the relationship between the consumer and the retailer or credit agency was a proper and exclusive sphere of the private sector. If the consumer wanted more information or didn't like a particular creditor's practices, the technique for meeting these demands lay essentially within the mechanism of the competitive system. Consumers had but to find the particular creditor who responded to their particular needs and if their demands were shared by a sufficient number of consumers, there was little doubt that the competitive system would produce a response. On the other hand, if there was trickery or deceit in the marketplace, this was essentially a legal question and therefore a problem for government to solve.

Today, the society in which we live has very different needs and problems and we are required to rethink most of our old approaches to our respective responsibilities. With credit a part of almost every significant purchase and sale transaction, the terms of the credit transaction are of almost greater importance to the consumer than the purchase price of the merchandise. Indeed as you well know many products are advertised in the daily press exclusively as respects the credit terms which will be extended to the purchaser and many do not even mention purchase prices, guarantees or other more traditional promotional features. With credit frequently extended through retailers rather than directly by the finance company, consumers have usually very little contact with professional lenders. Credit becomes a commodity to sell and for some retailers their margin of profit is as much accounted for by their credit transactions as it is by their sales of merchandise. Thus government's traditional concern with the effective functioning of our competitive system of necessity had to extend to a relatively new regard for the degree of credit sophistication of consumers and their ability to compare and understand the credit terms being offered to them—matters which had never before been regarded as within the province of government.

By the same token, as consumers confronted deception and dishonesty—as well as indifference—in the marketplace and increasingly vented their frustrations on the entire community, business, too, began to recognize that it had a stake in maintaining the integrity of the marketplace and in seeing to it that consumers' needs for information were responded to. Thus the problems which you as the businessman and I as a government official have been traditionally concerned with are inextricably merged. Consumer protection

is no more regarded as the exclusive province of government as is the extension of credit thought of as the sole concern of business. This type of compartmentalization of problems and programs is out of date and obsolete. Problems are total and each part is so inextricably related to every other part that nothing short of a systems type approach to these problems in which every institution in society is involved can offer any hope to any of us that we can and will in fact find viable solutions.

Today your industry and my agency are working hand in hand in seeing to it that all creditors understand their obligations under the Consumer Credit Protection Act and will indeed comply fully with both the letter and the spirit of these obligations. The endeavor is an exciting one and I hope one which will create between government and industry such long lasting bonds that the cooperative working out of mutual problems will become a permanent phenomenon in all of our future relationships.

Let me give you just a little flavor of our work with the consumer credit industry so that you can appreciate the day to day problems which are arising under the law and which hopefully are being effectively and realistically solved.

Since January of this year, our staff estimates that the Commission has committed an average of approximately three attorneys per field office to the job of participating in workshop or panel discussion sessions and in responding to inquiries about the reach and scope of the law and the propriety of various credit forms and other credit transaction papers. Our staff also estimates that Commission personnel both in Washington and throughout our eleven field offices have averaged at least one panel discussion or workshop session a day in meeting with different industry groups to discuss the requirements of the law and the problems which are involved. Our Washington office alone averages approximately 100 letters a day asking for advice of one kind or another. We have received inquiries from such disparate persons as hospitals and dentists, cooperatives and major oil companies, real estate boards and builders and contractors associations, automobile and tire dealers associations, the National Association of Cemeteries, the National Plant Food Institute, and the National Association of Music Merchants. Our staff has met with local Chambers of Commerce, Better Business Bureaus and bar associations throughout the 50 states. They have met with member groups of the American Retail Federation, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Industrial Bankers Association, the Credit Managers Association, the Retail Credit Association, state retail merchant associations, the Consumer Finance Association, and with a variety of local banking and other retailer institutions and associations.

Our major problems have been concerned with resolving questions of the applicability of the Act to various retailers and individuals, problems of whether retailers' charges for delayed payments constitute a credit charge or a late charge, problems of whether credit is being extended when an individual does not pay his bill in one lump sum although no formal agreement permitting this was ever entered into, and just recently, we had to resolve the question of whether funeral directors were subject to the Act when they extended credit to the deceased's estate.

Most of this educational program would not have been possible without the tremendous effort put into this work by industry groups themselves. Some of the panel and workshop discussions in which we have participated were initiated by Commission personnel. But the great bulk of them were organized and sponsored by the business community. Again, many times in responding to inquiries our staff is able to direct the inquiror to one or other of the major trade associations which has a particular expertise in the substantive area inquired into. For example, inquiries respecting real estate credit problems we can direct to the Mortgage Bankers Association. Similiarly, when we encountered problems involving the duration of the credit extended by a pawnbroker, we could turn to the pawnbroker's trade association for assistance in finding a solution which would carry out the spirit of the law and conform to the realities of the pawnbroker's business.

The Commission, as you know, disseminated on as wide a basis as possible copies of Regulation Z together with various explanatory notes and sample forms prepared by the Federal Reserve Board in order to assist business in bringing its credit practices into full conformity with the law. But the business community has done even more. Most of the trade associations have prepared their kit of educational materials expressly tailored to the particular needs of their members. Both the National Better Business Bureau as well as many of the local bureaus are also disseminating information about the basic reach of the law and of the regulations. Many Local Chambers of Commerce are becoming active in this field. In many instances, particularly for many small retailers and lenders who are not members of any trade associations, the educational material disseminated by the BBBs and the local chambers may constitute the first notice they have received of the existence of the law and its application to their business.

In addition to our work with industry, we have also worked closely with the Federal Reserve Board and with the other seven governmental agencies also charged with enforcing this law vis-a-vis their particular constituents. We have been meeting with these various agencies at least once a month and of course with the Federal Reserve Board our contacts are almost daily.

As you know the Board is the only body authorized to furnish official interpretations of the Act. However, banks receiving inquiries from retailers and finance companies usually refer these to the Commission and only infrequently have we encountered situations where we and the Board have taken inconsistent positions on the applicability of the Act to the companies subject to our jurisdiction. The responses which our staff gives are technically only informal opinions and not officially binding on either the Commission or the Board. Nevertheless, our staff opinions are based on their complete familiarity with the law and the regulation. It is extremely unlikely that their expertise on these issues would not in every case be endorsed both by the Commission and by the Board with whom they work so closely.

It is our impression that the enforcement programs of each of the seven federal agencies are uniformly strong and their interpretations of the law vis-a-vis their constituents completely consistent one with the other. I recall some fears expressed last winter at the NCFA conference in Florida as to whether the different enforcing agencies might approach their responsibilities with different intensities. It is my impression that no basis for this fear has materialized and that all creditors can rely on the fact that the compliance required of them will be uniform regardless of which agency is charged with their supervision.

You can see why I find the past few months' joint activities so exciting. I cannot recall a comparable occasion since World War II when business and government have so completely shared and carried out a common objective. July 1st is only seven days away. On that day the law will become a reality for all of us. In part our problems will probably only just begin. For your part, you will not only want to be sure that your credit practices are in full compliance but you will have an equal concern that your competitors are not advertently or inadvertently violating any of the strictures of the law to your competitive disadvantage. On our part, we will be starting on a long range enforcement program the first step of which will be to complete our universe of all of the creditors and retailers who extend credit who will be subject to our jurisdiction.

I hope that you will start now to consider just what role you can and want to play in protecting yourselves from the competitive disadvantages which can accrue to you if any of your competitors fail to comply with the law. Here again it seems to me that your industry and my Commission share a mutual concern in evenhanded and effective enforcement of the Consumer Credit Protection Act. You and we have several alternative courses of action which we can take either separately or cooperatively in order to ensure the success of such evenhanded enforcement.

On your part, you can ignore the credit disclosure practices of your competitors and instead tend strictly to your own knitting. Or you can as an industry or within your own community or trading areas develop informal machinery—through a local chamber or Better Business Bureau or through a special ad hoc committee composed of men and women whose integrity, judgment and knowhow about your industry is recognized by all or through a local trade association chapter—to examine complaints which a consumer or a businessman raises about possible noncomplying credit advertisements or credit documentation. At this point your truth in lending investigating group—however constituted—could seek to resolve the problem itself. If this effort proved unsuccessful, the group could decide to do nothing further. Or it could turn either the original complaint or its investigating file together with its findings to the applicable state regulatory official where he has power to act or to the nearest Federal Trade Commission field office or both.

On our part, we can proceed as we usually do to police compliance on our own. Or we could, in the first instance, refer certain types of complaints to an industry authority if one were created, with a request for a report within a defined period as to whatever action was taken. We would not be foreclosed in any way by the action, if any, taken by the private group. However, if the action was deemed adequate we would be enabled to allocate our sparse resources to those compliance problems requiring our intervention. Presumably different types of procedures could be experimented with, with different groups depending on their desires and capability to take effective investigative or remedial steps.

Whatever the degree of self-regulation which may be adopted, it is my hope that your industry will continue, in the enforcement stages of this law, to play a creative and effective role in furthering full compliance with this law. I am convinced that it is as much in your industry's interest as it is in the public interest. It is obvious that this area of business activity is of equal concern to government and business and that both of us, therefore, should continue to work cooperatively to solve whatever problems may arise as the law goes into effect.

There is one further aspect to the enforcement of this law which I would like to touch upon briefly before closing. In my judgment, this law—perhaps more than any other—depends for its real effectiveness on consumers' understanding of the credit information required to be disclosed. Its success, therefore, in the long run requires the same affirmative effort on the part of consumers to *use* the information as the Act requires of creditors to *disclose* this data.

The Board is preparing a consumer's film strip which will be ready in August. The Commission, too, is preparing to move into

the area of consumer education. It is our hope that we can achieve the same success in stimulating consumers to appreciate their responsibilities under the law as I believe has been achieved in helping the business community to appreciate their obligations under this law. But our resources and skills in this area are of necessity limited.

It is possible that credit counselling, with the Consumer Protection Act credit disclosures particularly in mind, can be one of the projects which President Nixon's newly formed Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action could sponsor as a high priority item. But in the last analysis, I am convinced that the business community has such an important stake in ensuring that consumers use this information intelligently and rationally, that they too must play a major role in helping to organize and sustain a long range educational campaign directed at consumers of all income levels and educational backgrounds.

I hope that your association and each of you in your own communities will initiate, organize and help others to organize continuing programs of workshop and panel discussion sessions directed specifically at assisting consumers to appreciate the absolute necessity of reading and understanding the credit information which will now be available to them every time they enter into a credit transaction. The format of these sessions cannot be the same as that used for businessmen. The materials used must be provocative and must stress the importance to the consumer of taking the extra few minutes which is required to think about the significance of the various items involved in the credit charge. The education campaign cannot be regarded as a one shot operation. The media, the schools, the women's organizations, the labor unions, the Better Business Bureaus and local chambers must be encouraged to follow through for some continuing period of time so that evaluating different credit terms becomes as automatic for consumers as deciding which brand to purchase or which retailer to patronize.

Your participation in this aspect of the enforcement of the Consumer Credit Protection Act can be as important in ensuring its effectiveness as has been your work in helping your own members to understand their obligations under the law.

Your industry can take the lead both in organizing the initial stages of this consumer education program and in seeing to it that other groups in the community will continue the project. In every community in which your members are located, it should be the responsibility of each of you to make sure that every citizen learns about the existence of this law, how it can assist them in their day to day living, who they can turn to if they encounter problems and in general to provide the community with visible evidence that the power structure or the establishment, if you will, is vitally concerned to serve their needs in concrete practical ways not necessarily immediately related to its primary function of selling goods and services and providing credit.

FLAG DAY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Robert R. White, commander of the Iowa Department of the American Legion, recently wrote the guest editorial for the Davenport Times-Democrat. His subject, "Flag Day," is not unusual, in view of his position with the Legion. He did, however, present his subject with unusual meaning and sincerity. For this reason, I would like to include it in the RECORD for the benefit of the other Members and the public:

HUMAN HOPE IN BLOOM

This is Flag Day and our guest editorialist on the subject is Robert R. White, 46, of Davenport, Iowa department commander of the American Legion. White has completed 27 years of service and is operations chief of transportation at the Rock Island Arsenal. He served in World War II February, 1943, through November, 1945, with the 612th Engineers Light Equipment Company in the European theater and took part in the invasion of France June 6, 1944. He and his wife Norine have two sons and a daughter. The family lives at 614 E. 14th St.

My fellow Americans, we celebrate an historic, a remarkable event today, the 192nd anniversary of the adoption of the Stars and Stripes as the symbol and flag of the United States.

This means the U.S. has had basically the same flag for nearly two centuries. Our flag is in fact just a year short of being the same age as our republic, whose 200th anniversary is just seven years away on July 4.

Hopefully, well before either the nation's or the flag's 200th anniversary, we will see Flag Day as not just a holiday established each year by proclamation but by law as a legal, patriotic, federal holiday.

This at least is the aim of the American Legion which recently committed itself, in the organization's golden anniversary, to working toward this end. We believe it is safe to say our flag, "Old Glory," will have its day, a truly national holiday, firmly and legally secured.

I say this not alone out of pride in our flag, and we certainly have that, but in faith as well in the basic good sense of the American people who will find this a firm response to those of recent date who have sought to dishonor this noble symbol of our country and her great traditions.

While we live in a time when some parade under all types of banners, I believe sincerely that we are coming upon new times when our nation will again insist upon a return to the old fashioned ideals, and, of course, a strong pride in our flag and all it stands for, all the hope and promise of this nation.

The flag flies today as a sign that Americans, proud of their stirring heritage, are determined to carry forward the American dream. Let us have faith in America, her ideals and her institutions. Let us strengthen this nation and her institutions by our personal example.

We have come into difficult times and occasionally Old Glory would seem to have fallen into hard times. Some have even termed our flag a "rag." But we predict a time will come when Americans will say from their hearts that this piece of red, white and blue bunting symbolizes thousands of years of struggle upwards. It is the full-grown flower of ages of fighting for liberty. It is the century plant of human hope in bloom.

We celebrate Flag Day because this flag which we honor and under which many have served is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and our purpose as a nation.

It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation—the choice is ours. It floats in majestic silence above those who execute these choices whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—of the past, of the men and women who have gone before us and of the records they have written upon it.

We celebrate the day of its birth, and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has flown on high the symbol of great events, of a great plan of life worked out by a great people.

The flag is a symbol of freedom, of victory over incredible forces, of right over might. It represents the greatest causes ever undertaken by mortal men, a cause to which mankind must rally if the concepts of individual dignity and man's right to self-determination are to be universally attained and preserved.

Should we, here at home, do less than recognize the sacrifice of the men and women wearing our nation's uniform through display of the flag and the showing of proper resepct for the living symbol of our nation?

Display of the flag is a privilege. It emphasizes the basic freedom of choice which is the very foundation of mankind's only hope for a better tomorrow.

Revere our flag and ideals not just one day but on all days and join with me as we study and repeat, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I received the May–June 1969 issue of the King Resources Co. magazine at my office the other day. This magazine carries two articles of extreme interest to all Alaskans and of general historical note to all Americans. This summer there will be a voyage from New York to Prudhoe Bay. This is through the Northwest Passage. The voyage this summer named the "Manhattan project," will involve America's largest tanker reoutfitted as an icebreaker. Mr. Speaker, this is exploration. This is a challenge and hopefully history will be made this summer. The two articles that I mention deal with the Northwest Passage, one is the story of the Northwest Passage and the other the story of the tanker SS *Manhattan*. I include the articles in the RECORD at this point:

THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE

It was a dazzling bright day in late July, 1845, and the two sturdy little barks lay motionless in a calm sea off the west coast of Greenland. Lacking a wind to fill their sails they had moored to an iceberg.

The 129 officers and men aboard were led by the aging Sir John Franklin, 59, who in recent years had been governor of Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania) and whose three previous expeditions to the Polar Sea had won him a knighthood from King George IV. That didn't mean his earlier trips, over a 10-year span between 1818 and 1827, had been without mishap. Franklin had been severely criticized in some quarters for the disaster that befell his first independent command. It was a land and water expedition in 1819–1822 on which he had instructions to map previously unexplored areas of Canada's northern coast from the Coppermine River east to Hudson Bay.

Thwarted by ice and threatening weather, the party on September 1, 1821, struck out on foot from Point Turnagain across the

Barren Lands, hoping to reach the safety of a previously established camp on the Coppermine. Eleven men out of the 20 died in the attempt, with at least one resorting to cannibalism toward the last. The rest were saved only through the courage and daring of one man, Midshipman George Back. With two reluctant Indian companions he slogged hundreds of miles to Fort Providence on Great Slave Lake, sustaining himself at times on carrion from which he drove feeding wolves and flocks of crows.

Many of his contemporaries felt Franklin was too old to go on the 1845 expedition. But now, after nearly three and a half centuries of dogged searching by men of a half dozen nations, it was regarded as only a matter of a year or two before someone would unlock the puzzle of a new trade route to China and the East Indies. Explorers from Elizabethan times had sought a shorter route to the fabled land of which Marco Polo wrote on his return to Italy in the 13th century. The passage of time had made the route itself less important than the knowledge being gained in the search. Franklin had been adamant. He wanted to go, and the Admiralty finally consented: "Arctic work gets into the blood of these men," Lord Brougham had observed. "They *can't help* going again if they get a chance."

Neither Franklin nor his men on that summer day in 1845 were impatient at the calm that had overtaken them. It was one of those small annoyances to be waited out; they had no need to worry. The ships, both converted bomb vessels, were veterans of earlier expeditions. Recently refitted, provisioned for a three-year voyage and equipped with screws and auxiliary steam engines of 20 horsepower, they were the most modern vessels that shipwrights of the world's greatest maritime nation could provide.

Besides, they had company. A Scottish whaler, the *Prince of Wales*, lay close by. In good spirits as he habitually was, Franklin ordered a boat lowered and sent a party of 10 officers over to invite her captain to dinner aboard his flagship that evening. But the dinner date was never kept. Soon after the boat was hauled back on board, the sails of all three ships began to flap in a gently rising wind. When the canvas snapped taut, Franklin eagerly directed his crews to cast off from the iceberg and shape a course toward Lancaster Sound and the elusive Northwest Passage.

Sailors on the *Prince of Wales* watched them go. Casks of stores were even lashed to the open decks. They were so heavily laden that they drew 17 feet of water and wallowed clumsily as they made sail westward and disappeared below the horizon on Baffin Bay. Captain Dannett on the *Prince of Wales* noted the date and their position in his log: 26 July, latitude 74° 48′ north, longitude 66° 13′ west. More than two years later the whaling master would begin to realize he had written the epitaph of the Franklin party. He and his crew were the last to see them alive. Some of them—even the ships—would vanish forever into the unrelenting Arctic.

Franklin's ensign flew from the *Erebus*, named for the god of darkness in classical Greek mythology and displacing 370 tons. But for this particular voyage her 340-ton consort was more appropriately named: *Terror*. As Franklin well knew, ice could do awesome things to sailing ships. In 1830 a westerly gale had blown the icebergs of Baffin Bay in against the Greenland coast, crushing a fleet of 19 whaling ships in one massive blow.

Six years later the *Terror*, with Franklin's old friend George Back in command, had been so badly beset by pack ice that her keel cracked; her bow, sternpost and cabin doors split; copper fittings in her galley twisted out of shape; her decks buckled amidships and turpentine squeezed out of the pitch along every seam. Over a period of 10 months she drifted helpless for 234 miles, frozen in.

A similar fate now awaited Franklin's little flotilla, but one from which no one would escape. He was to make the greatest human sacrifice in the history of Arctic exploration and give his name posthumously to the vast Canadian Arctic Archipelago that is known today as the District of Franklin, Northwest Territories.

The Arctic and the Northwest Passage had always treated intruders badly. Henry Hudson and loyal members of his crew were abandoned by mutineers and died together in 1611 on the shores of the bay that now bears his name. A Danish expedition led by Jens Munck in 1619 was nearly wiped out by scurvy and exposure while wintering at the Churchill River's mouth on the west shore of Hudson Bay. Munck and two other survivors out of 64 in the original party managed to sail one of the ships back to Denmark. James Knight, an official of the Hudson's Bay Company, lost his own life, two ships and all hands aboard on a hastily contrived gold-seeking mission to the vicinity of Marble Island in 1719–1720. These all entered the Arctic from the Atlantic side, but Vitus Bering, the Danish-born explorer for whom the Bering Strait is named, was no luckier approaching from the west. After sighting Alaska in 1741 he became lost in the fog-shrouded Aleutian Islands and finally died of scurvy on a tiny island off the Siberian coast.

Most historians agree the quest for the Northwest Passage began with Christopher Columbus before the dawn of the 16th century. But like Columbus, earlier explorers for more than 250 years were searching too far south. The St. Lawrence seaway and Hudson Strait-Hudson Bay regions occupied much of their time. It took 160 years to determine that there was no western outlet to Hudson Bay.

With sailing ships at the mercy of winds, tides and ice, progress was slow. At times they could proceed only by "warping," which meant running a line forward to an iceberg or floe known to be heavier than the ship and winding the vessel toward it with a capstan. Short stretches of pack ice were sometimes conquered by sending the crews forward with saws to cut a channel. Simple errors in human judgment added to the delays. Working in poor light and miserable weather, many an early adventurer saw no distinction between where land ended and ice began. Several of the larger Arctic islands for years were thought to be extensions of the continent. Captain John Ross, who led one of the first expeditions sent out after the close of the Napoleonic wars, made such a mistake. Ross was ordered by the Admiralty in 1818 to take two ships into Baffin Bay and resurvey for a possible ocean passage to the west. His second in command was a young naval lieutenant destined to become one of the most famous of Arctic explorers, William Edward Parry. Ross found no western exit from Baffin Bay because he mistakenly assumed that neither Jones nor Lancaster Sounds were through channels. Lieutenant Parry, believing the "mountains" Ross had seen at the western end of Lancaster Sound didn't really exist, reported his opinion to the Admiralty when he returned to England that fall, and was promptly appointed to head an 1819 expedition. His orders were to try and navigate the sound and proceed west to Bering Strait.

Thus it was that after 327 years the true eastern approach to the Northwest Passage was discovered. Parry almost made it through to the western sea, and won a prize of £5,000 for being the first navigator to reach 110° west longitude. Had he broken through to the Beaufort Sea and proceeded to Bering Strait, he would have come in for another £5,000. But Parry was stopped, as Franklin would later be stopped, by a stream of pack ice that flows easterly and southeasterly from the edges of the permanent pack in the Beaufort Sea north of Alaska.

Parry did reach the south coast of Melville Island, which itself was a remarkable accomplishment. No other sailing ship made it that far west without the use of auxiliary steam power and blasting powder. No sailing ship ever crossed the ice stream that confronted Parry. It was finally crossed more than 100 years later, in 1944, by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's 80-ton Arctic schooner, *St. Roch*, commanded by Sergeant Henry A. Larsen.

The ice stream flows eastward through M'Clure Strait and Viscount Melville Sound south of Melville Island, where part of it spilts off and wheels southward into the M'Clintock Channel between Victoria and Prince of Wales Islands. At the south end of this channel is King William Island, whose northwest coast is heavily bombarded by moving ice and where Franklin's ships were to become trapped in 1846.

After sailing out of Baffin Bay and into Lancaster Sound in 1845, the Franklin party beat westward past Devon Island and then turned north into the Wellington Channel to circumnavigate Cornwallis Island, west of Devon. As they returned to the southwest tip of Devon Island it was apparent the navigation season would soon be over, Franklin decided to winter on tiny Beechey Island. There two members of the *Erebus*' crew and one man from the *Terror* died—perhaps of scurvy, perhaps from eating tinned meat that was found to be tainted. More than 700 tins of the meat were consumed or destroyed that winter; the empty tins were filled with gravel to build a cairn, but no written records were ever found in it.

The following spring the expedition, now numbering 126 men, set sail west and south along the east coast of Prince of Wales Island to a point off Cape Felix, the northernmost tip of King William Island. Here, for whatever the reason, Franklin made his fatal mistake.

Had he continued down the east coast of King William Island he might have found the Northwest Passage and arrived safely in Bering Strait. Instead he took a westerly course and ran headlong into the ice stream from the Beaufort Sea. The ships were helplessly frozen in by early September 1846, and not for one winter but for two.

Sir John Franklin died of heart disease on June 11, 1847. By then 20 more members of the expedition had succumbed to scurvy. The remaining 105 men suffered through one more winter, apparently not lacking for food but despairing of ever freeing the ships. On April 22, 1848, both vessels were abandoned. The crews set out overland for Hudson's Bay Company posts hundreds of miles to the south, dragging the ships' boats with them as they went. *Erebus* and *Terror* had been outfitted with all the comforts, including a 1,200-book library and two barrel organs, but none of the equipment that the crews needed now. There were no snowshoes, no sleds, no survival clothing, no tents.

Eskimo hunters told search parties months later that they had seen some of Franklin's men struggling southward, many falling beside the trail and dying where they lay. Some reached the south shore of King William Island and crossed to the continent. About 40 were found in a place that came to be known as Starvation Cove. The man who found them, Dr. John Rae of the Hudson's Bay Company, reported on his return to civilization in 1855 that "From the mutilated state of many of the corpses and the contents of the kettles, it is evident that our miserable countrymen had been driven to the last resources." Cannibalism had again taken its toll of a John Franklin expedition.

But the Franklin disaster finally unlocked the Canadian Arctic. Thirty-four expeditions by sea and six overland search parties, some motivated by patriotism or compassion for Lady Franklin, others by an Admiralty reward of £20,000, spent more than six years crisscrossing the Arctic islands from east and

west. In doing so, they filled the remaining gaps in man's knowledge of the Arctic coastline and discovered two variants of the true Northwest Passage.

Commander Robert McClure of the *Investigator*, which had entered the Beaufort Sea along the Alaska coast from the west sailed within 30 miles of the farthest point sighted by Parry on his 1819–1820 voyage into Viscount Melville Sound. McClure's ship was trapped and eventually abandoned to the Beaufort Sea ice stream; early in their third winter in the Arctic one crewman and the ship's demolition officer lost their sanity.

In 1853, however, rescue appeared in the form of a young lieutenant off *HMS Herald*, which was anchored near Melville Island 160 miles northeast of the place where *Investigator* was trapped. McClure and his crew, led by the young *Herald* officer, walked across the ice to the rescue ship and thus became the first men to complete the Northwest Passage—even though part of it was on foot.

An 1857 expedition paid for by Lady Franklin and commanded by Captain Leopold McClintock finally discovered the only written record of the Franklin party's fate. In a cairn on King William Island was found a standard Admiralty form, printed in six languages, and with handwritten notes in the margins:

"April 25, 1848.—H.M. ships Terror *and* Erebus *were deserted on the 22nd of April, 5 leagues NNW of this, having been beset since 12th September, 1846 . . ."*

The McClintock party also established the certainty that King William Island was actually an island—not a cape or headland as was previously believed. So it was that in 1903–1906, the Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen sailed around King William Island to the *east* and *south*, keeping it between him and the Beaufort Sea ice stream, and became the first man to complete the entire passage on shipboard.

Amundsen demonstrated once and for all that there did exist a shorter route from Atlantic to Pacific than by way of Cape Horn or the Cape of Good Hope. It had taken more than 400 years and scores of lives to find. The last bitter irony was that it never became the commercially useful route Elizabethan adventurers had hoped for. Eight years after Amundsen's historic voyage the Panama Canal was opened.

DO OIL AND ICE MIX?—TANKER MANHATTAN WILL SEEK ROUTE TO ALASKA'S NORTH SLOPE

This July or August, man will make a bold new foray into the icy wastes of the Northwest Passage. It will be in hope of finding and developing a year-round commercial sea route over which to distribute Alaskan oil to world markets—oil that may exist in greater quantity there than in any other place in the Western Hemisphere.

Problems to be overcome are no less formidable today than they were 400 years ago. A Seattle, Washington, newspaperman specializing in maritime affairs probably wasn't far wrong when he called it "a great gamble in sea transportation." The stakes are high, with the initial ante measured in millions of dollars. But with an endless variety of sophisticated navigation and sounding gear, helicopters to scout the way, and the combined knowledge of U.S. and Canadian Coast Guards and Arctic experts to draw upon, backers of this new Northwest Passage adventure are confident they will at least find the answers they seek, even if the answers turn out to be the wrong ones. And the answers will come in a matter of weeks instead of years.

The joint plan of Humble Oil & Refining Company, Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO) and British Petroleum Exploration U.S.A., Inc., is to send a 115,000-ton oil tanker, the *SS Manhattan*, from New York through the Northwest Passage across the roof of Canada to Prudhoe Bay, Alaska—a distance of 4,427 miles. If the experiment is successful (Humble's marine experts give it a 50–50 chance) the company would build a fleet of icebreaker-equipped tankers even larger than the *Manhattan* to bring the crude oil out to East Coast and perhaps European refineries. A Humble spokesman said the larger ships would be in the 250,000-ton class, and enough of them would be built to double the present total tonnage of the U.S. merchant fleet.

The *Manhattan*, owned by Seatrain Lines, Inc., is the largest merchant ship that sails under the American flag. In recent months it has been getting bigger. Brought to the United States from East Pakistan in December, it was cut into four sections for refitting and modifications. Owing to a specially designed icebreaker bow and hull strengthening along the waterline, its length increased by 65 feet, its beam by 16 feet and its draft by about 20 inches. Hull modifications, more powerful engines and protective gear for rudders and screws increased its displacement by 9,000 tons.

The bow and stern sections were modified at the Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Yard in Chester, Pennsylvania. The forward section went to Newport News, Virginia, and the midship section to Mobile, Alabama. Final assembly was to be done in the Pennsylvania yard. When ready to sail, the *Manhattan* will have a length of 1,005 feet, a beam of 148 feet and a draft of 52 feet. Her engines will generate 43,000 horsepower, or about half again as much as the power plants installed in 250,000-ton tankers built for routine ocean travel.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the U.S. Coast Guard developed the special icebreaker bow that was being fitted to the *Manhattan*. While conventional icebreaker bows cut the ice at an angle of 30 degrees, this one tapers to about a 15-degree angle of incidence and should make for easier going through sheet ice. It has been tested at about 40 to 70 per cent greater effectiveness than conventional icebreaker bows, though the *Manhattan's* voyage will be its first comprehensive trial.

Two S–62 Sikorsky helicopters will accompany the *Manhattan* to spot the best "leads" through the ice, and two Coast Guard icebreakers—one Canadian, one American—will follow in its wake. Pads for the helicopters will be available on all three ships. The route is expected to be through Davis Strait and Baffin Bay from New York; west through Lancaster Sound, Barrow Strait and Viscount Melville Sound; and then south to Prudhoe Bay, either passing through Prince of Wales Strait to Amundsen Gulf or heading west and south through the Beaufort Sea.

Prince of Wales Strait runs along the east side of Banks Island, which is the westernmost island in the Canadian Arctic Archipelago. That variant of the route would give better shelter from ice than heading south along the unprotected west side of Banks Island.

Even if the Arctic route does prove feasible, there will be monumental engineering problems involved in building a tanker loading terminal on the North Slope of Alaska. Humble's Arctic task force is now studying two massive ice islands that have grounded in the Beaufort Sea about 25 miles north and 10 miles east of Prudhoe Bay. They hope to learn how the flow of other ice around the islands would affect an offshore terminal. Because of shallow water, the loading terminal might have to be built anywhere from seven to 30 miles offshore. By comparison, Gulf Oil Corporation's giant terminal in the Persian Gulf off Mina Al Ahmadi, Kuwait, is nine and one-half miles offshore. But there is no floating ice to contend with in the Persian Gulf. One suggestion has been to dredge a channel and harbor closer to shore and build a breakwater to shelter the Alaskan location from floating ice. But as Admiral Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard commandant, noted in a speech at Washington in mid-February, building a strong enough breakwater would be no small task—especially since there is no source of usable rock for hundreds of miles.

Humble and its partners in the *Manhattan* adventure are hedging their bets, however. Plans already have been announced for an 800-mile Trans Alaska Pipeline System to run from Prudhoe Bay south to a location on the Gulf of Alaska, probably near Valdez or Whittier. Preliminary engineering studies are under way and a tentative completion date (1972) has been set. The 48-inch pipeline, with an initial capacity of 500,000 barrels a day, would be the largest in the Western Hemisphere. Estimated cost is $900 million.

SOUTH AFRICA EVADES MONEY CONTROLS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, we in this Chamber have addressed ourselves to the urgency of the dollar crisis and the need for fiscal stabilization. That crisis and that need is of course of the utmost international as well as domestic significance. It is therefore with concern that I read of the abusive exploitation being practiced by South Africa in demanding ever higher prices for its gold. It appears that the South Africans have been avoiding the controls of the International Monetary Fund, and attempting in effect to hold the Western economics up for ransom. I urge congressional cognizance and condemnation of this serious abuse, and to that end I wish to insert the following article from Toward Freedom magazine into the RECORD:

SOUTH AFRICA EVADES MONEY CONTROLS

The apartheid regime of the Republic of South Africa may be boycotted by the longshoremen of Denmark, attacked by a wide spectrum of human rights organizations throughout the world and criticized even by the establishment-oriented AFL–CIO, but its stock is surprisingly high with one of the most powerful institutions of the Western world—the International Monetary Fund, with headquarters in Washington.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) was launched at the end of World War II with the objective of stabilizing national currencies. As the West's major gold producer, South Africa on the contrary wants to get a higher price for its gold, which means upsetting currency stabilization and bringing about the devaluation of the pound, dollar and franc.

One might expect, in these circumstances, that the IMF would be taking the lead in attempting to bring South Africa back into a responsible course of action.

SOUTH AFRICAN EMERGENCY

Unfortunately the IMF has just turned in the other direction by permitting the South African government to take advantage of "drawing rights" intended to provide help for a currency threatened by some sudden emergency. This provision is used to permit a country to obtain convertible currencies without subjecting its own currency to the sag in value which would be imposed by the private money market. But South African stocks are bulging with gold—the most convertible currency of all. This gold could easily be sold on the private gold market, as intended in last fall's tacit stabilization agreement among Western central banks to the effect that they would not buy South African

gold in order to force sales on the private market and thus keep the price there from mounting too far above the official rate of $35 an ounce.

The United States has taken the lead in dissuading the IMF and European central banks from purchasing South African gold, in order to hold the line on stabilization. Yet Washington did agree to a European plan to establish a "floor" under the price of gold at $35 an ounce, in order to give South Africa reasonable price protection. Under this plan, monetary authorities would purchase gold on the free market whenever it fell close to the official price.

South Africa has rejected this plan in what seems to be a calculated effort to exploit the rest of the world along with its black majority at home.

The United States and other Western governments should firmly reject being held up for ransom by the South Africa regime, and make their opposition known to the IMF.

BLATNIK WATER POLLUTION RECORD SET STRAIGHT

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, recent editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post have implied that Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, attempted to suppress a report concerning pollution in Lake Superior.

I have worked side by side with Mr. BLATNIK on the Public Works Committee since he first came to Congress and I know how he singlehandedly initiated the first permanent national legislation establishing an effective program of water pollution control.

Mr. BLATNIK was a leading advocate for water pollution control legislation years ago when pollution was not the popular issue it is today. He had the foresight to recognize that man's environment was being threatened, and he went to work to do something about it. And, he continues to be "Mr. Water Pollution Control" in the Congress.

The Times and Post allegations, therefore, come as a complete surprise, and as chairman of the House Committee on Public Works I felt it was important to establish the facts accurately for the public record. I asked Stewart L. Udall, who was Secretary of the Interior at the time the Lake Superior report was being prepared, to give me a factual account of what happened.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following letter I received from Mr. Udall. I call the attention of my colleagues to his forthright statement of the facts, which absolutely clears Mr. BLATNIK of any improper activities in this matter.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
June 11, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your telephone call concerning news stories and editorials which appeared a few days ago in *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post* carrying the implication that Congressman John A. Blatnik of Minnesota had exerted pressure on the Interior Department last winter to "suppress" a memorandum concerning Lake Superior pollution, dated December 31, 1968, from Interior's regional Field Coordinator to the District Director of the Corps of Engineers.

I have reconstructed the events of that period and am writing this letter to straighten out the record. The December 31 memorandum was prepared pursuant to a Corps-Interior agreement giving Interior a right to be heard on applications to the Corps for permits to dredge or fill in certain navigable waters. It related in part to the disposal of taconite tailings in Lake Superior by Reserve Mining Company.

Interior's then Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, Max N. Edwards, ordered the memo sent to Washington for review by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Edwards informs me that he made this decision because Reserve's operations were then under intensive study as part of my earlier decision to call an enforcement conference on taconite tailings in Lake Superior. This study was prepared in the usual fashion by FWPCA as the basic document which always serves as the background paper for any enforcement conference.

On January 16, 1969, I signed a notice setting up such a Lake Superior Enforcement Conference on May 13, 1969, in Duluth, Minnesota. To put it in proper perspective, then, the memorandum of December 31 was a preliminary staff report relating to an application to revalidate a 1947 permit from the Corps to Reserve Mining Company. The findings of Interior's enforcement study were therefore incorporated into the FWPCA background report. It was not practice to release such staff reports to the public in advance of any hearing, but rather to assemble all pertinent materials in a background paper for the use of all conferees at the conference.

In anticipation of the May 13 conference, FWPCA therefore issued its report, *An Appraisal of Water Pollution in the Lake Superior Basin,* which was publicly distributed at the Conference. Naturally, this report represented the official position of the Department on the overall issue.

I can state to you categorically, that neither Rep. Blatnik nor any other member of Congress intervened or attempted to influence the calling of the Conference or to "suppress" any part of the Department's report on Lake Superior.

Most sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

TELL ME NOT IN MOURNFUL NUMBERS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 193d anniversary of the creation of this great Nation of ours, one of the basic concepts under which our Nation was developed is the freedom of speech which permits the people of our Nation to join in healthy and productive debate about our Nation's goals and policies and the solution of our problems.

A short time ago our colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. MCFALL, addressed the graduating class of Modesto Junior College from which he was graduated just 33 years ago. In that commencement address JOHN MCFALL emphasized—

Intelligent discussion of the complex issues that face us is the very life blood of our democratic system.

Practicing what he preached, JOHN MCFALL outlined his views on many of the problems and issues which this Nation faces today. This summary of his evaluation of these difficult times concluded with the following statement:

America's greatest natural resource, more valuable than any other with which our rich and prosperous country is blessed, is your generation of young people. In your hands and hearts we know our future is secure.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the commencement address at this point:

TELL ME NOT IN MOURNFUL NUMBERS

Mr. President, Members of the Faculty, Proud Parents and Members of the Graduating Class of 1969.

It is indeed a privilege for me to address you on this proud and happy occasion, just as 33 years ago it was my proud privilege to be a member of the graduating class of 1936.

My pride in speaking to you is tempered somewhat by the realization that I cannot remember who my commencement speaker was or what he said. Perhaps it is the nature of things that to the graduate this speech is only an insignificant part of these proceedings and the world will not remember long what we say here.

But graduation ceremonies have been the occasion, and more especially it seems this year, for our President, Senators, Representatives, Students and even Cartoonists, to join in a healthy and productive debate about our nation's goals and policies.

Intelligent discussion of the complex issues that face us is the very life blood of our democratic system: an understanding of the issues that face our country is vital to the democratic process. A few slogans have crept in like isolationist and neo-isolationist and also some of the most pungent sarcasm that ever came out of Dogpatch.

But on the whole, the debate continues to be most instructive and I hope it will cause understanding and purpose to replace the confusion and anger and violent reaction that has crept in to our national life.

It is my hopeful objective tonight in joining that discussion to add, rather than detract from that understanding and purpose.

There are those who would tell us in "mournful members" that yours is a generation that is by no means sure it has a future. Will you have a reasonable chance to live, to work out your destiny in peace and decency and not go down in history as the apocalyptic generation?

I believe you will.

The penetrating and definitive interim statement on campus disorder issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, discussing the reasons for student discontent, describes the dissatisfaction of many Americans, both young and old, student and nonstudent, with our society.

It says: "Students are unwilling to accept the gaps between professed ideals and actual performance. They see afresh the injustices that remain unremedied. They are not impressed by the dangers that previous generations have overcome and the problems they have solved." It means little to them that the present adult generation found the way out of a major depression to unparalleled heights of economic abundance, or that it defeated a massive wave of vicious totalitarianism and preserved the essential elements of freedom for the youth of today. To students, these triumphs over serious dangers serve primarily to emphasize other problems we are just beginning to solve.

Today's intelligent, idealistic students see a nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so. They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. They see a world of nation-states with the technical brilliance to harness the ultimate energy but without the common sense to agree on methods of preventing mutual destruction. With the fresh energy and idealism of the young, they are impatient with the progress that has been made but seems to them to be indefensibly slow.

At a time when students are eager to attack these and other key problems, they face the prospect of being compelled to fight in a war most of them believe is "unjustified."

Let me attempt to speak with as little of the smugness that the young attribute to their elders as may be possible for a member of the adult generation, who has either witnessed or participated in or simply marveled at those triumphs over depression and totalitarianism, the preservation of those essential elements of freedom and the harnessing of that ultimate energy. Energy and idealism, like intelligence, judgment and true emotional response, is not confined to the young, but manifests itself in men and women of any age in varying degrees.

With sufficient confidence in a retention of those desirable qualities, I say we will attain those goals within the basic structure of our democratic system, which most of us, except for a tiny few anarchists and nihilists now at large, accept not only as valid, but as the most perfect system of government available in the world today despite whatever failures it may be presently experiencing.

We have presently before us the greatest opportunity to construct a peaceful world, since the beginning of the cold war, corresponding with the end of World War II. Our objective in that cold war, it seems to me, has been to find a way to live peacefully in the world with nuclear armed Russia. This search has consumed 23 years, many of our finest youth in Korea and South Vietnam and surely more than 500 billion dollars of the nation's resources.

Probably sometime in September, disarmament talks will begin with the Soviet Union for which secret preparations were begun following the Glassboro Conference in June of 1967 and which originally were scheduled to be announced on August 21, the day after the Russian march into Czechoslovakia. I believe that over the next several years of arduous negotiation our government will be able to reach some kind of agreement, not only on the reduction of nuclear armament but also on trade, the status of Europe and the Iron Curtain countries and Southeast Asia and some kind of joint approach to bringing China into the family of civilized nations. All of this can be the foundation for a peaceful world structure.

There are those who say we cannot trust the Russians and therefore even a beginning of talks is in vain. I still remember the man with the Wallace tie, who on our introduction refused to shake my hand because he said I favored "building bridges to the Russians." I am sure he was sincere in his conviction, but I believe not only that the survival of mankind depends upon this detente but also world conditions make it just as imperative for the Soviet Union to make and keep as it is for the United States. Such a detente or, if you wish, arrangement grudgingly arrived at, will have built-in incentives that will make it profitable on both sides to observe.

Even now we find the Russians helping to bring about an end to the Vietnam War, which many would not believe until President Nixon said it was true. Why? Because not only do they wish to avoid a nuclear confrontation with the United States, but the cost to them is excessively burdensome and because they share our need for halting the expansion of Chinese influence in Southeast Asia. They share our concern over Chinese nuclear progress and the blackmail political effect it will have on the world when it becomes a jarring reality in the mid-1970's.

They are helping us to find a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli crisis not out of a spirit of universal tolerance but because of the intolerable burden of providing billions in arms for Arab countries, they seem neither to admire or trust.

Both of us must find an alternative to the expensive burdens of a divided Germany and Korea. Our citizens rightfully groan at the expense of NATO and the occupation of Korea. However, they must remember that each results from our decision to retain an unarmed Germany and Japan after World War II. I personally would rather bear the expense than give these nations access to nuclear weapons. Without NATO, Germany would demand them. So would Japan without the existence of South Korea and if we do not find the way to protect them against a nuclear armed China.

And both of our countries must find an answer to China.

But as we move toward serious negotiation with the Soviet Union we must not permit the existence of these incentives to mask the realities of advancing Russian strength—their increasing nuclear power, their ABM, their use of force in Czechoslovakia and a government by committee that seems not unanimously convinced that doing business with the United States is possible or that Communist world domination is still not impossible.

Because of this, I support the initial deployment of the ABM system to protect our deterrent against a possible Russian first strike and Chinese nuclear blackmail that should develop in the mid-1970's.

But this opportunity to construct a peaceful world is marred by the continuance of hostilities in Vietnam. That war is coming to an end. Each day military and political developments bring us closer to the opportunity for the South Vietnamese to exercise their right of self-determination in a free election.

In my opinion what sustains the North Vietnamese effort is the continued hope that criticism of the war in the United States will cause us to quit and permit them victory by default even after our tremendous expenditure of lives and resources. Surely, Ho Chi Minh remembers that in 1954 the French were not defeated militarily, but quit, because of civil disorders caused in Paris. It is not inconceivable to me that such an attempt is now being made again by the Mao-inspired few revolutionaries that are the leaders in the Students for a Democratic Society.

At this time in the negotiations, lives will be saved if the enemy is convinced the nation is behind the President in his efforts to bring the fighting to an end. I intend to continue to give him every support in his search for peace.

With an end to hostilities in Vietnam and a beginning of talks with the Soviet Union that will permit agreement on methods of preventing mutual destruction that must be given every opportunity to succeed, we can with your help continue to press toward ever more progress in devising social institutions that will more adequately provide food, shelter and education for all and that will assure equal opportunity for all.

Our country has made much progress already on these urgent requirements especially in the last ten years but with your energy and idealism, we can accelerate that progress.

Let me conclude with a comment on the "Generation Gap." I am not certain what it is or if there is such a gap. But if it means that Americans of your age are stronger, smarter and better equipped to handle the problems and opportunities of our nuclear age, to begin the exploration of space and of bringing the blessings, liberty and abundance to the people of the world than any generation of Americans before you, as I am confident you are, then I give thanks for that "Generation Gap."

America's greatest natural resource, more valuable than any other with which our rich and prosperous country is blessed, is your generation of young people.

In your hands and hearts we know our future is secure.

ADDRESS OF ELMER L. WINTER AT ANNUAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE OF SOCIETY FOR ADVANCEMENT OF MANAGEMENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Elmer L. Winter, a fellow Milwaukeean and president of Manpower, Inc., has outlined some of the things the business community is doing to help remedy today's grave social ills. His address, titled "I Am an Encouraged American," and delivered at the recent management conference of the Society for Advancement of Management in San Francisco, is instructive in this regard, and I commend its contents to my colleagues:

I AM AN ENCOURAGED AMERICAN

(Address by Elmer L. Winter)

Our country has a surplus—a surplus of prophets of doom. Hardly a day goes by without a new statement by another prophet that America lacks the ability to cope with her admittedly serious urban and racial problems. These prophets are intellectual and ordinary, black and white, rich and poor. And, they are having their effect. As I returned from New York recently, I sat on the plane, next to a man who was reading a magazine article on the crises in our cities. He read for a while, then turned to me and said: "Things sure are going to hell in this country. It looks to me like in a few years we won't have any cities at all."

His statement reminded me of an old poem by an unknown author, who apparently had encountered his share of doomsday prophets. The poem says:

"My granddad, viewing earth's worn cogs,
Said things were going to the dogs.
His granddad in his house of logs
Swore things were going to the dogs.
His granddad in the Flemish bogs
Vowed things were going to the dogs.
Well, there's one thing I have to state:
Those dogs have had a good long wait."

Yes, those dogs have had a good long wait. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that they have a longer wait still ahead of them. Our nation has had crises before, and its brief periods when many people in the country believed chaos and doom were inevitable. It would be naive to say that our difficulties are not serious; pollyanish to believe that they will go away without substantial effort on our part. But saying our troubles are serious, and saying they are impossible to solve, are two quite different things.

I know there is the temptation to throw one's hands up in desperation—especially when we see, hear and read the news of campus turmoil, ghetto riots and strident

cries for revolution. But these things are only a part of the total picture, a total picture that is basically sound although the paint may be peeling here and there.

GRAVITATING TO NEGATIVE

We need to remind ourselves sometimes that the television camera that brings violence into our living room can only focus on a few square feet at a time—that the newspaper which tells us tales of woe is basically oriented toward the negative. This is not necessarily intended as a denunciation of these media, merely a statement of what is fact, and what, in fact, is human nature. Human beings, by nature, tend to gravitate toward the negative.

A recession always provokes more interest, analysis and conversation than a boom period; indeed, in a boom period the topic of conversation, more often than not, centers on worries about when it will all end—again, a negative view.

I'd like to say here and now that I am encouraged because of the many positive steps that are being taken by business leaders of this country to correct some of our ills. These business leaders are saying, "We have the expertise, the knowledge, the capital, and the will to wage our own war against poverty and to rebuild our cities." They are saying loud and clear, "The time has come now when we have to recognize that our role, as leaders, is not confined within our corporate gates. We must and will rebuild our cities so that there is equal opportunity for all of the citizens of our communities."

Dan Parker, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, has urged businessmen to be "innovators and instigators" and "not just reactors to circumstances not of our own making." Dan Parker pointed out that businessmen must approach social problems within the standard framework of doing business—that is, activity generating profits. "Social responsibility and profits are completely compatible," he said, as he warned against ignoring problems until they ripen into screeching crises.

BUSINESSMEN ARE INVOLVED

Yes, many businessmen are saying these things. Not only are they saying them, but they are becoming involved actively in the solution of key local and national problems.

A strong case in point is the National Alliance of Businessmen, formed 15 months ago by former President Lyndon B. Johnson. Let me go back for a moment to February, 1968.

I was down in Florida, enjoying a vacation I had been looking forward to for quite some time, when I received a telephone call from the White House. I was asked to join a group of businessmen in a program to find jobs for 500,000 hard-core unemployed people over a three-year period. My first reaction was to do the easiest thing and say: "Thanks for asking me, but I am so busy with so many other community programs that I would like to pass this one."

But there was some pretty good arm twisting at the other end. I flew to Washington that night. The following morning, I joined forty-nine other business executives of the major corporations of this country, who, under the leadership of Henry Ford, agreed to take on one of the toughest problems facing America. The problem was finding jobs for the hard-core unemployed—the people who had been out of the work force for many years. We received our marching orders from President Johnson to go back to our communities to turn these people into productive citizens once again.

President Johnson and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, along with Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz, admitted to us then that government alone could not solve the problem. They pointed out that we, in industry, had the jobs and expertise, and that it is our capacity to "get things done" which made this massive task possible.

LAYING IT ON THE TABLE

I went back to Milwaukee and called the business leadership of our city together. I laid it on the table. I asked industry to give jobs to 1,100 men and women who were out of work, out of money, and out of hope. I asked Milwaukee businessmen to hire people they would have turned away the day before—those with criminal records, no skills, no high school diplomas, poor work records. I made it crystal-clear to the businessmen of Milwaukee that, through our NAB effort, we were going to help reverse the poverty cycle, get people off relief and give them a chance to regain their self-respect.

Talk about encouraged! I was thrilled when business firm after business firm responded with pledges. In a few weeks, we had exceeded our goal by more than 300. You are probably saying that it is easy to pledge a job. But we not only pledged jobs, we placed people on jobs, and about 55 per cent of them are still on the job and are making excellent workers. The turnover we experienced was not any greater than the same companies had experienced in their regular hiring of people off the street. Indeed, some of our companies found that the hard-core trainees were, on the average, a cut above other new employees.

Were there problems? Certainly there were. As Charles F. Luge, Consolidated Edison's Chairman, said recently: "It is not easy for a company to train the disadvantaged, for both sides approach each other out of ignorance. After all, how many companies, in their traditional hiring practices, ever come in contact with young people from the ghetto who are actually considered employable. Conversely, the world of the large corporation is a new and frightening experience to a man who left school after, say, the fourth grade and has probably had no real contact with the white world. Yet industry must train the 'hard-core.' While it cannot solve the entire problem of the unskilled, it can certainly do its share."

NEED TO ADJUST

In Milwaukee, our Association of Commerce did its share by quickly developing what we call a "sensitivity training program," which provided an in-depth training program on race relations and minority problems for supervisors who were coming face-to-face with the newly-arrived, former hard-core unemployed. They learned many things about the special problems of black people and other minorities. They learned, for example, that a minority group employee might work a few days and then not return because of fear—real or imagined—of the company or its foreman or supervisor; not, as some thought, because he was too lazy to work. More than 1,000 supervisors in the Milwaukee area voluntarily participated in these sensitivity courses. The result was that they were better prepared to make a success of the program to hire the hard-core unemployed.

The program has been a success nationally, too. In February, the Urban Coalition and Urban America issued their report titled, "One Year Later," which assessed the nation's response in the year following the report by the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders on the 1967 urban riots. While much of the tone of the report was bleak, it did have bright spots. One of these was the private sector's efforts to provide jobs for the hard-core unemployed.

The report noted that in the past year there had been increased cooperation between the public and private sectors in the areas of job training and job creation. It said that progress in job creation was almost all in the private sector—not, as one might imagine, in the public sector. The report also pointed out that the National Alliance of Businessmen had created job opportunities for 125,000 of the hard-core unemployed in 12,500 firms. Of these, 85,000 were still on the job as of January 10 of this year—a retention rate of 68 per cent.

The very existence of Urban America, Inc., the Urban Coalition and the National Alliance of Businessmen also is reason for optimism. All of these important organizations, vitally concerned as they are with urban problems, came out of the business community. Urban America was organized in 1965 by the late Stephen Currier. It was Urban America that helped in the formation of the Urban Coalition. And I have just described how the National Alliance of Businessmen was organized.

Recently I attended a meeting in Washington at wihch President Richard Nixon expressed his full support of, and commitment to, the National Alliance of Businessmen and its program. At that time he asked American industry to double its quota of the previous year. This means an additional 200,000 pledges of jobs for the hard-core unemployed in America. I'm optimistic that the NAB will meet this goal and that industry will do a better job of retention and training compared to its effort last year.

THINGS ARE HAPPENING

There are countless other examples of how industry has responded to the urban crisis. In Cleveland, Ohio, the school system, area business and industry will use a former General Electric warehouse in a ghetto district as a center for a works study program to train school drop-outs. Western Electric has donated the use of its Kearney, N.J., tool and die shop for a program in which volunteer instructors teach higher skills to the unemployed and underemployed. The Wisconsin Telephone Company has adopted a predominantly Negro high school and makes available to the students various training programs, many of which lead to jobs in the company. Controlled Data Corporation is building a computer parts factory in Minneapolis' northside ghetto area. The facility will eventually employ 275 people, and area residents will be trained solely at the company's expenses to make precision computer parts. In the Roxbury section of Boston, Avco Corporation is investing $2.3 million, plus a $1,148,000 government subsidy, to build a printing plant. This plant will initially train 250 people formerly considered unemployable. Leaders of the insurance industry have diverted $1 billion of their investment funds from former channels and applied them instead to the cause of upgrading real estate in the hard-core urban slums. The industry already has pledged a second $1 billion to this effort.

I could continue to give you many additional examples of where companies, in their own individual ways, are attempting to solve the crises in our cities. Results like these are what help to make me "An Encouraged American."

AN INTEGRATED VIEW

I am also encouraged by certain aspects of what is happening in the black communities across the country. Positive, constructive statements are now coming forth from many quarters of the black community. Bayard Rustin, for example, in commenting on student demands for separate black studies in colleges and universities, said recently: "There is no Italian history in the United States. There's no Jewish history, there's no black history—but there is American history, and whatever role Jews, Italians and blacks have played in it ought to be written as it occurs and integrated into the whole picture. Therefore, you have American history. The problem is we have not yet had American history because blacks have been excluded. I believe there should be the integration of Negro contributions into the American historical forces, into the economic forces, and into other forces."

Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, urged Negroes to speak out loud and clear against extremists who are espousing apartheid racism, intimidation and violence. Bayard Rustin and Roy Wilkins,

among many others, believe in an integrated society—just as, I'm sure, we all do.

All of this, however, does not exclude the values which flow to America from black pride. As Urban Americans and the Urban Coalition said in "One Year Later":

"Black pride need not mean black racism; separatism can be a means rather than an end, a way of getting things together so blacks can negotiate their place in society more as equals in strength; black rage can turn to a constructive action rather than violence."

A poll by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, taken for the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in July, 1968, revealed that only a very few black people in the country favor separatism—the range in the survey is from 5 to 18 percent. "The most apparent fact," the researchers said, "is that the mood is not yet revolutionary. The great majority do not propose to withdraw from America; they want equal status in it. They do not talk of tearing down the economic and political institutions of the nation; they seek to share equally in the benefit."

BLACK POWER: ANOTHER LOOK

Regardless of the sentiment for it, I cannot subscribe to separatism. Nor, apparently, can most black people. But I can and do believe in self-pride and self-respect. These are necessary elements for all human beings. Fortunately, these intrinsic forces are becoming stronger among black people, many of whom have become mentally emasculated by slavery and generations of second-class status. "One Year Later" concluded that the most hopeful part of the University of Michigan survey was "an indication that the black community was making a distinction between the negative and positive aspects of black power: Violence and separatism on the one hand, pride and identity on the other." The report said that the assertion of black identity was something quite different from separatism, and well within the tradition of American pluralism. "This seems not to turn so much on the rejection of whites as on the acceptance of things black," the report said. "It involves a commitment to the development of Negro identity as a valid basis for cultural life within a larger interracial and, if possible, integrated society."

I think we have all seen indications of the resurgence of black pride and self-respect in this country. So-called "natural" hairdos grace the pages of *Ebony* magazine and the heads, not only of junior high school blacks, but of black college professors as well. Cosmetic companies that once produced a wide variety of products to straighten hair because Negroes wanted to look like whites now are busy producing products that make naturally kinky hair easier to comb. And, if there were a substantial number of black people at this conference, it is likely that they would have a black caucus. They would not try to melt into the crowd to hide their blackness; they would show us that they are proud of being black.

As managers and executives, I think we can all see the advantages in the new black pride. We understand competition. We relate well to a man of pride and bearing; we have little respect for the person who reacts to us in a sycophantic or inferior fashion. Your golf game and mine improve with competition. I daresay each of you, for example, would play far better golf against Arnie Palmer than against me.

The difference here is that we are in the somewhat unusual position of having to help improve the competition before we can play against it. But even this has precedent. After all, didn't the National Football League ultimately agree to merge with the American League?

DISSATISFACTION OF YOUTH

Unfortunately, the strongest sentiment for separatism among black people is expressed by the young. The survey for the Kerner Commission found that the percentage of teen-age Negroes who believed in a separate black nation was more than double the percentage of their elders. Almost a third of them said they were ready to use violence to gain their rights. Not surprisingly, the survey found a similar acceptance of violence among young whites, and the report to the Commission said this might be explained in terms of a conception of "teen-age masculine daring that has little to do with race." But the survey also acknowledged that there was no way to tell whether this means that the country was faced with the rise of a truly revolutionary generation.

Regardless of the implications in that survey, one thing is clear. We need to reach our young people, black, white or other. Let me take a page from my company to tell you one way of getting through. Five years ago, we organized a new non-profit company which we called "Youthpower." We wanted to help young people help themselves find jobs. Manpower, Inc., as a company, provided the space, telephones, overall mangement and advertising. We used volunteer young people to staff the Youthpower offices. Last summer Youthpower operated in 25 cities, and its volunteers found summer jobs for 12,500 young people. We had 900 volunteers who worked more than 40,000 hours. If you are tempted to write off the younger generation, give me the time, and I'll tell you about the great work that these 900 young people performed last summer to help other young people get jobs. They are another reason for my being "An Encouraged American."

But as I said at the outset: "To be encouraged is one thing; to be naive is another. Just because some encouraging things have happened, and are happening, or because there is reason for optimism, does not mean that we can all forget about the many problems confronting us which are, as yet, unsolved."

SOME NEW APPROACHES

I certainly believe that, although businessmen have done a great deal about the problems of race and poverty in the cities, a great deal more needs to be done. There are many approaches that can be taken. One avenue, which I suggested in a speech in Washington last November, would be for President Nixon to appoint a new alliance of businessmen to build housing in the ghettos. As I said then, we need to enroll the businessmen of this country in a program in which they, working together with government, could rebuild areas of America. There may be possibilities for this sort of business-government cooperation in the new housing program, "Operation Breakthrough," announced recently by George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The time has passed when business and industry could take a narrow view of its responsibilities. Not too many years ago, businessmen were saying that they could become involved only in areas in which they had expertise, such as employment. But then we discovered that we can be affected by, and can affect, other areas as well.

Education is one example. If you are unhappy with the educational level of high school graduates, black or white, coming into your company for employment, start asking some hard questions in your community. Never mind that you will be accused of meddling where you have no business. You have a vested interest in education. There is no question but that business already is having a profound influence upon education, through the development of curriculums, textbooks, teaching machines and other materials. You will not be on uncharted ground.

Send your young executives out to contact the vocational schools and predominantly black high schools. Let them find out about the quality of education that is being provided. Make it the business of your company to expand vocational programs to help to upgrade the quality of education that is being provided to our young people.

The students who will benefit from these programs, once properly trained, will help solve some of your labor needs in the years to come. Obviously, you have a vested interest in these potential workers and in the quality of education that is being provided them. The better trained they are, the better quality your work force will have in years to come.

NEW STUDENT COALITIONS?

Moreover, in our institutions of higher learning, perhaps we should take a more active interest in what our students are doing, thinking and saying. When I say "students" in this context, I am talking about *all* students, not just those militant dissidents who have captured most of the headlines of late. It seems to me that what we need on our college and university campuses is a coalition of students representing the majority, positive viewpoint.

It must be stressed that only a small percentage of our students are bent on completely overthrowing "the system." The overwhelming majority do not want to destroy our society, but to improve it. These students of the majority, by and large, do not commit the sensational acts which ordinarily command headlines. For that reason, if for no other, should we not take an active interest in seeing to it that they have a vehicle for expression by which they also can be heard?

WHAT IS ALTERNATIVE?

Is not the alternative to the establishment of such majority coalitions to continue to breed those situations from which violence occurs?

I am convinced that with the backing of the business community, such coalitions could be formed and that they could engage in any number of constructive programs. Such groups, it would seem to me, would be as concerned with the right of all students to attend classes as with the right of others to peacefully demonstrate. By working to open up new lines of student communication, both on campus and in the total community, they would, it seems to me, work to prevent those situations from occurring which result in violence. I, personally, am strongly opposed to violence and takeovers. So, too, I believe, are the vast majority of our students. It is to these students that we in the business community must trumpet the message: "We *do* care. We *are* interested in you and your activities, not only as individuals, but as our world leaders of tomorrow." And we must demonstrate our interest by backing any positive, constructive proposals they might develop.

A NEW BLUEPRINT

Now let me talk briefly to you about your Society for the Advancement of Management and what I believe its role must be now and in the years ahead. I say to you, in all candor, that the day has passed when any business or trade association can live within the blueprint of the past. It can no longer be "business as usual" in our voluntary organizations. I suggest that we must expand SAM's area of concern so that it will come to grips with our urban problems. I urge you to call upon the Board of Directors of SAM to appoint a special task force to devise ways and means whereby your society can be in the forefront of the social revolution that is taking place. This task force should not be designed to compete with existing government programs, but to come up with some new, imaginative and constructive programs for SAM's membership to develop at the local level. This task force might well design new job analyses to break down jobs so that the unskilled and semiskilled can be used to a greater degree. It might lobby for social legislation and design plans to improve our schools and housing in the central city. It could well devise plans for assisting blacks and members of other mi-

nority groups to become entrepreneurs. It might develop plans to provide sub-contracts to members of minority groups to get them started in the manufacturing field. I believe that within your organization there is the desire, the will and the knowledge to create a model for social change and improvement that will be the envy of many other trade associations. I would hope that SAM will urgently consider the appointment of a task force along the lines that I have indicated.

WE CAN DO IT

I suppose many of you are saying to yourselves, "This fellow Winter is certainly giving us a super challenge—one that may well be beyond our competence and the time that we can give." I doubt that. In our own businesses, each of us has demonstrated that we can accomplish just about anything we set our minds to. The task that face all of us in this room as we move forward to rebuild our cities will not be an easy one. There will be frustration and disappointments. Yet what is the heritage that you would like to leave to your children and your children's children? Isn't this an America where peace and the good life exist for *all* of us—not just for those of us who live in the white community? Don't we want to look our children squarely in the eye and say, "We not only care but we are doing something about our community problems!"

Yes, it is going to be hard work, but we are used to that. It seems to me that you might gain encouragement by looking to Don Quixote who was always reaching for that unreachable star. Yes, let's listen for a moment to Don Quixote as he describes our quest:

"To dream the impossible dream,
To fight the unbeatable foe,
To bear with unbearable sorrow,
To run where the brave dare not go.
To right the unrightable wrong,
To love, pure and chaste from afar.
To try, when your arms are too weary,
To reach the unreachable star."

CAMPUS UNREST—WHY?

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been extensive discussion about the disturbances that have occurred on many of the Nation's campuses.

The dialog has broadened and doubtless will continue in the months ahead because of the importance of this issue.

I was very pleased to have obtained a copy of a speech on this subject delivered by one of Ohio's most eminent educators. He is Dr. Brage Golding, president of Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

On May 5, 1969, Dr. Golding addressed the Society of Plastic Engineers at the group's education luncheon in Chicago. His topic was "Campus Unrest—Why?"

I believe Dr. Golding's remarks are instructive and would be of great interest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, insert the full text of Dr. Golding's speech at this point in the RECORD:

CAMPUS UNREST—WHY?

By Brage Golding)

Prior to two or three years ago my public remarks were more likely to concern polymers, their technology and applications. Unfortunately, that pleasant and self-rewarding era of my professional career has passed, hopefully temporarily, and I now find my career turned to quite a different task—to one that all university presidents must perforce turn—that of a mediator.

Because most of you are parents and either are academicians or have children in school, I think a frank discussion of student and faculty unrest is not only of interest but of importance. No brief talk can do the subject justice but I shall try. Having read omnivorously on this subject, so as to prepare myself for what appears to be an inevitable occurrence on almost every campus, I shall offer you my opinions and those of many distinguished writers, most of whom have said something in a better way than I could have done.

Let me begin with the general observation that the ultimate goal of all educators should be to educate the people to the realities of the late 20th century and the early 21st century, in such a way that the critical issues facing them can be understood and resolved in time to avoid real chaos.

Let me review them briefly:

The most important issues to be resolved in the immediate future are:

A. The population explosion
B. The threat of nuclear annihilation
C. The attainment of civil rights for all
D. Conservation and preservation of natural resources
E. Development of cultural commodities

Rational and humane solutions to these problems are the real objectives of education, in addition to the preparation of individuals for professional duties. Every educator must be willing to amend any curriculum which does not aid in reaching these objectives. This is the true meaning of curricular relevance to me.

We will have to change curricula very quickly in order that our students do not become victims of "skill" obsolescence. We will have to operate schools where there are no groups receiving inferior education because of the geographic location of their schools. We will have to do away with what has been the school systems' bugaboo—the standardized tests for all who come from widely differing economic, social, and ethnic backgrounds. Every child is going to have to be accepted for what he is and taught from his entering level. The greatest mistake is the promotion of pupils out of a grade before they can read and comprehend at that grade level.

These are some of the problems facing elementary and secondary school educators.

In the institutions of higher learning, the challenges are quite different. We should be able to assume that our students come to us able to read, write, and calculate at some minimum level of competence. This is true for about 40% of them. In addition to spending much time and effort bringing so many students up to a beginning college level, we are beset by special problems with faculty and students that are not encountered in elementary and secondary schools. I think it is important that we talk about them. But first we must answer the question: What is the role of the universities in American society? Joseph Kraft recently had this to say:

"One of the few things we know about the power structure in this country is that it is run by a relatively small number of large hierarchically organized institutions.

"By democratic principle—and to a surprising degree even in practice—admission to these institutions does not come by 'pull' or family connections. Merit decides. But who defines merit and selects those who have it?

"The answer is that the universities are the certifying agencies."

Therefore, universities wield power! And one important fact, like it or not, is that power is a prime motive force in the present revolution. Now let us talk about faculties—and what kinds of power motivate *them*.

I would like to make clear to you one area of authority and power which resides in a university faculty which is not generally understood by the press and the lay public. By long standing tradition and, in many cases, by direct delegation, faculties are charged with almost complete responsibility and authority for the academic programs of the university. The faculty may change the programs, add to, and take from, change the nature of courses, set requirements for graduation, determine curricula, etc., all without direct intervention by university administration. I believe this is proper, so long as faculties collectively exercise proper *responsibility* commensurate with the great authority granted them in this area. Faculties also, in many universities, have the power to deal with student matters, including student discipline. This then is why many recommendations for student amnesty, after actions by some students, are made by faculty or student-faculty committees. It seems to me that the often incomprehensible attitudes of some faculties, collectively, regarding amnesty, such as we have seen recently at Harvard and Cornell, may be the result of two strong feelings on the part of large numbers of faculty members. One is a feeling of guilt for having neglected their students and their students' education on the part of many faculties, particularly those in the humanities and social sciences. The other may be the identification that many faculty members seek with students from whom they may not be chronologically far removed.

It has been amply demonstrated that while faculties of many universities are relatively young, highly educated, and often extremely liberal in their political and social outlooks, in matters pertaining to their particular disciplines they are notoriously conservative. By and large, sweeping and desirable changes in educational philosophy are, in my opinion, far less likely to come from faculties than from either administrators or students.

Further, it must be borne in mind that a large majority of our faculties (and student bodies) are marginally concerned with or involved in the present academic revolution. As has been true since time immemorial, in every society it has been a relatively small, dissident group of whatever complexion which, while looked down upon by the majority and eventually feared by them, has prodded the latter into change. On the other hand, I believe it fortunate that there has been sufficient resistance—inertia if you prefer—by the majority to slow down the very disruptive changes continually proposed.

A university is a microcosm of society, containing essentially all the elements of the whole society. Within its community are the same small activist groups—and the large ponderous mass of status quos. Because of the long standing traditions of free speech, academic freedom, and tenure—for better or for worse—universities emit a proportionally larger sound per unit population than other groups.

One cannot discuss changes in faculty attitudes without remarking on the effect these changes have had on education and consequently on students. As John Fisher has said, we are in the midst of a counter-revolution, by students (liberal arts undergraduates particularly) against a quiet, almost unremarked, revolution which has changed the whole structure of American education in the last 20–30 years. The main beneficiaries of the earlier revolution were the faculty—the victims were the liberal arts undergraduates: The latter are now beginning to understand how they've been victimized.

Professionally-oriented students cause no great problems. They follow highly structured curricula for purposeful uses—this is, in part, skill learning, albeit of a sophisticated character. However, many of the very bright young people come to college not yet

sure what to do with their lives, and they hope to find out there. They want to learn about the world and themselves, and how to come to terms with our terribly complex civilization: For this they want a traditional liberal arts education—and find it no longer exists.

It is gone because the professors in our increasingly complex technological society found themselves, particularly after World War II, in a highly strategic position—as the producers of university trained specialists. As a result, the diploma has become the combination of meal ticket, union card, and passport to upper middle class life. Faculty have become the sole purveyors of a scarce and precious commodity and, like all monopolists, have used this new-found power to enhance their own wealth, prestige, and authority.

Many professors couldn't care less about the interests of undergraduates, since today a professor's status is often defined by his relation to the graduate program—this is true also in small liberal arts colleges which feed graduate programs elsewhere. A professor who cares seldom is rewarded by universities. (This means by his peers, not by the administrators.)

Bright undergraduates ask what *is* the good life, the nature of justice, the remedy for the evils of society? Such queries are a bore and an embarrassment to many professors, since few profess to have the answers to such large and "unscholarly" questions—each professes his own narrow specialty—e.g., minor British poets of the 18th century. So says Fisher, referring to Jencks and Riesman in their book, *The Academic Revolution*.

For many years now education for the doctorate has involved an increasingly narrow specialization in order to produce or discover something "original"—needed for the degree. This requires learning more and more about less and less. Also, while many of the faculty today in the *professional* areas have experienced and adjusted to what I shall call the "real world," a large proportion of *liberal arts* faculties go from graduate school *directly* to teaching. For what else can the latter do today outside the academic field?

These faculty attitudes and backgrounds have wrought a dramatic change in the minds of many young people who, as remarked earlier, did not find the answers they were seeking in college. Out of this confusion eventually has come resentment, then anger at their teachers, their parents, and society in general for not providing them in their bewilderment with idealistic solutions to the ills of the world.

Out of them came the new leftists, a term of recent origin and one which you have been hearing with increasing frequency.

Arthur Schlesinger has this to say:

"The new leftists believe in the omnipotence of the deed and the irrevelance of the goal. The political process is no longer seen as the deliberate choice of means to move toward a desired end. Where libertarian democracy had ideally demanded means consistent with the end, and where the Stalinist left of the 30's intended that the end justified the means, the new left propounds a different doctrine: that the means create the end!" Anarchy (my conclusion).

In the vanguard of the new left is a relatively small, but well-recognized group, the SDS: the Students for a Democratic Society. SDS was formed in 1962 when young members of the old "Socialist League for Industrial Democracy" quit the parent group and set up their own unit. Out of its first meeting in Port Huron, Michigan (59 people from 11 colleges) came the Port Huron statement: ". . . We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: That the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life: That society be organized to encourage independence in man, and provide the media for their common participation." The statement advocated "participatory democracy," a leaderless decentralized system in which every man's view would be as important as that of his fellow.

SDS's central theme is that the present American corporate capitalist system manipulates and oppresses the individual and is run by a corporate/military elite that profits, while the rest of the citizenry are only depersonalized pawns in the game. Basic to this thesis is the accusation that the nation's universities are key accomplices in this process, furnishing research and ideas to the military/industrial complex and psychologically conditioning students to take their places submissively in the corporate slots that await them.

SDS is out to overturn and destroy this set-up, starting where the system's strategic resources are located: in the universities.

SDS's ranks contain activists of almost all political varieties: Marxists, Anarchists, Socialists, Democrats, Communists (pro-Moscow, pro-Peking, pro-Castro), as well as the alienated apolitical types and hippie exotics.

Mindful that a college generation of the 50's had been frightened into silence by communist witch-hunts, the organizers of SDS deliberately opened their ranks to all political creeds to remove the Red-baiting weapon from its enemy's arsenal. (It may be noted that only Republicans are conspicuous by their absence.)

It has become apparent, to me at least, after studying the tactics of SDS at various colleges and universities this past year, that a practically unvarying and successful technique is being used against university administrations and faculties. The technique has been simple and has been hard to resist. It consists merely of making a series of demands of the university which are not too unreasonable, most of which can and should be met. The university dares not refuse to discuss and negotiate these requests, in part because they are reasonable, in part because it feels guilty for not having anticipated these requests, and in part because it naively believes that by granting these requests these students will be satisfied. However, as soon as some public announcement of agreement or progress is made by the university, a fresh series of *non-negotiable* demands are made which are of such a nature that the university has no choice but to refuse them. This puts the administration and faculty in the position of first bending toward the student demands and later being in such a position that they cannot either retreat or go forward—an impossible situation. This technique has been used repeatedly with great success and, in my opinion, should be resisted by refusing to bargain with the SDS in the first place. *This* however puts the university in the unpopular position of appearing to be unreasonable and unwilling to listen to *any* student requests—precisely the alternate position these students have maneuvered for.

The only remotely possible resolution to this dilemma, it seems to me, is for faculties and the administrators to make it unmistakeably clear that they work in concert and refuse to accede to "non-negotiable" demands while under duress. Unfortunately, few universities have shown the common sense to do this.

While the SDS is the most acute manifestation of student dissatisfaction, there are two other groups with which we are concerned, Albert W. Levi, distinguished professor in the humanities, Washington University, has this to say in part:

"A second class of students who participate in violent protest is considerably larger, relatively unorganized, more heterogeneous and amorphous in its composition. It is made up of those who have a burning concern for such aspects of American foreign policy as the Vietnam War and our defense commitments around the world, as well as our ongoing internal social problems; justice for the black community and poverty. It is also composed of those who have concretely suffered from these evils—students anxiously awaiting a draft for a war to which they are profoundly opposed, black students feeling the burning injustices to their kind, representatives of disinherited and disadvantaged minorities of every stripe.

"How are we to view the protesting acts of student dissenters of this second class? with considerable sympathy, I think, for in most cases their moral credentials are high. The Vietnam war is a dirty and immoral war, he says. The condition of our negro population and the way it has been deprived of economic opportunity and civil rights is a disgrace. The level of political morality and of simple honesty in speech and intention of those who govern our nation and who aspire to its governance is dangerously low.

"The last or third class of student protesters is enormous in number and is composed of almost all the undergraduates and graduate students in the school of arts and sciences. These are the 8,000 who sat down outside Sproul Hall at the University of California in 1964, the 4,000 who milled about in front of Low Library at Columbia last spring. These are the ones who initially are politically uninvolved, who stand curiously around the small group of militant protesters watching to see what will happen. Only in the face of truly monumental administrative unconcern or outside police brutality do they join the ranks of the violent minority. Why are they prepared to do so? Why is their loyalty almost never to the university as such? This class of third-act walk-on (without a particle of disrespect), I shall call 'the sheep.'

"Thirty-five years ago Robert Maynard Hutchins, then President of the University of Chicago, delivered a lecture whose message was to be prophetic. His text and his title was taken from a line of John Milton: 'The sheep look up and are not fed,' and he used this text to illustrate the plight of students whose real needs for liberal and humane education were thwarted by crude vocationalism in the universities, the absence of properly equipped and dedicated teachers of the liberal arts, and the many impediments which a noisy and unenlightened business civilization had put in the way of the only kind of education worthy of a liberal democracy—one which should produce not technological trainees or narrow specialists, but intelligent citizens, broadly educated and with minds prepared to deliberate the course of intelligent social action.

"Hutchins' message was, as I say, prophetic, and it is entirely in the meaning of his Miltonic text that I refer to the third class of student protesters as sheep. For it may precisely be that when the sheep look up and are not fed, not given that type of nourishment which they have every right to expect from an 'alma mater,' then it is not so infinitely puzzling that they should from time to time become wolves in sheep's clothing, roving the campuses of the 20th century and joining the violent minority at the last moment out of the suppressed sense of outrage that their legitimate educational demands have not been met.

"For the first class, the hard core of radical students whose aim is nothing less than the destruction of the university—their violence should be dealt with justly but determinedly. Their aim is not improvement but disruption, and their offenses, if continuous, should be met with permanent expulsion from the academic community.

"For the second class, those who have a burning concern for social justice in general, or are members of militant minorities, we must say: We have sympathy for your motivation, but your acts are misdirected. For

the university is not a political institution nor the underwriter of social policy at large. Your business here is learning in one of the few environments left in the modern world where some objectivity is possible, where freedom of expression and inquiry are actively encouraged, where rational debate is permitted to follow wherever the argument leads. Be thankful for your opportunity and take your violence elsewhere. Do not use it to destroy one of the few remaining centers of liberal democracy in the modern world.

"For the third class, the vast majority, who feel rightfully that somehow the modern university has gone astray in its neglect of undergraduate teaching and student concern, we must be most attentive of all. For this is criticism from within, directed to the one thing which we within the university have the power to affect and to improve. Here we all have something at stake and a rededicated faculty and wisely leading administration will do everything in their power to reduce the educational environment to manageable size, to promote fruitful interaction, and to make the campus, indeed a family of learning."

Many educators have been indignant—"Holier than thou"—in the face of student unrest. Others have tried to recapture their own misremembered youth, by assuming an adolescent stance and a penitence for their own academgic sins, by becoming apologists for all student activists. Professor Joseph Schwab of the University of Chicago is not. He says in his recent book, College Curriculum and Student Protest:

"Student activists, like many assistant professors, do not know who makes decisions. They do not know how decisions are made well. The students have been mistaught. They are victims of specious freedoms such as "constitutional" student government; they are hemmed in against thought by a plethora of opaque "elective" courses; they are forced to make early (and often meaningless) commitment to a "major." Worst of all, the students suffer from a poverty of models of mature men and women professing their disciplines and living lives that are visibly productive and satisfying even while they are occasonally disturbed, confused, and frustrated by disorder and nastiness in the only real world we can know.

"In the absence of such models and before a constricting and sterile academic community, a tiny percentage of the student activists become vicious junior demagogues and corn-belt storm troopers bent on attaining a following by kicking their father surrogates in the teeth . . . They combine ignorance of worldly conditions, handicaps of appearance and manner, considerable native ability and equally considerable interpersonal incompetence in such a fashion as to produce an enormous greed for power and prestige, an infinite capacity for generating righteous indignation, and the entirely correct conviction that only the destruction of public faith in legality and the shattering of social order will produce the success to which they are sure they are entitled."

And now a few words about black students, in particular, and their increasingly militant and isolationist demands. Robert M. Hutchins just ten days ago wrote:

"It is doubtful whether colleges and universities are doing black students a favor by admitting them when they are not prepared to do the work.

"They come from poor schools and, at the opening of the freshman year in college, it is late to repair the losses of the previous 12 years.

"Suggestions that black colleges might be established within the universities and that these colleges might have different standards from those attended by whites fail to take into account the world in which the black graduate is going to live. His 9-to-5 world is going to be predominantly white.

"Instead of admitting blacks who are not ready for college, the universities should conduct a nationwide search for those who are. They will demonstrate their capacity in college and afterward and will put an end to the supremacist notion that members of their race are all congentially handicapped.

"At the same time the country must renew the attack on poverty, on slums, on racial discrimination—on all the factors that have prevented blacks from making the educational progress expected of whites. The schools will have to do more, too, and they will have to start much earlier than the age of six to develop the intellectual potenitial of black children.

"Sir Arthur Lewis, a black West Indian, who has held many important educational and diplomatic posts, recently addressed himself to these problems in a talk to Negro students at Princeton.

"His concern was the 9-to-5 world, the integrated world of American business. He rejected black studies for black students. He was in favor of such courses—for whites.

"He felt that black studies in college came too late to be even of psychological benefit to blacks. He hoped the black students at Princeton would find better uses for their time."

And just a week ago today in a public address, Bayard Rustin, the Negro civil rights leader, called on college and university officials to "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students" and instead to "see that they get the need." Rustin criticized student demands for courses "in soul music and poetry." Pleading for courses for Negro students which would stress mathematics and English, Rustin said:

"What in —— are soul courses worth in the real world? No one gives a damn if you've taken soul courses. They want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence.

"Everyone knows that education for the Negro is inferior. Bring them into the university with the understanding that they must have the remedial work they require.

"The *easy* way out is to let them have black courses and their own dormitories and give them degrees.

"However, a multiple society cannot exist where an element in that society, out of its own sense of guilt and masochism, permits another segment of that society to hold guns at their heads in the name of justice."

Mr. Rustin, the civil rights leader who organized the 1963 march on Washington, said that Negro students "are suffering from the shock of integration and the searching for an easy way out of their problems with their demands for separate dormitories and study programs."

Strong words, indeed, but a refreshing bit of candor after the many guilt-ridden and emotional outbursts we have witnessed.

To many of us—reluctant, unwilling, or unable to adapt to these rapidly changing social forces, the present I have brefly described appears grim indeed. What of the future?

I have little hesitation in forecasting more of the same turmoil, until the troubled majority, in the name of law and order, as so often in the past, forces the movement underground. The changes unleashed will not stop, however, but will continue at a more moderate pace and, I predict, will result in a continuing evolution, hopefully for the good of our society.

Since we are all of roughly the same generation and certainly not of "the younger generation," I can think of no more fitting way to end my remarks here and add a note of cheer than to leave with you the remarks by Chancellor D. B. Varner to the graduating class of 1968 at the sixth annual commencement of Oakland University, April 20, 1968:

"If we were to follow the tradition of the occasion, the script would not call for me to point out to you, the graduates of 1968, the deplorable mess which my generation has made of things in general and to challenge you—the graduates—to go forth with your newly won degrees and put society back in shape. Tradition is not easy to abandon—especially at such a tradition-oriented ceremony as commencement—but we've done it before so let's try again.

"Certainly you may look about you and compile a pretty impressive tally of the malfunctions in our society. I would not deny this for a moment. As a matter of fact, for the past few years this has been an obsession of your generation—to point out the glaring failure of the adult generation. The criticism has been both searching and, at times, searing. We have heard much of 'phony adults,' of 'plastic values,' of hypocrisy. There has been talk of the 'generation gap' and 'alienation' and the 'credibility gap.'

"Two comments would seem to be in order.

"The first is quite brief—it is simply this: effective today you change your role from that of a critical observer to a participant in the game—I am pleased to welcome you to the ranks.

"The second comment is not quite so brief. I have heard a continuing commentary for the past few years—growing in intensity with each year that passes—that our society is in a deplorable condition. Our international involvements have led us into a war in Asia that is generally described as the most unpopular war in the history of the nation. Domestically we find that in an economy of abundance we permit pockets of abject poverty to exist. Further and worse—it is pointed out—we have permitted the racial problems of our society to lead us to the brink of civil disaster if not civil war. The clear and unmistable conclusion is drawn that the present generation of adults has unconscionably permitted—if not promoted—this near-catastrophic condition.

"For purposes of clear identification, let me put myself squarely in the ranks of this decadent generation. I graduated 28 years ago—almost a full generation—and I make no apologies for this generation of mine. I only hope yours does as well.

"You say that we have permitted pockets of poverty to exist in an affluent society. The charge is unfortunately true and it should not be so. Yet when I sat in your chair—those 28 years ago—there was no concern with 'pockets of poverty.' The entire landscape was one of poverty! We were just spinning out of a debilitating depression that had tried the souls of men. Bankruptcy, hunger, unemployment, hopelessness—those were the trademarks of the times. The problem being conveyed to your new generation is a totally different one—in the most affluent society mankind has ever known, you have the assignment of eliminating those remaining pockets of poverty. We wish you well!

"You say that we hand over to you a complicated, confused, and depressing international scene. Again, the charge is unfortunately true. But when my generation graduated those 28 years ago, the international scene was anything but bright. A totalitarian regime had taken firm control of Germany and the peace of the world was doomed. Small nations were being mercilessly overrun, Jews massacred by the thousands, France was tottering, and England threatened. Japan was joining the Nazi forces and Russia was an unknown quantity. My generation fought a massive war—one that lasted almost four years—and with a staggering cost in human lives. A cleaner war? Perhaps. A more purposeful war? Probably. But an unpleasant prospect, nevertheless for *that* group of graduates too! The war was fought and a peace was established—even though it was destined to be an uneasy peace. And that generation—my generation—created

and implemented the most massive post-war reconstruction program ever devised by man. I trust that you will do as well.

"You say that we hand you a nation so torn with racial strife that it may literally explode in your face. Alas, the charge is true! But on behalf of the generation which has just preceded yours, and in its defense, permit me to point out that it was this generation which had the courage to identify the problem, to label it as a problem, to focus public attention on a topic which had been ignored for almost 100 years. Admittedly, the problem of today is acute—but it is so precisely because this generation had been willing to put the issue in the center of the stage and has placed the spotlight squarely on it. It is from this point—and only from this point—that a workable solution can be found. And that is your charge!

"Why have I elected on this, your graduation day, to enter this brief defense of this older generation?

"I have done so for two reasons. First, I have detected a noticeable tendency on the part of many young people to apply large quantities of a magic and satisfying balm—one that provides temporary relief for all pain—by transferring the faults of society to the generation just ahead. While there is obviously an element of justification in this, let me urge you—as new graduates—to avoid the temptation to go wading off into this exciting world through a sea of self-pity. Second, I have done so because, if you will forgive the immodesty, it is my conviction that our generation has taken substantial strides toward the ultimate achievement of a world of justice, of dignity, and of equality for mankind. The accomplishments of my generation have been impressive—even staggering. The work in human medicine, in increasing food production, in lengthening human life, in reducing infant mortality, in technological advances in transportation, communication, manufacturing, in economic improvements in birth control—all these reflect astounding accomplishments. More than this—the creation of the United Nations—the best hope of society for world peace and understanding: The approximate doubling of the fund of organized knowledge in this world: The dramatic moves to eliminate poverty and racial discrimination among our people: These are the landmarks of that generation which passed through just ahead of yours.

"It is my hope that your class, and your generation, with all the tools at your disposal, will carry on the good work of my generation. My generation had handed to yours a level of physical comfort and economic affluency never before achieved in all the history of mankind. Tools for achieving peace are available. The tools for eliminating poverty in our country are at hand. The techniques for achieving human dignity are here. You are inheriting not a sorry and decadent state of affairs, but an exciting and challenging opportunity to find permanent solutions to problems which have perplexed mankind forever.

"Again, we wish you well!"

I only wish I had said this first.

PARITY CONTINUES UPWARD

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that farm parity has continued its slow upward climb this past month. Starting with 72 percent in January, parity this month hit 76 percent, the highest monthly index since January 1967.

Livestock prices were the chief factor in raising the farm income share as beef finally came within 5 points of the "fair" farm price. A year ago steer prices averaged $25.50 a hundredweight, or 80 percent of the average full parity value.

Farm expenses hit another record high this past month. The index is now 375 of the fair-price base period of 100. The USDA report noted that this increase was the sixth consecutive new high. This index is 20 points or 6 percent higher than 1 year ago.

The following table provides a 2-month comparison of the parity price percentages on some farm commodities for April and May 1969:

[In percent]

Commodity:	April	May
Cotton	42	44
Wheat	46	44
Corn	69	69
Butterfat	74	74
Milk	86	86
Wool	45	45
Barley	69	73
Flax	65	66
Oats	66	66
Sorghum	65	65
Beef	92	95
Chicken	67	69
Eggs	67	70
Hogs	86	92
Lamb	92	91
Turkey	63	64
Soybeans	70	69
Average	75	76

NEW JERSEY—THE NATION'S MEDICINE CHEST

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey's dominance in the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry has long been apparent, to the extent that our State is often termed "The Nation's Medicine Chest."

The term is a very appropriate one, what with New Jersey's 120 pharmaceutical companies accounting for more than 20 percent of the total U.S. production of pharmaceutical products. What is not so well known, however, is the fact that drug manufacturing is still the State's fastest growing industry and has exercised an important impact on New Jersey's economy and society in a variety of ways.

A recent study of this impact by Prof. Hal P. Eastman of the Rutgers University Graduate School of Business Administration has attracted a great deal of well-deserved attention.

In view of the importance of this industry both to New Jersey and the Nation, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure our colleagues will find most enlightening the results of Professor Eastman's study as reported in recent articles in the New York Times and the Newark Star-Ledger.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1969]

DRUG MAKING IS A BOON TO JERSEY

New Jersey's pharmaceutical companies, numbering 120 in all, account for more than 20 per cent of all pharmaceutical products manufactured in the United States, according to a new study of the economic contributions of the industry in the Garden State.

New Jersey drug manufacturers shipped products valued at $1.05 billion in 1967, the most recent full year figures available when the study was made.

The study was prepared by Prof. H. P. Eastman of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Rutgers University. It is entitled "The Economic and Social Impact of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers in the State of New Jersey." The study itself was sponsored by the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Information Committee consisting of the information officers of the 13 major drug companies in the state.

The study shows that the industry employs more than 19,000 persons in the state and has a payroll in excess of $160-million a year.

It was also noted in the study that the drug industry in New Jersey invests $140-million a year in research and development, about 25 per cent of the total for the entire industry.

The 20-page booklet, being distributed throughout the state, says New Jersey is sometimes referred to as "the nation's medicine chest."

[From the Newark Star Ledger, May 30, 1969]

INDUSTRY: DRUG STUDY HIGHLIGHTS

JERSEY'S CONTRIBUTIONS

(By John Soloway)

New Jersey's pharmaceutical manufacturing business—the state's fastest-growing industry—has finally put its best foot forward, in impressive fashion.

"The Economic and Social Impact of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers in the State of New Jersey," a study by Hal P. Eastman, a professor at Rutgers University's Graduate School of Business Administration, goes a long way to tell it like it is in the drug business in the Garden State.

It is the story of the 120 drug manufacturers in Jersey, their composite contributions in research and production, and what they mean to the state's economy, and their commitment to civic and community affairs.

Aptly written and smartly illustrated, the authoritative booklet is recommended reading for lawmakers in Washington and in Trenton who may be inclined to pick on the industry in headline-hunting forays.

From an economic standpoint, the drug industry in Jersey is important indeed. The state's drug-producing facilities account for more than $1 billion of product per year—about 20 per cent of all pharmaceutical products manufactured in the U.S.

Jersey's drug firms employ more than 19,000, pay wages and salaries in excess of $160 million, and invest $140 million a year in research—about one-quarter of all U.S. industry investment in pharmaceutical research and development. This research has made major contributions to medical science helping patients all over the world.

The civic-community activities of the New Jersey pharmaceutical companies are also reviewed in the report.

The industry plays a leading role in efforts to provide both jobs and training for hard-core unemployed, to upgrade training and job opportunities for minority groups and to provide challenging training in local hospitals.

Additionally, Jersey's drug industry is actively supporting higher education, cultural activities, voluntary health agencies, and efforts to assist the handicapped.

The report also shows that the pharmaceutical industry in Jersey paid $67 million a year in taxes to local, state and federal governments and invested about $60 million in new plants and equipment in the state.

The study, a year-long project, was sponsored by the New Jersey Pharmaceutical In-

formation Committee, composed of the information officers of 13 major drug firms in the state.

Headed by Donald J. Storch of Summit, the director of public relations for CIBA Corp., the group included the following firms: American Cyanamid's Lederle Labs, Bristol-Myers' Products Division, CIBA Pharmaceutical, Hoffman-La Roche, Johnson & Johnson's Ethicon and Ortho Divisions, Merck & Co., Organon, Chas. Pfizer's Leeming Pacquin Division, Sandoz Pharmaceuticals, Schering's Pharmaco and White Laboratories Division, Smith, Miller & Patch, E. R. Squibb & Sons and Warner-Lambert's Warner-Chilcott Laboratories.

The survey booklet is being distributed to legislators, libraries, schools and opinion leaders throughout the state.

JOBS AND THE POOR

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk about the effort to take the people where the jobs are by instilling in private industry and business its conscientious duty to open its doors to the untrained and unemployed sector of society. President Johnson responded to this call and initiated the JOBS program through the National Alliance for Businessmen. Even with some of the Nation's most outstanding businessmen serving to head the program, results fell far short of expectations through the first year.

Under the present administration, this effort continues. I am anxiously following the progress of the program in hopes there will be some evidence of real concern on the part of those who do the hiring—for the people who need jobs. Once employers embark upon a new course whereby they will train the people they need for productivity, this country will share in the benefits—both in terms of the gross national product and in terms of domestic welfare. It is a long-term investment, an investment which has not yet seemed necessary to major business and industry.

I insert and commend to my colleagues' attention this editorial directed to the NAB program. It appeared in the Washington Post, June 26, 1969.

The editorial follows:

JOBS AND THE POOR

Finding jobs for the unemployed poor is like finding mates for the unmarried: getting them together is easy, but who can make them stay together? Every day, the help-wanted sections of the newspapers announce that this many mechanics are needed, this many cooks, this many carpenters, waitresses, key punch operators, secretaries, plumbers and dozens of other openings. Smug believers in the bootstrap philosophy argue that there cannot be an unemployment problem—"the poor are just too lazy to work"—when the help-wanted sections are filled with job openings.

The answer is that employing the poor means much more than getting the man and the job together. First, you must get the *man* together: gather him psychologically, motivationally and socially so that he is able to get to work on time and, once there, be reasonably even-tempered, cooperative, productive, and content to work his way up—assuming there is a path leading upward.

It is true that 30 or 40 years ago, people with little money or education could make it the hard way. But today, automation and competition have largely made the hard way a lot harder. What appears like bending over backward to get the poor into jobs is really standing up to the fact that conditions of employment are much different than in the days following the depression. Thus, it is no longer a matter of getting jobs for those out of work; today jobs are needed for people who don't know *how* to work.

It is only recently that private industry has begun to concern itself actively about jobs for the poor. Among the more prominent groups is the National Alliance of Businessmen: an 18-month-old program that is commited to finding 614,000 jobs for the worst-off poor by 1971 in 125 metropolitan areas. To date, according to the NAB, 102,235 are on the job, out of 177,868 hired.

What *Washington Post* reporter Paul W. Valentine observed the other day about the local NAB efforts—a "rocky, sometimes disappointing, sometimes rewarding experience"—is generally true nationally. The main success of the NAB, aside from creating and filling jobs, has been in waking up the business community to its responsibility to the poor. On a Saturday morning last March, 500 company presidents, board chairmen and executives—representing by one estimate a trillion dollars in corporate assets—met in Washington to discuss what they had learned after a year in NAB and what still needed to be done. Representative of the middle and upper class, they have accepted a fact the middle and upper class have long refused to face: that the poor are not "lazy and shiftless," that they do want jobs, that they can and will work.

The main failure of the NAB is to get across its message to the entire business community. Perhaps this is asking too much. But the uncooperative businessmen, the ones who train and hire only sure-thing prospects and ignore the people who often need consideration the most, ought to consider a basic economic fact: when the NAB finds jobs for 100,000 poor Americans, affluent America benefits also. That many people are off welfare, out of jail, off the streets; they now pay, rather than consume, taxes. In short, eliminating joblessness can benefit the employer as much as the employed.

THE NIGERIAN WAR

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the current developments in the Nigerian war are deeply disturbing to anyone who possesses a vestige of humanitarian sentiment. The interference with the relief efforts of the International Red Cross threatens to result in the starvation of many thousands. The U.S. Government must continue to assert every possible pressure upon the Federal Government of Nigeria and upon the Biafran regime to work out some method of continued delivery of food and medical supplies. Placing the blame is not important. The method of delivery and its timing are impediments that somehow must be overcome, despite the deep-seated fears of each side that the other may gain some advantage. Our Department of State and other representatives who are trying to effect a solution must omit no effort to achieve the result of restoring deliveries at the earliest possible time.

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA, 1969

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we Americans in 1969 are under attack by every force which can be marshaled by the international Communist conspiracy—that is, from propaganda, infiltration, sabotage, to armed guerrillas.

Many Americans dislike admitting to reality and all of us wish it were not true but the facts are incontrovertible.

The game is rapidly approaching a climax. Our people must tak a stand or be overcome.

"America, 1969" prepared by Gary Allen which appeared in the July-August American Opinion probably best explains "why the score is so high." It follows:

AMERICA, 1969—WHY THE SCORE IS SO HIGH

(NOTE.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of Communist Revolution In The Streets—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to American Opinion. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

You probably wouldn't believe the past year if you hadn't lived through it. If some would-be Nostradamus had submitted a history of it to a science-fiction magazine five years ago it would have been returned with a curt note of rejection stating that the story was too fantastic even for the buffs of science fiction. Indeed, it was a year in which the Fickle Finger of Fate Award went to America.

It was a year of assassinations and gun laws; of repeated international monetary crises; of roaring inflation and increased taxation; of escalated guerrilla warfare on our nation's campuses and in our streets; of increasingly violent criminals and increasingly permissive judges; and, of meaningless negotiations over Vietnam while American aid to the Communist arsenal of the Vietcong continued and American soldiers died in ever greater numbers. It was a year in which political personalities changed but political policies remained the same.

But, it was also a year in which it was increasingly difficult to be a "Liberal" keeping up with the latest Leftist line. Many "progressives" found it traumatically difficult to adjust to the switch from advocating forced integration to forced separatism. It was especially disconcerting to "Liberals" to have to advocate integration in some instances and segregation in others—according to the whims of whatever "Civil Rights" leader was momentarily in vogue. This situation caused more schizophrenia in the ranks of the Left than any event since the Hitler-Stalin pact. But, alas, America's "Liberals" seem always to have felt that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, and many actually adjusted to their madly shifting double standards without the absolute necessity of a strait-jacket.

During the past year we have moved more than twelve months closer to George Orwell's *1984*—which keeps threatening to arrive early. As the gothic Professor Russell Kirk was moved to write:

"Just now, let me inquire whether we are indeed only fifteen years away from a hideous totalist society ruled by brutes who enjoy stamping upon a human face; a society in which 'war is peace' and in which history and literature are corrupted to serve the interest of the total state. . . ."

Yes, this was the year that "Liberals" offered "positive proof" that God was dead—and our astronauts reminded us from outer space that He is not only alive but Lord over a vastness beyond even "Liberal" imagination. It was a year nonetheless, when the American Left continued to "whore after false gods," endowing the State with the qualities of Vishnu—thought by Hindus to be both man's preserver and destroyer—as their satrap politicians and guru social scientists moved to implement plans for 1984. Typical of those plans is one discussed by New Jersey Congressman Cornelius Gallagher:

"The social scientists, in their zeal to discover more and more about disadvantaged citizens, proposed to use low-cost housing as a great pool of research—and those who lived in it, as guinea pigs.

"They seriously proposed to bug each room in each apartment of a federally-sponsored low rent project.

"They would then feed every single sentence uttered by the apartment dwellers into a computer. This computer would then deliver a profile of these Americans and their habits—and compare these statistical profiles to Americans who have 'made it.'"

Congressman Gallagher became so outraged at the project that it was stopped, but the example does provide an insight into the mentality of contemporary social scientists and what they can accomplish by working in alliance with totalitarian bureaucrats and politicians. There is no end to how far it might all have gone: If we are going to bug the poor, surely we should bug the rich to find out how they got that way. And, after all, since most Americans are of the middle class, one can't make accurate comparisons unless he has extensive information on them as well. So, Big Brother, or Big Mommy, or Super Sibling, as our expanding State is sometimes called, might soon have been our ever-present electronic companion. After all, we might be reading magazines like American Opinion, or muttering anti-social thoughts, or discriminating as to sex with our wives or husbands. The social scientists should *know* about it.

One remembers that in Orwell's *1984*, also, every citizen was assigned a number so that the government could keep track of all his activities. *U.S. News & World Report* revealed this year that on July 1, 1969, the armed forces of the United States will help Big Brother by assigning numbers to our servicemen that are the same as their Social Security numbers. *U.S. News* explained as follows:

"First major agency to fall in line was the Internal Revenue Service, which has already reassigned individual tax numbers that are, in fact, the same as Social Security numbers.

"And the Federal Government is not the only body to take such action. Some State and local governments, schools and private firms are using the numbers to help cut back the flood of digits assigned to the average American.

"A wider use. Some officials foresee the Social Security number as the all-inclusive identification—on drivers' licenses, bank accounts, employee personnel records, credit cards, and dozens of other numbered documents.

"Some federal officials are considering a plan to make Social Security numbers the ultimate in identification—by putting them on new-born babies' birth certificates."

This was also a great year for Newspeak,[1] the Esperanto of the Orwellian set. As my colleague Alan Stang is so fond of saying: *Observe!* In America those who would continue to move us towards the all-powerful State, or Communism, are called "Liberals." Those who are anti-Communist, who oppose collectivism in all its forms, are called (at best) "conservatives." Yet, in Czecho-Slovakia those who allegedly want to reduce the power of the State and move away from Communism are called "Liberals." Those who want to magnify the terrors of Stalinism are called "conservatives." Are you confused? Well, you are supposed to be. Just remember that, in the vernacular of Newspeak, the "Liberals" are always the good guys and the conservatives are always the bad guys.

The war in Vietnam, which is now the longest war in U.S. history, is also right out of 1984. During the past year of "peace talks," American casualties have accelerated and now total 34,835 killed, 223,525 wounded, and more than 1,300 listed as missing or captured. Since America has stopped bombing the North, Ho Chi Minh is no longer under any pressure to reach a settlement, and talks drag.

Meanwhile, through aid and trade with the nations of the Soviet bloc, America continues to equip our enemies by proxy. *Human Events* of March 15, 1969 quoted President Nixon as stressing that the Soviets "furnish . . . 85 per cent of the sophisticated military equipment for the North Vietnamese forces. Without that assistance, North Vietnam would not have the capabilities to wage the major war they are against the United States." *Human Events* of May 17, 1969, reports that "word has leaked from the White House that the President wants to loosen restrictions and promote the flow of goods between Communist nations and the United States. Key officials recently picked by Nixon [*all members of the Council on Foreign Relations*], moreover, have been vigorous advocates of expanded Red trade." This report was confirmed in *Business Week* for May 24, 1969.

During his campaign, Richard Nixon promised faithfully and vigorously to stop aid and trade with the enemy. But, in the Newspeak of 1984, things mean just the opposite of what they appear to mean, and "War is Peace."

It is obvious that to make the nightmare of Orwell's *1984* a reality in America, we must be driven to reduce ourselves to a totally socialist State. And, to do that, the *Insiders* and their puppet politicians and bureaucrats must wage war on private ownership. Karl Marx said it, oh so succinctly, in the Communist Manifesto of 1848: "Our objective can be summed up in one sentence—'abolition of private property.'" Most Americans think of the Soviet Union when Marx or Communism is discussed, but the deadly principles of Communism have nothing to do with geography, and could as easily be applied to Burnt Mattress, Idaho, or Elephant Breath, Arkansas, as in Moscow or Peking. It was the sagacious Admiral Ben Moreell who observed:

"Communism with a 'Made in Moscow' label is not popular in America. It doesn't need to be, if only we can be induced to accept Marxism under some other label. This we are now doing. . . . Slavery is commonly thought of as ownership of one man by another. But no slaveholder would quibble about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise, the denial of all other freedoms follows."[2]

The bench-marks on that road to the sort of total government foreseen by Admiral Moreell mark our progress toward 1984. One such bench-mark is the number of those directly employed by the federal government—persons who are not likely to ever vote for the abolition of their own slot at the trough. In mid-1930, civilian personnel employed by the Hoover Administration totaled 605,000—a ratio of one to every 203 Americans. At the beginning of the current year, there were 3,055,000 civilians on the payroll (excluding "hush-hush" agencies like the C.I.A., of whom the Civil Service Commission keeps no record). This represents a ratio of one employee for every sixty-seven Americans, and does not include military, state, and local workers who are now for all practical purposes federal employees.

In short, the national bureaucracy has grown by five hundred percent during a period in which the population has increased by only sixty-three percent. According to the authoritative *Weekly Labor Forecast*, total government employment now runs over 14 million—meaning that at least one out of every five employed persons in the United States must be totally supported by the other four.

Not only are government employees multiplying like Welfare Mothers, their pay is skyrocketing. According to *U.S. News & World Report:*

"Working for the U.S. Government is getting to be more and more rewarding. Federal employees have just been told details of a new pay raise being proposed for them—averaging 9.1 percent for white-collar workers. . . . If the boosts go through on July 1, as expected, the typical employee's pay check will have risen 19.5 per cent in 21 months."

This little boondoggle will cost those of us who work for a living an extra $3 billion, and will make a total of $6 billion given to government "workers" in three separate raises since September of 1967. A federal employee rated at "G.S. 18" (Government Service), for example, will receive a fat $33,495 a year. This becomes alarming when one realizes that percentage-wise, there are more bureaucrats now at top-rated G.S. jobs than ever before in our nation's history. Is it any wonder that more and more of our fellow citizens want to quit work and take a job with the government, where it is almost impossible to get fired? Some of these people will be in for a real shock when, as in ancient Rome, they learn that it is an economic impossibility for the entire population to live as certified government pick-pockets.

In discussing the federal pay hikes, we would certainly be remiss not to mention our Congressmen, those gallant inflation fighters who this year voted themselves an annual pay raise of $12,500. Don't you wish that *you* could vote yourself a raise? Try telling your boss tomorrow morning that your family took a vote and it was unanimously decided that this year your salary will be raised by $12,500. Senators now receive $42,500 in salary, with benefits amounting to something like $10,000, plus junkets and various "insider deals." Sorry, can't end the surtax this year. We've got to keep the trough full you know.

---

[1] Not to be confused with *Newsweek*, a weekly magazine published in Newspeak.

[2] How are things done in "the Workers Paradise"? The *Los Angeles Times* recently reported that the "Soviet people were jubilant over the news that minimum wage for factory and office workers had been raised to the equivalent of $66 a month. That is about 55 cents an hour for a 40-hour, four-week month." In an America rapidly becoming the "Loafers' Paradise," shiftless bums do four times as well by simply applying for Welfare.

Naturally, all of these expensive government employees take up office space. According to *U.S. News & World Report*, the federal bureaucracy has offices in more than 421,000 buildings—and, "Nobody quite knows what all the civil servants in these buildings are doing or trying to do." Of course, even our federal bureaucrats know that you can't just hang all of those buildings in thin air . . . so, with admirable foresight, the U.S. Government has managed to obtain 760 million acres of land—ownership of a mere one-third of the nation. Then, too, all of those bureaucrats in the 421,000 office buildings must also sit at desks and pound on typewriters or other machines. *U.S. News* admits that nobody knows their number or value. It has been established, however, that the government does own 380,000 motor vehicles—since our precious bureaucrats cannot be expected to walk or use public transportation.

How successful are these bureaucrats at spending your money? Just at the federal level they manage to tip-toe through your fiscal tulips at the rate of $350,000 a minute, or $3.5 billion dollars a week, and $184 billion last year.

The Tax Foundation has computed that to pay his tax bill the average American had to work twelve more days for Uncle Sam this year than he did last year. The Foundation revealed that the average American must labor 117 days—from January first through April twenty-seventh, to meet all tax "obligations." Of this, eighty-one days of work go to pay federal taxes, and thirty-six days of labor must be devoted to the benefit of state and local bureaucrats.

This year Americans will spend eight minutes more of their average eight-hour working day earning the money to pay the additional tax bills they did not have in 1968. The time consumed this year working to pay the tax man will be more than an hour and a half longer than the estimated working time required to pay for housing and household operations, and an hour and thirty-eight minutes more than the time needed to earn money for food, tobacco, and liquor.

Thirteen years ago, according to the Tax Foundation, taxes collected by all governments were only $1,897 per family. Taxes now come to about $3,927 per American family—up $370 from fiscal 1968. Of course, not every family is average. "Liberal" economist Sylvia Porter recently pointed out that many Americans in the middle-income brackets are now paying almost half their earnings in taxes. Part of the escalating tax loads is made up of Social Security taxes—which started out at two percent and now amount to 9.6 percent, with a proposal currently pending to raise Social Security taxes to 10.4 percent in 1970. The "free goodies" are getting a little expensive.

The Tax Foundation estimates that the total government tax take will be $247 billion in fiscal 1969—$147 billion higher than in 1956. Tax receipts of $170 billion in fiscal 1969, for the federal government alone, will exceed those of fiscal 1968 by $24 billion, and will have more than doubled since 1956. Meanwhile, state and local collections ($77 billion in 1969) will have increased about $5 billion over the previous fiscal year, and will be about $13 billion greater than in fiscal 1957. The state and local tax take for fiscal 1969 will come close to tripling that of 1956.

The staggering amount of money being spent raises the question of whether it is being spent wisely and frugally.

According to U.P.I. Senior Editor Louis Cassels, no Rightwing Extremist by a country mile:

"The U.S. government is wasting huge sums—at least $10 billion a year and probably much more than that—by spending money blindly. That is the conclusion of a month-long investigation of federal budgetary practices by United Press International."

One official of the General Accounting Office estimated that as much as $30 billion a year is being wasted—even by *federal* standards.

At a time when we are reminded by the *Wall Street Journal* that the jobless rate is at a fifteen-year low, that there is a manpower squeeze and a labor shortage with many Americans moonlighting at two jobs, and countless jobs going begging, the number of those on Welfare continues to multiply. The *Wall Street Journal* of April 24, 1969, revealed that "the relief rolls are rising almost 10% a year, with no letup in sight. . . . " The *Journal* continues: In short, the Great Society enlarged the demand for welfare and also increased its supply." Then, the *Wall Street Journal* quotes an official of the Nixon Administration: "My main conclusion is that the increase in the caseload is a good thing. More eligible families are getting assistance, so that system is in this sense working better." The *Journal* added: "This judgment is shared by many other Nixon Administration officials."

That hardly sounds like last year's electioneering rhetoric, but one must keep in mind that spending is flagrantly wasteful only when the other gang is in office, but vitally necessary when your mob takes power.

An example of what is happening to Welfare, nationwide, is to be found in the case of New York City. The Department of Social Services there has asked for $1.7 billion for aid to New York City's "needy" during the next fiscal year. This is $600 million over the current Welfare budget, and four times the budget for 1964–1965, the last full year before John Lindsay became Mayor. It is more than seven times as large as the Welfare budget of only a decade ago.

According to *U.S. News & World Report*, New York State will spend about $2.2 *billion* on Welfare this year, whereas in 1965–1966, the cost was $983 million. Still, New York trails California in the Welfare Grand Prix. California, where the state Budget is up thirty-three percent since voters there elected a "tight-fisted conservative" Governor, will this year spend $2.3 billion on Welfare handouts. And, now that the Supreme Court has held that when writing the Constitution the Founding Fathers intended that there be no residency requirements for Welfare payoffs, California is preparing to be blitzed by the nation's indigents. What "Welfare client" would not delight in wintering in sunny California at the expense of generous California taxpayers? The result will undoubtedly be the establishment of "federal Welfare standards," followed by federal financing of state Welfare programs. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch (sometimes known as Nixon's "Seventh Crisis"), has already accepted the recommendations of a committe set up by President Nixon and announced his belief that the federal government should impose minimum standard payments to the nation's 8.5 million "Welfare clients."

In the eight years of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations, according to a Johnson aide, the number of domestic federal aid programs increased from 45 to 435. In his Budget for 1970, President Johnson told us that the estimated $27.2 billion for aid to the poor "represents . . . almost three times the level of 1961." Also, "Outlays for health and welfare programs are estimated at $55 billion in 1970. . . . This represents an increase of $6.1 billion over the 1969 level and is more than double the level prevailing in 1964."

Economist Henry Hazlitt reveals:

"In the fiscal year 1968 the federal government spent for education, old-age pensions, veterans pensions, health, relief and all other major 'social welfare' and 'anti-poverty' programs a total of $61 billion. If we add the cost of similar programs to the states and cities in 1968 of $51 billion, we get a total government welfare cost in 1968 of $112 billion.

"It is officially estimated that the costs to the federal government alone of these programs will increase from $61 billion in fiscal 1968 to $68 billion in 1969 and $76 billion in 1970. There will no doubt be a similar increase in state and local costs."

Hazlitt makes no guestimate of Welfare spending by 1984.

Naturally, the politicians and bureaucrats want to expand history's biggest leachathon. As a recent U.P.I. release noted: "President Nixon's chief urban affairs advisor [*William Moynihan*] suggested Thursday that the federal government double its aid to state and local governments after the Vietnam war ends. He said this would amount to about $40 billion per year." So far no politician from whom we have heard has suggested that after the Vietnam War ends (if it ever does, or if we are not soon in another) producers be left with the product of their own toil by reducing taxes.

It seems ironic that in last year's political campaign Republicans were giving dire warning that only Richard Nixon could save the nation from the socialism of Hubert Humphrey. Now we read a report in the *Wall Street Journal* of May 7, 1969, which informs us:

"In a message to Congress . . . Mr. Nixon called for a massive increase in food-stamp spending to provide free stamps for families in the lowest income brackets . . . The package would cost 'something in excess of '$1 billion a year beyond present food-aid spending, the President said . . . . Mr. Nixon's proposals would seem to go along way toward satisfying liberal demands for a bigger Federal antimalnutrition role. They certainly exceed by far the food spending approved by President Johnson, who had voiced skepticism about the extent of malnutrition in this country."

Now, Heaven help us, Big Mommy is preparing to spend better than $2 billion a year of our money to run about making certain that every last Appalachian gets the "minimum daily requirements" of things like leafy vegetables and cod-liver oil. One can only gasp at the thought of a federally enforced menu, with hordes of new female bureaucrats screeching things like, "Eat your spinach, Luke!"

Last year President Johnson's Budget was $183.7 billion, and represented an increase in the federal Budget of eighty-eight percent during the Kennedy-Johnson years. "Reckless spending," shouted Republican Congressmen; "Dangerous fiscal madness," echoed Republican Senators. During the ensuing political campaign Americans were treated to the usual oratorical bunkum and political promises about slashing wasteful government spending. Now, with the frugal Republicans controlling the White House, last year's profligate spending is this year's barebones Budget. It all depends on whose gang of socialists is doing the spending. Of course, Mr. Nixon *is* cutting down here and there. For instance, he noted that President Johnson kept seventy official Presidential photographers around the White House to record for whatever history we have left to us L.B.J.'s every itch, smirk, and ear-wiggle. Mr. Nixon finds that to take his photograph he requires only forty official photographers—no doubt at a considerable "savings" to the taxpayer.

The *Los Angeles Times* of May 14, 1969, tells us that "The Nixon Administration and House Democratic leaders have agreed to place a $192.9 billion ceiling on the amount of federal spending in the fiscal year starting July 1." The article goes on to state that the Nixon Administration "would have preferred none [*no ceiling*] at all." The net result was a $9.2 billion *increase* over L.B.J.'s last Budget, which the Republicans had denounced over and over again for its extravagant wastefulness.

House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills argues that the Budget will windup being even higher than this. As the *Los Angeles Times* reported on May twenty-first: "Mills argued that if Congress approved a 1970 budget total of $192.9 billion, as the President has asked, 'before the end of the year, there would still have to be $5 to $6 billion more appropriated.'" This would mean that Republican Nixon would in but one year have boosted spending over the Johnson expenditures by $15 billion. Irreverent wags in Washington are saying that those who still call Richard Nixon a cheap phony have not seen his Budget.

The Republicans have denounced every increase in spending by the Democrats since Ike's last Budget of $99.5 billion. After all, only $500 million of that increase was for defense costs. The balance was for domestic spending, with an extra $800 million added in increased interest costs on the swelling national debt. It is curious to note that the newspapers played up the Nixon Budget as a *cut* from L.B.J.'s proposed Budget of $195.3 billion—and made no mention of the fact that the Budget represents an actual visible increase of $9.2 billion in spending over last year.

The deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, was an enormous $25.4 billion—the biggest since World War II. President Johnson, the man who wanted Honest Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice, claimed that there would be no deficit for the year ending June 30, 1969. Most monetary students were extremely skeptical about this claim, but the Republicans, apparently hoping to open the Nixon Administration on a harmonious note, did not challenge this absurdity from the man who last year predicted a deficit of $8 billion and delivered one amounting to $25 billion. President Nixon, as I have noted, has already persuaded Congress to raise the limit on the national debt by $12 billion! When the Democrat socialists were in power, Republican Congressmen voted consistently against raising the national debt; but, now that the pink elephants are stampeding into fiscal irresponsibility, the tune has changed.

President Nixon didn't even blush when he claimed that the raise in the debt limit was "in the interest of responsible management." If it were already 1984, all of Nixon's old speeches about the government squandering our money could be shoved into the "memory hole."

This government borrowing, which has ballooned the national debt, is the prime cause of inflation, since banks buy government bonds and then present them to the Treasury, which issues new fiat cash against them. The official cost of living escalated 4.4 percent during 1968. During the first quarter of 1969, the government reported a 1.5 percent increase in the cost of living—the sharpest rise of any three-month period since May–July 1956. In March, the consumer price index rose eight-tenths of one percent, the biggest monthly gain in eighteen years. This rise, at the rate of 9.6 percent annually, shows that inflation has not been slowed but is actually *gaining* momentum. Commenting on this inflation in the *World Currency Report*, Franz Pick writes:

"If we accept this fact [a 1.5 percent rise in the cost of living during the first quarter of 1969] and apply it to the purchasing power of total public and private debt, conservatively estimated at 3 trillion Minidollars, we have to conclude that not less than $45 billion of purchasing power of this debt has been wiped out during the first 90 days of 1969."

As of April seventh, the cost of day-to-day loans soared to 9.5 percent, the highest since 1929. If a Nixon tight money policy leads to a decline in the stock market (as it did in 1929), a slow-down in demand for goods, and rising un-employment, the President and the Federal Reserve will likely turn on the printing presses full blast under the resulting political and social pressures. Retired persons, widows, and others on fixed income may be decimated by inflation, but *they* suffer in relative silence while unemployed urban minorities are being agitated in their displeasure to hurl Molotov cocktails. If it comes to a choice between these voting blocs, the aged or the urban minorities (as it probably will), it is obvious which one will win. The elderly will, however, be consoled with an insufficient rise in Social Security "payments" which will only add to inflation and further weaken the bankrupt agency.

It is not just the aged and minorities who are victims of inflation. Articles are already appearing in newspapers and the finance journals suggesting that home ownership may in the future be the perquisite of the rich only. (Two years ago we were being told that within a decade most Amreican families would own two homes.) A recent Associated Press release states:

"Higher interest charges on mortgages, higher taxes and insurance and rising costs of lumber and other materials have sent house prices skyrocketing. More increases are in prospect. . . .

"Bernard Janis, president of Janis Corp., of Miami, Fla., estimated the cost of a $30,000 home has risen 20 per cent in the past year and will rise 10 per cent more to about $39,500 in the next six months."

U.S. News & World Report says that while labor's wages rose 6.2 percent last year, "Rising living costs and the fedearl tax boost designed to hold down consumer spending have more than offset the extra pay."[3]

Understandably, all this inflation is destroying America's ability to compete in world trade. In 1964, says *U.S. News & World Report*, the United States *sold* $3.6 billion more than it bought abroad. By 1968, the U.S. was *buying* $2.5 billion more abroad than it was selling (not counting foreign aid giveaways). The stimulation of imports caused by inflation, defense spending overseas, and foreign aid have combined to create a simply horrendous American imbalance of payments.

Our government has claimed that America did not last year have a balance of payments deficit; but, it is a case of where figures don't lie, liars figure. As *Barron's*, the influential financial weekly, notes:

"Last year's so-called payments surplus largely reflected a series of bookkeeping devices designed to put the national accounts in a more flattering light; without such cosmetic treatment (which the new Administration vows to shun), an ugly deficit upwards of $2 billion would have surfaced."

Proof of the pudding came when the *Wall Street Journal* announced that, during the *first quarter* of 1969, the U.S. ran its only first-quarter trade deficit since 1950, causing the worst three-months imbalance in nineteen years. Canadian financial analyst C. V. Myers observes:

"The U.S. suffered a B.O.P. deficit of $1.8 billion in the first quarter—highest since 1950. At the same time Europeans invested $1.3 billion [in the stock market]. Except for this good luck the deficit would have been $3.1 billion in a single quarter. What happens when foreign D. J. investors decide not only to quit buying, but decide to sell?"

It was the $3.5 billion deficit for *all* of 1967 which prompted the Johnson Administration to institute panicked controls. The 1969 first-quarter deficit amounted to a staggering $6.8 billion on an annualized basis, and the Nixon Administration is openly admitting we are in for a bad year. This means more strains on the faltering dollar and potentially disastrous claims against our seriously diminished gold supply.

Most conservative analysts did not think the dollar would survive 1968 intact, or that the world's currencies could avoid severe devaluations. Although nothing has changed, and none of the problems have been solved, the international monetary structure still staggers along as it was. Predicting the date when the monetary mess will hit the air conditioning is very difficult because of unknown political considerations. That it will do so is now simply a matter of time.

Meanwhile, the monetary time-bomb which was handed by President Johnson to President Nixon ticks away. Nobody knows the exact time of the explosion, because nobody knows the length of the fuse. But Calvin Coolidge, who chose not to run, may have had better foresight than Richard Milhous Nixon.

A sure sign of a decaying civilization is a rising crime rate. And, we are rapidly learning that the wages of "Liberalism" is anarchy. The latest crime statistics divulge a twenty-one per cent overall increase in crime during the first six months of 1968, as compared to the same period in 1967. The figure becomes even more meaningful when one realizes that it is piled on top of a sixteen percent increase for the same period of the previous year, and an eleven percent increase for the year before that. These statistics represent an increase in crime amounting to 109 percent in just eight years.

The new statistics reveal that seventy-six police officers were killed in the line of duty during 1967—bringing the total killed since 1960 to 411. A startling aspect of these figures is that, of the 539 offenders in the slaying of policemen, seventy-seven percent had prior arrest records; two-thirds had been granted leniency in the form of parole or probation, and *thirty percent* were actually on *parole* when they murdered a police officer.

Are America's professional "Liberals" upset by the hideous permissivesness these statistics represent? A typical attitude was displayed by the late *Saturday Evening Post*, which this year decried the "American obsession" with increasing crime. The *Post* editors exclaimed:

"According to a Louis Harris survey, 8 out 10 Americans agree that law and order have broken down in this country. Politicians have exploited this fear . . .

"We are now in the midst of several momentous revolutions that are exerting majestic forces on us but creating little bloodshed. American Negroes are breaking out of thralldom that ranges from prejudice to near slavery, our young people are breaking away from the Establishment. . . . This has been a fierce struggle, but most of the violence has been committed against property, and it is really extraordinary that these convulsive efforts could be as peaceful as they are. . . ."

Young people, absorbing the "Liberal" attitude that mere property need not be respected, are now annually doing $200 million in damage to America's school buildings alone. "Liberals" might properly concern themselves over how many ditches must be dug, nails pounded, or bricks stacked by honest working people to earn the extra $200 million in taxes required to replace such senselessly destroyed property.

Coming in on the same swell as the rising

[3] The following letter is reported to have been recently received by the Federal Reserve Board: "I understand that there is a move to replace the image of George Washington on the quarter with that of General Eisenhower. Since we already have Kennedy on the phony half dollar and F.D.R. on the phony dime, may I suggest we go along and put Ike on the phony quarter, Martin Luther King on a phoney nickel, Earl Warren on a phony penny, and Walter Jenkins and L.B.J. on opposite sides of a three dollar bill. This entire move now seems to present another problem. There is an apparent overwhelming shortage of phony money on which to immortalize all the phonies."

tide of crime statistics, though less susceptible to physical measurement, is the Leftist promotion of perversion among the young. With the Leftist mass media glamorizing the drug cults, for example, a *two thousand* percent increase in juvenile drug arrests in the last eight years has been reported by California Attorney General Thomas Lynch. Mr. Lynch disclosed that juvenile drug arrests so far this year have jumped 165 percent above the first half of 1967. The figures, alas, are typical.

Robert Betts of the Copley News Service researched the effect on young people of the growing degeneracy in the mass media. He concluded:

"Beneath the flood of revolutionary propaganda and exhortations to violence aimed at today's youth is an undercurrent of filth which goes far deeper than most Americans realize.

"For parents to be shocked at youthful pranks is nothing new. What is sinister, however, about the present student preoccupation with sex, drugs and perversion is that it is largely the result of planning and organization. It is the most sinister aspect of the Red youth subversion program. . . .

"The coupling with political propaganda of blasphemous, sacrilegious and vulgar sexual terms used with regard to religious themes and family relationships is a deadly weapon, blatantly used to demoralize and destroy."

Some might assume that the liberation of the young radicals from conventional morality would give them a tremendous feeling of freedom and happiness. That's what *they* would have you believe; but, having interviewed hundreds of them, my experience has been that hippies and New Left activists are as a group enormously unhappy people. This has been confirmed in a less subjective way by a number of studies concluding that the promotion of free love and revolution among the young has contributed to a rapidly ascending suicide rate. Harvard psychiatrist Dr. Matthew Ross, for example, has reported to the American College of Physicians that currently, "Adolescents of college age are the highest potential suicide risk within the population." The professor noted that the suicide rate for college students is now fifty percent higher than for Americans in general of a comparable age. Among all youths in the fifteen to twenty-four age group, suicide is the fourth-ranking cause of death. During 1966, nearly a hundred thousand of our ever more radicalized college students threatened suicide, one in ten of these actually tried it, and a thousand succeeded.

Even though statistics show rising drug usage, vandalism, venereal disease, and suicide among America's radicalized youth, the "Liberals" are pointing proudly to the fact that this is the most politically committed generation ever. They are especially happy because that commitment has been directed Leftward.

The January 1969 issue of *Fortune* magazine revealed the results of a survey of youths conducted for the magazine by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., an attitude-research concern. *Fortune* reported that what would have been "fairly characterized as a lunatic fringe on the campuses" a few years ago has grown into an "important and militant minority." It estimated that about 750,000 American college students now "identify with the New Left." *Fortune* did not note that F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has revealed: "the objective of both New Left and old-time Communists and their adherents in our society is to completely destroy our form of government."

Young persons between eighteen and twenty-four were divided up in the *Fortune* survey into three groups: those who had not been to college; those who go to college for pragmatic reasons (fifty-eight percent of college students), and a group with less tangible goals (forty-two perecnt). *Fortune* calls the latter group the "forerunners," because it "foresees their number and influence growing in the years ahead." According to *Fortune*, these student critics of America "represent the principal intellectual thrust of the oncoming generation." In every category surveyed, the "forerunners" were far to the Left of the "pragmatics," who were in turn to the Left of those who did not attend college.

Since *Fortune* sees the "forerunner" group growing in "numbers and influence" in the coming years, their attitudes are most significant. They "identify themselves as 'doves' who are anti-Vietnam and anti-war in general, who believe the U.S. is a 'sick society.'" Obviously, the "forerunners" listen attentively in class. Eugene McCarthy is the most admired man within this group—followed by Teddy Kennedy, John Kenneth Galbraith, Allen Ginsberg, Communist "Che" Guevara, and Communist Stokely Carmichael. The man most despised by the "forerunners" (and, by a country mile) is George Wallace (seventy-eight percent).

Only nine percent feel strongly against the late Communist murderer "Che" Guevara, and only six percent deeply oppose Marxist Professor Herbert Marcuse. Only eight percent of the "forerunner" group intend to enter business, while fifty-three percent want to enter teaching at some level.

Not everyone is quite as impressed with the "forerunners" as is *Fortune*. Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, a University of Chicago psychologist, told a Congressional Committee recently that the campus revolutionaries are "truants from life . . . fixated at the age of the temper tantrum." Dr. Bettelheim compares the schoolboy Lenins to the Hitler youth. The ideology of the revolutionary German students who helped in the rise of Hitler, he said, "pitted the sons against the fathers," insisted that "the generations cannot understand each other" and are, in fact, enemies; and, in short, "said exactly the same as our rebellious students who insist that nobody over thirty is trustworthy."

Not surprisingly, these "forerunners" have a strong tendency to react in any situation like so many Pavlovian dogs. Recently at Fresno State College a leadership class decided to determine how far the misleaders can lead. This class formed a group named the Malaperts—which means nothing—and then the Malaperts called a campus rally and demanded the most absurd things they could conjure up. They demanded trolleys to transfer students from dorms to classrooms; flood control for the high and dry campus; free beer in the student union; and, that students be allowed to choose their own roommates in the dorms, male or female. Two hundred and fifty students showed up for the rally and 150 signed up with the Malaperts. Campus leaders of the Marxist Students for a Democratic Society announced: "We're with you all the way." When one student shouted, "I stay in touch with campus activities and I've never heard of any outfit called the Malaperts," he was booed off the stage.

The whole situation would be hilarious if the hardcore activists weren't growing more psychotic, and therefore increasingly dangerous, day by day. The militant young Marxists really don't understand that the real Communist revolution is taking place within the Establishment, using their street-bunder activities as an excuse to pull the strings of dictatorship tighter and tighter. The young Leninist types can't understand why the revolution didn't start yesterday, and they are growing more frustrated and organizing for sabotage and other forms of violence. (See American Opinion for May 1969.)

Providing what the Communists call the *agit-prop* for this revolutionary effort is the so-called "underground press," which now publishes five hundred youth-oriented Marxist papers across the country. Another way of spreading the virus of revolution is through classes such as those given by the "Free University" using a building of the University of California at Santa Barbara. One class there is called "The Tactics and Practice of Guerrilla Warfare at U.C.S.B. and in the Santa Barbara Community." A mimeographed sheet announcing the program states that it "will cover strategies and will hold drills"—providing instruction in "how to hold a building against police attack; to conduct hit and run missions; to defend against police harassment; to sabotage military-industrial-police functions; and, to get the community involved through terrorism."

At the first meeting of the above training center an outline was distributed which stated that "it is the purpose of this class to give the people who are already convinced that the government needs to be overthrown a method of overthrowing it. . . . The method of teaching this class will be to take abstract strategies of guerrilla warfare and to apply them, in the classroom and in the field, to the environment of Santa Barbara and the UCSB campus specifically."

Never to be outdone, the University of California at Berkeley is offering a course in urban revolution, with the opportunity to receive academic credit. Professors for this effort are S.D.S. founder Tom Hayden, and Dr. Herbert Marcuse, an avowed Marxist popular with European student Leftists who coined the chant "Marx, Marcuse and Mao." The course is sponsored by the Center for Participant Education, which last fall sponsored lectures by Communist Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver.

Robert Betts recently prepared a six-part series on how the Communists organize and manipulate campus disorder. In that nationally syndicated series, appearing in the *San Francisco Examiner* and a number of other major newspapers, Mr. Betts noted:

"Americans don't have to look for Reds under the bed. They can be seen almost any night on television—leading a college riot or mingling in the melee like extras in a movie crowd scene. They're not all card-carrying members of the Communist Party. They are defined not by whether they pay party dues, but by their actions, their vocabulary, and the way they always manage to be where the trouble is.

"Those who keep close watch on the unfolding pattern of subversion [law enforcement Intelligence personnel] in this country can pick them out easily.

"The average American sees only turmoil and shakes his head over the 'impetuousness of youth.'"

The primary organization of the New Left is the Students for a Democratic Society, about which F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has stated:

"Unfortunately, much of this unrest and violence was instigated and precipitated by a subversive force which is growing in numbers and militancy. It is called the New Left, and at its core is the organization known as the Students for a Democratic Society.

"The concept of violence as an instrument to destroy the existing social order is as inherent in the philosophy of the New Left movement as it is in the philosophy of the old-line Communists who have worked for years to undermine this nation from within.

"This was particularly evident at the national convention of the Students for a Democratic Society."

Associated Press recently quoted S.D.S. National Secretary Mike Klonsky as reporting that S.D.S. membership now stands at 100,000.

In addition to its normal routine of driving spineless deans to distraction, Students for a Democratic Society has three stated projects. One is to abolish R.O.T.C. on the nation's college campuses. It has already forced many schools to deny academic credit

for the military training courses. What is it all about? Simple: The Army gets half its new officers from R.O.T.C., the Air Force forty percent, and the Navy thirty percent. Columnist John Chamberlin explains:

"If they had their way, the S.D.S. authoritarians would render a nation of 200 million prey to the blackmail of Soviet Russia on its eastern flanks, Maoist China in the Pacific, and Fidel Castro anywhere south of the Caribbean.

Project Two of the S.D.S. is to bring the revolution down from the universities into the high schools. Much of the propaganda for this movement comes from the so-called "underground" newspapers now published by many high school revolutionaries. The number of such Marxist papers is confirmed at *five hundred* by Dr. B. Frank Brown, director of the Institute for Development of Education Activities, Inc.

The third major S.D.S. project is to infiltrate factories for the purpose of "achieving solidarity with the working class" and to propagate sabotage. Labor columnist Victor Riesel writes of the S.D.S. plan:

"There are regional and group 'coordinators.' Last year they sent 130 students into the shops, stores and mills in New York, Rochester, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Baltimore and Newark. Now the coordinators, operating on the theory that there can be no American revolution without the working class, and war material shipments cannot be halted without this same proletariat, are escalating their infiltration."

Still it is the college campus which absorbs the overwhelming effort of the New Left. Thus, when the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, said that rioters there would be expelled, one could hear a collective gasp from the halls of ivy to the shores of 'Frisco Bay. It is said that the mass inhalation caused vacuous low pressure areas resulting in windstorms from high above Cayuga's waters to Cal's symbolic Campanile.

The *Wall Street Journal* cites a "typical reaction" to Hesburgh's position from an administrator at California's San Fernando Valley State College: "If we had taken Father Hesburgh's stand, the place would probably have burned down." As it was, Black Militants only did $100,000 in damages, held a Dean overnight at knife point, and forced a written promise of no reprisals. The President of a "prominent liberal arts college in the East," who refused to allow the *Journal* to use his name, stated in impeccable Liberalese: "He has taken a simplistic approach to a complicated problem. It isn't fair to mislead so many people—including the President of the United States—into thinking that this hard line will result in restoration of peace on the campus. I haven't talked to a single college or university president who feels this is a good solution." That gives you a pretty good idea where the administrators of our schools stand, and why the student revolutionaries dare be so bold.

Dozens of universities during the current year have been besieged by arson, bombings, beatings, kidnappings of administrators, and the capturing of school buildings by renegade students. Yet the Neville Chamberlains in the halls of ivy only purse their lips and wring their hands. It is obvious that many of the student revolutionaries know that they either have a soft touch or a secret ally in the administration and push accordingly.

Dr. Charles B. Huggins, Nobel laureate in physiology and medicine at the University of Chicago, has made these perceptive comments on the handling of student demonstrators:

"Liberals are famously capable of handling demands that originate from their right. Their defenses are well organized, their responses are facile yet firm, their knowledge of what is negotiable and what is non-negotiable is unmistakably clear. In contrast, liberals are almost completely incapable of handling demands that issue from their left. Complaints from the left confuse the liberal. Complaints from the left automatically weaken him by implication that he is not liberal enough. Demands from the left make him feel illegit. And the liberal feels this way regardless of the actual, substantive character of the demands.

"Facing left, the liberal frankly cannot distinguish a good demand from a bad one, for voices from the left remove his bearing. . . . The liberal faces right with a forthrightness and honesty. He faces left with hypocrisy." [4]

Time and again the campus Leninists have instituted revolutionary activities only to go unpunished. Columbia University, for example, arranged to have those students arrested during last spring's siege turned over to the school for "punishment." Despite the fact that the students proudly admitted violating both civil law and University regulations, Columbia's disciplinary tribunal imposed no penalties whatsoever on the young revolutionaries. This incredible decision was taken in order "to re-establish student relationship to the University." The campus Reds won complete amnesty for actions that, when they occurred, had been deemed worthy of criminal prosecution by civil authorities. Do you think any of those students quit S.D.S. because of Columbia's leniency? Or, is it more likely to have augmented their contempt for the poltroons who run the school?

Stanford recently suspended a number of students for an academic quarter. The crime was invading the Stanford Research Institute and occupying it for over a week; but, again, the punishment was mere tokenism to calm alumni and public opinion. Suspended students were not even restricted from campus. Now, the suspended revolutionaries can devote full time to agitation at the school. The fact that it will take them an extra quarter to graduate undoubtedly leaves them less than heartbroken.

Then there is *Hahvaad*, sometimes mispronounced "Harvard" by middle brows, home of the crème de la crème of the Liberal Establishment. National F. Review Jr., the Establishment's favorite conservative and a Yale man, lampooned Harvard's President Nathan Pusey and his fellow administrators for the spinelessness they displayed during the April unpleasantness at that institution. Even a Yale graduate could see that as an Administrator Dr. Pusey has a limp wrist. He tried to get his deah, deah revolutionaries released, but a local judge refused to grant a University request to drop charges against 169 ersatz Lenins. Those found guilty were fined (hold your breath) the grand sum of twenty dollars. One hundred thirty-nine are appealing the "sentence." Certainly the Pusey-cats are smiling. But, not everyone at Harvard is smiling. As J. C. Helms, a Harvard graduate student, wrote to the *Wall Street Journal:*

"The problem at Harvard is not SDS. The problem is not the use of police, nor is it the student strike. The problem is the Harvard faculty: Its lenience, its blindness and its cowardice.

"On April 9 several hundred students seized University Hall by force. They came armed with crowbars for smashing windows and chains to secure the doors once they were inside. They evicted nine deans, dragging some of them through the halls: One was even carried out, slung over a student's shoulder. They physically beat an undergraduate in University Hall who was not in sympathy with their action: He was alone, and five of them held his arms and his hands while two others beat him . . . the next morning one of their leaders urged a mob of many hundreds to pelt President Pusey's house with rocks.

". . . How can it surprise us that such an incident occurs, when last year a mob of students held an interviewer from Dow Chemical Co. prisoner for seven hours, and the university did next to nothing . . . ?

"Can our faculty not see the damage that will surely come to this university if it is not made crystal clear that lawless force can never be permitted here? Or is the faculty always blinded by the argument that these militant moralists are fighting in a good cause?

"I think it's time somebody called nonsense nonsense. I think it's time somebody called nuts nuts. Isn't this the generation that wants to tell it like it is? Why, then, is everyone mincing words? The students who occupied University Hall are violent people; they do not belong here. Their wrongdoing is not just youthful restlessness; it is not just misdirected idealism. It is a crime, and those who committed this crime should be expelled immediately and never allowed to return."

If students faced expulsion for participating in such violent demonstrations, the chaos would dry up faster than water in the Sahara. Yet, the National Student Association has reported that of 39,000 students who were involved in rioting during the first half of 1968, only thirty-nine were permanently suspended. The Fire and Police Research Association reveals that, in more than twenty-five years, no student has ever been expelled from the University of California—the focal point of the national student revolution.

Many are wondering why the alumni of our harassed colleges don't temper their benevolence until such time as college administrators move and move hard against the campus revolutionaries. Harvard went so far in provoking its alumni over the student strikes there this spring that the issue of *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* for April 28, 1969, was bound in a cover displaying a red, clenched fist—the international symbol of Communist revolution.

The truth of the matter is that most universities, including many private ones, are now getting so much money in federal grants that they are no longer dependent upon the benevolence of old grads. Mr. C. L. Dickinson of the Institute of Humane Studies, and a former employee of the Stanford University business office, relates that Stanford now receives nearly $50 million a year—seventy percent of its total income in government research grants. Like so many other prestigious schools, Stanford is no longer a private institution, but for all practical purposes a federal university.

Stanford's situation is not atypical. "Liberal" columnist Joseph Alsop writes that the federal government paid Harvard just under $64 million last year—of which $20 million went to the faculty of arts and sciences. "As to the U.S. academic world as a whole," Alsop says, "the overall federal subvention to the universities has now reached $4.4 billion a year, even after subtracting all funds for defense contracts. Of this huge sum (far, far bigger than the federal subsidies to education of poor children) $3.3 billion takes the form of student aid and other straight subventions that have nothing to do with any kind of research."

Congressman Paul Rogers of Florida has demanded that Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch stop financing those arrested in demonstrations. Rogers as-

[4] When dissidents took over the administration building at the University of Chicago, Dr. Huggins called a press conference and denounced the invaders as "adolescent ugly ducklings." He called the takeover a "criminal act" and said: "This was a hijacking and we are on our way to Cuba." The "hardcore," Dr. Huggins told newsmen, is part of the International Communist Conspiracy which seeks "to bring America to its knees."

certained that "of the 549 students arrested this school year for participating in campus disorders at San Francisco State College, 122 were receiving federal financial assistance. . . . Yet there has been no indication that this assistance has been terminated."

Who is financing the revolution against the U.S. Government? Why, the U.S. Government, of course.

Revolutionary Black Nationalism spread during the year from the inner cities onto the campus as the most militant of ghetto youth were provided with government scholarships. Once on campus, these Black thugs, far from appreciating the opportunity provided them, formed coalitions with white thugs to disrupt the schools. If university administrations were loathe to enforce discipline against white radicals, they were positively appalled at the thought that Blacks should have to obey the rules. This year the Blacks brandished weapons—including guns, spears, and clubs. Next year, you may assume, they will probably use those weapons as the radical movement requires constant escalation to maintain its momentum.

Who is to blame? Clearly, the school administrators who waived entrance requirements to bring the academically unqualified militants onto the campus in the first place. Demands made by the Black Student Unions and similar organizations varied only slightly from school to school. Typical demands included: all Black flunk-outs are to be reinstated; abolition of the indignity of grades for Black students; admission of Blacks to the college without meeting *any* entrance requirements; that Blacks be allowed to attend classes when and if they feel like it; and, that after four years all collegiately registered Blacks be awarded a degree. Such requests are deemed quite reasonable by many "Liberals," but some cynics have suggested that it would be infinitely cheaper to issue every Negro child a college diploma at birth.

Of course, those who suffer most from such demands are the qualified Negro students who earned their way into school, most of whom are in the library or laboratory while their dullard brothers are threatening to torch the "racist honky college." The qualified Negro student realizes that if Negroes are given college degrees, without having to earn them, his own diploma becomes worthless.

When the above demands are met, the tribal chiefs among the militants cook up a few more "non-negotiable" demands for Whitey. A standard demand is for the establishment of "Black Studies" departments. White college administrators have been falling all over themselves establishing these little horrors. Black Studies are so ludicrous that even oldtime Negro Leftists like Bayard Rustin have ridiculed them. Rustin actually asked college officials to "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students . . . and see that they get the remedial training that they need." Bayard claimed the Black militants are looking for "an easy way out of their problems." As he phrased it: "What the hell are soul courses worth in the real world? In the real world, no one gives a damn if you've taken soul courses. They want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence." Rustin added: some white professors desire a "revolution by proxy" and are using unwitting Negroes to this end.[5]

It is possible to have legitimate courses on African history and culture, although the field is somewhat limited by the absence of primary written sources. Nonetheless, most of what is masquerading as Black Studies amounts to no more than courses in Hate Whitey. Even "Liberal" columnist Joseph Alsop is concerned about Black Studies becoming studies in Black Mythology and revolutionary propaganda. "In short," Alsop writes, "the question is whether 'black studies' are going to be historically truthful and therefore intellectually respectable and academically valuable. . . . Unhappily, any practical-minded person can foresee that 'black studies' will too often fail to meet the above mentioned tests . . . if they are commonly organized in the way now demanded. Hate-promoting readings in Frantz Fanon are more likely to be emphasized. And so will black-racist bosh like the claim once made by the New York leader of the Revolutionary Action Movement, Herman Ferguson, that there had been 'an Anglo-Semitic plot to conceal the leading role of the universities of Timbuktu' in all of Western progress and science."[6]

Earlier this year, two U.C.L.A. students who were members of the Communist Black Panthers were shot to death with .38 magnums in a campus building while participating in a "discussion session" over who would control the U.C.L.A. Black Studies program. The two executioners were members of a rival Black Communist group called *US* (for Us Slaves) headed by psycho-fanatic Ron Karenga, an officer in the Republic of New Africa.

Ironically, the two dead Panthers were attending U.C.L.A. on government scholarships in a program which, other than being Black, had but two primary qualifications: first, you must *not* have graduated from high school; and second, you must have spent time in prison on a felony charge. Those qualifying, believe it or not, are called "high potential students."

Naturally Cornell, the victim of the most brazen takeover by armed scholarship students, is now in the process of instituting a Black Studies program. Cornell President James A. Perkins, you will recall, caved in to all the Black demands. The *Chicago Tribune* reports that Cornell is considering hiring James Turner, a graduate student in sociology and African studies at Northwestern, to be director for Afro-American studies. Turner is described by Perkins as "militant but responsible." The *Chicago Tribune*, however, seems to know a great deal more about Mr. Turner than does President Perkins. It notes:

"[James Turner] manifested his militancy in May, 1968, by leading more than 120 black students in the occupation of Northwestern's old administration building, housing its costly data processing equipment and financial records, and demonstrated his responsibility by marching them out when Northwestern accepted all their demands, confessed guilt of white racism, apologized, and begged forgiveness . . . . If he declines the offer, Cornell might try to get [Communists] Robert F. Williams or Eldridge Cleaver . . . ."

In the meantime, other revolutionary savages are raising money by blackmailing the masochist leadership of our "Liberal" churches. Communist James Forman, an officer in the Maoist Black Panther Party and also S.N.C.C.'s Director of International Affairs, has presented demands to the Episcopal Church for $500 million in "reparations" for Negroes—to come from all white churches and synagogues. The demand is contained in a "black manifesto" adopted in Detroit during May by the National Black Economic Development Conference (N.B.E.D.C.). The Conference was sponsored by the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (I.F.C.D.). According to the official Communist newspaper, *The Daily World*, speakers at the affair included Communist Milton Henry of the Republic of New Africa; radical socialist Julian Bond of the Georgia State Legislature; former football star Jim Brown, whose specialty is beating-up women; Fannie Lou Hamer, of the Marxist Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; and Marxist James Boggs, writer for a Mau-Maoist Communist sheet called *The Liberator*.

As you might guess, the money collected is not to be distributed on a pro-rata basis to Negroes, but is earmarked for specific N.B.E.D.C. projects like the establishment of Maoist collective farms in the South—a Republic of New Africa project.

Reception of the demands has been mixed. Bishop Stephen Bayne, First Vice President of the Episcopal Executive Council, declared: "I welcome the manifesto because any sinful man, black or white or any other color, needs to be confronted with a demand for justice." California Episcopal Bishop C. Kilmer Myers described the demands by these Communists as reasonable, and added: "I do think the figure is a little low. I think the church is far more wealthy than you imagine. You are so right respecting the miserable response the church has made to this terrible injustice." As would be expected, the Union Theological Seminary is also supporting the reparations demands. The United Presbyterian Church flew Comrade Forman to its convention and applauded his speech, and top leaders of the National Council of Churches also expressed an appreciative tolerance.

"We're not begging," Communist Forman told the N.C.C.'s 250-member board, "we have a right to demand." Forman is candid about what he advocates. The *New York Times* quotes him as stating, "Whether it takes a thousand years, the economic problems of black people—and whites, too, for that matter—are not going to be solved unless there's a revolution that takes money away from the few rich whites who run this country." Since his demands have received such sympathetic backing from church leaders, Forman has upped the ante by an unspecified amount. His goal has been shifted above the $500 million mark, "to ask for a percentage of the assets from stocks, bonds, capital investment and unrelated business incomes of all the churches."

---

[5] Typical of the concessions of which Rustin speaks is the recent approval by the Academic Senate of the University of California at Santa Cruz to name the seventh college of the school after Communists Malcolm X as demanded by Black militants and their supporters.

Corroboration of Rustin's thesis of whites promoting "revolution by proxy" came recently from S. I. Hayakawa in testimony before a Senate Subcommittee. Dr. Hayakawa accused rich white radicals of recruiting black militants on American campuses to be "cannon fodder in a revolution." He told the Senators: "To use a phrase I detest, but which in this instance is all too descriptive, white revolutionaries, by their largesse, are making 'house niggers' of their black allies."

"And when the crackdown on revolutionary activities comes," he said, "it will be the black who will go to prison, not the whites who fed them, taught them their Marxism and egged them on." Hayakawa contends "that many of today's black militants are being pushed into revolution by white revolutionaries, including wealthy people from outside the college community.

The acting president of San Francisco State told the committee that black militant rhetoric stems from Communist classics dating back a half century or more: "But whites are doing much more than giving them words to recite and arguments to use. . . . They help blacks with money, food, jobs and transportation. Blacks in trouble with the police at San Francisco State are usualy bailed out promptly and given expert legal help. By these means blacks are recruited to be cannon fodder in a revolution planned by whites."

[6] Not all of the Black Studies curricula are academic. Federal City College in Washington, D.C., offers a course in physical development to "strengthen the body and discipline the mind," including akikdo, karate, and the African hunt and dance.

Comrade Forman's parent I.F.C.O. group is naturally a tax-exempt organization which, according to the *Chicago Tribune*, has distributed $885,831 since its founding 2.5 years ago—eighty-three percent of which went to groups involved in militant or disruptive activities.[7]

James Forman, you will remember, is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Black Panthers, a paramilitary Communist organization. Panthers are required to carry their "little Red book," *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, with them at all times. Like the New Left, the Panther movement is growing rapidly. Assistant F.B.I. Director William C. Sullivan recently reported that less than a year ago the Panthers claimed 125 members, all in Oakland, California. Today, they are operating in twenty-four cities with more than sixty thousand sympathizers. Their publication, *The Black Panther* (whose specialty is advocating mass assassination of police), has doubled its circulation in just a few months and now boasts forty thousand subscribers from coast to coast.

True, the Panthers are having *some* trouble. For example, twenty-one Panthers have been indicted on charges of conspiracy to murder, arson, and weapons violations stemming from their plot to set off bombs in the New York department stores of Macy's, Bloomingdale's, E. J. Korvette, Alexander's, and Abercrombie & Fitch. The bombs were to have been detonated at the height of the Easter shopping rush. In addition, the Panthers planned to dynamite the tracks of the New Haven branch of the Penn Central Railroad at six points, and to bomb the Morrisania Police Station in the Bronx as a diversionary action. As New York Supreme Court Justice Charles Marks put it: "The crime here, if carried out, could have resulted in the deaths of hundreds, even thousands." It almost *was* carried out. Police who had infiltrated the Panthers foiled the operation but *one* day before it was set to be triggered.

The Republic of New Africa is another organization very similar to the Black Panthers. The principle object of R.N.A. is the establishment of a Negro Soviet Republic in the South—a Communist Party project which dates back to at least 1928.[8] The demands of R.N.A. are simple. All it wants is the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina, plus $400 billion in reparations. Remember that R.N.A. founder Milton Henry is part of Forman's group seeking reparations from the churches.

The R.N.A. is only a little over a year old and its membership is limited, but the Communist line behind it has many adherents. Robert M. Hutchins, Director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, says ghettologists estimate that about thirty percent of the Negro slum-dwellers are now advocates of such black separatism. According to Robert Sherrill, writing on R.N.A. in *Esquire* for January 1969, this "comes to a million or so Negroes eager to make the break and who are—according to the timetable of New Africa's politicians-in-exile—ready right now to get things started with guns."

According to Sherrill, Comrade Milton Henry's strategy seeks to establish the Republic of New Africa in these steps:

"(1) Arm the black communities of the North and West, and if whitey tries anything rough, blast hell out of him. . . . (2) Ship about a million well-armed blacks into Mississippi, take over all of the sheriffs' jobs through the ballot box, seize the government, and then move on to Alabama and repeat the process; the next three Southern states would be seized in no special order, but it would be done in the same way, by shipping in armed blacks who would first try to grab the government by voting and, if that didn't work, by guerrilla warfare."

According to Milton Henry, the shift of black Comrades to Mississippi has already begun. He states:

"We have bought a hundred acres in Mississippi. That isn't much land but it is sufficient for a base headquarters. Like the Jews moving into Israel we will start to organize along the lines of cooperative and collective farms. You have to be able to feed your people. But the collective farm does more than just provide food. It's a center where people can get together, can politic themselves and can protect themselves."

You will recall that $200 million of the money Communist James Forman hopes to blackmail from the churches is earmarked for buying property for collective farms in the South. You will also recall that Communist Milton Henry is a charter member of Forman's extortion gang. In fact, he may really be the head of it. Are the pieces starting to fit?

They *should* be!

According to Henry:

"The reason we are setting up a Black Legion [R.N.A.'s army] is so we will get our votes counted. If you bring in enough voters to take over a county, that gives you a sheriff. If you are wise in selecting your county—particularly in the Mississippi delta—you will have a large number of blacks to build with. Then we will have a legitimate military force, legitimate under U.S. law, made up of people who can be deputized and armed. The influence we will then exercise over the whole area of Mississippi will immediately be disproportionate to the numbers under our command. If we had only four sheriffs down there, with all that can be done with deputizing, we could change the state of Mississippi."

The R.N.A. is convinced that with the U.S. Army tied down in Vietnam or elsewhere, and the threat of major guerrilla warfare in all major cities, the government will negotiate. Says Henry:

"We've got second-strike power now in our guerrillas within the metropolitan areas—black men, armed. Say we started taking over Mississippi—which we are capable of doing right now—and the United States started to interfere. Well, our guerrillas all over the country would strike. Our second-strike capability would be to prevent the United States Armed Forces from working us over, not the local forces. The local forces couldn't compete with our forces. . . . They [the U.S. government] can't win in Vietnam and they can't win in the United States. We can fight from within. How are they going to get us out of here? Where would they make the guns to shoot us—in the United States? Do you think we are just going to let them keep on making guns? How will they transport their guns and soldiers—on railroad trains? The United States can be destroyed [by sabotage and guerrilla warfare]."

What happens to the industries and farms of the South? Henry replies:

"We keep them. We take them and we keep them. The United States would pay reparations. . . ."

Author Robert Sherrill asked a number of white Southerners whether they would stay if R.N.A. took over. A typical reply came from former Mississippi Governor Paul Johnson, who said: "I would stay. I surely would. For one thing, I own a great deal of property here. It's not hard to make a real fine living for your family and loved ones." With all due respect, former Governor Johnson doesn't quite get the picture.

And, alas, that's just the problem. Americans *don't* get the picture. On Easter weekend, revolutionaries marched fifty-thousand strong in the streets of New York City to support the Communist Vietcong; our politicians are already preparing to turn Vietnam over to the Communists; Communist-led riots in our streets and colleges have become commonplace; inflation is eating up the American dollar; the socialist dole has reached an all-time high; judicial permissiveness has tied the hands of our police as crime explodes all over America; smut, revolution, and pornography are pushed at our children from every conceivable source; Communist sabotage and violence are sweeping the country.

What is happening is that the Communists are moving in on America—and doing it fast. It's time we *all* "got the picture." When we do, we will stop them and stop them cold. Until we do, however, the *Scoreboard* figure for the United States is going to continue to be frighteningly high.

[7] The *Chicago Tribune* lists the following organizations as financing I.F.C.O., which in turn is presenting the demands of the Black Communists to American churches: American Baptist Home Missions Society; Board of Homeland Ministries of the Church of Christ; Board of Missions of the Methodist Church; Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church; Executive Council of the Episcopal Church; General Board of Social Concerns of the Methodist Church; American Jewish Committee; Catholic Committee for Urban Ministry; National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; and Foundation for Voluntary Service.

[8] And, the line is still a part of the official Communist program. The November 1968 issue of *Political Affairs*, official theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A., carried an article credited to top Comrade Claude Lightfoot entitled "The Right of Black America to Create a Nation," identified as material discussed at the Special Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held in July of 1968. As the title implies, the article supports the establishment of a Negro Soviet Republic in the American South.

GREAT LAKES AREA TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the decline in the Great Lakes shipping fleet over the past decade is alarming leaders of business and industry in the States bordering the lakes. Mr. John J. Dwyer, executive vice president of Oglebay Norton Co. of Cleveland, now points out that both lake steamship and railroads in the Great Lakes region are in serious trouble. In brief, not enough new investment is going into either rail or lake transportation to keep up with the economic growth of the region. A new program of business cooperation and improved coordination between railroads and lake vessels is badly needed if investment in new ships and additional rail equipment is to be unblocked. In a recent address to the Toledo Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Dwyer offered some thoughtful suggestions on how this might be accomplished. Following is the complete text of Mr. Dwyer's remarks:

TRANSPORT EFFICIENCY AND OUR LAGGING REGIONAL ECONOMY

In the traditional spirit of business optimism in a time of affluence and prosperity when we are worrying about too much demand, I should be talking to you this afternoon about the onward and upward trend of the general economy. If the gross national product continues to increase at its present

rate of about 4 per cent a year, we will be turning out double the amount of goods and services in 15 years than we are today.

We read these figures and we look at our order books and the fantastic capacity of the American economy to absorb goods and services and we relax. It's all coming our way—all we have to do is keep on doing what we're doing and the flood tide of expansion will continue.

I am here today to say to you that in the Great Lakes Region there are signs of a perceptable, but apparently inexorable, trend that is beginning to worry some of us. The plain fact is that other parts of the country are growing faster than we are. The rate of growth of the states bordering the Great Lakes is slowing down. We are losing out in the fierce competition for the location of new industry and the expansion of old. We are losing out mainly to the South, the Gulf Region, the Southwest and the West Coast.

One important measure of growth is the trend in personal income. The U.S. Department of Commerce periodically analyzes regional changes in personal income. The latest analysis published in April of this year shows the Great Lakes Region lagging slightly behind the national rate and substantially behind gains registered for the Southwest, Far West and Southeast.

The article in the Department's "Survey of Current Business" commented: "The Great Lakes region, which had been classified as either trendless or as having a slightly declining trend on the basis of developments during the 1930's and 1940's, evidenced a persistent and significant downtrend during the 1950's. In retrospect, it appears that the increased demands that the Great Lakes economy received as a result of World War II and the subsequent durable goods boom provided a powerful but short-term boost to the region. This was only partially repeated (and to a significantly lesser extent) during the 1960's, under similar circumstances of increased war production and another durable goods boom."

Another indicator is the growth in human resources. Whereas the U.S. as a whole showed an increase of 8.1 per cent in population 1965 over 1960, according to the Bureau of Census, the Great Lakes Region increased 5.5 per cent. A census projection shows our region increasing 4.3 per cent between 1965 and 1970 compared to a 6.5 per cent increase for the nation as a whole. The projection runs out to 1985 and shows our regional increase to be consistently less than the national average.

Through 1966, our region also lags the U.S. average in expenditures for new plant and equipment. An index of Bureau of Census figure using 1952 as a base year, shows expenditures for new plant and equipment in 1966 at 254 per cent of the 1952 level for the U.S. as a whole and 239 per cent for the Great Lakes Region.

The Great Lakes Region is justly proud to be the nation's industrial heartland. In value added by manufacture the Great Lakes states account for almost as much of the total value added by manufacture as all the other regions put together, again according to the Bureau of Census. But there is a disturbing trend. In the *non* Great Lakes states, the value added by manufacture in 1966 amounted to $129 billion dollars, up 400 per cent since 1947. For the Great Lakes states, the comparable figure was $122 billion, an increase of 289 per cent since 1947. Over the same period, California increased its value added by manufacture 534 per cent. At the end of 1947, our region accounted for 57 per cent of the total for the nation; by 1966 that percentage had fallen to 49.

Is the Great Lakes Region maintaining its competitive position versus other regions of this country? And, also, I should add, versus other countries in the struggle for world markets? Will current trends accelerate? What chances are there for a reversal of unfavorable trends and what do we need to do about them?

I do not propose to answer all these questions, here, but I hope others will consider them as we are doing in my company. Our region has great advantages. Not least is a skilled and work-minded labor force. We are close to rich supplies of raw materials and close to the largest markets in the nation. We have the management know-how to out-produce and out-compete other regions of the nation. All the means to hold and improve our competitive advantage seem to be available to us, provided we use those advantages expertly and efficiently.

But there is one important aspect of the economy which is in serious trouble—the lowest cost modes of transportation, lake vessel and railroad. I suggest that in the employment of rail and water transportation major inefficiencies are developing. For a region committed to heavy industry, which requires, if it is to maintain its competitive edge, the lowest possible cost transport for large volumes of raw materials and heavy volumes of semifinished products, trouble among the low cost modes of transportation is indeed bad news for the region. Some idea of the importance of transportation to the competitive efficiency of the region may be obtained from the fact that 10 cents of every dollar of gross national product goes into the cost of transporting freight. And for low value commodities such as coal, freight costs may go as high as 40 cents on the dollar. What is the problem? First, investment is not going into either lake or rail transportation in sufficient volume to keep up with the growth of the region. And second, rail and water coordination of service, which traditionally contributed so much to the growth of the region, is being abandoned. As a result our region is failing to make use of the most efficient organization of its transport resources. A major change in this crucial area of the regional economy could well make for more efficient use of existing resources and, at the same time, unblock the way for much-needed investment in transportation and thus repair the weakest part of the region's economy.

Our company operates a fleet of lake ships but we are also, for other segments of our business, heavy users of rail transportation. For example, Oglebay Norton loaded 176,527 rail cars with 12,000,000 tons of traffic last year. A rail industry in trouble is of great concern to us because railroads are essential to the competitive marketing of the commodities we manufacture and mine. It is of no comfort to us to hear that the railroads in our territory are falling far behind the needs of the region in new investment in cars and facilities. For heavy industry, which both rail and water serve, this lag is critical. Lake transportation can't expect to be healthy, if industry finds rail freight cars unavailable and turns to more expensive means of transportation, adversely affecting its costs and therefore its ability to compete in domestic and foreign markets.

It is disturbing to hear Mr. Stuart Saunders, Chairman of the Penn Central, say of his new investment needs, as he did before the Railroad Progress Institute recently, and I quote: "We are not spending nearly enough. We ought to be spending 50 per cent or 75 per cent more than we are now. And I think that is true of every railroad in this country. The reason we are doing so is because we do not have the resources to do it with. Our rate of return is so poor, our financing possibilities so meager because of the low rate of return, and this applies generally to the railroad industry, we are not able to acquire the equipment we should. And furthermore, we are not able to carry on the research that is necessary to develop new types of equipment because our earnings are not average."

That's bad news for the Great Lakes Region.

It does not please us to hear William B. Johnson, President of the Illinois Central Industries, testify in recent ICC hearings, and I quote: "It is thus clear that many of our investment dollars have been made to maintain present service and that we have been unable to make the added investment that is necessary to keep pace with the industrial growth of the region."

That's bad news for the region.

We do not like to read that the C&O–B&O suffers from an "inability to replace or modernize equipment facilities" and that even such a relatively prosperous line as the N&W has been "forced to postpone investment needs in covered hopper and coiled steel cars."

That's bad news for the region.

Incidentally, our company testified in support of the C&O–B&O merger in the belief that adequate investment resources would be made available.

If one were to stand back and look at all the competitive advantages of one region over another in this country—climate, access to market, skilled workers, capital resources, raw materials, transportation—the single advantage that would or should jump out at you about the Great Lakes Region is the simple fact of the broad water highways of the lakes themselves. To say that lake transportation is as cheap as pipeline transportation is really to understate the advantages of the lake vessel. It has been customary to talk about lake transportation as a system which can deliver freight at 2/10ths of a cent per ton-mile, about the same as the charges for pipeline transport. This should also be compared with the lowest cost land transportation—by rail—of half a cent a ton-mile. I am talking here of the most efficient "unit train" service. Under the "unit train" concept, the train is in almost continuous movement stopping only four hours to load and four hours to unload. According to a Department of Transportation study, cars under the "unit train" system move 75 per cent of the time compared with 10 per cent of the time for ordinary rail movements which have an average rate per ton-mile of 1.3 cents. A 100-car train moving 75 per cent of the time over 2 to 3 hundred miles will deliver in a 12-month year about 1,000,000 tons of coal at half a cent a ton-mile.

Mile-for-mile, a modern 20,000-ton capacity lake vessel is more efficient. It will deliver 2,000,000 tons over similar distances in a nine-month season for less than half the rate of the most efficient rail service.

That's the economic advantage of the floated ton in the most modern vessel currently in operation. However, no new vessels have been built since 1959 and in the intervening decade much has happened. Ten years ago the Sault St. Marie locks limited the size and therefore the capacity of lake vessels to about 27,000 tons. Today, the new Poe locks permit vessels with a carrying capacity of 40,000 to 50,000 tons. The most efficient self-unloader today puts 3,000 tons of coal an hour on the shore. New equipment now under design could put 10,000 to 15,000 tons an hour on the shore, shortening vessel time in port from 8 to 12 hours to about four hours, greatly improving turn-around time and vessel capacity. Automated engine rooms, better designed hulls, and many other refinements would, on a new Great Lakes self-unloader built today, make possible a piece of floating machinery at least twice as efficient as the ones now operating.

But you will be astonished to hear that, despite a willingness on the part of managements throughout the Great Lakes Region to invest in new ships, no new ships are being built other than one for U.S. Steel and one for Bethlehem Steel, both of which are intended for private use. Unless we

change some of our current transportation policies, they cannot and will not be built.

We must join efforts to maximize the use of the region's transport resources by connecting the most efficient rail service with the most efficient water service. The ready availability of coal, ore and limestone at very low cost has long been the region's principal competitive advantage. A program of enlightened cooperation, rather than conflict, between rail and water would seem to be most in the region's interests.

Despite all the potential for improved efficiency of the Great Lakes steamship, the fact is that lake transportation is declining as a factor in the regional economy. Admiral James A. Hirshfield, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, recently testified that while in 1953 there were 403 American-flag bulk cargo ships with a lift capacity of 3.5 million tons, in the current season, there are only 228 vessels with a total carrying capacity of 2.7 million tons. The reduction in number of vessels is 43 per cent and in carrying capacity 23 per cent.

This is bad news for the region.

But this is only part of the story. The fact is that, unless present regulatory policies are changed, as I believe they are certain to be if we all work together to change them, the self-unloader fleet, almost certainly the most efficient dry-bulk transport system ever devised, is in danger of being phased out of existence by the mid-1970's.

That would be bad news for the region.

The reason for this situation is older than civilization. Everyone is taking the short term view. The railroads, the coal companies, the steel companies, the auto manufacturers, the electric utilities—all without exception are failing to see the advantage that can be achieved in the long run if we work together in accordance with sensible economic principles for the advantage of the region. As a result, our livelihood is beginning to drift away from us—not significantly yet, but still perceptibly.

What is the answer? I can tell you what it is in the transportation field. And I don't have to spell it out for Toledo or any other Great Lakes port which continually suffers from rail rate discrimination.

We simply have to make a permanent breakthrough *now* on improving rail and water coordination at the lake ports both for domestic commerce and international commerce, and achieve new and sounder standards for rail and water competition and cooperation.

Let's not criticize past actions of the railroads. But I do think we have a new situation, new pressures and new opportunities which call for new policies and new methods of attack.

First, we have the beginning of an undeniable drift of industry away from the region. Second, the railroads themselves say that they cannot afford to make the investment in transport equipment that is necessary to maintain the growth of the region.

The crucial new principle to be established is that competitive success should depend on superiority in economic performance, not in the abuse of economic power. An example of such abuse is the refusal of railroads to provide their most efficient service to lake ports with the purpose of excluding lake carriers from participation in the market.

If a fair principle is established we can use the facilities we have to the best advantage and the capital resources at our command to re-establish the region's competitive edge. If it is not, an important asset of the region will remain unused and further slippage of our livelihood will occur.

As one major effort in this direction, the Lake Carriers' Association has launched a landmark case before the Interstate Commerce Commission to require railroads to provide a parity of service, distance considered, from Southeastern Ohio coal mines to Toledo, Sandusky, Lorain and Ashtabula as they provide for their all-rail service.

Cost study after cost study has demonstrated that the most efficient use of transport resources is achieved when there is a combination of the most efficient rail and the most efficient water services. We need not go into detail here about the rail rate structure which prefers Atlantic ports to Great Lakes ports on foreign commerce, and adds to our costs of competing for foreign markets. This is a well-known problem. Less well-known is the problem our company and others have recently been facing in attempting to persuade the railroads to give "unit train" service on coal to the Great Lakes ports for transhipment to U.S. destinations. The railroads regularly provide such service for Canadian destinations. Our problem is simple. A rate of $2.15 a ton from the coal mines of southeastern Ohio is charged for a 355 miles all-rail haul to Detroit. A higher charge of $2.635 per ton is made for a much shorter haul, the 191 mile haul to Ashtabula. No matter how efficient the lake vessel is, there is obviously no way it can share in this traffic, despite the fact that the rail plus lake service is more efficient—that is, lower in overall cost—than the all-rail service. By maintaining an artifically high rate to the port, the rail-lake route is squeezed out of the picture.

The lake vessel industry is dependent on reasonably priced railroad service to the lake ports to perform its essential function. Manipulation of rates to the ports which foreclosures any opportunity for the lake fleets to participate in the traffic regardless of efficiency removes both the lake industry and the prod of competition of water transportation to the railroads. Without the prod of competition, rail rates inevitably will drift upward. The more they are allowed to increase, the less competitive the region becomes with regions where effective barge or ocean vessel competition exists.

The facts are now too well established for this issue to be ignored. Toledo, which in 1968 shipped 19,239,086 tons of coal out of total Lake Erie shipments of 27,995,163 tons, has the most to lose if rail-lake coordination falls apart. Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority and all the Great Lake ports are active in our support in the Lake Carriers' Association case. But we must have clear understanding of the problem among the business community in the Great Lakes Region. Our company and other companies are today prepared to begin the construction of even more efficient Great Lakes vessels than now exist which could make an even greater contribution to the improvement of the efficiency of production of the region than is possible today. But, as a detailed study by the well-known accounting firm of Ernst & Ernst recently demonstrated, any investment in new Great Lakes vessels would be foolish unless the principle of parity of rates, distance considered, by railroads to Great Lake ports is clearly and permanently established.

On the one hand the railroads complain that they lack resources to provide the service the region needs. Except where they feel the competition of water transportation, they are embarking on a program of rate increases which adversely affect the competitive position of the region. On the other hand, the steamship interests would willingly invest tens of millions of dollars in new steamships using the most advanced and efficient technology to carry essential freight at less than half the lowest rail charge, a service which would materially improve the competitive position of the Great Lakes industries.

I come back to my basic theme. All of us need to take the long view of the best interests of the region. We need better cooperation between rail and lake interests from the standpoint of the enlightened self-interest of each as well as the region as a whole.

I think that rail-water cooperation could readily be produced, if organizations such as yours and individual corporations with a major long-term stake in the prosperity and growth of the region could appreciate, as our grandfathers did, that the number one asset of this region is the low cost water highway of the Great Lakes.

It may well be that a new determination by the ICC to enforce present laws requiring rail and water coordination is the remedy needed. It may be that new legislation must be developed.

In our country, however, by far the most effective channel for getting things done has always been voluntary action by business groups which are concerned with the long range interests of the public. In the water carrier industry, we are dedicated to finding new ways to cooperate with railroads, but it takes two to make cooperation work. I am confident that those interested in maintaining sound growth of the Great Lakes Region can make meaningful progress on this vital issue of using the region's transport resources in the most efficient manner possible. Perhaps the best way to get this launched would be to have a special fact-finding Commission of business leaders appointed by the Governors of the Great Lakes states with an urgent charge to make early recommendations or perhaps special hearings by the Great Lakes congressional delegation would bring out both the facts and the needed remedies. Solving this problem will, I am sure, go a long way to revising the lag that is beginning to show up in the region's growth.

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN THE 1970'S

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is no longer enough to think of manpower programs and policies solely in terms of the Nation's current public and private employment needs. The scope of our social problems, the rapid pace of technological change, and the pressure to set national priorities for the years ahead compel us to take a broader view of our manpower resources and requirements. However rudimentary the effort may be, it is becoming increasingly important to make projections of our manpower needs for as much as a decade ahead and more.

The National Planning Association has made one of the more ambitious attempts to pull together and analyze the information involved in such projections. Leonard Lecht, a staff member of the association's center for priority analysis and author of several previous books on manpower policy, has recently written "Manpower Requirements for National Objectives in the 1970's."

Recognizing that the successful implementation of each of our national goals will require not only money but also employees skilled in specialized occupations, Lecht has attempted to relate the series of goals listed by President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals to the

civilian labor force necessary to carry out those goals.

Both the size and quality of the labor force needed for such a monumental task point up once again that we must move from a hodgepodge of categorical programs to a comprehensive manpower policy and that we must develop manpower training programs designed to meet the needs of tomorrow as well as of today. As the various public and private agencies involved in formulating our national goals set forth their priorities, it will then be necessary to adjust our manpower resources accordingly. Whatever the priorities turn out to be, it is difficult to see how they will be achieved, unless we develop the skilled manpower without which those goals cannot be achieved. A sustained manpower development and training effort of this magnitude will require an approach such as the one recommended in my "Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969," H.R. 10908.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this point the chapter in which Mr. Lecht spells out some of our basic goals and indicates the manpower resources needed to implement them successfully.

The chapter follows:

MANPOWER NEEDS FOR NATIONAL GOALS IN THE 1970'S

(By Leonard Abe Lecht)

GOALS ANALYSIS AND MANPOWER NEEDS: A SUMMARY VIEW

The nation's goals can significantly affect manpower requirements and employment opportunities. The impact of Medicare and Medicaid in enlarging needs in the health occupations or the role of the space program, in the early 1960's, in increasing the demand for engineers, and scientists, offer recent, and sometimes striking, illustrations. Similarly, pursuit of national objectives, as in education or manpower training, can add to the supply of manpower in a variety of occupations and skill levels. The activities we undertake to make progress toward achieving our society's goals, accordingly, can be expected to constitute an important influence in the coming decade in determining the volume of employment, the occupational composition of employment, and the prospects for bottlenecks or surpluses in specific occupational fields.

Many organizations and many agencies are concerned with the nation's future manpower needs. The U.S. Department of Labor, for example, publishes projections indicating the probable level of employment in a number of occupations in the next ten years.[1] The U.S. Office of Education prepares estimates of requirements for teachers in the coming decade, and the National Science Foundation has published similar projections for scientists, engineers, and technicians.[2] These estimates represent expected manpower needs to meet coming production requirements, or growth in school enrollments, or the anticipated increases in spending for research and development by universities, industry, and government.

This report is also concerned with projections of future manpower requirements, but it analyzes them from a different standpoint than that of other organizations and agencies—namely, from the perspective of the manpower needed for the achievement, by 1975, of an illustrative set of national goals designed to provide over-all improvement in the pattern of American life. The findings are based on a study conducted by the National Planning Association's Center for Priority Analysis and undertaken for the Manpower Research Office of the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. Implicit in the study is the recognition that manpower bottlenecks in critical occupations can constitute as serious a barrier in achieving goals as insufficient funds.

Concern with the nation's goals, as with manpower needs, is, of course, nothing new. What is new is the degree of concern with our society's purposes, with the quality of life, and with narrowing the differentials in opportunities for fulfillment available to individuals in the United States. This concern is evident in the quadrupling (in current dollars) of federal expenditures for skill development and social welfare in the 1955–67 period,[3] in the establishment of a cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development, and in the decisions of private groups, as in Detroit, to sponsor programs for rebuilding and revitalizing their strife-torn cities. The same interest is present in the past administration's choice of terms such as "The Great Society" to describe its long-range domestic goals, and in the work of a host of voluntary organizations that educate, lobby, and publicize for better education, for measures to cope more effectively with poverty, for programs in mental health, for the preservation of our parks and wilderness areas, and for a variety of other purposes.

The activities described as the pursuit of national goals typically represent activities we select piecemeal as pragmatic responses to specific individual and national problems, activities we sometimes blunder into, rather than constituting programs consciously selected because they contribute to our society's goals. Home builders, developers of industrial parks, or local mass-transit authorities, to cite examples, seldom view what they are doing as part of a massive aggregate of expenditures and resource commitments concerned with the nation's urban development objectives. All told, the private and public outlays that contribute to urban development were probably larger than the expenditures for national defense in the years before the increase in defense spending caused by the war in Vietnam. In 1962, the most recent year for which comprehensive information is available, the total spending for urban facilities in the United States was nearly $68 billion (in 1964 dollars) or about 25 per cent larger than expenditures for national defense, which amounted to almost $54 billion (see chapter 2, Table 2–2). However, this total included a mass of individual details that were frequently unrelated to an over-all concept of metropolitan area needs and the means for serving them. The net result of these expenditures, in a number of instances, has been to make the city less hospitable to human habitation by adding to congested traffic, to patterns of residential segregation, or to polluted air. In the absence of a framework of information about the costs, benefits, manpower needs, and side effects of individual programs, which relates them to the over-all objectives they may further or frustrate, the choices implemented often create unanticipated problems that cancel out the anticipated benefits, or they reflect the options of narrowly based pressure groups and special interests.

Where and how we assign priorities in a democracy is determined by the decisions of firms, trade unions, and consumers, and by legislation enacted at all levels of government, rather than by experts. Goals research attempts to contribute to these decisions by increasing the information available for making choices. In this regard, goals analysis can indicate the probable dollar costs and resource requirements for particular goals, and whether our output is likely to be adequate for our aspirations. Research can demonstrate where rapid expansion in the pursuit of different goals in the same period of time is likely to create serious competition for the same manpower and material resources. Education and research and development are instances. Goals analysis can also highlight the areas where greater progress toward the achievement of some objectives such as transportation and health, can add, over time, to the resources available for other purposes by eliminating costly bottlenecks or by increasing the productivity of the labor force.

This kind of research becomes increasingly pertinent as the successful blending of fiscal, monetary, and manpower policies gives evidence of a significant breakthrough in the nation's ability to realize full production and full employment on a continuing basis. With these advances, our society has become more concerned with utilizing the enlarged potentials created by the economy's growth in resources for the pursuit of specific social and economic goals directed at furthering individual well-being and meeting national needs. It has also come to be generally recognized that public programs and private activities aimed at narrowing the gap between our achievements and our aspirations in health and education, in modernizing and expanding our industrial plant, in research and development, and in other areas can contribute substantially to over-all economic and employment growth.

In 1960, the President's Commission on National Goals issued a report listing a series of goals in fifteen areas affecting most aspects of American life.[4] The commission's report was significant in that a group of outstanding leaders from different walks of life reflected in it a growing concern with the nation's objectives and recognized the importance of a critical examination of our goals. The list was increased to sixteen with the addition of space exploration after the late President Kennedy proposed, in 1961, that it become a national objective "to put men on the moon and bring them back."

The NPA, recognizing the need for providing information about national goals and their interrelationships, established the Center for Priority Analyses in 1962. Later, standards for achieving goals in each of the sixteen areas were formulated by the NPA from special studies, recommendations of bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences, legislative hearings legislation, and national policy. The standards for the goals reflect current developments and current opinion in these areas and, separately, they represent levels of achievement regarded as reasonable and within reach on the basis of present knowledge and within a free enterprise system.

The sixteen areas of concern defined as goals include virtually all sectors of the private and public economy, and they account for almost all of the national production. They offer a framework, therefore, for relating the use of the nation's resources to its aspirations. As the initial step in developing this framework, the NPA's Center for Priority Analysis undertook a two-year study of the dollar cost of achieving all sixteen goals in the 1970's.[5] These dollar estimates provide the point of departure for the projections of manpower requirements in this report.

The areas for which goals have been defined and "priced out" are as follows:

1. Agriculture. 2. Area redevelopment. 3. Consumer expenditures. 4. Education. 5. Health. 6. Housing. 7. International aid. 8. Manpower retraining. 9. National defense. 10. Natural resources. 11. Private plant and equipment. 12. Research and development. 13. Social welfare. 14. Space. 15. Transportation. 16. Urban development.

Some of the goals such as consumer expenditures or housing, are concerned with individual well-being. Others—education is

Footnotes at end of article.

an instance—involve the well-being of individuals, and they also affect the economy's potential for growth in productivity and output. Several of the goals are directed at removing the adverse effects of economic change on groups of individuals. Area redevelopment and manpower retraining are illustrations. Others—for example, the private plant and equipment goal—make their contribution by increasing the productive capacity available to provide the additional output needed to achieve the other goals.

In many areas, the role of public authority is minimal; for example, consumers determine the manner in which they spend their income. In others, public authority alone determines the standard and makes decisions controlling expenditures; national defense is an example. In still others, the federal government uses its resources to encourage private firms and municipalities to undertake more adequate programs; rebuilding the blighted areas of the central cities—urban development—is often such an instance.

Most of the activities for pursuing national objectives involve expenditures in the private or the state and local government sectors of the economy. Nonetheless, they presuppose the combined use of the federal government's fiscal, manpower, and monetary policies as a means of translating the economy's potential output into a larger volume of disposable resources so as to realize social and economic goals more effectively. If the nation were to accord a high priority to rebuilding urban facilities, both as a social goal and in order to sustain economic growth in the next decade, shortages of skilled manpower in strategic building trades could create bottlenecks that would frustrate the effects of enlarging public and private expenditures. Similarly, the absence of policies assuring a sufficient supply of long-term credit at reasonably low interest rates could negate the attempts of private groups or state and local governments to use available manpower to reduce significantly the backlog of facility needs in urban areas. Training and employing the manpower required for urban development, in turn, could itself be a major factor in reducing the unemployment and poverty among nonwhites that has contributed so substantially to the decay of the inner city. Rebuilding the nation's cities, as indicated in the projections for the urban-development goal, could create an estimated 1 million jobs for nonwhites in the coming decade (see chapter 4).

The estimates of dollar costs and manpower requirements for the aspiration goals have been derived from the quantitative relationships their achievement would require. The improvements considered in the education goal, to cite an instance, have taken into account such factors as the ratio of teachers and related professionals to students, increases in the compensation of faculty, and the additional classroom, laboratory, and dormitory space needed to accommodate the larger percentage of the school-attending age groups who are expected to be in school. The standard for the housing goal includes the cost of rehabilitating or replacing the substandard housing units, estimated at 6 per cent of the total, that are expected to remain in the housing inventory in the mid-1970's. The dollar-cost projections for the specific goals are listed in chapter 2 (see Table 2-2). A summary of the standards for the sixteen goals can be found in Appendix C.

In the budgets of governments and private organizations, requirements for attaining future objectives are usually stated in terms of dollars, and dollars serve as the common denominator for adding up and comparing the manpower and capital needs involved in the alternative courses of action available for pursuing objectives. Similarly, the estimates of dollar costs for the aspiration goals provide a useful first step in determining the claims on resources involved in the achievement of different national objectives. However, dollars and the GNP represent an incomplete and sometimes misleading picture of the bottlenecks and feedback effects likely to arise from pursuing goals that frequently require different kinds of resources drawn from many segments of both the public and the private economy.

The limiting factor in attaining a goal such as health is very likely to be an insufficiency of doctors, scientists, nurses, laboratory technicians, and other trained personnel. Moreover, the kinds of manpower problems that must be considered depend on the particular program involved. Thus, $1 billion spent for the space program entails radically different manpower requirements and, consequently, education and training needs, than the same amount spent to eliminate slums. This implies that we must also consider time as an important factor since it typically takes between five and ten years before plans for significantly increasing the nation's supply of scientists, teachers, or physicians can be translated into additional facilities in higher education and into larger enrollments and more degrees awarded in these fields. On the other hand, goals whose manpower requirements consist largely of semiskilled factory operatives or service workers will usually require training courses of considerably less than a year's duration.

The techniques used in arriving at the manpower projections consist basically of translating the dollar-cost estimates for the aspiration goals into expenditures for the output of the industries that contribute to their pursuit (see Appendix A). The relationship between output and employment in each of these industries in the early 1960's, together with the anticipated changes in productivity, supply a basis for estimating the total employment in the different industries in the mid-1970's needed to produce the output each would contribute to the various goals. The employment levels estimated in this way have been distributed, by industry, into approximately eighty detailed occupations, with additional estimates of the distribution of employment by race and sex in each occupation. The occupational distributions reflect the changes in the composition of employment during the 1950–64 period. They also reflect judgments based on the available evidence concerning the probable impact of technological advances, such as the use of modern data-processing equipment, for employment in the occupations likely to be affected by these changes. The NPA's projections of the GNP, labor force, hours of work, productivity changes by industry, and similar variables have provided the economic framework for the estimates of output and employment in this report.[6]

The over-all conclusions of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. Full achievement of the sixteen goals by the mid-1970's would require an employed civilian labor force of more than 100 million—some 10 million more than are expected to be in the civilian labor force in 1975.

2. Vigorous pursuit of these objectives in the next decade, therefore, would probably be associated with an insufficiency, rather than a surplus, of manpower. The resulting manpower problems are likely to focus on upgrading through education and training, making better use of existing manpower potentials, and improving mobility, rather than concentrating on the issues posed by a high rate of unemployment and underemployment.

3. Substantial progress toward achieving the goals considered could be a major factor in creating more and better job opportunities for the country's unutilized and underutilized human resources, especially nonwhites, women, older workers, and the handicapped.

4. The kinds of jobs the economy will need in the 1970's will be significantly influenced by the nation's choice of priorities. Assigning a high priority to objectives in health or education would primarily increase the demand for white-collar workers. Emphasis on goals in urban development or transportation would largely increase the demand for blue-collar workers.

The projections of manpower requirements in this report represent the anticipated consequences for manpower utilization of attempting to attain, in the next ten years, a series of national objectives as they are currently conceived. In this sense, the estimates refer to social rather than to market demand. Yet, in a society in which priorities and expenditures often undergo marked changes in response to emerging problems and opportunities, many of the unmet social demands of the present are likely to be translated into market demands for manpower and other resources in the next five or ten years. Employment projections that attempt to take these aspirations into account can often provide a basis for anticipating future changes in job opportunities and manpower needs, which would be lacking in extrapolations reflecting the nation's current priorities and expenditure patterns.

The assumed GNP, labor force, or productivity estimates that provide the economic framework for the projections are "best guesses" as to how the forces that have shaped the economy in the past decade are likely to change in the next one. The introduction of different standards that are also reasonable could result in a somewhat different structure of manpower requirements. The historical data on which the estimates are based is sometimes conflicting and often surrounded with a considerable, and partially unknown, margin of error. Yet, after allowing for these uncertainties, what the estimates fundamentally test are two hypotheses. The first is that our society faces a problem of defining its priorities in the use of manpower resources because, in the next decade, these resources are unlikely to be sufficient to achieve all goals fully. The second hypothesis is that the nation's choice of priorities, and the weight assigned to each, can make for significant differences in the occupational composition of employment and, to a lesser extent, in the total volume of employment. The findings of the study are consistent with these hypotheses.

Looking toward the next decade, it is anticipated that, with growth in GNP approximating 4.5 per cent a year between 1964–75 (in constant dollars), total civilian employment will reach a level of approximately 88 million in the mid-1970's.[7] This implies an average growth in civilian employment of 2 per cent a year over the decade. Achieving all sixteen goals is estimated to require the employment of 101 million people by 1975, or an annual increase in civilian employment averaging 3.4 per cent. In the absence of major productivity increases considerably beyond those of the recent past (see chapter 2), the measures to obtain the labor output of the equivalent of an additional 13 million people could involve such changes as a longer work week, shorter vacations, postponement of retirement, recruitment of more female heads of families into the labor force, or if these measures prove inadequate, government wage policies to encourage increases in the supply of labor and in its allocation by industry and occupation. While a small part of the deficit in manpower could be compensated for by reducing the unemployment rate to its peacetime minimum of between 3 and 4 per cent of the labor force,[8] the magnitude of the required increases in manpower make it reasonable to anticipate that achieving all goals simultaneously would entail "forced draft" pro-

Footnotes at end of article.

grams unlikely to be acceptable in peacetime.

It is apparent that our society possesses the resources to make substantial progress in attaining most, if not all, goals in the next decade. With advance planning to develop the manpower potentials and technology for pursuing more effectively our social and economic goals, we could reconstruct the central cities, significantly reduce, if not eliminate, poverty, and increase the availability of medical care for Americans to the degree necessary to render obsolete present statistics indicating that almost a dozen nations have lower infant mortality rates than the United States. Yet, it is unlikely that our manpower resources would be adequate to realize the targets for all goals at the same time. If this were our objective, the anticipated shortages of manpower would be paralleled by a deficit in output estimated, in 1964 dollars, at about $150 billion by 1975 (see chapter 2). Hence, the need for priorities—for choices—to determine what is to come first as a claim on our manpower and material resources.

Consideration of the barriers to realizing national objectives posed by manpower limitations also points to the need for seeking ways and means to reduce the discrepancies between aspirations and resources. Full utilization of the economy's manpower is probably the least costly step in increasing the volume of output available for whatever priorities the nation chooses in the coming decade. Even in the year 1964, to cite a recent example of a "prosperity" year before the impact of the Vietnam buildup on the economy, the unemployment rate for those in the 16–24 year ago group who were not enrolled in school was nearly 10 per cent.[9] If this rate had been reduced to 4 per cent, an additional 570,000 young people would have been at work. The output produced by the employees in this age group, largely made up of less-skilled and experienced workers, was probably smaller than the 1964 average GNP produced per worker of $8,700. Assuming that the average output of the younger workers was one-fourth less, reducing their unemployment rate to 4 per cent would have added $3.7 billion to the nation's output. Similarly, the persistence for over a decade of an unemployment rate among nonwhites double or more the white rate represents opportunities foregone for increasing the resources at the nation's disposal to expand the pursuit of our objectives as well as a source of simmering discontent in a large and rapidly growing segment of the population.

Emphasis on the gap in resources for attaining goals underscores the necessity for making choices rather than the desirability of diminishing aspirations. From this viewpoint, the task of policy and, essentially, of politics is to reconcile the claims arising from different objectives and to keep a multitude of competing claims within the constraints set by the nation's resources. Current differences of opinion concerning the weights to be assigned to these claims are apparent in the discussions of the desirability of concentrating scientific and engineering recources on landing a man on the moon by 1970 and in the widespread concern that the scope of the resources required by the military operations in Vietnam will continue to lessen significantly the resources at hand to pursue "Great Society" programs at home.

As a democratic and relatively wealthy nation, we shall very probably, in the 1970's, be pursuing all sixteen goals considered in this study. The choices in pursuing national objectives in the next decade are not as likely to concern the global manpower or dollar totals for each goal as they are to involve the consequences of a greater or a lesser priority assigned to a variety of objectives in the public and private sectors of our society. Should urban land be used for more highways and parking lots or for additional parks and other recreation areas? Should the federal government hasten the advent of the supersonic and, eventually the hypersonic transport plane by underwriting their development, or would the same expenditures and the claims on manpower they represent yield a greater return if used to expand programs for developing the nation's vast undersea resources or for perfecting an automobile powered by electricity, steam, or perhaps, by fuel cells, which would be free of the contaminants currently polluting the air? Will the world role of the United States in the coming decade require a larger proportion of the economy's resources for national defense and economic aid to the developing nations, or should a larger percentage of the nation's output be allocated to higher levels of personal consumption or to more effective elimination of the blighted areas in the central cities? Each of these choices has its particular pattern of manpower requirements.

The available choices and the manpower needs they are likely to generate suggest the need for advance planning to make possible the increases in manpower supply that are significant for realizing national objectives receiving a high priority without creating bottlenecks elsewhere in the economy. For example, according to the Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower, to fulfill the purposes of the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act extending family and child welfare services would require 49,000 more social workers by 1970 than were employed in these programs in the mid-1960's.[10] By contrast, employment in social work increased by an average of only 4,000 a year between 1950–60.[11] Attaining the objectives included in the urban-development goal would involve an estimated annual growth in employment for carpenters, to cite an instance, of about 7,000 a year over the next ten years. Yet, the pool of people employed as carpenters decreased by 50,000 between 1957–65.[12] Planning to enlarge opportunities for education and training and to increase efficiency in the use of our manpower resources, as these illustrations indicate, is a strategic ingredient in the programs for implementing national priorities in the next decade.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For a recent example of these projections, see Allan F. Salt, "The Need for Skilled Workers in 1975," *Monthly Labor Review*, April, 1966, pp. 365–71.

[2] See U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1974–75* (1965); and National Science Foundation, *Scientists, Engineers, and Technicians in the 1960's* (1964).

[3] National Planning Association, Center for Economic Projections [NPA, CEP], *National Economic Projections to 1976–77* (1966), p. 18, Table III.

[4] See the American Assembly, *Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals* (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960).

[5] See Leonard A. Lecht, *The Dollar Cost of Our National Goals* (Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, 1965); and his *Goals, Priorities, and Dollars: The Next Decade* (New York: The Free Press, 1966).

[6] See NPA, CEP, *American Industry in 1976 and 1985* (1964); *Revised Statistics of Output, Employment, and Productivity, 1947–1985* (1965); *National Economic Projections to 1974* (1964); and *National Economic Projections to 1975–76* (1965).

[7] This estimate assumes an unemployment rate of 3.9 per cent in 1975.

[8] A reduction of 1 per cent in the unemployment rate is estimated to increase civilian employment by 900,000 in the mid-1970's.

[9] *Manpower Report of the President* (1965), p. 187.

[10] U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Closing the Gap in Social Work Manpower: Report of the Department Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower* (1965), p. 3.

[11] U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, Detailed Characteristics*, PC(1) ID (1960), p. 528, Table 202. Estimate refers to social, group, and welfare workers.

[12] U.S., Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Employment Statistics: Sources and Data* (1966), p. 8 (mimeo.).

WORD MERCHANTS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the following advertisement in the New York Times that if Congress will only adopt the O'Brien-Kappel-Johnson-Nixon-Blount bill to establish a corporation to operate the postal service, never again will a letter be late; never again will a package or letter be lost or damaged; never again will deliveries be cut, and never again will postage rates go up.

If only citizens will open their purses, say the Madison Avenue word-slingers, and contribute to the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., utopia in the form of a postal corporation will await them, and if you do not believe that write to your nearest Congressman for a copy of the O'Brien-Kappel-Johnson-Nixon-Blount bill.

Here is the Madison Avenue approach:

THIS COUPON AND A 6-CENT STAMP MAY SAVE YOU $1,000,000,000

Every year, the U.S. Post Office runs a deficit of over one billion dollars.

One billion dollars.

That's about five dollars for each and every man, woman and child in the United States.

That's one billion dollars that could be used to rebuild our cities, educate our children, lower our taxes, feed our hungry, improve our medical care, retrain and upgrade our police.

And yet, despite the billion-dollars-a-year deficit, our postal service seems to get progressively worse. Mail is late, letters and packages are lost or damaged, rates go up, deliveries are cut back.

Changes are obviously—and desperately—needed. How can we get them?

A BIPARTISAN ANSWER: TOTAL REFORM

President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount have sent to Congress legislation for total postal reform: H.R. 11750. This legislation includes proposals originally made by Lawrence F. O'Brien when he was Postmaster General. These proposals were later endorsed by the President's Commission on Postal Organization appointed by President Johnson, of which Fred Kappel, former Chairman of AT&T, was Chairman.

The objectives of HR 11750 are:

Reorganization of the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis as a nonprofit TVA-type government agency under a charter from Congress.

Dependable and efficient mail service at reasonable prices with modernization of outdated facilities.

Better working conditions and increased career opportunities for postal employees with true collective bargaining between labor and management.

HR 11750 stands for total postal reform.

Total postal reform is essential to provide better mail service, better jobs for postal employees—and lower costs for taxpayers.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Various special interests, for one reason or another, are opposed to the O'Brien-Kappel-Johnson-Nixon-Blount proposals in HR 11750. They would keep the deficit-ridden, inefficient, antiquated postal service as it is with very little change. These opponents of efficient mail service are making a lot of noise. It is time that the tax-paying, mail-using public is heard from, too.

YOU HELP IN THESE WAYS

1. Write your congressmen in support of total postal reform: specifically HR 11750, on which hearings are now being held in the House of Representatives.

2. Fill out the coupon and join our Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.

3. Contribute to the Citizens Committee, so that we can have the funds to wage a true grass-roots campaign for a modern, dependable, reliable, economical United States Postal Service.

As a former Postmaster General and Chairman of the Democratic National Committee and as a former U.S. Senator and Chairman of the Republican National Committee, we have joined hands in a bipartisan spirit to save the mails. Will you help us—and yourself?

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Cochairman, Citizens Committee for Postal Reforms, Inc.

[Coupon]

To: Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.
Post Office Box 19321
Washington, D.C. 20036

I wish to become a member of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.

I wish to contribute $—— to the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.

Name: ----------
Address: ----------
City: ---------- State: ------ Zip: ----

WAITING FOR THIEU

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for real political negotiation if the Paris talks are to succeed is admirably underlined in the following editorial from the New York Times of June 30:

WAITING FOR THIEU

The tendency in Washington and Paris to ascribe the stalemate in the Vietnam peace talks to the intransigence on the part of Hanoi and the Vietcong is a sound bargaining tactic, but not necessarily accurate. The lack of a Communist response—so far—to President Nixon's 25,000-man troop reduction and his expressed hope of withdrawing all American ground combat forces before 1971 was to be expected.

From the beginning of the Paris talks, the United States has tried to discuss troop withdrawal. The Communists have insisted that the political future of South Vietnam be settled first. In their ten-point peace plan, the Vietcong made a concrete proposal on how to do it; coalition government, both to conduct elections and to rule the country afterward. President Nixon, in his eight-point reply on May 14, agreed to discuss both issues together. But neither then, at Midway nor since has President Thieu produced the long-awaited counterproposal for a political settlement. Mr. Nixon rightly wants Saigon, rather than Washington, to advance it.

"I know," Mr. Nixon said on June 19, that President Thieu "will be making an offer of his own with regard to a political settlement." Saigon resented this needle, but until that offer is forthcoming—and unless it contains a real basis for negotiation—the other side is unlikely to open serious substantive discussions in private.

Mr. Thieu undoubtedly faces complex problems at home in attempting to devise a political proposal adventurous enough to entice the Communists into talks yet conservative enough to achieve a concensus in Saigon. But until he overcomes those problems, progress in Paris is unlikely. Mr. Thieu reportedly is contemplating a proposal for a mixed electoral commission, with Vietcong participation, to conduct elections in 1970—all of which requires amendment of the South Vietnamese constitution by an absolute two-thirds majority of Senators and Congressmen.

The White House is recruiting a panel of experts to study detailed proposals by Cyrus Vance, the former American deputy negotiator in Paris, for a standstill ceasefire.

The attraction of this proposal would be three-fold if the Communists agreed. It would halt the killing. It implies a division of power through negotiation confirmed by elections—which is more realistic than expecting either side in South Vietnam to stake its future on the outcome of a truly free election (even if such a Western concept could be applied in Asia). Finally, it indicates in advance the outcome of the political negotiation: local control by the forces on the ground—a kind of provisional partition of South Vietnam leading to a federal structure. With local autonomy leaving the Vietcong secure in regions they now control, they might settle for a minority role at the center.

President Nixon's moves to reduce American forces should encourage the Communists, as well as Saigon, to get on with peace negotiations. Unilateral American troop cuts lessen the domestic political pressure on Mr. Nixon to end the war. A Gallup poll shows 40 per cent of Americans in favor of a more-rapid pullout than the President has ordered against only 16 per cent who favor a slower rate.) Yet the withdrawals would leave American aid and logistical support for the South Vietnamese Army—and, probably, some ground combat forces in reserve. To get American troops out completely, the Communists will have to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

But those negotiations cannot begin until Saigon and Washington put their political proposals on the table. A second and more substantial American troop cutback may be needed to get Saigon to face its responsibilities.

TAX REFORM PROPOSAL ON MUNICIPAL BONDS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, one of the tax reform proposals now under consideration in the Ways and Means Committee is whether or not to change the tax-exempt status of interest paid on municipal bonds. Legislation on this same subject was introduced in the 90th Congress. At that time I stated:

The financial plight of the State and local governments in America today is one of fiscal poverty.

We are still faced with this great need to strengthen the fiscal base at the local level. The tax reform proposal either to limit or remove the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds would hamper capital improvements and discourage local initiative and innovation. The problem of excessive use of loopholes by some taxpayers is one the Congress must face and act upon early and effectively, but this is not the way to do so.

I have received a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cincinnati, expressing opposition to this proposal and, I submit it for insertion in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY COUNCIL OF CINCINNATI

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has under consideration several proposed plans which would remove entirely or limit the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes of interest paid on bonds issued by state and local governments; and

Whereas, among those suggestions under consideration by the Congress are proposals which would

(1) include interest paid on state and local bonds in the base income for a proposed minimum income tax,

(2) require allocation of deductions between taxable income and income from interest paid on state and local government bonds,

(3) include interest paid on state and local bonds among income which would have tax preference limitations,

(4) provide a guaranty subsidy in exchange for the surrender of all or part of such traditional tax exemption; and

Whereas, it has long been considered unconstitutional for the Federal government to tax a state or local government; and

Whereas, any of the foregoing plans or any other plan which would directly or indirectly tax interest paid on state or local government bonds would be an impairment of such constitutional immunity; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on state and local government bonds would result in higher interest rates to be paid by state and local governments in their borrowing, pushing the cost of money beyond tolerable economic limits and in many cases beyond legal maximum interest rates; and

Whereas, any increase in cost of borrowing is paid directly by the taxpayers of the community borrowing or by the users of publicly owned facilities, thus shifting the burden of additional cost directly onto local property taxpayers, who would be unwilling or unable to carry such additional burdens; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on state and local bonds would limit the market for such bonds; and

Whereas, any limitation of the market in which state and local bonds are sold would handicap state and local governments in providing funds for urgently needed public improvements; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Cincinnati, State of Ohio:

That Council by this resolution expresses its opposition to any plan by the Congress of the United States that would in any way limit the tax exempt status of interest paid on bonds issued by state or local governments.

Be it further resolved that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of Council and that the Clerk of Council send copies thereof to the President of the United States, the Senators from Ohio, Representatives from Hamilton County, and to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

Passed June 18, 1969.

EUGENE P. KUEBLER,
Mayor.

Attest:

R. A. MACDONALD,
Clerk.

CONGRESSMAN HOGAN TACKLES CRITICAL INDUSTRY LEGISLATION

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, In the June issue of Contractor News, I have read a timely article in which my good friend and colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, expresses his views on various issues which will confront the Congress in the months to come. Because these matters are of concern to us all, I would like to bring this message to all the Members of the House and, therefore, commend the following article to my colleagues:

U.S. CONGRESSMAN HOGAN TACKLES CRITICAL INDUSTRY LEGISLATION

Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Maryland) is one of the few United States Congressmen who can discuss construction industry problems with authority.

Before winning a seat on Capitol Hill last year, Hogan was a familiar figure in construction industry circles. His list of industry clients included the National Council of Specialty Contractors, the Washington Association of Plumbing Contractors, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. and the Washington Building Congress.

Hogan, an ex-FBI agent, also found time for politics in his busy schedule. After leaving the FBI in 1958, he worked in various campaigns including John F. Kennedy's last senatorial campaign and Kennedy's preconvention presidential drive.

Residing in a predominantly Democratic county, Hogan set out to "even up the odds" as a Republican candidate for Congress. Last year he became the first Republican in his county elected to any office in 16 years. Hogan garnered more votes than any candidate from either party had ever received—in the history of the county.

After Hogan's election, Contractor News' editor, Pete Cockshaw, called the congressman for an interview. Cockshaw, who had worked with Hogan on industry problems before his election, asked the Maryland lawmaker to speak out on critical legislative proposals that affect construction.

The Cockshaw-Hogan question-and-answer interview follows:

Congressman, what major legislation do you think will be considered by this Congress that directly affects construction?

Common situs picketing is one bill under study. There may be some activity regarding construction safety. Multi-employer certification, bi-lateral promotion, general contractor certification, retention of 14(b) in Taft-Hartley, and a bid-listing bill may receive action.

I understand that upwards of 12,000 bills are introduced each Congress. This means that only a relative handful can possibly receive serious consideration. That being the case, which of the construction industry proposals do you feel will get serious consideration?

The two to watch are situs picketing and construction industry safety. During his campaign last year, the President called for some form of safety legislation affecting the construction industry. Safety is an emotional issue. Everyone favors safety just as everyone opposes crime but we have to be careful that we don't create more problems than we solve by calling for unrealistic changes.

I plan to study the proposed safety bill recently brought to the attention of the House Education and Labor Committee by the Associated General Contractors. I understand that this bill has been endorsed by a number of management groups in the industry, including the Contracting Plasterers' and Lathers' International Association and others.

I don't think I could go along with the safety bill which some labor unions are pushing. It is vague, all punitive and it gives the Secretary of Labor too much power in my opinion. I am all for safety as everyone is. But I won't vote for a bill just because it is labeled a "safety bill." I want to make sure it is a good bill.

I hope the AGC proposal is workable. There's no question about it; we do need safer working conditions on construction jobs. It's a serious problem. I hope that we can come up with a solution in this Congress.

What about situs picketing?

Situs picketing is definitely going to be an important piece of legislation this year as it has been for eighteen years. But I don't intend to support situs picketing in any form—because the principle of situs picketing is repugnant to me. It is just not right to say that because one small trade of say, two men, walk off a multi-million-dollar project, that other workers on other aspects of the job can walk off and shut down the whole project until the dispute in question is settled.

How about multi-employer certification? Will it go anywhere this year?

Well, first, the contractors will have to agree on *something*. In the last Congress, a bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Dominick at the request of the plasterers' Joe Baker. However, the various management groups could not get together to support the proposal and it did not even come up for hearings.

Right now the various contractor associations are floundering on this proposal. Frankly, unless there is an unanimity of expression by the overwhelming majority of contractor associations, I don't give multi-employer certification much of a chance. I am in favor of the multi-employer certification principle, but I only have one vote out of 435 in the House. And I would have to see the specific piece of legislation before I decide how to vote.

What other proposals do you think will be of major importance?

I expect to see the building trades give bi-lateral promotion a big push again. They've come quite close to getting this passed twice now. The House has agreed to it in the 89th and again in the 90th Congresses. I think the House will go along again in this Congress, but I don't know where the Senate stands.

Will you vote for bi-lateral promotion?

Not in its present form, I won't.

Then what is your feeling on this?

Frankly, I haven't made up my mind. The idea has merit, but it also has its drawbacks. Now I know that there is hardly ever any proposal that doesn't have two or more sides, but this particular one has more than two sides.

First, look at the industry itself. The building trades support the suggestion. In fact, the building trades are unanimous in their support. On the other hand, the construction contractor associations are badly divided. Here, we should ask ourselves just what there is in the promotion bills that splits up management so badly? If the industry's national management associations cannot get together, then maybe the bills aren't what they are cracked up to be.

I know only two management associations that support bi-lateral promotion: the painters and the plasterers. The AGC, the mechanical associations, and the Chamber of Commerce are opposed. I would prefer to have this legislation held in abeyance until we come up with something fairly acceptable to all.

In view of that statement, Congressman, how do you stand on bid listing? Here is a proposal which has management split right down the middle.

I don't expect to see the management associations 100% together on all legislative proposals. Bid listing is one of those that might not draw unanimity from management.

Even so, I strongly endorse bid listing as a requirement on Federal construction. It has worked out very well on GSA and Interior projects; we now have had several years of experimentation. The time has arrived to put what we have learned into law. I co-sponsored a bid listing bill with Congressmen Bob Leggett (D-California) and Bill Hungate (D-Missouri).

Do you think that all or most of management could possibly get together on this?

Well, to the best of my knowledge every one of the specialty contracting groups has endorsed the bid-listing idea—although some of them disagree on specific details. The general contractors, for the most part, are opposed.

The blame for bid shopping is not entirely on the shoulders of the general contractor. The subcontractor associations admitted this in their testimony before the Judiciary Committee. Several subcontracting representatives used the words: "It takes two to tango." There will probably always be subs hungry enough or stupid enough to allow themselves to underbid to a bid shopper just to get a job.

I suggest that the general contractor associations get together with the subcontractor groups. They should try for a workable solution so that the Congress can go ahead and pass a good and acceptable bid listing law—which will get at the core of this vicious trade practice.

What would you call "workable" and "acceptable"?

Well, for one thing, there has been an attempt in the past to cover only the mechanical trades in bid listing legislation. To me, this is ridiculous. If we are going to afford protection on federal projects, then *all* trades must share that umbrella of protection.

Further, we can't saddle the government with a mountain of paperwork, so the various subcontracting trades have to realize that, when they constitute a very small percentage of a job, it is just not feasible to be covered under bid-listing procedures.

How small would you say a trade can be to be covered?

This is a tough problem, I could support any level, but I think that the Interior Department's listing procedure of 2% is fair. But perhaps we should consider extending the coverage to second tier subs and to suppliers who come under the 2% guidelines.

Sub-subs and suppliers? Don't you think that that might bring about opposition from the first tier subcontractors?

If it does, then they are not being honest about this. They would then be guilty of the same thing they accuse the generals of. They can't have their cake and eat it too. If we work out a means of protecting sub-subs and suppliers, then I should think that the first tier subs would welcome this.

Mr. Hogan, on behalf of Contractor News, I want to thank you for your time and wish you every success in Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, although the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kans., has been an entity for some time, the death of President Eisenhower has intensified the interest of scholars in the full development of this repository of the papers related to the remarkable career of this soldier and President who served his country for so many years.

It is generally known, of course, that the Eisenhower Library, as are other Presidential libraries, is administered under the direction of the National Archives and Records Service.

Private funds were required, however, for the construction and equipping of the library, and additional private funds will be needed to establish fellowship programs for scholars and other projects related to President Eisenhower's hope that the library would become a continuing center for historical study of the period during which he was active in public life. It has not been the intent of the trustees of the library, however, to mount an aggressive fundraising campaign, and the contributions which have been made, large and small, have been a grassroots expression of the regard in which President Eisenhower was held by his countrymen.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to recognize one modest and spontaneous effort which has been underway in Charlottesville, Va.

Four banking institutions in Charlottesville have agreed to accept contributions for forwarding to the Eisenhower Library and, in May, Mayor G. A. Vogt, of Charlottesville, proclaimed Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Fund Week.

Impetus for the community effort was provided initially by Lewis Glaser, who has achieved a measure of personal fame as a full-time craftsman in the making of quill pens.

I might mention that it is fitting that Charlottesville, in the Seventh Virginia Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, has taken this community notice of the Eisenhower Library, because, across the Blue Ridge in Augusta County, also in the seventh district, President Eisenhower's mother was born.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I enclose several newspaper articles, as follows:

[From the Daily Progress, Charlottesville (Va.), May 12, 1969]

EISENHOWER LIBRARY FUND DRIVE OPENS

A memorial fund drive for contributions for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kans., began today in Charlottesville and Albemarle.

The fund in memory of the late president has been established at four banks in Charlottesville to be forwarded to the Eisenhower Library.

Lewis Glaser of Charlottesville initiated the memorial fund drive here and has received the endorsement of John E. Wickman, director of the Eisenhower Library. Glaser visited Eisenhower while he was president in 1955 and was given a knife by Eisenhower to be used to make the points of quill pens which Glaser makes.

In conjunction with the start of the memorial drive, Mayor G. A. Vogt has declared this week as "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Fund Week" in Charlottesville.

In a proclamation, the mayor says:

"Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower was a great president and a great leader of our nation, and a man greatly beloved and admired by all his people. We would seek to have a meaningful share in a memorial which will perpetuate his memory and honor his name.

"It is only fitting and proper that the citizens of this city and this community have an opportunity to express their feelings by being the launching point of a movement which may want to be shared by all the people of this land."

Mayor Vogt called on all the citizens of Charlottesville to participate.

Glaser said the fund will not be collected by solicitation. Contributions will be received by the following banks which will serve as trustees for the fund, Glaser said:

The Virginia National Bank, National Bank and Trust Company, Citizens Bank and Trust Company and Monticello National Bank.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch, June 10, 1969]

MYRIAD HONORS FOR GREAT MAN

Upon opening the neatly handwritten envelope from Northampton, Mass., dated May 27, I read:

Dear Mr. Glaser:

David and I are so happy to learn of your great success with the Eisenhower Library. I know that General Eisenhower would have been so proud and glad that the people of Charlottesville are honoring him in such a special way. I want to thank you for your devoted work in this project.

With deep appreciation,

Sincerely,

Julie Nixon Eisenhower.

Julie, as you know, is the younger of the two lovely daughters of President and Mrs. Nixon, and David is their son-in-law who is showing the remarkable qualities of his illustrious grandfather.

David's father, Ambassador John Eisenhower, has written from the United States Embassy in Brussels:

All my family join me in sending thanks to you for your work and diligence in connection with the Memorial Funds drive for the Eisenhower Library in Abilene.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kan., was established to preserve the papers, books, and other historical materials relating to former President Eisenhower. Much of the material relates to his service as Supreme Commander of the Allied Armed Forces in World War II. It was built and equipped through contributions from many thousands of friends and admirers of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It was dedicated on May 1, 1962. The library is part of the Eisenhower Center which includes the museum, the family home, and the Place of Meditation. These properties, including their contents, were given to the United States by the Eisenhower Foundation in 1966.

On May 12 the Charlottesville Memorial Fund for contributions to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene began with a proclamation by Mayor G. A. Vogt. The Virginia National Bank, the National Bank and Trust Co., the Citizens Bank and Trust Co., and the Monticello National Bank agreed to act as trustees for any contributions. I felt at the time that our Charlottesville and Albemarle citizens would be generous in their response but the results have exceeded my most optimistic expectations. Dr. John W. Wickman, director of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, informed me that the enthusiasm from the Charlottesville community inspired a $5,000 contribution from a well-known national foundation.

By honoring the memory of a great and good man we honor ourselves.

HOUSE JUDICIARY CALLED ON TO SCHEDULE HEARINGS ON CAMPUS DISORDER LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the House Committee on Education and Labor has today effectively killed any hopes for reporting out legislation from the committee dealing with the subject of campus disorders.

I believe the refusal of that committee to report out legislation on this subject flies in the face of a growing public demand for congressional action. The disturbances that have taken the very foundations of higher learning in America, and which are creeping down to this Nation's elementary and high schools, must be dealt with if the interests of law-abiding students and the broader public interest are to be protected.

On June 2, along with 19 colleagues, I introduced H.R. 11802, a bill designed to give law-abiding students the right to file a complaint with the Justice Department when they are denied free access to their schools' facilities by disruptive students.

The measure also permits the Attorney General to proceed on his own motion without such a complaint "whenever he determines that prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice." The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee and I am sorry to report that no hearings have been scheduled.

In view of the action by the House Education and Labor Committee today, I am asking that the House Judiciary Committee make my bill the subject of immediate hearings. I believe it is imperative that the question of student disorders be fully aired and responsible legislation enacted to protect the rights of the majority of this Nation's students.

Passage of my bill, coupled with the administration's proposal, calling for injunctive relief for students and universities which are threatened with disorders provides a two-pronged attack on this increasingly serious problem. Both proposals have the virtue of permitting the schools and serious-minded students to institute legal action to protect their interests when they are threatened by revolutionaries whose disruptive activities have the effect of denying an education.

IN THE FACE OF WAR AND DEATH, WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF LIFE AND HEALTH UNDER THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION?

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished former Vice President of the United States recently contributed a thoughtful but unsettling article to the Washington Daily News concerning the achievements, thus far, of the Nixon administration in the critical area of medical care. While conceding that the new administration should be granted a fair chance to come up with new ideas and programs, the Honorable Hubert Humphrey writes that he can only conclude that the new administration's record in the health care area is "poor."

The facts and figures in the article offer a disturbing picture of the most affluent nation in the world failing to insure that its citizens will have access to adequate, quality medical care. What is worse, as the article points out, is that at a time when we ought to be moving ahead to meet our crucial medical needs, the Nixon administration is actually cutting back in this area.

While thousands of American boys continue to die in Vietnam and billions of dollars continue to be spent on that conflict, the President continues to push ahead with efforts to persuade Congressmen and Senators to ratify an investment of billions of dollars for the disputed ABM weapons system.

The American people last November clearly indicated their dissatisfaction with a set of priorities which puts war ahead of people, missiles ahead of medicine, and military needs ahead of human needs. Yet, almost 8 months later, what really has changed? With no end to the war in sight and a dangerously provocative weapons system on the horizon, it would appear that there has been no change in our policies. In fact, however, there appears to be a substantial change—a change for the worse. Under President Johnson, the previous Democratic administration made a strong commitment to improving the quality of American life for all Americans, young, old, black, white, rich, and poor. The great efforts made to improve education, erase poverty, expand health care, insure civil rights, and rebuild our cities were the brightest spots on the Johnson horizon, but now they are the very areas which President Nixon seems to be willing to forsake in favor of the unfortunate, less constructive wars and weapons policies which are causing this Nation so much anguish.

Mr. Speaker, a clear outline of Republican policies is not yet evident, but some writing is on the wall and I do not think it augurs well for the domestic and human needs of our society as we enter the critical 1970's. I sincerely hope that the picture will change but, in the meantime, I intend to continue observing the new administration's decisions and directions and noting the opinions of such outstanding Americans as the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey. The former Vice President's article follows:

IT'S TIME FOR A POOR REPORT CARD ON NIXON ADMINISTRATION

(By Hubert Humphrey)

Since January, as one of the leaders of the loyal opposition, I have tried to put forth my ideas in as positive and constructive a way as possible. Like most Americans, I think the new administration deserves a chance to come up with new programs and put its stamp on our foreign and domestic policies.

But the Nixon administration now may be graded in two areas:

Improvement of the quality of education.

Improvement and availability of quality medical care.

In both areas, I believe the Nixon administration deserves a grade of "poor." The Nixon formula in both education and health has been to drift, to cut expenditures, to do nothing to solve the difficult problems that we face.

Let us look this week at the health and medical care record of the new administration. The question should be asked: who has been speaking foı the public interest in the field of health and medical care?

The answer is: nobody.

For five months, with medical costs soaring, the Nixon administration has had no top health official to represent the public interest.

For five months, with growing evidence of abuses by physicians, dentists, and druggists in the Medicaid and Medicare program, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch had battled with Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen over who should fill the important post of assistant secretary of health and scientific affairs.

Back in January, Secretary Finch said he wanted Dr. John Knowles, director of Massachusetts General Hospital, as his assistant secretary. Back in January, the young, energetic Dr. Knowles said he was willing to take the job, and he attracted widespread support from groups such as the American Hospital Association and American Nurses Association.

The opposition to Dr. Knowles has been some conservative wing of the American Medical Association—some of the same doctors who fought Medicare for so many years.

By threatening to fight the Knowles nomination on the Senate floor, Senator Dirksen was able to hold up the appointment for five months, thereby creating a serious leadership vacuum at HEW.

Former HEW Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen has called the delay "a calamity" for HEW and the nation. He is right.

At stake is the $10 billion a year federal investment in health and medical care.

At stake is the $50 billion a year we pay for medical care, an average of over $200 for every man, woman, and child.

At stake is the leadership and coordination of the many health and medical care efforts scattered thruout HEW and other federal agencies.

Where do we stand on health and medical care in this country?

Despite the miracles of science and the drama of heart transplants, many of our 30 million poor do not receive minimum medical care.

The United States ranks 15th in the world in infant mortality. For our nonwhite babies, the infant mortality rate is almost twice that of white babies. If we could bring our rate in line with that of Sweden, we would save the lives of 50,000 babies a year.

In 20 countries, men live longer than they do here. In 11 countries, women live longer.

The problem is not that we do not know how to provide top quality health and medical care. The problem is one of planning, leadership, coordination, and commitment.

We know we need more physicians and nurses. For many people, no family doctor is available, and for others the shortages of doctors has caused a sharp rise in their medical care bills. While we are graduating 8,000 doctors a year, the Soviet Union is graduating 35,000 a year.

We know neighborhood health centers can reduce hospital use by as much as 80 per cent by preventing serious illness. The cooperative relationship of physicians, nurses, dentists, and social workers at these neighborhood centers can be America's first big step toward providing equal health opportunity to every citizen.

We know there are less costly alternatives to hospital care such as outpatient care, home health services, extended care facilities, and nursing homes.

We know the quality of health care in many rural areas is becoming a critical problem. Enlightened doctors, such as those at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., are experimenting in providing health care to rural areas.

We know mental patients respond better if treated in community mental health centers rather than being put away in state mental hospitals. We have 330 of these centers now, and in the past eight years, they have helped reduce the number of patients in state mental hospitals from 536,000 to 426,000.

We know prepayment programs can help reduce hospital use by encouraging people to take advantage of preventive and diagnostic health services. Yet 30 million Americans have no health insurance at all, and two-thirds of our personal health costs are not covered by insurance.

We know many children are permanently damaged by inadequate prenatal and infant care.

We know we are paying a heavy price for the disorganization and fragmentation of our health services. Better planning and use of biomedical communications networks can help end expensive duplication and provide better medical care at lower cost.

Federal leadership is needed. The Federal Government must play a much needed supportive role. I do not advocate federal control, or federal interference in the doctor-patient relationship or in the setting of fees.

What kind of leadership are we getting?

President Nixon has ordered $300 million in Medicare and Medicaid cuts which will lower mental health care and nursing home benefits. He advocates a $100 million cut in Hill-Burton grants for hospital construction. He is not expanding neighborhood health center or medical education programs.

And worst of all, for five months the Republican administration will not take the lead, it is up to the Democratic majority in Congress to take over the leadership responsibility of helping to provide better health care to every American.

The sick, the elderly, the babies—every American—deserve better treatment than they are getting.

THE BUCK STOPS HERE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and join with my colleague Congressman ANDREW JACOBS from Indiana and those others who have stood up this morning to draw our attention

to an injustice taking place on this Hill for which the Congress must be held responsible. It is outrageous that the food service employees working in the cafeterias which we use everyday are being thwarted in their efforts to organize by the firing of Wendell Quinn, leader of the Capitol Hill Employees' Association. Yesterday, the workers, in support of their leadership gathered on the Capitol steps to protest the firing of Mr. Quinn.

The workers in private industry of this country have been given the right to collectively bargain. Many Federal employees have similarly organized and are accorded that right. Only those least able to demonstrate muscle are intimidated when they try to exercise that right. We cannot take the position that someone else is responsible. In this case, the buck stops here.

CHARLES J. BELLAMY, EDITOR AND GENTLEMAN, RETIRES FROM THE SPRINGFIELD DAILY NEWS, WHICH HIS FAMILY FOUNDED IN 1880

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Charles J. Bellamy, one of the most witty and perceptive newspaper editors I have ever known, and the descendant of a distinguished family in American journalism, has retired from the staff of the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, which his father and uncle founded 89 years ago for the benefit and enlightenment of the common man and immigrant class then coming to our great country.

Mr. Bellamy's first service to the newspaper was in 1893 when he broke ground for the new Springfield Daily News building at Dwight and Worthington Streets in Springfield.

His father, Charles J. Bellamy, Sr., was cofounder of the Daily News with his brother, Edward, who later left the newspaper to write his famous "Looking Backward," one of the most influential books ever written.

Mr. Bellamy succeeded his father as editor and publisher upon his graduation from Yale University in 1913, and 2 years later, in 1915, sold the majority interest in the Daily News to Sherman H. Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to wish Mr. Bellamy, who has always remained young in heart and mind and spirit, a healthful and long life in retirement. He has always been a great gentleman in the true sense of the word. I include an editorial on Mr. Bellamy and a news story, published in the Daily News on June 28 and June 30, with my remarks in the RECORD:

CHARLES BELLAMY, A GENTLEMAN

Charles Bellamy, father and son, served The Daily News for all but 18 of our 89 years.

The father founded the newspaper and was its editor and publisher for 31 years. The son served as an officer of the publishing company and a member of the editorial department for 37 years until his retirement Saturday.

Charles Bellamy Jr. has been more than our newspaper's link with its origins, and more than our "old families' editor" as he allowed us to call him.

In fact, Mr. Bellamy always made friends with the youngest members of our staff. He has the appeal of the master raconteur. Also, some older writers here have noticed that only the young could engage Mr. Bellamy in repartee and rely blissfully on his mercy.

However, these are but the superficial reasons for his rapport with the young. He has always been more interested in tomorrow than in yesterday, and has been optimistic that change will lead to improvement.

Indeed, it is not what is old about Mr. Bellamy, but what is young about him, that we shall miss.

When he founded this newspaper, Charles Bellamy Sr. said that he intended it to be a gentleman. He raised his son the same way.

CHARLES BELLAMY RETIRES FROM DAILY NEWS STAFF

Charles J. Bellamy, 78, retired today after 37 years on the staff of The Daily News, which his father and uncle founded 89 years ago.

Bellamy's first service to the newspaper was in 1893 when he broke ground for The Daily News building at Dwight and Worthington Streets where the Telephone Building now stands. Last year, he broke ground for The Springfield Newspapers Building now nearing completion at Main and Cypress Streets.

His father, Charles J. Bellamy, Sr., was cofounder of The Daily News with his brother, Edward, who left the newspaper to write "Looking Backward," one of the most influential books ever written.

Charles Bellamy, Sr., remained as editor and publisher until his death in 1911. His son and namesake became publisher in 1913, the year of his graduation from Yale, and sold the majority interest to Sherman H. Bowles in 1915.

After World War I, in which Bellamy served as an Army captain, he became assistant telegraph editor of The Daily News where he remained until 1926, when he entered the brokerage business. He returned to The Daily News editorial department in 1941 and remained until today.

Bellamy has served in several community positions, including campaign chairman and president of Springfield Community Chest, trustee and president of City Library Association, president of the Adult Education Council and a member of the Police Commission. He is a member of the Colony Club.

Bellamy, who has lived at Kimball Towers since the Colony Club's Wesson Mansion was destroyed by fire, will now make his home with his daughter, Mrs. Jo Bellamy Shuart, and family in East Longmeadow.

CAPITOL RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to find that a number of other Members of this body are refusing to remain silent on the serious matter of employee relations in the Congress. Situations have now deteriorated to a point where none of us can afford to ignore them any longer. The Architect of the Capitol has now fired an employee who would dare attempt to raise for discussion the subject of adequate wages and working conditions for restaurant workers.

It seems to me more than an accident that these employees who are in a very weak bargaining position are now being intimidated by conduct on the part of the Architect which would be repugnant by any normal labor relations standards, but is nothing less than scandalous when it occurs here in the U.S. Congress over minimal adjustments in wages and working conditions.

I think the question raised here is basic. In my opinion everyone who works on the Hill ought to be able to join any union or association of his or her choice. This is too fundamental a principle for anyone to surrender in order to be employed by the U.S. Congress.

HAZARDOUS TOYS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys of life is giving a small child a toy, but today it is all too possible that such a gift can bring death or serious injury, instead of happiness.

Recent hearings of the National Commission on Product Safety vividly illustrated the dangers of many common toys, given to children in innocence, concealing their hidden hazards under bright colorings.

The dangers vary. Some toys contain spikes underneath an easily destroyed covering; other toys burn easily; still others are explosive or sharply pointed. Even toys designed for cribs often can strangle or smother a tiny baby.

Many of these hazards were described recently by Mrs. Joanne Lopez in a series of articles published in the San Jose News from June 15 through June 20, 1969. Mrs. Lopez, a reporter for the Mercury-News, discovered some of these hazardous toys on sale in the Santa Clara Valley. Her warnings to parents were timely and much needed. The readership response was immediate and parents added to the list of dangerous toys with their discoveries in their own homes. I would like to share Mrs. Lopez' series of articles with all who are interested in the safety of children and I include the series of stories in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The hazards are real. Examples crop up every day. Children are being injured and even killed by these toys. Therefore, today I am joining other Congressmen and Senators in introducing the Child Protection Act of 1969.

The bill closes existing gaps in the Federal Hazardous Substances Act and protects children from toys and other articles for their use which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

My action today is a direct result of the stories written by Mrs. Lopez, and published in the San Jose News, and I

wish to thank her and her newspaper for bringing this problem to my attention and to the attention of its thousands of readers. The series of articles follow:

UNSAFE TOYS—EVEN THE DOLL YOU BUY COULD BE LETHAL

(By Joanne Lopez)

A few moments after giving her 16-month-old child a new doll, a young mother in Lexington, Mass., returned to find that the child had removed the legs, exposing three-inch spikes which the mother described as "lethal weapons."

In Greenwich, Conn., a 13-month-old boy hanged himself from the string of a musical toy designed "to entertain infants in their cribs."

Eleven Philadelphia, Pa., children had to have small one-inch plastic darts removed from their lungs when they inhaled them instead of blowing them out of a small plastic blowgun.

These are but three of the many case histories taken from the files of the National Commmission on Product Safety, a seven-member team that is seeking passage of a Toy Safety Act that would give the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the power to ban lethal toys and infants' furniture from the market.

It is ironic that despite the large number of federal agencies involved in consumer protection, there presently exists no single agency to which consumers can direct complaints.

Furthermore, there presently exists no set of uniform safety standards with which to screen and govern toys manufactured in the United States.

THE CASE OF THE LETHAL CRIB

A tragic example of the need for immediate legislation is the case of the Rev. John R. Dryer, pastor of Convenant Presbyterian Church in Wellsville, Ohio, and the father of a crib death victim.

At the age of one year and 17 days, his first child Johnny became entangled in a lidded "Kiddie Koop" and was strangled to death.

According to Rev. Mr. Dryer, the tragedy was attributable to a long metal hinge so constructed that the more his infant son tried to pull away, the tighter it clamped his throat between the lid and side of the crib.

Efforts were made by the National Commission on Product Safety to have representatives of the crib manufacturer testify, but written and telephoned invitations to appear were summarily rejected with the notation that "We will not be able to testify. . . "

The firm, which continues to market the crib, is one of the largest in the infant furniture industry, with showrooms in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, San Francisco and Seattle.

The company's slogan, ironically set forth in its catalog, is: "Since 1912. Your baby's health, safety and comfort . . . our only business."

THE FIRM EXPRESSED SYMPATHY

The Rev. Mr. Dryer explained to the commission how, upon the death of his son, he pleaded with the manufacturer either to make the crib safe or stop selling it.

The firm expressed "sympathy."

In frustration and grief, the Rev. Mr. Dryer subsequently instituted civil action for damages and finally settled out of court for $15,000.

He sorrowfully told the commission how dismaying this kind of "compensation" was, and urged adoption of federal safety standards or federal laws which might prevent the recurrence of such a tragedy.

Dr. Brian D. Blackbourne, assistant medical examiner of Dade County, Fla., told the commission that only three and one-half weeks before the death of Johnny Dryer, the nine-month-old son of a Coral Gables, Fla., policeman died in an identical manner.

Blackbourne further testified before the commission on the mis-design of certain slatted cribs and playpens—the "Kiddy Koop" is not a slatted crib.

He informed the commission that in a period of 12 years, 11 infants in the Miami area had died of strangulation accidents. Projected nationally, the Miami statistics would indicate that there are at least 200 such crib deaths a year.

IRONICALLY THERE'S NO STANDARD

According to Larry A. Schott, chief of the National Commission on Product Safety's investigations unit, officials in Los Angeles estimated that 15 to 20 of the 250 deaths each year due to crib strangulation could be attributed to "mechanical compression of infants."

Schott described for the commission how cribs can be dangerous if the slats are too wide apart. His analysis indicated that where slats are three and one-half inches or more apart, an infant can get his head entangled between them and strangle while trying to free himself.

As a parent, do you find it ironic that there presently exists no industry or government standard to govern this and other such crucial factors of design?

UNSAFE TOYS—MANY ON THE MARKET CAN MAIM—AND EVEN KILL

(By Joanne Lopez)

"The little toy dog is covered with dust, but sturdy and staunch he stands . . ."

If Eugene Field were alive and well and living in the 20th Century, as the saying goes, he might well feel compelled to revise that first stanza of his poignant "Little Boy Blue."

Any little toy dog that remains around long enough to collect dust these days, more than likely does not "sturdy and staunch" stand.

Usually, an eye or two is missing, an ear or a tail, and sometimes, a leg or three.

Toys today come complete with timed obsolescence, as do most all consumer goods. The public has been educated to accept the fact that "they just don't make 'em like they used to."

TOYS THAT CAN MAIM AND KILL

American parents, however, should be appalled that they are, albeit unknowingly, accepting the fact that there are a number of toys on the market today that can maim, and, in some cases kill.

For instance:

A baby rattle with eight sharp inflexible spikes.

A stuffed rabbit whose ears are fitted on sharp wire.

A doll whose hair ribbon is attached with a straight pin.

A "toy" oven that heats up to 600 degrees.

Party balloon whistles that can be inhaled.

"Magic" candles that reignite after being blown out.

The aforementioned "toys" were among the ten potentially lethal playthings presented by Dr. Arnold B. Elkind, chairman of the National Commission on Product Safety, during a recent U.S. Senate consumer subcommittee hearing on the proposed Toy Safety Act that would give the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the power to ban such lethal toys from the market.

The National Commission on Product Safety, which was established in the 90th Congress, was directed to develop means to protect the American consumer from unreasonable hazards in products commonly used in and around the home today.

In carrying out its primary job, the commission became acutely aware of grave inadequacies in the protection of children against death and injury from hazardous toys and other articles intended for use by children.

PROTECTION FOR OUR CHILDREN

On the basis of its findings, the seven-member commission is recommending legislation to strengthen the Child Protection Act of 1966 to include protection against hazards not now subject to regulation.

Specifically the commission is seeking enactment of the Child Protection Act of 1969 which would allow for protection against electrical, mechanical and thermal hazards.

The act would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act of June 1967 which was limited primarily to toxic, extremely flammable and corrosive substances.

Since the commission's first public hearing last October in New York, its fact-finding efforts have produced some shocking statistics.

Of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in the United States, more than 15,000 die each year from accidents at a rate of 28 per 100,000 population. This figure is higher than the deaths from cancer, contagious diseases, heart diseases and gastroenteritis combined.

Another 17 million children annually are injured severely enough to restrict normal activity or require medical attention—at a rate of 300 per 1000 population.

CAN WE EDUCATE FOR SAFETY?

Questioned about the most urgent need in accident prevention, Dr. Allan B. Coleman, chairman of the Committee on Accident Prevention of the American Academy of Pediatrics, stated, "It is probably not education."

Dr. Coleman, who testified at the commission's New York hearing, admitted that he and his colleagues are getting somewhat disenchanted with the idea that one can educate for safety.

"Education is useful" he maintained. "But as I have written in the past, the person who pays the most heed to educated effort doesn't need it and didn't need it in the first place. The biggest need is probably engineering for safety, built-in safety, fail-safe products and fail-safe designs."

Morris Kaplan, for the past 22 years technical director for Consumers Union of the United States, Inc., a non-profit organization that publishes Consumer Reports, almost echoes Dr. Coleman's opinion.

In a statement before the commission, Kaplan pointed out that toys are different from any other product on the market in several significant ways.

"They (toys) are usually bought FOR the user, not BY the user," Kaplan stated, "and the user usually can't read instructions and cautions."

Therefore, he contended, the education of the consumer of the toys, the child, presents a serious problem.

"A toy manufacturer can't educate the child in the safe use of a toy; he must educate the purchaser. That's hard enough if it's a parent," maintained Kaplan, "but if it's a doting grandparent who has long forgotten the many ways a child can interact with a toy it's doubly difficult."

Kaplan further emphasized the uniqueness of toys from the point of view of product safety in this manner: "Toys are not necessities of life but embellishments of it, so that the argument that can be made about trading off some safety risk against some vital human need cannot be made for toys as it has been for other consumer products."

He concluded that in designing a toy the manufacturer has a responsibility (even beyond that of the manufacturer of a product bought and used by an adult) to choose materials and methods of construction that require a minimum of education on the part of the user to make it safe.

"Ideally," Kaplan opined, "it (a toy) should be child-proof—that is, no imaginable use or abuse by a child should make it unsafe. And anyone who has children can appreciate what a task that is!"

BABY RATTLES

Last Thursday evening on the way home from work, this reporter stopped at her neighborhood supermarket to pick up a few items, one of which happened to be baby food. Right next to the baby food display, she spotted a number of baby rattles that resembled ones ordered off the market on May 6 in New York by Bess Myerson Grant, consumer affairs commissioner. This reporter purchased the rattle, brought it home and discovered inside: Eight sharp inflexible metal prongs protruding from a disc inside the handle. Intact, the prongs are surrounded only by a thin cardboard and plastic cylinder decorated with various animals. Made in Japan and distributed by Reliance Products Corp. in Woonsocket, R.I., this particular rattle sells for the discount price of 48 cents. Ironically, it includes a guarantee: "This toy is made of the purest materials and unconditionally guaranteed to be completely safe." This reporter would like to point out that the rattles were not on display Monday of last week, thus indicating that they are part of a recent shipment.

UNREPORTED INCIDENTS CREATE DISTORTED VIEW OF INJURIES

(By Joanne Lopez)

Luckily, a young couple in Flushing, Mich., heard the choking and crying of their six-month-old son in time to rescue him when he managed to twist the long cord of his toy telephone—the telephone had been advertised as a "crib" toy—around his neck.

In Downey, Calif., a mother discovered, while attempting to replace loosened ornaments, that the bow on her child's doll was secured by an inch-long spike with a handle that made it easily removable.

A Philadelphia, Pa., mother was horrified to discover that after a few minutes play with a new musical rattle, her baby had removed the plastic and cardboard top from the handle and uncovered seven spikes, ranging from one and one-half to three inches in length.

These additional case histories from the files of the National Commission on Product Safety point up the fact that many parents have not been educated to realize the dangerous potential of the toys they buy.

When their child innocently injures himself, they tend to blame their own inattention, or accept the accident fatalistically, rather than look to the manufacturer's negligence as the true source of injury.

A DISTORTED VIEW OF INJURIES

Testifying before the National Commission on Product Safety, Boston attorney Edward M. Swartz produced an armload of toys purchased during a half-hour shopping trip through Boston.

He proceeded to pull the suction tips from an assortment of "toy" arrows; then, with the accompanying bow, fired the arrows through two thicknesses of corrugated cardboard.

He also showed the commission a doll's hair-ribbon attached with dangerous protruding pins, sharp metal fins on a toy rocket, and a number of other potentially lethal "toys."

Ironically, Swartz stated: "The number of reported decisions which involve injuries caused by defective toys is surprisingly small."

Most likely, many cases never even get into court; then too, a number of injuries are not serious enough to warrant litigation. Cost alone, in some cases, makes lawsuits prohibitive.

Law professor F. Reed Dickerson of Indiana University cited for the commission one case that would require $10,000 just to go to trial.

The result is a rather distorted view of the number of children's injuries caused by toys.

THE CASES OF THE RED HERRING

Swartz, who prepared a report on unsafe toys at the request of the commission, terms a "red herring" the case involving a mother who purchased a plastic "Blo-Yr-Top" for her 13-year-old daughter. The store clerk specifically told her the top was safe.

The mother put it in a paper bag underneath many groceries, and when the daughter spun the top for the first time, it exploded and shattered, cutting her nose and eye.

The child lost the sight of her right eye.

The mother, however, was denied recovery because the retailer—action was against the retailer only—without calling any witnesses, successfully contended that the mother failed to prove the top was not in the same condition as when it was purchased and that it was not damaged by being carried home under the groceries.

AN IRONIC DECISION

The final case Swartz presented in his report involved that of a 14-year-old student who made a whip from a rolled bed sheet bounded with pieces of wire.

The boy gave the "whip" to a teenage friend to use, and as the second boy was using it a piece of wire flew off and struck him in the eye. The injured lad brought suit on negligence against the boy who made the whip.

Recovery for the injured lad was sustained.

The court held that the boy who made the whip was in the same position as one who manufactures or owns an instrument he knows to be dangerous.

If he disposes of this dangerous instrument in a way which he ought to foresee as causing harm to a third person, he owes a legal duty to such third person to prevent injury to him.

"In effect," marvels Swartz, "this case holds a private individual who makes a dangerous toy from homemade materials to the same standards of due care imposed on commercial manufacturers."

Ironic?

TOY SAFETY—SHOULD THEY BE SAFE ONLY IF USED AS INTENDED?

(By Joanne Lopez)

In 1967, Congress recognized a new human "right"—the right of the consumer "to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market for the use of himself and his family."

William G. Cole of Shelbourne Falls, Mass., is one consumer who justly feels he has been denied this new human "right."

His nine-year-old son, Ronald, was blinded when an exploding cap device—it was advertised as "harmless"—hurtled a feathered projectile into his eye.

Immediatley following the accident, the elder Cole went to the retailer from whom the toy had been purchased and asked that it be taken off the shelves.

Checking at a later date, the distraught father found that the item was still being sold.

The National Commission on Product Safety decided to investigate the incident and enlisted the aid of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories.

The Cornell study revealed that when a single ordinary cap is used and the missile thrown down onto a surface, the upper part of the toy will move at 54 miles an hour.

However, the study pointed out, "it is common practice for children to put more than one cap into these toys."

When two caps are inserted, the upper part (that which caused the Cole boy's blindness) will fly at a velocity approaching 79 miles per hour, and with three caps it will move at a speed in excess of 80 miles per hour.

It is obvious, as the report notes, that "the most important potential hazard may be vested in the inventiveness of the user."

ALL AGREE SOMETHING MUST BE DONE

Presently, it would appear that this new human "right" is in the hands of the manufacturers of America who have exclusive power over standards that apply to a vast variety of products—one of which is the toys we buy for our children.

The seven-member National Commission on Product Safety, in recommending a Toy Safety Act to remedy the situation, cites the fact that there are "a number of toys on the market today that can maim, and, in some cases, kill."

Whether the proposed legislation will abolish the present system of voluntary standards in favor of government-controlled pre-marketing clearance, remains to be seen.

All concerned, however, seem to agree that something must be done—and soon!

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL TAKES A STAND

The Toy Manufacturers of America, at present, maintain a Safety Standards Committee which it claims works in conjunction with the National Safety Council to eliminate specific hazards in toys that are brought to its attention by the consuming public.

Richard J. Manuell, child safety consultant of the National Safety Council, however, told the commission that "the National Safety Council is not a clearing-house for toys," and that, in fact, there is no systematic review by the council of toys that come into the marketplace.

Commenting that "you can't completely protect the child," Manuell stated that the results of a study conducted by the council concluded that "toy injuries are most often the result of a lack of parental supervision and instruction rather than a defect in manufacturing."

Manuell further advised the commission that "we (the National Safety Council) are quite satisfied with what the toy industry has been doing in the United States."

He added that "A child has to experience some minor injuries, some minor experiences of trauma in order to learn."

However, upon being informed of the failure of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to cover many of the hazards presently found in toys, Manuell admitted that the act was in need of amendment to remedy the situation with respect to children's toys.

Subsequently, a letter addressed to the commission stated the official position of the National Safety Council on the matter of the proposed Toy Safety Act:

"The National Safety Council welcomes the opportunity to go on record as supporting a need for an amendment to the Child Protection Act, 1966, extending the act to cover electrical, mechanical and thermal hazards with appropriate exemptions similar to those in the present act covering chemistry sets, etc."

Testifying before the commission on behalf of the Toy Manufacturers of America, Aaron Locker, a New York attorney, informed the commission that the toy industry's annual sales range from $2.5 to $3 billion.

He went on to disagree with a number of observations of prior witnesses who had identified particular toys as hazardous, but he conceded that hazardous toys do occasionally come into the channels of commerce.

"As far as the (toy) industry is concerned, if there are hazardous toys which are not covered by the present definition under the Child Protection Act of what is a hazardous toy, and I believe there are—I think electric shock hazard is a good example of this—we

should have no opposition to the extension of the legislation to prohibit such known hazards."

In conclusion, Locker observed that "most of the safety work of toy manufacturers is concentrated on making playthings that are safe when used as intended."

However, in F. Reed Dickerson's "Product Safety in Household Goods," in the section on toys, a 1961 study on safety states: "The survey concluded that, with respect to commercial toys, injuries usually resulted from misuse."

And, as any parent knows, "misuse" is the order of the day with a toy.

UNSAFE TOYS—IS IT ENOUGH TO BAN THEM ONLY AFTER THEY HURT SOMEONE?

(By Joanne Lopez)

A seventh-grade science enthusiast in Ohio who used matchheads to power toy "rockets" was killed before his young sister's eyes when the missile blew up prematurely and "launched" itself through his throat.

A two-and-one-half-year-old boy in Strafford, Pa., lost an eye when he fell against the unprotected metal handgrip of the toddler's tricycle on which he was riding.

A two-year-old San Jose boy required brain surgery when he fell onto a sharp steel spike used to secure the wheels of a toy wagon designed for toddlers.

A lawsuit—which, unfortunately, can only compensate a victim, not prevent marketing of unsafe products—is pending in the San Jose case.

These and other case histories taken from the files of the National Commission on Product Safety adds up to one thing—that there are a number of toys on the American market today that can maim, and, in some cases, kill.

Furthermore, there is such a gap in existing legislation that physical hazards such as electric shock, burn, cut and puncture with regard to children's toys are not covered by the present Federal Hazardous Substances Act.

OUR MOST TRAUMATIZED INDIVIDUALS?

Boston attorney Edward M. Swartz, who displayed a number of toys that could inflict grievous injury or death before a hearing of the National Commission on Product Safety, was prompted to comment:

"It is interesting that recently, with the new regulations we have regarding the automobile industry, they (the auto makers) finally recognized the danger of protrusions. Now, who are most traumatized individuals, aside from parents, in our society?

"Obviously, they are children," he continued.

"They fall countless numbers of times each day, and if they are given anything with protrusions on it, the risk of injury is seriously increased."

Isn't the fact that it took a law to force the auto industry to recall defective cars indicative of the action that must be taken in regard to unsafe toys?

According to Aaron Locker, the New York attorney who testified before the commission on behalf of the Toy Manufacturers of America, "Most of the safety work of toy manufacturers is concentrated on making playthings that are safe when used as intended."

However, as Morris Kaplan, technical director of Consumers Union of the U.S. Inc., noted: "They (toys) are usually bought for the user, not by the user."

WARNING NOT ENOUGH

"Let the buyer beware," you say?

Never has the old Latin proverb been more meaningful than today—in the face of the massive annual toll of deaths and injuries in American households.

"Let the buyer beware" alone, however, provides no protection for the adult consumer, much less the child, in this day and age when certain "seals of approval" have been found to be worth about as much as the paper on which they are printed.

It is also rather idealistic for parents to assume that pride, self-interest and stiff competition are enough to motivate manufacturers to produce safe products for our children.

Is, then, the answer some sort of standard pre-clearance regulated by the government?

Kaplan, speaking for Consumers Union, believes a system of pre-clearance is the answer.

"We hold that no product, toy or otherwise, should be allowed on sale until it has been judged safe by reasonable standards."

Kaplan also said that CU is pleased to note that passage of the Toy Safety Act won't close the books on hazardous toys as far as the commission is concerned.

Commission Chairman Arnold B. Elkind contends that it might not be enough protection to remove hazardous products from the market only after they have hurt someone.

The Toy Safety Act being sought by the National Commission on Product Safety would enable the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to ban toys from the market that pose hazards from "sharp or protruding edges, fragmentation, etc."

Since the commission's recommendation for the enactment of the Child Protection Act of 1969, legislation to carry it out has been endorsed by the Administration and introduced in both the House and Senate.

And the seven-member commission has high hopes that the 91st Congress will see fit to pass such legislation so that American children may be protected from such unnecessary hazards.

But, what to do in the meantime?

First and foremost, "Let the buyer beware."

Secondly, concerned parents might do well to follow the advice of Swartz, the aforementioned Boston attorney who also prepared a report on unsafe toys at the request of the commission.

If an accident occurs, parents should question the manufacturer's negligence as a possible source of injury—not just their own inattention.

Lastly, it might be well for parents to remember: "The wheel that squeaks the loudest is the one that gets the grease."

UTAH HONORS HANDICAPPED CITIZENS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed with individuals who have conquered personal handicaps to become productive members of society. Unfortunately, too many times these accomplishments go unnoticed by the general public. I hope to change that in a small way today.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent meeting of the Governor's Committee on Employment and the Handicapped in the State of Utah. At this meeting two of my constituents were given State and National recognition for their contribution to furthering development and understanding in this area. Miss Kathy DeAnn Saxton won the Utah "Ability Counts" writing contest. Miss Saxton is a junior at Bonneville High School in Ogden. Her report went on to take first place in the national ability counts contest. She was here in Washington a few weeks ago to accept this award at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Kathy visited my office and proudly displayed the picture she had been given of President Nixon congratulating her.

Mr. Richard Thomas, a Logan, Utah, jeweler, received the Utah Handicapped Citizen of the Year Award. Dick, as he is known by all his associates, is a victim of polio. This handicap has not, however, lessened his activities. Dick Thomas is an active member of his community and is an avid supporter of Utah State University where he is known as a friend by all students who associate with him in purchasing jewelry. He is indeed a model citizen.

These two fine people have done more than their share to promote and develop opportunities for the handicapped. I salute them today and urge all responsible citizens to follow their outstanding example.

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, encomiums concerning the late William H. Bates continue to come in. In this connection, I am in receipt of a letter from our former colleague, the Honorable A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.

I insert his letter at this point:

ASSOCIATION OF
SOUTHEASTERN RAILROADS,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1969.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Armed Services, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard your remarks on the floor of the House today in tribute to the memory of our dear friend Bill Bates. They were most fitting and beautifully delivered. I know you were under a great emotional strain because your heart was so heavy. I know how well you two worked together and what a loss his passing is to the Committee on Armed Services, to our country and to you personally.

I just want you to know that I share your sorrow. Having served with Bill in the House of Representatives for 19 years I had come to love him as a brother. We were in each other's homes often and truly the Good Lord never made a finer man. I have not known one who had more genuinely outstanding qualities than Bill Bates. He spent a weekend with me and some other friends just before he went into the hospital. I had the opportunity to visit him several times during his illness. He was, of course, most uncomfortable, but he never lost that ebullient spirit which endeared him to all who knew him. I came away from my visits feeling enriched by the very fact that I had been in his presence. Of him it can truly be said this world is a better place because he passed this way. As you said, your Committee, the Congress and our country are poorer because of this great loss—but we have some wonderful memories that we will carry with us always.

Thank you for the fine job you did.

Most sincerely,

A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr.

TAXPAYERS DEMAND LAW AND ORDER ON CAMPUS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Federal funds are the taxes which hard-working Americans have paid to their Government. They are used for the good of the Nation—not as a private source of private income. When Federal grants are made to assist an individual in a program of education or research, and that individual is either unable or unwilling to do his part, there is no justification for the continued subsidy.

The ultimate absurdity is the case where students who, with Federal aid, are studying English fail their courses. They then feloniously seize the buildings of their college, steal foodstuffs from the cafeteria, rename the buildings after a convicted pimp, arm themselves, and proclaim "nonnegotiable" demands. Among their demands is one to the effect that they all get passing grades in English in any class where they have a white instructor.

To terminate the subsidy to such "students" is far from a violation of any possible freedom of either speech or assembly which they might claim. It is simply a matter of refusing to throw good money after bad. The people to whom the money belongs—who earned it and paid it in taxes—understand this simple situation perfectly, and they demand that crime, anarchy, and sedition no longer be subsidized and rewarded with their hard-earned money.

A news article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 29, 1969]

NIXON "LINE" ON COLLEGES REPORTED SET

President Nixon has circulated a Michigan professor's traditionalist view on higher education to top administration figures and directed them to "follow this line," the American Council of Education says.

The University of Michigan professor, S. J. Tonsor, made his comments at an April 1 meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers in Washington which the President attended.

"I am sure the establishment reaction to this speech will be 'tut, tut, this is old hat,'" the Council quoted Nixon as saying in his memo to administration officials.

"HAPPENS TO BE MY VIEW"

"However, this happens to be my view. It will be a view that I will increasingly express very vigorously in the months ahead. I want everybody who has anything to do with education to read this speech carefully and to follow this line in their public announcements."

Nixon's reported strong endorsement of Tonsor's views is the first clear evidence of a definitive White House stance on higher education's role. There seems to be no doubt among educational authorities of the authenticity of the White House memo, as reported by the council yesterday.

Tonsor, a historian, expressed a basically conservative, traditional view of higher education's role and urged institutions of higher learning to stick closely to teaching and avoid fields and projects for which they are unequipped, including some types of research.

BLAMES EXTREMISTS

In one passage of his speech, Tonsor said: "Student and professor activists inside the university and certain ideological groups outside the university no longer believe the truth must be essential to the academy. Both the extreme right and the extreme left hold the same destructive view.

"Both Mark Rudd of Columbia and Gov. Wallace of Alabama stand in the schoolroom door, and seen from the vantage point of the academy they both hold the same low view of reasoned discourse.

"These groups cannot be permitted to disrupt and destroy the institutions they so obviously do not understand. They constitute a small minority and it is possible that had university administrations not been long accustomed by their faculties to bearing fools gladly, these groups would already have disappeared from the campus scene."

CANNOT BE ALL THINGS

Tonsor stressed his conviction that today's universities cannot be all things to all men. He added that the idea of a multiversity is rightfully rejected by most students and by perceptive faculties.

"They reject it not simply because it is impossible to administer but because it is an institution without goals. It does not know its own mind. . . . To compound the problem now by expecting the university to become a court of last resort for the solution of the major social problems of our times will only deepen the crisis which the university faces," Tonsor declared.

"Higher education," Tonsor said, "has as its chief goals the education of young men and young women."

PITTSBURGH BLACK CONTRACTORS FIGHT BOND, CAPITAL PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the construction business, like many large industries, is fraught with failures and bankruptcies. But for those companies who stick it out and make a success of their efforts, the construction field can be a very rewarding financial venture.

The black contractor faces all of the obstacles to success that his white contemporary encounters, plus a few more.

Chief among these is the problem the minority contractor has in securing a performance bond, a guarantee that the work contracted for will be carried out to the specifics of the contract.

The black contractor, often new to the business, has little experience and even less capital—the two ingredients that make him a poor risk for a surety company.

His failure to get a bond means infrequent work and this in turn hinders the future issuance of a bond. Thus the familiar vicious circle forces the small contractor into a marginal job market. In other words, he takes anything he can get, often barely making a reasonable profit.

The relation of these factors to the contractor's credit is also inescapable. No jobs, no bonds equals no credit. No credit means no jobs or bonds. It is simplistic, but it is telling.

United Skillcraft, Inc., a Pittsburgh black contracting firm, is attempting to bust out of the mold and become a permanent, successful fixture in the construction industry.

A recent article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette tells of the company's efforts. At this point I would like to introduce this story into the RECORD:

TOO BUSY WIELDING HAMMERS, SAWS—SKILLCRAFT "EXECS" DON'T RIDE DESKS

(By Dave McConnell)

When you hear the corporation president ordered to run down and fetch a hammer or climb out the window and lend a hand with the roofer it sounds mixed up.

It's like a swab jockey telling the Admiral to stand by to take a line, but it's going on every day at 610–12 Somer St., Hill District, where United Skillcrafts Inc., is remodeling an old four-apartment building.

"We can't afford an office full of executives—too much overhead," says Chester Perkins, corporation president and carpenter.

Peter Baker, vice president and plumber nodded and curtly said: "Work or get out."

The Skillcrafts men have come a long hard way to get where they are and, as Perkins says: "We have a rough road ahead but we'll make it."

Each of the group is skilled in one or another phase of the tricky, hard and dirty job of old home remodeling and repair. It's a job where a man has to be a jack of all trades, one moment a plumber, the next plasterer or carpenter.

In the past each got by taking on jobs here and there. They made just enough "to live on" and to purchase tools and a truck to cart their supplies.

"No one would look at us for a contract job," Perkins said. "We all were stuck with odds and ends, but it was dirty work and you couldn't get skilled union journeymen to do it."

"They wouldn't know how to go about resetting a sagging window or jammed door frame," Waller Claybrook, corporation secretary and electrician, said with a knowing chuckle.

The group formed United Skillcrafts and in a city crying for housing, virtually begging for crews to rehabilitate run down old houses, Perkins and his fellow officers went out to bid for contracts.

Into the picture cropped: "They," business with financial know-how. It provoked a dialogue between Perkins, Baker and Claybrook which ran as follows:

"It used to be they wouldn't touch this work.

"It's tough. It means a hard day's work tearing out and then a skilled day's work putting it back together.

"Now Uncle Sam's puting a buck into it they want to take it but want us to do the work."

Skillcrafts found no room in the market for a new corporation with less than tiny assets. Even if their bids were low there was the problem of obtaining performance bonds. Companies were reluctant to cover a brand new firm with no experience record and assets which amounted only to a skilled work force composed of men determined to earn enough to pay their own way in life.

"We need financing and can't get it," Perkins said.

Men of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh and the National Alliance of Businessmen, working to put the job training program across, heard of Perkin's problem. On their own time they searched the nooks and crannies of the cavernous Federal money cave for ways to get assistance—U.S. loans or government guarantees on loans from banks.

"No soap," Perkins said and shrugged shoulders broadened by hard work.

Help did come but not from the hodgepodge maze of Federal do-gooding. Quietly the United Methodist Church Union, Downtown, went to work.

The church had been bequeathed four run-down buildings at 2017-31 DeRuad St., Uptown.

"At first," said Perkins, "they contracted with us to put the buildings in shape. We went to work. They liked the job we were were doing and offered to sell us the buildings. Then when they saw we really meant business they gave up the buildings and several thousand in 'seed money' to keep going."

United Skillcrafts is converting the buildings into 16 three bedroom apartments and will use the income to advance other business enterprises.

The renewal project is about half done and much of the profits from the contract on Somers street will go towards finishing it.

But even the Somers Street job was hard to get. The Urban League of Pittsburgh offered a contract for the rehabilitation work. It looked good but no one would write a performance bond for United Skillcrafts.

It looked hopeless until Interfaith Housing Inc., composed of an alliance of churches, stepped forward to guarantee the bond.

With the successful completion of the Somers Street job Perkins hopes to show a good performance record which will make it easier next time to get a bond. But working capital still is the new corporation's bug-a-boo. As Perkins explains:

"Someone writes specifications but when we get to work we find rotten boards that must be replaced. While we're waiting for an order covering the additional work we have a payroll to meet and additional supplies to buy. That takes cash."

That's why the president, officers and directors of United Skillcrafts are chasing hammers, helping shingle and running errands. They're scrouging every penny to build up a financial reserve.

They may be chiefs, but they can't afford Indians—yet.

But when the long hard work day is done they can go back to their office and put in a few white collar hours after dinner keeping the books up to date and planning the next day's schedule.

"Like to be a corporation executive?" Perkins asks.

CAPTAIN DEMEY DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. John DeMey, an outstanding young man from my district, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CAPT. DEMEY, IN VIETNAM COMBAT

The Army announced yesterday that Capt. John DeMey of 611 Mulberry Lane, Edgewood, was killed June 20 in combat around a helicopter landing zone near the Cambodian border in South Vietnam.

Captain DeMey, a 1962 graduate of Western Maryland College, was a career officer who returned to Vietnam March 8 for a second tour of duty.

He was a company commander in the 1st Air Cavalry Division in Tay Ninh province northwest of Saigon.

Captain DeMey, 29, received a Purple Heart and was decorated by the South Vietnamese government while serving as an adviser to the South Vietnamese Army from September, 1966, to June, 1967.

ADMIRED TROOPS

His wife, Joan, 26, recalled yesterday that he frequently spoke of his "admiration for the young boys" he was leading. She added that he had intended to volunteer for a record tour in Vietnam if he had not been assigned there.

Funeral services will be held at 11 A.M. Thursday at Eastport Methodist Church, Annapolis, with burial at Annapolis National Cemetery.

Captain DeMey is survived by his parents, Chief Petty Officer and Mrs. Martin DeMey, USN (Ret.) of Annapolis; his paternal grandmother, Mrs. John DeMey, of Sheboygan, Wis.; a brother, Martin DeMey, Jr., 21, of the Navy, and a sister, Miss Marie DeMey, of San Diego.

He is also survived by his wife and two children, Craig, 6, and Mara, 3.

A VETERAN SPEAKS ON ABM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the turmoil of the present ABM controversy, opinions by veterans assume added importance. Mr. Walter W. Burtt, Americanism chairman of the Department of New Hampshire Veterans of Foreign Wars, has expressed his opinion in an interesting and challenging manner in a letter to the editor appearing recently in the Concord Daily Monitor. The letter follows:

[From the Concord (N.H.) Daily Monitor, Apr. 24, 1969]

VETERAN ANSWERS AN ABM CRITIC

SIR: This letter is in response to a letter signed by Edith Kissine of Silver Spring, Md., which appeared in your paper April 17, 1969.

In that letter Mrs. Kissine said the ABM anti-missile system proposed by President Nixon would be provocative and lead our nation on a suicide race. Such a statement is not true, so let's face facts.

The anti-missile is a fantastic achievement of American scientific and electronic genius which can shoot down enemy missiles hurtling through space at 18,000 miles per hour. In a matter of seconds, the anti-missile can sort out real warheads from among clouds of decoys, and then destroy the enemy warheads before they can destory us with blast, radiation or fallout. The anti-missile has only one objective: to save American lives against enemy attack. The anti-missile is made up of three parts: the multi-function array radar, which is the radar computer complex that identifies and tracks the attacking missile; the Spartan, which is the long-range anti-missile that destroys attacking missiles hundreds of miles out into space; the Sprint, which is the higher speed short range anti-missile that destroys attacking missiles at the edge of the atmosphere.

There is not room here to go into all the technical aspects of the ABM defensive system, but there are a few points to be understood: Firstly, the Safeguard ABM defensive system proposed by President Nixon is defensive in nature and designed to protect the nation's retaliatory strike capability. Secondly, by deploying its own ABM system, the U.S. will strengthen its bargaining hand in any negotiations with Russia or Red China. The Soviet Union had already deployed an ABM system, which certainly tells us something. If we proceed with our own system it will serve as an added incentive for the Russians to negotiate a meaningful agreement on arms limitation. Thirdly, in deploying the Safeguard ABM system, we are letting Russia know that we do have retaliatory capability, and this in itself will serve as a deterrent to any aggressor. Fourthly, we believe the Safeguard system will work. It is interesting to note that most of those scientists who have stated otherwise are men who have not been actively engaged in working on the ABM system. The great bulk of the critics of the system are the sociological intellectuals who dream of a world that is not yet a reality.

In the last eight years the Soviet nuclear striking power has increased 300 per cent. In the last two years the Soviet missile force has nearly quadrupled. Yet, in the face of such enemy power, we still have to be treated to emotional outbursts against a weapon whose sole purpose is to save American lives. One wonders why.

Let's examine the arguments made against the anti-missile system.

False argument No. 1: "The anti-missile costs too much and those billions should be spent on urban problems, etc." Our answer: If we fail to deter or repel a nuclear attack, most Americans would not be alive to enjoy any money spent on other projects. Also, the anti-missile could be the cheapest life and property insurance anyone ever bought.

False Argument No. 2: "The anti-missile is provocative." Our answer: There is nothing more provocative about anti-missile system than there is about a burglar system. The only one who thinks the burglar alarm system is "provocative" is the burglar. A burglar alarm system is purely defensive, and never goes into action until the burglar is on your premises.

False Argument No. 3: "The anti-missile is unnecessary because the Soviets are deterred from attacking us by the assured destruction capability of our offensive nuclear forces." Our Answer: Since Russia already has an anti-missile system, we have no "assured destruction capability" against the U.S.S.R. But, as long as we have no anti-missile system the Soviets do have an "assured destruction capability" against us.

False Argument No. 4: "It would be a waste of money to build the anti-missile because we might have something better in ten years." Our Answer: If anyone can look into a crystal ball and tell us the precise moment when the Soviets or Chinese Reds will attack, then we could build weapons for exactly that date and not waste earlier preparations. In the absence of such precise knowledge of the future, the only sensible policy is to follow the advice of President George Washington who said, "If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

America cannot be protected by weapons which are on the drawing board—only by weapons which we actually have. At the time of Pearl Harbor, the Pentagon knew that in three or four years we would build a better airplane than the B-17 and B-24. The improved, larger B-29 went into action in 1945. But meanwhile, the war had to be fought with the B-17 and the B-24. If we had waited for the B-29, we might have lost World War II. In the case of a nuclear attack, we will not have any time to reopen plants and build

weapons—as we did after Pearl Harbor. In the nuclear age, the only weapons which count are those which are on alert at the moment of attack.

WALTER W. BURTT,
Americanism Chairman,
V.F.W. Dept. of N.H.

EARTH BENEFITS FROM SPACE PROGRAM

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to share with my colleagues an editorial from one of my district's finest newspapers, the Fontana, Calif., Herald-News which succinctly and dramatically capsulates the meaning of our space program in terms the average American can understand.

Too often Americans, even Members of this House, think of our space activities only in terms of spacecraft, 25,000 miles an hour speeds, heroic astronauts, and precise navigation, and exploration in outer space. This editorial takes another tack—an important one which all of us should consider.

The editorial follows:

MOON PROGRAM PAYS DIVIDENDS

For those who view the planned lunar landing next month with mixed emotions—proud of the U.S. accomplishment but dubious about the cost—Rep. Jerry Pettis (R-Calif.) has some reassuring words.

Pettis is in a position to know whereof he speaks as a member of the Science and Astronautics committee of the House. This committee oversees the operations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NSA).

According to Pettis the moon program, which has captured the imagination of millions, has also provided benefits for the nation and its citizens. Pettis says he has insisted highest consideration be given to earth-oriented benefits.

From the laboratories funded through the space program have come more than 2,750 technological advanoes that have been shared wtih industry.

According to Pettis some of these discoveries have medical application. Others have brought about improvements in power conversion systems, structural and fabrication techniques, and metallurgical processes. Still others have improved television and other electronic equipment, new lubricants, better insulation, longer lasting house paints, welding and galvanizing methods, fireproof materials and safety measures.

Purely on a dollar basis, says Pettis, the potential benefits are stupendous. Nimbus III, a new weather satellite, is furnishing detailed information for long range weather forecasts that can save billions of dollars a year and countless lives now lost to hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and other weather disasters. The Communications Satellite Corp., which makes it possible to witness overseas events in your homes, already is operating at a profit. The space program needs have been a principal stimulus to the computer industry which grosses $20 billion a year and provides 800,000 jobs that didn't exist 20 years ago.

Pettis lists many other benefits in medical and scientific fields.

And, as he concludes, the space program will go on improving the quality of our lives on earth. Future generations may look upon our vast investment in this research as the biggest bargain of our time.

HALT MIRV TESTS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining Mr. COHELAN and others in sponsoring a resolution calling on the United States to declare a temporary moratorium on the testing of the MIRV strategic missile warheads. This is the single most important arms-limitation problem now faced by the major nations of the world. Completion of the MIRV tests before the United States and Russia sit down at the strategic arms limitation talks this summer would close a major avenue to effective arms control and rapidly escalate the nuclear arms race.

On April 15, 1969, I spoke to the House of Representatives on the subject of MIRV testing. I pointed out at that time that testing of MIRV warheads by both the United States and Russia threatened a major escalation in the nuclear arms race. The United States now has about 2,400 targetable warheads in its arsenals. A conversion to MIRV warheads would raise this total to 10,000 or more. A single MIRV warhead for the Poseidon missile, for example, might carry as many as 14 40-kiloton nuclear bombs. If both countries arm their strategic missiles with MIRV warheads, the threat of a first strike would become a serious threat. It would probably lead to the development of a new series of strategic missiles, such as a mobile land based system or a sea-bottom mounted system, posing new problems for arms control and placing crippling economic costs on both countries.

The importance of the test phase of the MIRV program is that it is the last point where the use of this warhead can be checked without actually physically inspecting a missile. Both the United States and Russia have the capability to observe the MIRV tests that are conducted over the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans. Without having to place inspectors on the territory of the other nation, both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are able to verify whether the other nation has completed MIRV tests. Once the tests are completed, however, each nation must assume that MIRV warheads are being used.

I understand that a temporary halt of from 2 to 3 months in MIRV testing, until the United States and Russia sit down to discuss strategic arms limitations, would not prevent resumption of the tests should it be impossible to reach a mutual agreement on a test ban at the talks. I urge President Nixon to take the initiative and declare a test moratorium now. It would be a major step on the road to effective arms limitations. Not to do so would be a major setback in attempting to control the nuclear arms race.

I am including in the RECORD an article and an editorial that appeared in the June 18 ,1969, issue of the Wall Street Journal on MIRV that I believe would be informative to my colleagues.

The article follows:

MISSILE DEBATE: THE REAL VILLAIN IS MIRV

(By Robert L. Bartley)

The great missile debate of 1969 has been a debate about the wrong missile.

Or anyway, that's the strongest impression that sticks as a journalistic onlooker comes up for air after immersion in the literature the strategic controversy has engendered. Prospects of avoiding a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union are not directly menaced by defensive antiballistic missiles. From the standpoint of avoiding this holocaust a far more serious threat arises from the offensive multiple warhead missiles both sides apparently are developing.

This week multiple warheads have finally been brought to the forefront of the strategic debate, at least momentarily. A halt in U.S. tests of MIRV (for multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) is being sought by a group of Senators led by Clifford Case and Edward Brooke. At best, though, MIRV remains a side issue in the ABM debate, which has spawned political, emotional and personal impedimenta that seem to make it unlikely any MIRV decision will rest on especially rational grounds.

The problem is that it's not enough to work the wonder of stopping the nuclear arms race; the additional trick is to stop it at a level conducive to future stability. It will make an enormous difference, to take a pointed example, whether nuclear arms are frozen when both sides have second-strike capability, or when both have first-strike capability.

Mutual second-strike capability, the current posture between the U.S. and USSR, means that each side can absorb the worst nuclear blow the other can mount, then still retaliate overwhelmingly. Since a first blow would be suicidal, this posture helps promote stability.

UTTER DESTRUCTION

Mutual first-strike capability, by contrast, would mean each side could so utterly destroy the other that the attacked power could not even effectively retaliate. Each would know that if it shot first it would win, but that it would lose if the other got off the first salvo. The deterrence that has so far helped prevent nuclear war would no longer pertain; in any crisis the present pressure toward stability would be quite reversed.

To preserve any pretense of deterrence in such a situation, each side probably would have to adopt fire-at-warning policies, threatening to fire its retaliatory forces in the 15-to-30 minutes between when a first strike would appear on radar and when it would hit. This constant state of alert would involve an obvious and destabilizing increase in the risks of nuclear war by accident.

The distinction between these postures is by no means academic, for it appears there's a real chance that the advance of technology will take us out of the era of mutual second-strike capability and into an era of mutual first-strike capability. If anything like this does happen, the principal villain will not be ABM but MIRV.

With MIRV each rocket launcher would have, say, three warheads. Thus it could attack three of the enemy's launchers. In other words, one missile with three warheads could take out three missiles with nine warheads. Theoretically, two sides with equal numbers of missiles could wipe out the other's retaliatory missiles with only a third of its own force. Whoever fired first would win.

In practice, to give thanks for small favors, a first strike is scarcely so simple. Since no missile system works perfectly, for one thing, such a blow would require many more missiles than simple arithmetic suggests. Opponents of the ABM have argued that because of unreliability and other factors, the possible mid-1970s force of 500 Soviet SS-9 missiles with MIRV would not be enough for a first strike against the approximately 1,000 U.S. Minutemen.

Such calculations, though, have been impressively attacked by Albert Wohlstetter, a leading strategic specialist at the University of Chicago. He notes, to take one example, that ABM opponents have ignored that most missiles that prove unreliable do so either at launch or shortly thereafter. So a power mounting a first strike would know almost immediately which missiles failed, and could quickly send a second salvo against the remaining targets. Thus he calculates only 5% of the 1,000 Minutemen would survive an attack by 500 SS-9s, an impressive testimonial to the essential effect of MIRV.

Even total destruction of the Minuteman force, however, would not in itself prevent retaliation. The U.S. deterrent forces are "mixed," including not only land-based Minutemen, but also aircraft and Polaris submarines. This mixed posture is specifically intended to complicate any attacker's problems, and also to guard against sudden breakthroughs in any one field. A true first strike against the U.S., as Dr. George W. Rathjens has recently written, would require not only that the Soviets destroy the Minutemen, but also that they be "highly confident of also destroying the other components of our retaliatory strength essentially simultaneously, a possibility that is all but incredible."

Faced with such argument, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has retreated somewhat from his earlier invocations of a Soviet first strike. He now says that if the Russians continue their present developments, "the survival of two of the three major elements of our strategic offensive forces, namely the bombers and the land-based ICBMs, could be gravely endangered. To rely on only one of the three major elements would, in my considered judgment, be far too risky, considering the stake involved, which is the very survival of our nation."

In other words, the Secretary currently argues that the U.S. cannot ignore a threat to the Minuteman missiles if it wants to preserve the full stabilizing effects of a mixed force. If Minuteman were neutralized, a technical breakthrough in anti-submarine warfare would open thoughts of a successful first strike. The mixed force is in jeopardy because one of its components, the land-based missiles, is already obviously subject to that kind of destabilizing breakthrough, which is MIRV.

MR. PACKARD'S TESTIMONY

To be entirely precise, MIRV is a large step toward first-strike capability only when combined with warheads large and accurate enough to attack hardened launcher silos. While the U.S. is ahead in MIRV technology, the multiple warheads it's developing for Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles are apparently not large enough to be especially useful as a counterforce weapon. In Congressional testimony, Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard said the Minuteman is not a first-strike weapon with or without MIRV, and elaborated, "some of the considerations involve estimates of accuracy and weapons size, and I would be very glad to go into that with you in detail. I cannot do it in open session."

The Soviet SS-9 missile apparently can carry a warhead load some 25 times greater than the Minuteman can. Estimates of a MIRV system for SS-9 center on three warheads, each of 5 megatons, or 250 times the size of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The Soviets have other smaller ICBMs, and apparently U.S. intelligence once mistakenly expected them to taper off SS-9 deployment. Since the 5-megaton warheads would seem superfluous in a second strike against cities but ideal for a first strike against missile silos, Defense Department planners find continued deployment of the SS-9 highly threatening.

Both sides have long known how to make larger rockets and larger warheads, though, and the technical key to a first strike against land-based missiles is MIRV. Senators now starting to stress a curb on MIRV developments also stress its inspection difficulties. At present, with both sides still testing MIRV, each can monitor the other's efforts. A moratorium could be easily supervised. But once the systems are perfected. no agreed limitation could be easily enforced without unlikely on-site inspections. MIRV would be a reality, and all of its destabilizing effects would be upon us.

The missile debate has not concentrated on MIRV, of course, but on the ABM. The effects of ABM on stability are far less clear-cut. An all-out defense of cities is uniformly considered destabilizing, because it could facilitate a first strike by shooting down the few retaliatory missiles to survive an initial onslaught.

Proponents of the ABM nonetheless consider a light city defense a stabilizing factor, because it would guard against attack by a minor nuclear force such as Mainland China is expected to develop by the mid-1970s, and against a small accidental launch. An ABM can also be considered stabilizing if it protects missile forces, as the current Safeguard is supposed to do. Indeed, ABM proponents believe it would help offset the destabilizing three-for-one effect of MIRV, because an attacker would have to insure penetration of the defense by targeting several warheads on each of his enemy's launchers.

Opponents of the ABM often agree that a defense of the deterrent would not upset the strategic balance. But they contend the Safeguard program is not actually adapted to that end, because it is a carryover from city defense plans and tries to combine defense of the deterrent with a light shield over cities. They seem to feel any defense of the cities is destabilizing; for one thing, it would force the other side to counteract it by developing MIRV.

The latter argument, in a sense, only stresses that the emphasis in the strategic debate has been misplaced. The reasons ABM became the focus of the debate seem largely political and personal. MIRV was the cost-effective pet of former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, whom the ABM critics generally consider an ally of sorts. Secretary McNamara also proposed the first ABM deployment, but with an obvious distaste that hardly prevented his Congressional friends from attacking it.

More generally, critics of the ABM actually are less interested in any particular missile system than in establishing effective Congressional control of the Pentagon budget. They want to demonstrate that Congress can intelligently review and even reject Pentagon proposals. MIRV, an ongoing program for some time, would be an inconvenient target for such a demonstration. ABM development is not so far along, and the attack on it was all the more convenient because of suburban displeasure with ABM sites under the old Sentinel program.

Some leading ABM foes do not want to sacrifice the momentum they have gained on that issue by taking on MIRV as well or instead. Sen. William Fulbright recently told the Washington Post that the ABM has "become a symbol of this body's attempt to control the spending on arms." Rather than confuse the issue with MIRV, he suggested, "we should stay right on the ABM until it's disposed of."

A PRESIDENTIAL TEST?

On the other side of the debate, President Nixon seems to have permitted the ABM issue to shape up as a test of his Presidential leadership. A suspension of the MIRV tests with the ABM vote still pending would make it look as if the President had been faced down. It might endanger his prospects in the ABM fight, as opponents of the system would probably assume the Soviets would reciprocate with their own MIRV slowdown, and would use this as an argument against the ABM.

MIRV has become prominent in the debate, in short, only after positions on both sides have been pretty well frozen. Yet if MIRV development continues both here and in the Soviet Union, it would seem that little stability will be gained by stopping ABM development. And if MIRV development is stopped by agreement or mutual example, the current mutual second-strike capability will be preserved regardless of what the two sides decide about limited ABM deployment for such reasons as protection against minor nuclear powers.

The ABM may be a technical flop and an enormous waste of money, as its opponents contend. But in promoting stability in the nuclear arms race, the ABM does not matter nearly as much as the intensity of the debate has suggested. What does matter is MIRV.

THE ARMS RACE AND MIRV

In nearby columns the reader will find an attempt to untangle some of the skeins of the debate over strategic nuclear posture in general and multiple warheads in particular. One does not need to run with the outspoken doves to recognize that MIRV is a highly dangerous technical development and a very special case.

As a matter of fact, we have never subscribed to the fuzzy notion that the key to progress on arms control is for the U.S. to demonstrate its good faith. Rather, we think the chance of a really meaningful arms agreement rests on a strictly hardnosed bargain between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Nor do we think much of the vaunted "action-reaction cycle" as the ultimate explanation of the arms race. Certainly it's true that both the U.S. and the Soviets react to the other's arms advances, but in a deeper sense each is reacting to the inexorable advance of technology. The "action-reaction" explanation is not one that can be turned on its head; who will say straightaway, as this talk so often hints, that if the U.S. unilaterally stops its developments the Soviets will automatically do likewise?

We do strongly believe, however, that the U.S. and the Soviets must do whatever they can to stop the arms race. Even allowing that the actual chances of an eventual agreement can be improved by a certain amount of preparation, we have not been happy with the Administration's apparent slowness in completing arrangements for Soviet-American arms talks. It is encouraging that the U.S. has now reportedly proposed a starting date of July 31.

MIRV would be a logical first item in any arms talks, since future stability depends on both sides possessing a secure deterrent, and MIRV is a large step toward the ability for each to destroy the other's deterrent forces. But the U.S. development of MIRV is already in its final flight tests. Once the tests are completed, a MIRV limitation agreement would be vastly complicated by inspection issues. Thus a number of Senators have asked that the Administration halt the tests pending the forthcoming negotiations.

In reply, Dr. John S. Foster, Pentagon research chief, has argued that the U.S. needs to proceed with its present MIRV schedule because the Soviets might upgrade their aircraft defenses into a full-scale ABM. Yet

such upgrading surely would require some amount of lead time, and apparently we already can start to deploy MIRV within a few months.

Defenders of MIRV also argue that a mutual moratorium might have been a good idea at one time, but that it is now too late to stop at a point where both sides are confident the other does not already have the weapon. While there is some disagreement about the precise status of the Soviet MIRV program, everyone seems to agree the U.S. is substantially ahead. At this point, in other words, it is the Soviets who would suspect that the U.S. has perfected the weapon.

That means that the U.S. could experiment with an announcement that it is suspending its tests for a limited period contingent on Soviet reciprocation. It could also stress that, whatever its progress in separating and targeting the warheads, it has not experimented with multiple warheads of the huge size necessary to attack Soviet deterrent forces. In this situation, the Soviet reaction would tell us whether it's already true that "the genie is out of the bottle."

Thus we think the Senators trying to shift the debate away from ABM and toward MIRV have a strong case. If the political obstacles to a MIRV holdback prove too high, indeed, they may want to consider offering to defer to the Administration's judgment on ABM provided it postpones the MIRV tests. Because of its huge destabilizing potential, MIRV is the truly urgent issue.

For multiple warhead technology is more dangerous than other arms developments now on the public horizon, and at the same time one on which a suspension seems reasonably feasible. The United States has a lead in the key technology. As long as development remains in the testing stage, a moratorium by mutual example could be unilaterally supervised merely by watching Soviet tests. Since arms talks are about to start, an announced moratorium could be for a limited period, pending formalization through negotiations.

We do not think much of the prospects of disarmament by mutual example as a general rule, and still less of unilateral holdbacks as a method of arms control. But the case for a carefully designed exception is seldom likely to be stronger than it is regarding MIRV.

HON. WILLIAM BATES

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, there is little that can be added to the tributes that have been paid to the memory of the late Honorable William Bates.

To say that he will be missed is an understatement of the highest order. But I would like to include in the RECORD at this time a letter I have received from one of the most outstanding naval officers in the history of our Nation, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Admiral Rickover's tribute is eloquent and sincere and I know that it will bring comfort to Mr. Bates' family to know of the high esteem which Admiral Rickover held for Bill Bates.

The letter follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1969.

Hon. MENDELL L. RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: It is my understanding that members of the House of Representatives are planning to include in the Record comments concerning the distinguished service Congressman William Henry Bates gave his country during his 19 years as a member of the House. If it is appropriate, I would appreciate it greatly if you could include this letter.

I have known and respected Congressman Bates since his election two decades ago, and it is with deep sorrow that I learned of his death. All of us in the naval program who have been in any way associated with him, as well as many others, have reason to regret his death.

Over the many years that I have been responsible for the Navy's nuclear propulsion program, my respect for this distinguished American has continuously grown. He was always available when I asked to visit with him. No matter how pressed he was for time he befriended and helped me. It was a comfort to be able to go to him for his wisdom, his objectivity, and his kindly advice. I am proud to have been associated with so fine a gentleman and patriot who did such honor to his country and to his state.

I speak from personal experience when I say that the support he unfailingly gave as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy contributed immeasurably to our nuclear Navy—which is today a major factor in preserving peace. He was a wise man, a good friend; kind and warmhearted. His accomplishments will be better understood in the future.

Expressions of condolence always sound hollow and inadequate. But Congressman Bates was so unusual a man in every respect that I can't help writing to say that I feel his death as a personal loss.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

VOTING RIGHTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it appears to be the policy of the egalitarians that justice cannot be equally punitive in our land.

We of the seven Southern States who have had our State constitutions suspended at will by the U.S. Attorney General, under the Voting Rights Act of 1965, were amazed to overhear the screams of anguish and prejudice against the present administration's initial proposal to extend the Voting Rights Act uniformly into all 50 States. Noteworthy, some who were the most violent objectors to the Nixon Voting Rights Act led the fight to pass the Johnson Voting Rights Act—a dual standard of equality—acceptable so long as it applied only to the citizens of the Southern States.

We, of the often-persecuted and colonized South have—for 5 years—pointed out the inequities of the unconstitutional, highhanded Federal intervention into the rights of our people to have some voice in our voting laws—denying us the self-determination enjoyed by other States but which was denied us by the Voting Rights Act—reducing our States to the condition of conquered provinces.

The Voting Rights Act was but the spite work of unconscionable power politics in 1965 under the Democrats and no more right in 1969 under the Republicans merely because it would extend the long arm of the centralized Government into the registration offices and the voting booths of all States. But at least the tyranny against statehood and citizens would have been equally applied.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings which can but conclude a hypocritical scheme of prejudice against the South:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 2, 1969]

NIXON YIELDS ON VOTING RIGHTS—GIVES APPROVAL FOR EXTENSION OF PRESENT LAW

(By John Beckler)

The Nixon administration, apparently moving to head off a potential revolt by House Republican civil rights supporters, has indicated it will not oppose a compromise that could clear the way for extending the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Under the compromise, originally suggested a week ago, the House will first act on extending the 1965 law, then consider the broader package voting legislation sought by the administration.

First indication the administration would not insist on a total substitution of its own program for the 1965 act came yesterday after a White House meeting between House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford and President Nixon.

MATTER OF TACTICS

The dispute over the legislation was "just a matter of tactics," Ford told reporters after the meeting. "You know there will be an extension. It's just a question of whether it will be done in a package or in a two-step procedure."

The 1965 act is narrowly drawn to protect Negro voting rights in seven Southern states. The administration bill would expand its provisions—with one major change—to all 50 states and also ban state residency requirements for voters in presidential elections.

The major change in the administration proposal from existing law is in a provision designed to prevent states from changing their voting procedures to make it more difficult for Negroes to vote or run for office.

LIBERALS RAP MOVE

The present law requires the states to get prior approval from the attorney general before any change in procedures can go into effect. The administration bill would leave it up to the attorney general to uncover such changes and then institute any action to block a procedure.

The administration's attempt to replace the 1965 act brought a strong reaction from liberal Democrats and Republican civil rights advocates, who complained the new bill would weaken Negro voting rights by diluting the law's effect where it is needed most—in the South.

Some civil rights groups also have charged President Nixon agreed to take the sectional character from voting rights legislation in order to obtain Southern support in last year's presidential election.

MITCHELL IN HOUSE

And some critics say Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell would not be particularly inclined to search out discriminatory changes made by the states in voting procedure.

The strength of the opposition, which had taken on the dimensions of a revolt within Republican ranks, was brought home forcefully yesterday when Mitchell appeared before the House Judiciary Committee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 30, 1969]

VOTING RIGHTS

The 1965 Voting Rights Act is bad legislation in the sense that it seeks to remedy in-

justice by embracing inequity. If it were to lapse this year, at the end of its five-year statutory life, there would be no occasion for mourning.

The 1965 law moves along two main lines. It bans literacy tests in certain Southern states as a prerequisite to voting. And it requires those states to come to Washington and obtain the O.K. of the attorney general or a federal judge before any change can be made in their voting laws.

Now there is no doubt that literacy tests had been misused in the South in some instances to discriminate against potential Negro voters. And this certainly should not be tolerated. But the impact of the 1965 law is not based on any claim or showing of voter discrimination. Instead, its authors merely decreed that the law would become effective in any state or county in which fewer than 50 percent of the people of voting age failed to vote or were not registered to vote in the 1964 election. If 50 percent voted, a state was in the clear. But not so if only 49.9 percent of the eligibles went to the polls.

It turned out, by coincidence if one likes to believe in fairy tales, that this formula covered Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Virginia and 39 of 100 counties in North Carolina. Literacy tests in 13 non-Southern states were not affected.

Condemning this as "regional" legislation, Attorney General Mitchell has opposed a simple renewal of the 1965 law. He prefers new legislation which would ban all literacy tests and which would drop the requirement that Southern states come hat-in-hand to Washington for approval of any change in their election laws. As an alternative, Mitchell advocated legislation empowering the Justice Department to obtain injunctions against any discriminatory state law affecting voting, and which would also authorize the Attorney General to send observers and examiners into any state to guard against discrimination or voting frauds.

It has not been our view that a simple literacy test, given without discrimination, is an evil thing. Illiteracy and an informed electorate hardly go hand in hand. This country needs more rather than fewer voters who can at least read and write their names.

Since Congress obviously will take some action, however, we think the Mitchell approach is much better than perpetuation of the existing law. By all means, discrimination whether in tests or state laws should be struck down. But this should not be done through a federal statute which is both disingenuous and singularly invidious in its own discriminatory application.

CLARKE COLLEGE NAMES NEW PRESIDENT, ROBERT J. GIROUX

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, this is a most significant day in the 126-year history of Clarke College in Dubuque, Iowa, as Dr. Robert J. Giroux takes over as the first lay president of the institution.

Clarke, one of the oldest colleges for women in the country, was founded in 1843 by the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In 1895, when the school was drawing students from as far away as Massachusetts, Canada, Hawaii, and Mexico, it began offering postgraduate courses. Chartered by the State of Iowa in 1901 as Mount St. Joseph Academy and College, it conferred its first bachelor of arts degree in 1904. In 1928, the academy was closed and the name was changed to Clarke College in honor of Mother Clarke.

Still largely a residence college, Clarke now has a steadily growing enrollment of day students who commute from a 40-mile area in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

Dr. Giroux, formerly vice president for academic affairs and academic dean at St. Michael's College in Winooski, Vt., was elected by a predominantly lay board of trustees to succeed Sister Mary Benedict Phelan, B.V.M., who has held the office since August 1957 but who announced in May of this year that she would not be available for another term.

During the 12 years Sister Mary Benedict has served Clarke College, student enrollment has increased by more than 50 percent—from 713 to 1,075. Part of that increase resulted from the expansion of one residence hall in 1961 and construction of a new dormitory in 1965. The college has also opened in the past 5 years a $2.3 million science-classroom building and a maintenance services center.

In 1966, Clarke converted its 12-year-old lay advisory board into a board of trustees, with legal control of the college. In 1967, it became a charter member of a tri-State consortium including Aquinas Institute, Loras College for men, the coeducational University of Dubuque, and the University of Wisconsin at Platteville. The following year, it established with Loras and the University of Dubuque a tri-college cooperative effort, which now has a $200,000 Federal grant for study of curriculum coordination and faculty-student exchange.

A graduate of St. Michael's College, Dr. Giroux holds a master of arts in teaching degree from that school and a doctor of philosophy degree from the School of Psychology and Education at the University of Ottawa, Canada. He has also studied at the University of Notre Dame and the C. W. Post College of Long Island University.

Before joining the faculty at St. Michael's in 1962, as Director of Extension Services, Dr. Giroux taught in schools in Vermont, Connecticut, and New York. He designed and directed the first NDEA Guidance Workshop in Vermont, was appointed by the Governor to the Vermont Technical Services Board, and served as president of the Vermont Personnel and Guidance Association and consultant to the Vermont Personnel Board.

He was active in the preparation of the Bilingual Education Act in the last Congress, and has also served as consultant to the secretary of education of the diocese of Ogdensburg, N.Y.; as a member of the State advisory board for the religious education of the retarded; and as a consultant to the provincial association of Catholic Teachers of Montreal. He designed and initially directed an Upward Bound project at St. Michael's and a program for black students from New York City, through Mayor Lindsay and Governor Hoff of Vermont.

Mr. Speaker, as Dr. Giroux assumes the presidency of Clarke, it is an appropriate time to give recognition to the contributions which the institution has made for more than a century, and which Sister Mary Benedict has made for the past 12 years, to the excellence of higher education for which eastern Iowa is noted, and to the development of young women throughout the Middle West. We wish Dr. Giroux every success as he continues the high standards and traditions which have marked Clarke College through the years.

WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS WORK FOR YOUTH

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I just had the pleasure of meeting and talking with 150 high school students who have come here to the Nation's Capital to participate in the Washington Workshops on the U.S. Congress. The purpose of these Washington Workshops—to be carried on throughout the summer—is twofold: To offer in-depth study and on-the-scene involvement in the American legislative and political process and, at the same time, to improve the lines of communication between the Nation's leaders and its young people—the leaders of tomorrow.

I have participated in the workshops both last year and at the present time, and I am so encouraged by the program that I would like to tell my colleagues more about it.

The workshops sessions are built around daily Capitol Hill conversations with Members of Congress. Some 50 Democratic and Republican Congressmen and Senators, representing a broad spectrum of political thought, will meet with the students. Some of this summer's participants include Senator MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine; Senator MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota; Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona; Senator HATFIELD, Republican, of Oregon; Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York; and House Members, Speaker MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts; Minority Leader FORD, Republican, of Michigan; Mr. PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida; Mr. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York; Mr. MCDADE, Republican, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Republican, of California. Preceding these sessions, morning campus seminars at Mount Vernon Junior College on the legislative process are led by Washington Workshops instructors who are college and graduate school government majors, and teachers of the American Government.

One focal point of this summer will be congressional and governmental proposals concerning college unrest. The students will discuss and consider various responses to this problem, analyze pending legislation and administration proposals dealing with campus unrest, and hold dialog discussions in this vital area of American concern.

Additional activities include guest lectures and discussions with Cabinet members and Government officials, evening panel discussions with visiting international students, as well as social events featuring Embassy receptions, a congressional pages party, and concerts.

Washington Workshops, a nonprofit educational foundation, founded by my friend Leo Tonkin, offers the only study program on the U.S. Congress for high school students in the Nation's Capital, and has received the cooperation of the National Council on Social Studies of the National Education Association, the National Catholic Education Association, and the National Association of Independent Schools.

Applicants are selected on the basis of their interest in American Government and the U.S. Congress and on recommendations of their high school government teachers and guidance counselors. This summer's seminars will include nearly 1,000 participants from every State of the country and every social and economic background. I am especially pleased to find that Miguel Guillermo Guilarte, valedictorian of Miami Senior High School, participated in this event. Many students come with scholarship assistance provided by the Washington Workshops Foundation, schools, local civic and business groups, and title I—disadvantaged student assistance—of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As I previously mentioned, I have just met with the first group of students and it was an experience that reinforced my confidence in America's young people. They are concerned and involved, and determined to find solutions to the problems that frustrate all of society today. Many of these splendid young Americans will be here for the remaining 2-week Workshops this summer.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I want to welcome them, and to say that I know the Washington Workshops will prove to be an educational and challenging experience for both them and the Members of Congress.

THE DRAFT

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am currently undertaking a survey of the views and attitudes of high school principals, college presidents, and members of selective service draft boards in my district on the draft and draft-reform proposals. Being of the belief that there is much value in Congress going directly to those citizens who are directly involved with a particular issue, I have requested the assistance of these persons in formulating some attitudes for upcoming consideration of selective service revision.

I have just received a most beneficial and informative letter from Mr. Calvin Hewitt, of Kenosha, Wis., expressing some observations of local board No. 31, Kenosha County, Wis. As evidence of the national concern of my constituents, and as an expression of much significance, I am including the letter in the RECORD and commend its reading to Members of Congress:

VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
Kenosha, Wis., June 26, 1969.

Congressman HENRY SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Your letter to Stanley Przlomski, Chairman of Local Board No. 31, was read with interest by the five board members, and I was informally designated as the one to reply. I am in my fifth year of service on the board and as a part-time board member who contributes eight, ten or more hours each month to my uncompensated responsibility to administer the Selective Service laws, and as a full-time local citizen who is fully aware of the effect of the "draft" upon the local community, I trust my observations may be of some interest to you.

Even though the local board member is knowledgable about the "draft," he finds that joining the debate about the "draft" could impede his effectiveness as an administrator. Generally, we quietly observe, and listen to the bias, half-truths, and condemnations espoused by the uninformed and/or malcontents. Too often persons of considerable stature in government, educational institutions and the news media, display shameful ignorance of the selective service system.

As an administrator of the selective service laws, my perspective must be oriented to my understanding of national interests as it affects all the registrants under Local Board 31's jurisdiction, and how this in turn effects the individual registrants who are being considered for classification. I presume that your perspective as a Congressman charged with the responsibility of providing for our national security, must begin at this point of issue, and after you decide the needs of our national security, must then consider the best way of providing security and finally a system that affects all of your constituents consistent with fullest equity and justice.

I believe that until such time as our military commitments may be appreciably reduced, the present draft system should continue to serve as a flexible supply of men to the armed services. Improvement in the procedures are always possible and desirable. The present system of local boards exercising very limited discretionary powers for granting deferments is both democratic and more uniformly practiced than is generally believed. Stricter guidelines for deferments for critical employment, graduate level education and for concientious objectors could be an improvement. It may also help if Congress would appropriate sufficient funds to examine all 19 year olds so that acceptability can be determined at an early date. I believe the present selection of the oldest first should be continued for the present and for the forseeable future. The idea of random selection may make sense at some future date, but it would create greater inequities than presently exist if instituted at this time.

One must consider the fact that the present system of selection has been built upon both the successes and the failures experienced throughout the history of our country. The fact of military service is certainly more disruptive to an individual's life than the fact of obligation to serve. One incontestable fact is the military mission is best served by male youths in the 19 to 26 year age bracket. By imposing reasonable standards for acceptance into military service, a certain percentage of this age group will be found physically, mentally, or morally unacceptable. It is obvious that inequity in the 19 to 26 year age group is impossible to avoid.

It is my belief that our Republic form of government places a specific burden of responsibility upon each citizen. In our pluralistic free society, the degree of individual responsibility must increase in proportion to the increase in the social and economic diversity of our citizens, and the task of achieving greater justice and equity under the law becomes increasingly difficult to attain. Those citizens who are physically, mentally, or morally disadvantaged must necessarily assume a lesser share of the burden and thus a greater share of responsibility must be borne by those more favorably endowed. It seems there is considerable shirking of responsibility by some young people and too much pampering of this attitude by some adults. The present selective service system continues to serve its mission in spite of the physical and verbal barbs hurled at it by self-seeking, misguided, people who display little understanding of or concern for our national interests. It is my opinion that this session of Congress should spend very little time on this matter because it has already been studied more than adequately. I strongly recommend little or no statutory change in the system in this session of Congress.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote in January, 1968, which covers some of my attitudes and opinions about the draft. One additional subject should be touched upon, that of the so called voluntary military service. The some 1,400 men and women presently in the armed services from Local Board #31's area of jurisdiction (Kenosha County) represents approximately 4 enlistees for every 1 inductee. The board members are aware of many enlistments motivated by the draft, but there is no realistic measure of how many are primarily motivated by the "draft." A feasibility study of the voluntary military should begin with the present retention rates of the various services. In my opinion, due to a lack of a military tradition (ours is a concept of the civilian oriented "citizen soldier") and unfortunately modest to low status of military careers, an all volunteer force is impractical. Even if it was practical, I would question the desirability of an institutionalized professional military as being out of character with our very successful experience with the civilian oriented military. It is paradoxal to hear the same people bewailing the "military-industrial complex" and at the same instance strongly urging the abolishment of the draft in favor of an all volunteer professional military. I pray that Congress will be able to consider this matter in its proper perspective.

Yours truly,

CALVIN HEWITT,
Member of Local Board No. 31.

BROADCASTING IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, for a wide variety of reasons, the Federal Communications Commission has been a toothless watchdog over the public interest in radio and television broadcasting. Most of the responsibility, of course, lies with the FCC, but Congress itself must share in the blame.

Recent developments, however, give us a small degree of hope for the future. The FCC, with an 11th-hour exhibition of bureaucratic legerdemain reversed the precipitous action of its staff in the

WPIX case, and at the same time was ordered by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to invite new applicants for WLBT's broadcast license in Jackson, Miss. WLBT had a long history of biased reporting of civil rights news, but the FCC's bureaucratic blinders denied the possibility of an effective challenge, except through the courts.

The New York Times in a June 25 editorial presented an encouraging perspective of the broad issue these two cases present. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PUBLIC AIRWAVES

The ruling by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia denying the license renewal of WLBT-TV in Jackson, Miss., is a decision of major significance not only for broadcasting but for other Federally regulated businesses.

For the court has held that wherever the public interest is at stake, the public has standing before the Federal agencies and can challenge licenses and franchises without legal apologies. This concept, which underscores an interim ruling of a few years ago in this TV license case, already has had the effect of encouraging conservationists, for example, in matters before the Federal Power Commission.

Five years ago, Dr. Everett C. Parker, director of communication for the United Church of Christ, initiated a method of monitoring Southern TV stations to see if they were carrying the whole civil rights story. WLBT-TV appeared to be one of the worst offenders in failing to report fully on civil rights developments. The United Church of Christ, leaders of the local National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other private citizens accused this station of racist programing practices before the Federal Communications Commission. But they were regarded as interlopers and slapped down.

Last summer the F.C.C. went through its usual motions of allowing this station to stay on the air and denying a challenge by the civil rights groups. In a strong dissent, Commissioners Nicholas Johnson and Kenneth Cox declared that "it is simply undeniable that bigotry was a watchword at WLBT."

Now that dissenting view has been upheld by none other than the new Chief Justice of the United States, Warren E. Burger. In his final opinion as an Appeals Court judge, he encouraged the challengers, rebuked the F.C.C., withdrew WLBT's license and invited new applicants for this station's franchise.

The decision means that TV and radio stations holding franchises of the public air do not have, in the cynical phrase, "a license to print money." As Judge Burger put it, "Broadcasters are temporary permitees—fiduciaries—of a great public resource and they must meet the highest standards which are embraced in the public interest concept."

Broadly, this decision will help educate the Federal regulatory agencies and the courts as to the inherent rights of public challenges against licensed private interests.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO KATHLEEN O'HARA

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a prize-winning essay, written by an eighth grader, containing a statement of principles we all should like to see practiced. Its author, Miss Kathleen O'Hara of Bloomingdale, N.J., was named State champion in the New Jersey Jaycee essay contest.

Kathleen, obviously, is not among the "alienated youth" we hear so much about these days. It is good for us to be reminded that there are young people like Kathleen, who are outspoken for the principles on which this Nation was conceived and dedicated.

I think it particularly appropriate to insert Kathleen's essay in the RECORD this week, as we prepare to mark the 193d anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

The essay follows:

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By Kathleen O'Hara)

The baby toddling his first steps, the boy on his way to baseball practice, the young man of twenty-one voting for the first time, are all American citizens.

Citizenship is your privilege, your right—no one can take it away from you. You are a citizen, now, this very minute. But because America so generously bestows its citizenship upon you, you owe it to your country to become a good citizen, and you can do this by practicing Americanism, the best way to do this is first to know and then to do.

America is a land, a people, and a way of life. By getting to know your country you will come to love it. Learn how your country, your own state, your city, town, or village are governed and find out how you fit into that government. Discover where that government is strong and where it is weak. Do your part as a citizen in the big task of upholding its strength and overcoming its weaknesses.

But be prepared as well to do your part in the smaller tasks—in such everyday things as obeying traffic regulations, living up to game laws when you go hunting or fishing, serving on jury duty when called, and many other things.

Find out about our political parties and what they stand for—all of them, not just one. Study all sides of a question that concerns the welfare of your community, your state, your country, then take your stand and vote as your conscience bids you. Vote those people into public office you feel best fitted to do what you think is right that's the way to make democracy work.

But don't stop here.

Remember that America is not a gift that is freely given us. Each of us must deserve it. We must work for America, live for it and, if the call should come, die for it.

"A chain is as strong as its weakest link." A nation is as strong as each of its citizens. America is as strong as you are!

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT'S "OPERATION ARUBA"

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I brought to the attention of our colleagues through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the plans of Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., for its 1969 youth incentive and economic education award project, Operation Aruba.

I am now delighted to report to our colleagues that Operation Aruba was a complete success and deserves to rank as one of the finest international public relations and youth education projects yet executed.

As a part of my remarks, therefore, I am pleased to include Junior Achievement's official report on Operation Aruba. I do so not only because I am deeply proud of the accomplishments of these young achievers and of the guidance and encouragement provided them by outstanding business and industrial leaders in my area, but also because I am convinced that the experience of our own junior achievement program can be an important incentive to similar programs, both real and potential, in other parts of the country.

Learning by doing, Mr. Speaker, is still the most effective kind of education, and as our colleagues will discover from the report, Junior Achievers of Union County, N.J., have demonstrated impressively the great potential of young Americans to develop the competence and self-reliance that will benefit them and our country in the years ahead.

The report follows:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, INC.—REPORT ON OPERATION ARUBA

1968–1969 YOUTH EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC EDUCATION PROJECT

Tenth in a series of unique youth incentive and economic education projects developed and executed by Junior Achievement of Union County, Inc., which comprises Union County, New Jersey and the nearby communities of Carteret and Holmdel, Operation Aruba was an unqualified success. The 8-month project was designed to develop competence and to stimulate outstanding performance in all phases of Junior Achievement. All objectives were attained and Operation Aruba has been acclaimed for its contribution to international understanding and goodwill.

Products of the 31 Junior Achievement companies were well designed and attractively packaged.

Production was efficient, quality good, and production goals established and met, keeping pace with sales.

Dollar sales of the junior companies totaled $45,031, the highest to date.

140 Junior Achievers earned membership in the JA $100 Sales Club. Top dollar sales winner had sales of $1,449. The aggregate sales by this group was $22,705.

The attendance record of the Junior Achievers was excellent and the highest in the Eastern Region, ranking among the highest in the nation.

30 of our 31 Junior Achievement companies operated at a profit. 27 of them paid dividends to their stockholders—one company operated at a loss—3 operated at about a break-even, but were able to return 100% of their stockholder's investment upon liquidation.

49 Junior Achievers were nominated for participation in the Operation Aruba award trip to industrial, educational, and cultural sites in Aruba in the Netherlands Antilles, May 4 through May 10, 1969. 33 award winners and 2 alternates were selected by a panel of business and community leaders after probing individual interviews. They were questioned about their performance in Junior Achievement, their understanding of the principles, functions, risks and rewards of free enterprise, their extracurricular interests and activities, and their knowledge of the history and economic development of Aruba.

FREE ENTERPRISE ESSAYS

As part of the Operation Aruba competition the Junior Achievers were required to write an essay on the subject "Why I Believe in

Free Enterprise and What Junior Achievement Has Taught Me About It". Biographies of the award winning Junior Achievers, which were sent to Aruban hosts and to newspaper, radio and television editors and programmers prior to arrival in Aruba, included excerpts from their essays and information about the young people's extracurricular activities.

Typical is the essay of Thomas Zepko, 16 year old sophomore at Rahway High School who is President of JARCA, sponsored by Radio Corporation of America. He wrote:

"My original intentions in joining Junior Achievement centered around the desire to be involved in something truly worthwhile. I have not been disappointed.

"Junior Achievement has helped me to develop those character traits which I feel are most important in a successful career, and has strengthened my trust in this nation and its free enterprise system.

"Since I have been involved only in purely academic courses in school, Junior Achievement has given me valuable experience in understanding the business world. By operating a junior company, I have seen first hand the mechanics behind our free enterprise system. By actually performing all the same tasks required of a real company, I have become better acquainted with the problems faced by a large corporation and can understand the motives behind many of the actions of such companies.

"In the business atmosphere of Junior Achievement, I have learned a great deal about the qualities of leadership, productivity, and personal initiative and their importance in all walks of life. It has been necessary for me to become aware of the company policies, to form my own opinions and to present these at Board of Directors meetings. I have tried to display leadership in convincing others of the importance of presenting their ideas in helping to determine the success of our company.

"All members are directly exposed to the problems of producing a saleable product, since this is the chief goal of any company, large or small. The Achiever soon finds that the success of the company product depends on how well members can work together in getting a job done properly. Getting along with fellow workers in an amiable atmosphere is of great importance and fosters quality production.

"I gained the most, however, in my job as salesman. Since selling is entirely up to the Achiever himself, a successful salesman must show drive and initiative in completing a sale. An Achiever must know how to effectively present himself to his customers and must learn what character traits others find appealing in him and what he can best do and say to impress them with his product. This knowledge about himself can help any Achiever greatly in the future when he must rely on self-confidence to sell himself at interviews for college entrance, employment etc.

"During the Operation Industry visit to our sponsoring company I was able to relate my experience as a Junior Achiever to the full scale operation of a large factory. We were not only shown the details of the production line, but also spoke with company executives, all of whom seemed very interested in our junior company.

"For the first time I really became involved in the operations of such a plant. This visit showed me in what ways our own company was similar to almost any industrial firm. For this day, at least, I felt I was no longer a high school student, but a functioning member of our industrial society.

"All in all, this year in Junior Achievement has proved to be richly rewarding. It has given me valuable experience in understanding the business world. It has aided me in gaining a better insight of myself and has inspired inner confidence and determination to be an active and responsible citizen."

Diane McVey, 15 year old sophomore at Orange Avenue High School and Purchasing Agent of PURCO, sponsored by Purolator Inc., said: "Ours is the best economic system tried to date, the only one concerned with the creation of wealth, and through incentives and rewards it encourages good work". In concluding her essay she summed up her convictions: "If the youth of America *really* want to do something for the world—they might go to work! That's what created and built this country, and that's what developed the highest standard of living in history."

The Junior Achievers were well prepared to meet businessmen in Aruba and to discuss their Junior Achievement activities.

BROAD COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT CONTRIBUTES TO INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Although Operation Aruba was planned and executed by the Board of Directors and staff of Junior Achievement of Union County, its success can only be attributed to the total involvement of the business, financial, and professional communities, government leaders, educators, clergy, and the civic and business organizations in the home community and in Aruba.

Upon arrival in Aruba at mid-day, the young people were greeted by host families with whom they visited overnight. The following day was spent observing normal business activities of the hosts, who were primarily businessmen but included members of the clergy, professionals, government officials, and an officer of the U.S. Navy.

Well groomed, interested to learn, articulate about their Junior Achievement activities and career interests, the young people made a fine impression causing some, accustomed to reading headlines about civil disobedience and unrest on university campuses, to inquire if the Junior Achievers were "the cream of the crop". Elizabeth's Mayor Thomas G. Dunn explained at a Rotary Club of Aruba dinner that this was "not true". He said, "These Junior Achievers are typical of millions of young Americans. We are proud of them, but we are also proud of the overwhelming majority of young men and women in our country. An unfair amount of publicity has been given to a ridiculous minority of young people who cause so much trouble in our universities and elsewhere. I assure you, they are a small minority and these Junior Achievers more typically represent American youth."

J. W. Digby, President, Aruba Chemical Industries, N. V., wrote: "It was a pleasure to be able to be of some service to such bright young people and their dedicated sponsors."

Lieutenant Governor Oscar S. Henriquez wrote: "It has been a great pleasure for us to have those young people here in Aruba. They were genuinely interested in learning as much as possible about our Island, the people, and the industries. The contact between them and the pupils of Colegio Arubano has been mutually instructive. Wishing you much success with the good work being done."

ENLIGHTENING VISITS TO ARUBAN INDUSTRIES

After Lieutenant Governor Henriquez had addressed them and reviewed the history, government system, and economic development of Aruba at the dinner hosted by the Rotary Club of Aruba, the Junior Achievers visited the major industrial installations on the Island: Lago Oil & Transport Co. Ltd. and Aruba Chemical Industries, N. V., affiliates of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Web (Water-Energiebedrijf), the $11 million seawater evaporator plant and power station owned by the Island Territory; and several important trading companies. They also had a behind-the-scenes inspection tour of the Aruba Sheraton Hotel where they were headquartered, and of the Grace Line cruise ship, Santa Paula, escorted by the Captain and First Officer. They learned how the deep water harbors have enhanced trade, commerce and tourism. They learned how the decision to locate the refinery on Aruba has affected the Island, resulting in a complete change in the economic structure, population growth, expansion of the educational system, harbor improvement and expansion, the promotion of industrial development through incentive plans, and hotel construction.

Witnessing first-hand the prosperous growth of the Island economy emphasized the importance of cooperative, long-term planning not only within the Island Territory but also with foreign corporations and investors, and also the far-reaching effects on trade and commerce of the European Common Market.

Also, by contrast, it emphasized to the young people the strength of the American economy and the scope of opportunities available to them at home.

Their reactions are reflected in a letter from Dennis Branden, 16 year old junior at A. L. Johnson Regional High School and Purchasing Agent of BURRY'HO, sponsored by Burry Biscuit Division of The Quaker Oats Company. To his host, David Lennard, Manager of S. E. L. Maduro & Sons, he wrote: ". . . thank you for your generous hospitality . . . This past week has been one of the greatest times of my life . . . I really appreciated the day I spent with you in your office and I would like to thank everyone who helped me to get a basic understanding of the operation of S. E. L. Maduro & Son."

STUDENTS COMPARE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

The Junior Achievers spent a day at Colegio Arubano where Rector J. A. M. van Roosmalen reviewed the new system of higher education instituted in 1968 in the Netherlands Antilles. He emphasized its major advantages: better opportunities for every student to choose from a wide range of subjects those best for him; opportunity within the system for correction if errors of selection are made; and opportunities to progress in relation to one's capabilities. The upper classes at this school achieve the equivalent of college level credits elsewhere.

The Junior Achievers were amazed to learn that all students are required to take a range of subjects including at least four languages, mathematics, biology, physics, chemistry, geography, history, drawing, music and physical education, and to attend school year-round with only about 50 holidays.

Despite some differences in their educational patterns, including more leisure time for the American students, the young people found common ground in the sports arena. The Junior Achievers trounced the Aruban boys at soft ball, but lost to them in their national sport, soccer, known there as football.

Symbolic of their visit, the students exchanged flags of the Netherlands Antilles and the State of New Jersey. The New Jersey flag flew at the Colegio Arubano throughout the week of the Junior Achievers' visit in Aruba. The students also exchanged books on Aruba and the American way of life and an autographed soccer ball was presented to the Aruban students by the Junior Achievers.

The Junior Achievers returned home with great respect for the dedication to education of the Aruban teenagers. Also, they are now more conscious and proud of the scope of opportunities for higher education available to them throughout the United States.

INDUSTRIALISTS EXCHANGE IDEAS WITH ACHIEVERS

A dinner honoring the Junior Achievers was hosted by members of the Kiwanis Club of Aruba. Conducting a regular meeting, James Downey, President, opened up a broad discussion between the young people and the professionals and businessmen members ranging from how the Junior Achievement companies calculated taxes to an evaluation of the capacity of the local hospital to meet extraordinary emergency needs of the community. Junior Achievement has long believed that frank questions and responses, and a free exchange of opinions between the younger and the older generations are possible, welcome, and constructive and enlightening. This occasion was unique because of the diverse backgrounds of the participants.

At a dinner hosted by Arturo Arends, President, and members of the Chamber of Commerce & Industry of Aruba, there was a report of Junior Achievement activities launched in Aruba in the early Sixties by businessmen there. This emphasized to the Junior Achievers how fortunate they are to live in an industrial community which for almost a quarter of a century has provided this learn-by-doing educational advantage not available to them through other educational or extracurricular channels.

ARUBAN HOSPITALITY ACKNOWLEDGED

The Junior Achievers were impressed and overwhelmed by the friendship and hospitality extended to them by the Aruban people. This was expressed sincerely in newspaper and television interviews and in letters to their hosts.

Typical is the following letter from Thomas Tomalavage, 17 year old senior at Roselle Catholic High School, to Mr. and Mrs. K. D. Seeger. Mr. Seeger is Comptroller, Lago Oil & Transport Co. Ltd.

"I owe you a great debt for helping to bring about one of the most enjoyable experiences of my life. Your home became my home, your little son like my little brother. Your so patiently and sincerely explaining to me the life on Aruba helped transform this business and educational trip into a warm personal understanding of the Aruban way of life. I cannot repay you for everything that was done for my sake, but perhaps I can reflect an honest gratitude to you for making my stay as pleasant as it was.

"Please thank Lors for treating me as a friend rather than as an overnight visitor."

Another enthusiastic Junior Achiever, Mitchell Gardiner, 17 year old Linden High School junior, in a letter to B. E. Nixon, Manager of Employee and Industrial Relations at Lago, who helped coordinate the program for the award trip, wrote: ". . . I can truly say that you helped make Operation Aruba a success. The trip had definite educational advantages and the goodwill that was spread was really great."

To Lieutenant Governor Henriquez, Thomas Zepko wrote: "Thank you for the time spent with me and the two others from our group. By participating in the official business of your Island's government I was directly exposed to a facet of international relations, an experience which has helped me to understand some of the world's problems." Tom and two other Junior Achievers had been invited to spend the day with the Governor and his Minister for Finance observing their normal day's activities.

In goodwill gestures Mayor Dunn and the Junior Achievers, representing the City of Elizabeth and residents of all of the New Jersey communities from which the young people came, presented to the Lieutenant Governor and other hosts keys to the City of Elizabeth, Junior Achievement Distinguished Service Awards, products manufactured by Junior Achievement companies, libraries of business books including biographies of great Americans, and an oil painting, "Ships at Rest", by artist Arthur Golding of Cranford, New Jersey.

The hosts reciprocated with a silver cigarette box engraved with a map of Aruba and other products of local origin for Mayor Dunn; books, souvenir coins and other mementos for the Junior Achievers. Most important, the Junior Achievers received appropriate literature about Colegio Arubano, the industries visited, and the civic organizations which participated. These were used by the young people in preparing their reports to high school classes and civic organizations upon their return.

In a special gesture of appreciation and respect toward the Aruba Trade & Industry Association, after presentation of the Junior Achievement Distinguished Service Award to Gustave Nouel, President, the Junior Achievers stood and repeated the Association's Code of Ethics, engraved on a plaque presented to them as they were made honorary members of the Association:

"1. To promote community economic progress through enlightened business practices.

"2. To provide customer satisfaction through good quality products and service for value received.

"3. To display integrity and fairness in dealing with customers, employees, suppliers and competitors.

"4. To retain high standards of good taste, ethics and honesty in advertising."

This they recognized as being comparable to the Performance Standards set forth for their junior companies as the basis for the Operation Aruba incentive award competition.

CULTURE AND ENTERTAINMENT

Michael Kuiperi, Director of Tourism, who is credited with the recent successful effort to direct American tourist attention to Aruba, made certain that the Junior Achievers had more than a casual tourist view of the Island. Opportunities were provided for them to visit the Cultural Center in Oranjestad, the historic century old Church of Santa Anna at Noord and new churches of modern architectural style. They saw old pastel-tinted dwellings trimmed with lace-like ornaments which dot the countryside, modern ranch style private houses being constructed as vacation residences and retirement homes by residents of the U.S., Venezuela and other countries, ancient monoliths, ruins of the gold smelting plant abandoned when the gold find was exhausted, the authentic Dutch windmill shipped from Holland.

At the Kiwanis Club dinner the Junior Achievers were treated to a color motion picture of the 1967 Carnival and, at the Chamber of Commerce dinner, a performance by Eddie Laaf and his Carnival group, the Incas, accompanied by the Dakota Steel Band gave the visitors a real-life sample of the color, conviviality and excitement which characterize Aruba's Carnival.

TELEVISION AND PRESS COVERAGE EXTENSIVE

The press in the metropolitan New York area and in Aruba was most cooperative and gave extensive and favorably publicity to the entire 8-month Operation Aruba project.

Prior to arrival in Aruba of the Junior Achievement group, the color sound motion picture "Opportunity Unlimited" was shown on Tele-Aruba. This award-winning film, written and produced by Junior Achievement of Union County and Henry Charles Motion Picture Studio, included activities on a previous award trip. Mr. Charles accompanied the group and filmed replacement scenes of activities in Aruba.

Mayor Dunn, John LeMaire, Editor of New Jersey Business Magazine, J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President of Junior Achievement of Union County, and Harlan Gardiner, President of KIM-CO, Junior Achievement company sponsored by Peter J. Schweitzer Division of Kimberly-Clark Corporation, were invited to appear on Tele-Aruba. Moderators on a half hour television program sponsored by Lago were Gustave Nouel, President, Aruba Trade & Industry Association, and Arturo Arends, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Aruba.

There was a wide-ranging discussion of the Junior Achievement program, the reasons why Aruba was selected as the site for the award trip, the method of selection of award winners, and reactions of the Junior Achievers to Aruba.

At the end of the program Mayor Dunn recalled that over the years many residents of his New Jersey community where the Humble Oil & Refining Company Bayway refinery is located had transferred from that installation to Lago and he extended greetings to them.

PARTICIPANTS IN OPERATION ARUBA

Industrial sponsors and other organizations and individuals who participated in Operation Aruba are:

Airco Welding.
Anchor Corporation.
Arthur Andersen & Co.
Aruba Chemical Industries, N. V.
Aruba Island Administrative Council.
Aruba Sheraton Hotel.
Aruba Tourist Bureau.
The Austin Company.
Ben Bayne.
Beckman Instruments, Inc.
Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.—Murray Hill and Holmdel, N.J.
Bishop Industries, Inc.
Bristol-Myers Products, Bristol-Meyers Company.
Burry Biscuit Division, The Quaker Oats Company.
Chamber of Commerce of Aruba.
Chevron Oil Company.
Colegio Arubano, Oranjestad, Aruba.
De Palm's Sightseeing Tours.
Enjay Chemical Company.
FMC Corporation.
GAF Corporation.
GM Assembly Division, General Motors Corporation.
General Electric Company.
Honorable Oscar S. Henriquez, Lieutenant Governor, Aruba.
Humble Oil & Refining Company.
Industrial Management Club.
International Business Machines Corporation.
KLM Royal Dutch Airlines.
Lago Oil & Transport Co. Ltd.
Merck & Co., Inc.
New Departure-Hyatt Bearing Division, General Motors Corporation.
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.
New Jersey Manufacturers Association.
P. C. Osterman.
Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corporation.
Public Relations Society of America, New Jersey Chapter.
Public Service Electric & Gas Company.
Purchasing Management Association of North Jersey, Inc.
Purolator, Inc.
Quinn & Boden Company, Inc.
Radio Corporation of America.
Harry Rosenblum.
Rotary Club of Aruba.
Schering Laboratories Division, Schering Corporation.
Peter J. Schweitzer Division, Kimberly-Clark Corporation.
Simmons Company.

The Singer Company.
Union County Chapter, Society of Certified Public Accountants.
WEB (Water-Energibedrijf).
Weston Instruments, Inc.
White-Pharmaco.
Young Presidents' Organization.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN COMMENDS CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my remarks to those already made by many of my distinguished colleagues on the retirement of Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren.

During his 16-year tenure, Chief Justice Warren presided over our highest Court during one of the most turbulent periods in its history and that of the Nation. The high tribunal made many important decisions which generated both praise and criticism. It was indeed a fearless and forthright body whose imprint on the life of this country will be visible and remembered for generations to come.

Chief Justice Warren now has concluded, formally at least, literally a lifetime in the service of the public. I have no doubt that he will continue to contribute his talents to the betterment of all of our citizens even in his retired status.

President Richard Nixon, a member of the bar himself, quite clearly was mindful of the great service rendered by Chief Justice Warren. The fact that the President became the first Chief Executive to address the Court on the occasion of Chief Justice Warren's retirement indicates this acknowledgment.

Mr. Speaker, I was highly impressed by the President's words before the Court and I share his sentiments. Commenting on the 16 years that Justice Warren spent in presiding over the Court, Mr. Nixon noted that there have been great debates and even disagreements within the Court:

> But standing above these debates has been the symbol of the Court as represented by the Chief Justice of the United States: fairness, integrity, dignity.

I would like to add also, Mr. Speaker, the editorial reflections of two daily newspapers from my district on Chief Justice Warren's departure from the Court:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, June 25, 1969]

END OF WARREN ERA—CHIEF JUSTICE REPLACED BY WARREN EARL BURGER

Earl Warren, 14th chief justice of the United States, has ended a career on the Supreme Court that defies comparison with any save that of John Marshall, chief justice from 1801 until his death in 1835.

The tenure of Warren Earl Burger begins at a time when intense social tumoil promises to keep the high court returning again and again to the Bill of Rights to arbitrate disputes between society and its dissidents.

Marshall, the fourth chief justice, presided over the court in its formative years; his great decisions reminded the states that they had become a nation, that the Constitution was the law of the land and that the Supreme Court interpreted the Constitution.

The court under Earl Warren reminded the nation that the Constitution was ordained and established by the people, whose fundamental concern was to secure for themselves protection against the state they were creating. In explicating this constitutional philosophy the Warren court added new dimension to the civil liberty amendments.

Great controversy attended many of the court's major decisions—school desegregation, the so-called one-man, one-vote ruling and the various rulings dealing with criminal procedures.

Warren Burger comes to the court with the reputation of interpreting the civil liberty amendments somewhat more narrowly than did Earl Warren, but the consensus among legal scholars is that the high court will not retreat significantly from the frontiers explored by the court under Earl Warren.

It has been the fate of most chief justices to be less remembered than their more brilliant colleagues. Thus, such articulate legal scholars as Associate Justices Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., Louis Brandeis and Felix Frankfurter overshadow the chief justices they served with.

Yet, despite the presence on the court of such men as William O. Douglas, Hugo L. Black and Arthur Goldberg (briefly), the last 16 years have been Warren years, and will be remembered so.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, June 23, 1968]

CONTROVERSIAL CHIEF JUSTICE GUARDED EVERYONE'S RIGHTS

Well, the "Impeach Earl Warren" billboards can come down now, and the view may be improved more than scenically. With the chief justice retired, perhaps a calmed population will be able to see his contribution in perspective. The impeachment campaign never was more than embarrassment to the nation and always was silly, for what its backers really wanted was to repeal an era.

The "Warren" court, which oddly piqued ultraconservatives by carefully watchdogging citizen rights, was misnamed. Certainly the chief justice played a key role, but the opposition that fastened on Earl Warren as devil-in-residence missed the point that the Supreme Court rules by majority.

Many of the controversial decisions of that majority were "liberal" only according to a slant that sees all ideas as either/or propositions, holding that if they aren't classically conservative, they therefore must be liberal.

When it pulled the teeth of much anti-Communist legislation that had been enacted amid panic, when it held out against compulsory school prayers, corralled censorship vigilantes, required police to inform the accused of their rights and to respect those rights—when it did all those "liberal" things, the court in fact was strengthening us all against a state which might mean well now but which with unchecked power, could give in to the temptation for convenient repression in the future.

It was the strength—and the trouble—of the court during Justice Warren's tenure that it took the long view of the American potential, refusing to run with passing passions.

From the school desegregation decision that opened the Warren era to the open housing ruling that closed it, the court consistently stood against the tyranny of the majority. It insisted that when the state is unfair to one man, it potentially is unfair to all. It held open the possibility that the majority, after all, may not always be right. Without that reservation, democracy can be lamed to faltering.

Chief Justice Warren built his own monument with the principles he helped mortar into the national structure. It is the nation's shame that he sometimes was so vilely heckled while doing it.

A FATHER'S DAY MESSAGE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Record Call of Bergen County, N.J., on June 15, 1969, printed an excellent expression and analysis of the "generation gap" from the pen of an articulate writer of the young generation, Miss Lynn Litterine.

Miss Litterine is a 23-year-old staff writer in the Record's Rockland bureau. Her father, Louis Litterine, Jr., 59, of Edgewater, is an Army Air Corps veteran of the European and African campaigns of World War II. Of this Father's Day letter to her dad, Lynn says:

> It sounds like there's more conflict between us than there really is. He's the kind of guy I can say this kind of thing to. He listens.

Never have I read such an excellent analysis and relations of the problems as expressed in this article. I feel that every member of this honorable body should have the opportunity to read this Father's Day message from a daughter to her father.

Mr. Speaker, this article was brought to my attention by Judge Arthur J. O'Dea, judge of the Bergen County Court in Hackensack, N.J.

As a criminal court judge of considerable experience in this urban community, and a father of seven children, he has had much experience and constant inquiring and study of the social problems which give rise to the generation gap.

Because of the importance of this subject and the timely and thoughtful comments presented by Miss Litterine, I place into the RECORD the full text of her Father's Day message.

The article follows:

TO MY DAD ON FATHER'S DAY

(By Lynn Litterine)

Let's drop the lip service gifts of ties, slippers, and handkerchiefs this Father's Day, Dad, and give each other an hour. Maybe with some talk across the generation gap we can shorten the distance of 36 years, two World Wars, and an economic depression that separates us.

Mine has been called a materially spoiled generation, but I don't hear us asking for material things. A bigger car or another television set just isn't a part of my dreams.

I've had them and I know they're no cure for individual or social ills.

When Kenneth Kenniston says you have to grow up in Scarsdale to know how bad things really are, he's not being flip.

When you've known the comforts of Scarsdale and still find yourself unhappy and alienated, you know we can't buy our way out of our problems. I don't dream about things I can buy.

I dream of seeing my government quickly respond to an obvious injustice. The Civil Rights Act was passed in 1952, but de-facto segregation still exists.

I dream of a society that considers love valid with or without a marriage license. The new morality is condemned as hedonistic.

I dream of the people of each nation determining their own destiny. We are still interfering in what should be a Vietnamese civil war.

I dream of voting for a politician without feeling as though I've compromised myself. Government scandals are in the news every day.

Are my ideas radical, Dad? Communist-inspired? I learned them from you—justice, the right of self-determination, the beauty of honest love, the principles of democracy.

And I'm alienated because the principles you taught me don't fit the realities I have to live with.

The glorious experiment of 1776 turns into Mayor Richard J. Daley's yelling "fink" at duly-elected political representatives.

The Bill of Rights and the Emancipation Proclamation turn into white backlash and black power.

The spirit of the American Revolution turns into CIA support of Asian and Latin American dictators.

The government lies to me. The physical environment chokes me with pollution. Society suspects me because I'm under 30. Oh boy, am I alienated.

But I'm not prepared to leave it at that, accept the situation, and conform. I've kept my dreams relatively intact for 23 years and I'm not about to drop them now. If that means going against the system, I'm ready.

I shrink from violence, Dad, but the hugeness and immediacy of our problems may require a real upheaval to be cleared away.

Suppose that happens? What comes after destruction?

My generation hasn't proposed much in the way of a different type of government. Perhaps we are ill prepared.

I have no theories. I can only tell you the general beliefs with which I face the uncertain future.

First, I have a great fear of all-out, international war. I'm not a pacifist. There are freedoms so important to me that I would both kill and die to preserve them.

I would, however, take a long, hard look before entering any situation that could result in nuclear war.

You see, Dad, I've had the bomb around all my life. Sirens have terrified me since I was very young, because they reminded me of air raids and H-bombs. I've grown up knowing man has the power to wipe himself off Earth in a day. That makes my attitudes about war very different from yours.

I also find it hard to think in terms of The Enemy or The Communist Threat or The Little Yellow Men.

Communications have made the world smaller since you were young.

This has stretched my loyalties beyond the boundaries of the nation to an interest in the well-being of all men.

I define myself first as a human being, second as an American. To me, the welfare of all men comes before the more limited welfare of the nation. Is that disloyal, Dad?

I was taught not that just all Americans were created equal but that all men were created equal. That belief is hyprocrisy until we match it with fact.

Fear of new ideas, fear of poverty, fear of crime, fear of social condemnation—they're all killers of the individual expression of life.

When I raise two fingers in a V I'm not playing games, I'm affirming those belief—"Peace and love to you, brother. You have nothing to fear from me. I respect the life in you."

That's my spiritual monolith now, Dad. I can't live on promises of an unreal life after death. This troubled world is real to me and I want to make it better. I want life during life.

I have a special tool to use in the attempt to better life, something I've been taught to trust as a child of the scientific age—objective truth and proof.

Tell me not to take LSD because it's against the law and I'll tell you laws can be wrong. Alcohol was illegal once too. Alcohol didn't change; the law did.

Tell me not to take it because it can cause chromosome damage and monster babies, and I'll listen. You've given me objective proof of its dangers.

Try to lump heroin, marijuana, pep pills, and LSD together in your explanation, and you'll lose my attention again.

I know people who have tried each one, and I know they don't all have the same effect, should not carry the same legal penalty, and cannot all be bunched under the same general heading of narcotic.

If you do that, you're ignoring objective proof, something I've been taught to hold dear. You're functioning outside my value structure and you can't expect me to honor your conclusions.

Along with my insistence of proof, I feel a deep distrust of dogma and a strong affection for individualism.

Our world is changing more rapidly every day and organized dogma—religious, political, or moral—is notoriously slow to adapt.

Initials, symbols, mottos—they all stand for an identifiable credo and that to me, means danger, Rigor mortis of the mind! I'm as wary of SDS as I am of the CIA.

My goal is to keep my lifeview, my religion, my politics, and all my thoughts and feelings personal, flexible, and ready to incorporate tomorrow's discoveries. This influences my feelings about law and civil disobedience too.

Law is made by men according to the knowledge and value systems of their times. It should not be immutably carved on stone, but should flow with the nation.

I won't run a STOP sign or speed. I understand the danger in doing that. The law is logical and I can accept it.

But I refuse to accept a life imprisonment for possession of marijuana. Grass isn't a thing to outlaw, much less to equate in penalty with murder.

I also refuse to accept a state legislature's suggesting death sentence for murder. Killing is as wrong for the state as it is for a citizen. The law must be changed. It must grow with us.

I'm calling to you across quite a chasm, Dad. Would you like to know how it looks from my side?

Most of the beliefs I've mentioned are things we agree on in principle. The difference begins with my insistence on putting the principles into action.

My insistence involves changes in a society in which you, as an established citizen, have vested interests.

I can attack material values—I haven't invested a life in earning a house, car, or business; you have.

I can attack the political and economic establishment—I don't belong to it, you do.

After two World Wars and a severe economic depression, your generation opted for material security.

Working for that security meant letting some other things slide—integregation, backward nations, urban ghettos, industrial pollution.

We've had material security all our lives and we've decided to work for some different goals—the very ones shelved during the industrial advancement your generation worked for.

We want to practice the abstract ideals we were taught at home and in school.

Why would you invest in our learning them if you didn't want us to apply them? Did you think you could teach us the principles and not hear us ask for the substance for everyone?

If you believed the things you taught us, we are your voice of conscience. If you didn't we are your Frankenstein's monster. The judgment is yours. The future, however, is ours.

MAURICE COHEN: A LEGEND IN HIS TIME

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Cattleman magazine carried an article by Paul W. Horn on a long-time friend and constituent of mine, very properly entitled "Maurice Cohen, a Legend in His Time." Maurice's life, as beautifully captured by Mr. Horn, not only epitomizes the maverick tradition of the Texas cattleman, but gives a look at the fine qualities that made Maurice a living legend not to be easily forgotten.

At this time I wish to share this article with my colleagues, as I pay tribute to a great man:

MAURICE COHEN, A LEGEND IN HIS TIME

(By Paul W. Horn)

Maurice Cohen the legend and Maurice Cohen the man fuse into one when he tells you that three times in his life he couldn't change a quarter. Speculator, producer, feeder, purebred operator and packer, Maurice has moved so many thousands of cattle north, he has forgotten more than most men knew about the Texas cattle business.

Now, at 73, Maurice Cohen looks back on some 60 years of buying and selling, of making money on nickel and dime cattle, of going broke when the bottom fell out, then coming back, of borrowing without a scrap of paper and selling without a dollar down. "I couldn't have done it without credit," he says.

Uncle Jesse Oppenheimer was his credit. San Antonio remembers this grand old banker and so does Maurice with a tear in his eye. "I went to him one day shaking and stuttering. The market fell out and I had no money to pay for what I'd bought. I told him I was going crazy."

"How many cattle did you buy?" asked Uncle Jesse.

"About 35,000," said Maurice.

"You're not going. You *are* crazy," said Uncle Jesse. But he paid for them like he had done so often and Maurice, with the luck of the trader he was, sold them and came home smiling.

When Maurice was 10, after the century just turned, he went to work for his uncle in his father's San Antonio packing plant. "My father's the one who started me out in the packing business and I wound up doing all his buying. When his plant burned down I went to work for Kruz Lozano at Quality Packing Co. and stayed with him for 25 years. "Kruz could do more business with less money than anyone in the world."

One day Kruz and Maurice went to see old Mr. Frost at the bank about borrowing

another $5,000 for the company. "You've got too much of my money already," said Mr. Frost. But that didn't keep Maurice from his regular trip to Mexico to buy corriente steers, with more luck in his pocket than money. With a sharp eye, he picked them by the thousands, put them on pear and cake in South Texas for the winter and then sent them to Kansas for grass.

But Maurice was too much of a speculator to keep from dabbling in this buy-sell business on his own. He and his brother-in-law, Jamie Brook of Brady, started shipping steers too thin to kill to the Cornbelt. Maurice wore out his first banker in a week, but the Oppenheimers who still operate a private bank in San Antonio stepped in to finance the Cohen and Brooks firm. Soon Maurice was on his own, looking at cattle all over Texas. The phone was always ringing, beginning at 4 o'clock in the morning.

"Some people are dope fiends," said his wife. "You're a cattle fiend."

There were lots of good years from the '20's on but the bad ones always came along to wipe away the results. Whatever happened usually found Maurice far out on a limb since he always had thousands of steers on contract. Many a time he had blocked the train with 20 loads ready to ship north at Brady. He spent most of the 30's building up a $90,000 surplus, then lost it in a week in 1937. Again in 1948 he lost $100,000 in a week along with 17 lbs. The Oppenheimers, Uncle Jesse and his nephew Dan, were always trying to get Maurice to slow down—for both their sakes.

Maurice and Dan usually had lunch together. When they crossed the street, Dan always took his friend's arm with "We don't want any accident to happen to Maurice."

But plenty of them did, as Maurice remembers back today. Raymond Bell, the owner of the famous Atotonilco Ranch in Durango, Mexico, sent word that he had 13,000 head of cows scattered around South Texas that he needed to dispose of. Maurice was a bit skeptical of such a deal due to the money that was going to be required, but he knew Uncle Jesse would respect his judgment. Mr. Bell wasn't easy to do business with, since he had odd sleeping hours and also he celebrated some occasion or other most every evening. Maurice spent some while inspecting some of the cows and testing out where he could move them, then approached Mr. Bell with his first offer. The usual juggling of price and conditions went on for a long while but Mr. Bell's secretary finally got the contract down in black and white to the agreement of both. Just as Maurice was about to sign, Mr. Bell said:

"Oh, one more little thing. I owe Milton Friedland $400,000 on these cattle. You pay Milton off first and then pay me as you sell them."

What do you do at a time like this? Maurice signed. He made out a check to Friedland's bank in Kansas City for $400,000 just like he had the money waiting. "I couldn't wait until the Oppenheimer bank opened—I had to run see Uncle Jesse but I didn't know what I was going to tell him."

When Maurice walked in, Uncle Jesse looked up at the new $20 hat Maurice was wearing and asked, "What did you pay for that hat?"

"Oh, six dollars," lied Maurice.

"I got one just as good for a dollar and a half," said the banker. "Now what did you want to see me about?"

Maurice beat around the bush quite a bit in explaining the Bell deal but he never could bring himself around to mentioning the $400,000. Finally Mr. Oppenheimer said "OK, Maurice, I know it's going to take a lot of money. But after this, stay out of these big deals."

It's no wonder that Maurice was paying $100 a day interest for years and years back when interest rates were low.

"You can be the smartest man in the world but if you haven't got credit, you're just Willie the Weep," says Maurice Cohen.

This Milton Friedland of Kansas City who got the $400,000 check was one of Maurice's backers. When Maurice and Joe Straus of San Antonio were dealing to purchase the Painter purebred Hereford herd at Roggen, Colo., they got a tentative agreement from Friedland to put up the $75,000 down payment. "This was back when Joe didn't have any more money than I had," said Maurice. "Before we closed the deal, I put in a call to Milton and we had to get him away from his lunch. I asked him, with Joe right at my elbow, if we could put the bank down for the $75,000 and he assured me I could. I thanked him and hung up. Then Joe asked me if I had asked about what interest we were paying.

"Joe," I told him. "I didn't have the nerve. If you want to know, you call him, I'm not."

Joe didn't have the nerve, either.

"Milton Friedland, by the way," adds Maurice, "backed probably 90 per cent of the ranches in Texas. His was the City National Bank and Trust Co. in Kansas City. He was a big help to all of us."

Dan Oppenheimer went in partnership with Maurice on cattle many a time. Once they along with Damon Smith had 2,500 cows up in Kansas that went through one of the worst winters on record. "We kept putting up money and losing everything we had just to keep them alive. The market was terrible and the weather was worse. Finally the three of us went up to Kansas to see what could be done but there was nothing we could do. That night Dan suggested we get something to drink to forget our troubles. I bought some champaign and when it was about half gone, Dan said:

"We're going broke and drinking champaign? What would we drink if we were making money?

It was on one of these sorties into Kansas that Jim Corley of the Texas Livestock Marketing Association in Fort Worth first met Maurice Cohen. "He had a couple thousand head up there and was losing $100 a head. I met him in the Broadview Hotel in Emporia The dining room was full of couples—cattlemen and their wives. Maurice had the waiters lock the door and he paid the entire bill. He's a legend in his own time."

"Maurice has the compulsion to feed everybody," remarks Louis Moorman of San Antonio. "He won't eat himself but he'll stuff the rest of us. If there's no restaurant around, he'll haul in food enough for an army. And his word is the way it will be. You never need to get anything in writing from Maurice Cohen."

The market has had its ups as well as downs. "It's been a wonderful life," says Maurice, "full of the world's best people. I still get lots of calls but I have to turn most of them down. I can always tell how the market is in the Cornbelt. If they call me and say, 'Maurice, how are you feeling? You need to slow down and take care of yourself.' Then I know the market's good. But if they could care less how I'm feeling, then I know the market's bad."

Some say Maurice hasn't really dealt in cattle all his life, but in people. He handled the Catto-Gage cattle for 30 years, back when they were shipping 6,000 to 7,000 calves, bought from King Ranch (including one shipment of 2,000 cows at 80 cents a hundred delivered in San Antonio), Jack Bowman, Rollie and Charlie White around Brady, the Kokernot cattle and hundreds and hundreds more. Then add 4,000 to 5,000 steers out of Mexico every year. He started buying these at 4 cents a lb.

"I've seen Maurice year after year buy 75 to 80 per cent of the cattle out of the San Saba-Llano-Brady-Menard country," says A. J. Lindsay of the Texas Livestock Marketing Association in San Antonio. "I've known him since I was just a kid. Maurice never bought anything but the best he could find and he's one who always stayed hitched, even though the market broke and he lost on everything he handled."

The telephone was a mighty instrument for selling calves for Maurice. Cornbelt buyers used to tell him "You're the only one I know who can make me see cattle over the phone." He didn't like to deal with less than 750 head for he felt he couldn't shape them up properly unless he had at least that many. So, he needed to sell in big numbers, too, and he would deal with the buyers who bought by the thousands. Wisebark Bros. in Denver was one who bought thousands of cattle every year through Maurice. And the telephone was their major communication.

"About 80 per cent of my business I made over the phone and the other 20 per cent just came to San Antonio to see some girlfriend."

At first, though, before his reputation grew, he showed Midwest buyers thousands of cattle. A Mr. Skinner from Kansas City and a Lee Devine who represented Producers in St. Louis came to Maurice who took them to Brady to select 1,000 steers and 1,000 heifers. Devine who wanted the steers asked how much down was required and since this was their first dealing, Maurice asked $5,000. On the train home, Devine told his wife: "That's the craziest thing I ever did. I'll never see that money or the steers or that man again."

But in a few years, Devine was ordering 10,000 to 15,000 calves a year from Maurice, all over the phone.

A. J. Lindsay who ought to know says: "I'll put Maurice up against anyone for guessing the weight of a calf."

That was a requirement on many a deal Maurice got into. Thousands had to be bought by the head and sold by the pound. Dan Harrison of Harrison and Abercrombie who ranched at Campbellton simply would not deal by the pound. Jim Abercrombie was a lifelong friend of Maurice's but Harrison didn't seem to trust any speculator. Rather than accept a dime a pound, he insisted on $100 a head, figuring that they would do well to reach 1,000 lbs. Maurice sized up the several thousand head and bought as offered. He had the Missouri Pacific to build pens and put in scales on the spot. The cattle averaged right at 1,150.

Maurice would sell Jim Abercrombie 5,000 calves a year and line up the trucks for blocks delivering. Claude McCan of Victoria would take 3,500 top steers a year. "Every time I sold Claude a load," says Maurice, "he'd kick about it. One time I got a heifer in there by mistake and he swore I did it purposely to show him how good my heifers were."

Claude remembers back then, too. "We've dealt with Maurice for many, many years, both buying and selling. I remember once when we were dickering around the nickle figure on some calves. I was trying hard for $5.05 but Maurice told me, 'Claude, I swear to God I can't give it to you now but I'll give you a nickle more than they're worth on the next trade.' And I'm still waiting for my nickle."

H. A. Fitzsimons was one who sold by the pound and about every pound of calf he ever produced went to Maurice. "A finer man never owned a cow," says Maurice. "When delivery time would come, he always brought his boy Hugh Jr. I would give little Hugh a dollar to stand on the water trough to keep the cattle from drinking. Now I do the same thing with Hugh's boys."

Maurice emphasizes that he never was an order buyer but rather a speculator. He bought first and then looked for a home for them. Jamie Brook would shake his head and exclaim: "Where are they all going?" But they always went somewhere. Maurice had some good men working for him, men like Damon Smith at Llano, A. M. Hark at Mason, Roy Barton at Brady, Walt Copeland at Menard, Cleve Jones at Sonora and then Walker White who managed all his leased land around that country.

Francis Kothman was his head sorter. In fact, Maurice was probably the first man to sort cattle by quality and weight for buyers. He and Francis by eyeballing would sort hundreds into weights within 50 lbs. This was a treat for buyers back in those days.

Maurice hasn't any idea how many cattle he has handled—it might well run into the millions. He leased a lot of land in the Brady-Llano-Menard country and was running as many as 2,500 cows at one time. He kept his interest in packing and today owns the Apache Packing Co. in San Antonio and he is in partnership with George Lucky in feeding heifers, with 3,000 to 4,000 head on feed right along. Maurice has also fed cattle at San Marcos and up in Illinois. Besides buying the Planter herd of purebred Herefords with Joe Straus, the two also bought the Jamie Brooks registered herd.

"And I'm in the chicken business with Dick Kleberg," says Maurice. His apartment at the St. Anthony Hotel where he lived for 47 years is decorated with many prints and statutary of fighting cocks. "We've got half-a-mile or more of birds we fly around here and there" he says with a smile. Maurice has been known to bet a little.

In fact some people might think Maurice Cohen's whole life has been a gamble. But he was dealing with a good product and with good people and those two big factors threw the odds in his favor over the last 60 years.

"It's a different world today," says Maurice. "I couldn't buy and sell the way they do it nowadays." Not everybody quite believes that he couldn't get right back into the swing of things.

PRESS ETHICS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Military Establishment has apparently become fair game for everyone who is interested in attributing everything that is wrong with the United States as being a product of the Military Establishment.

The calculated effort on the part of some newspaper columnists to disparage the military image and our efforts in Vietnam reached a new low on May 30, 1969, when the Washington Star carried an article, entitled "Vietnam 'Duty' Becomes Tax Dodge." The article, written by Columnist Carl T. Rowan, illustrates an utter disregard for the facts. It suggests, at the very least, that the columnist violated the precept of every good newsman by not checking the accuracy of his sources.

The article in its entirety follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 30, 1969]

VIETNAM "DUTY" BECOMES TAX DODGE

(By Carl T. Rowan)

High-ranking military men not remotely involved in fighting have been using the Vietnam war as a tax dodge.

By the thousands, officers posted in the U.S. and Asia have been flocking to Saigon to take advantage of special "combat zone" tax deductions.

The U.S. Embassy in Saigon has complained bitterly, this columnist has learned exclusively, because the number of VIP tax-deduction hunters has been so large as to impede the war effort.

But the Pentagon has done nothing to stop the influx because use of the special tax loophole is legal—although it is being abused rather cynically by many officers and men.

At issue in this behind-the-scenes contretemps is a special tax law providing that a military man of warrant officer rank or below need not declare or pay taxes on his pay for any month in which he served any time in a combat zone, or for any month during which he was hospitalized for any time as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone.

Officers of higher rank may deduct $500 of pay for each month in which either of the above conditions is applicable.

This is a laudable provision enacted a few years ago to boost the morale and economic condition of those unfortunate GIs who are being shot at, wounded, and killed in Vietnam.

But the "smart" military men stationed in the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, Hawaii, and even Washington have learned how to take advantage of the law.

A Washington colonel can see Tokyo, Hong Kong, and points east then visit Saigon on May 31 and leave June 1 and deduct $1,000—or $500 for each month in which he endured a partial day of "combat zone" exposure. The military services have informed their members, with Internal Revenue Service approval, that "the combat zone exclusion is applicable to members traveling on authorized leave in aircraft and ships which pass through or make an intermediate stop in the combat zone."

Thus a soldier on leave, vacationing in the Far East, may find it financially advantageous to take an airliner that stops in Saigon. Many do.

The U.S. Embassy has complained that some 5,000 VIPS's a year, many of them military men looking for tax savings, have been descending upon Saigon. Aside from the extra burden these VIPs put upon embassy personnel, the "tax loophole" invasion is regarded as an insult to the officers and men who are clearly involved in the war and who deserve even more than this tax break.

Thus, there is another and larger reason why some Embassy, State Department, and Pentagon people have agonized over the widespread abuse of this tax exclusion: it adds to the evidence that the war is an "immoral" undertaking which drags on because thousands of Americans and South Vietnamese profit from it in myriad clever ways.

The U.S. Post Exchange (PX) waste and abuse detailed two years ago in this column was never really corrected and it could make ugly headlines again soon.

Flagrant corruption by some Vietnamese, most often with an American accomplice, is still commonplace, although the current Saigon government has imposed some curbs.

In the interest of maintaining support in the United States and understanding elsewhere, it is incumbent upon the allies to remove every possible taint from this war.

Someone ought to move soon to insure that a Navy captain, living graciously in his Hawaii assignment, cannot take a month's end vacation jaunt to Saigon and seize benefits meant for people like the poor soldiers who risk everything to hold a hill overlooking the A Shau Valley.

To the tax reformers, this may look like chicken feed compared with the millions lost through the shrewd manipulations of the rich and super-rich.

But the large issues of national honor and integrity of purpose in Vietnam lift the "combat pay" dodge to a level where it begs for Congressional attention.

Let me tell the story.

The Rowan article alleges:

Thousands of officers posted in the U.S. and Asia have been flocking to Saigon to take advantage of special "combat zone" tax deductions.

The U.S. Embassy in Saigon has complained bitterly, this columnist has learned exclusively, because the number of VIP tax-deduction hunters has been so large as to impede the war effort.

The article goes on to say that the Pentagon, despite the "bitter" protestations of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, has done nothing to stop this alleged abuse of tax benefits.

Mr. Rowan then concludes his article by saying:

The large issues of national honor and integrity of purpose in Vietnam lift the "combat pay" dodge to a level where it begs for Congressional attention.

The clear implication of the concluding paragraph is that Congress is either unaware or indifferent to this alleged problem.

More than a month before the Rowan article, the Committee on Armed Services made an inquiry to the Department of Defense concerning allegations that a problem of this kind existed in Vietnam.

The Department of Defense, by letter of April 22, 1969, denied the existence of any large-scale abuses of this kind and pointed out the controls which have been designed by the Department to prevent such abuses. I will insert the Department's letter in the RECORD at this point:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1969.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 10, 1969 regarding abuses of combat pay and tax deductions by unnecessary TDY rotation to the Vietnam area.

As you are aware, it is the responsibility of every Commanding Officer to insure that all pay entitlements are administered properly in accordance with both the letter and spirit of the governing regulations.

I am certain that abuses such as those alleged by [deleted], as well as others, would not knowingly be tolerated by officials who are in a position to take corrective action. I am equally certain that if the facts and circumstances of any deliberate circumvention of the statutes or military regulations were brought to the attention of proper local officials, such charges would be thoroughly investigated and appropriate disciplinary action would be taken against the offender or offenders. The general nature of [deleted] allegations, however, do not provide sufficient information or basis for the initiation of an official investigation of the matter.

Military personnel may travel to the Vietnam combat zone only under competent orders, copies of which, appropriately certified by a designated individual or the unit's personnel officer, must be filed with the disbursing officer to obtain credit for the income tax exclusion or the entitlement to hostile pay (combat pay). These controls are de-

signed to prevent abuses such as those reported by [deleted]. In this connection, it should be noted that efforts are made by the Department of Defense to restrict U.S. travel to the Vietnam combat zone to that absolutely essential to the war effort and to also restrict visits which overlap two consecutive months. I have enclosed copies of two policy memorandums which pertain to these imposed restrictions. Similar policy directives have been issued by the military departments.

The alleged abuse of the hostile fire pay entitlement under the circumstances described by [deleted] does not appear conceivable since a minimum period of 6 days in the hostile fire area is normally required to qualify for hostile fire pay. As a matter of fact, a member who performs assigned duties in a designated hostile fire area, for a minimum of 6 consecutive days, beginning in one month and ending in the following month, qualifies for hostile fire pay for the month in which the duties end and not for 2 months pay as asserted by [deleted]. I have enclosed a copy of Department of Defense Directive 1340.6 which governs the eligibility of members for hostile fire pay. Also, I have enclosed a copy of Chapter 10 from the Department of Defense Military Pay and Allowances Entitlements Manual, which governs the conditions of entitlement to hostile fire pay.

We appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention. Please be assured that the Department of Defense will take all feasible steps to insure that pay entitlements are properly administered in accordance with the intent of the Congress, the law and applicable directives.

Sincerely,

Brig. Gen. LEO E. BENADE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

In view of the response from the Department of Defense, I was understandably shocked by the subsequent article in the Washington Star on May 30 which stated:

Thousands of officers were flocking to Saigon to take advantage of these special combat zone tax deductions and the U.S. Embassy in Saigon had complained bitterly that the VIP tax deduction hunters had been so large so as to impede the war effort.

I therefore directed an inquiry to the American Embassy in Saigon to determine the validity, among other things, of Mr. Rowan's claim that the U.S. Embassy in Saigon had lodged a bitter complaint over this practice, which allegedly the Pentagon had ignored.

My letter to the Ambassador follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 9. 1969.

Ambassador ELLSWORTH BUNKER,
Embassy of the United States,
Saigon, South Vietnam.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On May 30th of this year the Washington *Evening Star* carried an article by Carl T. Rowan, entitled "Vietnam 'Duty' Becomes Tax Dodge." A copy of the article is enclosed for your information.

The burden of the allegation is contained in the first four paragraphs of the article. Briefly, it is alleged that—

"thousands [of] officers posted in the U.S. and Asia have been flocking to Saigon to take advantage of special 'combat zone' tax deduction.

"The U.S. Embassy in Saigon has complained bitterly, this columnist has learned exclusively, because the number of VIP tax-deduction hunters has been so large as to impede the war effort."

The article goes on to say that the Pentagon, despite the protestations of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, has done nothing to stop this alleged abuse of tax benefits.

As a matter of possible interest to you, on April 10th of this year, I directed an inquiry to the Department of Defense on a similar type allegation. The Department of Defense replied, by letter dated 22 April 1969, which, in effect, denies the existence of any large-scale abuses of this kind.

Since the information contained in the Rowan article appears to contradict the statement of the Department of Defense and identifies your Embassy as the source of its information, I would appreciate being advised as to the accuracy of the allegations contained in the Rowan article.

I particularly wish to be advised as to whether your Embassy has either officially or unofficially made a complaint of the type cited in the news article and whether these alleged "abuses" run into the "thousands" as indicated in the article.

I will be looking forward to an early response.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

I have now received a letter from our Ambassador to Vietnam, Ellsworth Bunker, which categorically denies the statements made in the Rowan article. Since the letter from Ambassador Bunker speaks for itself, I will include it in the RECORD, at this point:

SAIGON, VIETNAM,
June 21, 1969.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIVERS: This is in response to your letter of June 9 asking whether the Embassy complained about the "abuses" alleged in the May 30 article in the Washington Evening Star by Carl T. Rowan, entitled "Vietnam 'Duty' Becomes Tax Dodge." You also asked whether the alleged "abuses" run into the "thousands" as indicated in the article.

We have been unable to substantiate the charges made in the Rowan articles. The U.S. military has established elaborate rules to insure that visits to Vietnam by military personnel are strictly limited to essential missions. These rules permit visits only after a determination has been made that there is no other satisfactory method of obtaining the desired information or rendering the service required, and require that visits by senior Defense officials be held to the absolute minimum.

Current directives also seek to insure that the persons involved cannot use the special "combat zone" tax deduction as a tax dodge. Thus, where a proposed trip would overlap two consecutive months, it is carefully screened to determine whether it is justified and cannot be accomplished within a calendar month period.

All such visits to Vietnam by military personnel are closely coordinated with the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, and this Embassy has never complained about the practice as alleged in the Rowan article.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

ELLSWORTH BUNKER,
American Ambassador.

At a time when some segments of the press are expressing "lofty judgments" on the behavior and ethics of Members of Congress and the executive branch, it appears that perhaps the time has now come for these "gentlemen of the press" to take a long and hard look at their own ethics and practices.

In the vernacular of the sport's arena, it is easy for a newspaper columnist to take a "cheap shot" at a public figure or the military when such individuals do not have the same opportunity to present their side of the story to the reading public.

Perhaps old-fashioned concepts of "fair play" and honest reporting no longer applies in American journalism. If that is the case, every American has very good reason to fear for the future of this country.

INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1969

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, millions of Americans will celebrate the historic date of the signing of the Declaration of Independence from Britain. To others, the significance of the day will be nil but another day off work.

Defusing patriotism and downgrading national holidays is a goal of those small groups—heavily financed—who would destroy all recognition of national sovereignty, our historic statehood, and the culture that we cherish as traditional American.

One such movement is called "Metro Government" or "1313." An interesting account on the "devolution" of the United States by Metro through its Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—ACIR—by Jo Hindman which appeared in the Yakima Eagle of June 26 follows:

WILL METRO DEVOLUTION PHASE OUT U.S. INDEPENDENCE DAY?

(By Jo Hindman)

On the Fourth of July, many Americans will celebrate the tradition of Independence Day. At the same time ironically, a certain segment of the population will accelerate the "devolution" of the United States.

Dictionary-defined as "retrograde revolution," devolution is equated as "a search for a new federalism" in the tenth (1969) report of the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR). For almost two decades, perceptive citizens have resisted the deterioration as Metropolitan Government, or Metro, now called devolution.

A current stage of devolution is visible in legislation that moves in Congress as this is written. Metrocrats are buys daubing last year's framework—Public Law 90–577, with Metro mud—amendments.

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (PL 90–577) is the eight-title frame, with Title VII knocked out. Enough lawmakers had balked to quash the grant consolidation authority therein proposed for the U.S. President.

Under PL 90–577, regions pre-empt state and county governments, illustrating devolution in another sense. ACIR which created the measure, is placed in a key power position.

PL 90–577 came from one of ACIR's numerous studies. Ideas from the "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System" (publication A–31, 1967) blossomed in bills introduced by members of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of the two congressional Government Operations Committees. PL 90–577 resulted.

Now, with the same backing, The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 (H.R. 7366) is ready to daub in Title VII and add new Title IX to PL 90–577, featuring auditing and joint funding respectively.

The Grant Consolidation Act of 1969 may become the new Title X of PL 90–577; S. 2035 reintroduces the kicked out consolidation authority. Companion bill is H.R. 10954. House and Senate Subcommittees which approved the original PL 90–577 will hear both pending bills.

Grant packaging (consolidation) by The President is falsely ballyhooed as a correction of bureaucratic bungling and waste. Actually, the measure veils a devolutionary technique that switches legislative and executive powers. Whereas Congress constitutionally makes the laws, and the President signs or vetoes them, the pending bill, Sec. 1005(a), S. 2035 calls for the House and Senate to veto by resolutions of disapproval, or by silence permit the Executive Law to go into effect.

The chain of events typify the revolution incubated by Syndicate 1313, self-named from the communal address, 1313 E. 60th St. Chicago. The Metro syndicate units are too numerous to list here, but include National Municipal League of New York and the Council of State Governments (CSG) which is relocating in Lexington, Kentucky.

ACIR conceived, packed and controlled by 1313*, expedites the self-seeking syndicate's monopoly over U.S. Government. ACIR, funded by congressional appropriations, also accepts money from the U.S. Treasury** direct, also the Housing and Urban Development Dept., and Ford Foundation.

One of 1313–CSG's fifty state links, The Louisiana Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is designated as that state's agency to fulfill a requirement of Title II Sec. 201 of PL 90–577.***

1313 groups are backing the new PL 90–577 titles.

It is shocking that the U.S. Government can be kept under that type of syndicate attack while an oblivious American public celebrates an independence that is fast vanishing under 1313.

Re. *"ACIR Federal Beachhead" in Blame Metro by Jo Hindman; **ACIR 10th Report 1–31–69 and "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System, Vol. I, 1967; ***Louisiana Memorial To Congress Sen. Concurrent Res. 35, Louisiana Legislature, Cf. Congressional Record Jan. 6, 1969, p. 93.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 7, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.—Psalms 37: 7.

O God, our Father, grant that we may have so enjoyed our holiday that our bodies have been renewed and our spirits restored, making us ready for the responsibilities of these days.

Give us steadfast hearts that no trouble may overcome, strong spirits that no temptation may overwhelm, and steady minds that worthy thoughts may keep wholesome.

Teach us to serve Thee and our Nation faithfully and fully, to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to labor and not seek for rewards, save that of doing Thy will and seeking the best for our people.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 853. An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; and

S. 1373. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, June 30, 1969, he did on July 2, 1969, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 12167. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

PUBLICATION OF EULOGIES TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Printing currently is receiving many calls in connection with the publication of congressional eulogies in tribute to former President Eisenhower. The joint committee now has set Friday, July 11, as the closing date for final acceptance of any further insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It must be noted that ample time has been extended to all Members who wished to express their sentiments. It is the joint committee's intention that these tributes be published and distributed later this year. For that reason, all copy must be submitted on or before the above-mentioned date.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues in the Congress and with President Nixon in wishing Chief Justice Warren well upon his retirement from the highest judicial bench in the land.

The former Chief Justice has concluded a long and distinguished career of public service—as a member of the California Legislature, as attorney general of the State of California, as Governor of California for 10 years, and as Chief Justice of the United States for nearly 16 years.

Many Americans may have forgotten that prior to his being named to the U.S. Supreme Court by the late President Eisenhower in September 1953, Governor Warren was the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1948.

I was privileged to serve with the former Chief Justice on the special Presidential commission named by President Johnson to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. I want to commend the former Chief Justice once again for assuming that heavy and extraordinary burden. In his capacity as head of that Presidential commission, Chief Justice Warren displayed exemplary leadership in a time of national crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Chief Justice Warren as he begins his retirement and wish him many years of good health and happiness.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISCONTINUANCE OF ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS AS TO ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4246) to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the question has been asked as to whether this relaxation of the reports to Congress would be in fact delegating additional authority of the Congress to the executive branch, and, at the other end of the stick, it has been maintained that these reports are of no real value, and that few read them.

Certainly the gentleman from Missouri, who has reserved the right to object, wants to expedite the business of the Government, and we do not need unnecessary reports, but from time to time we have found additional and valuable material available in connection with such reports.

I would like to ask my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who has visited with me concerning his subcommittee report on the bill H.R. 4246, if in view of the next Consent Calendar bill, H.R. 4247, increasing the amount for administrative settlements to $15,000, we would thereafter have no reports on any case that is settled under $15,000?