By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 12868. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12869. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, to restore to such section the provisions requiring proof of intent to deceive in connection with the use of the mails to obtain money or property by false pretenses, representations, or promises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 12870. A bill to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12871. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 12872. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 12873. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12874. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrustion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 12875. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; tc the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 12876. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's and mechanic's liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 12877. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 12878. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands at the Yavapai-Prescott Community Reservation in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12879. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12880. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress by providing for public disclosure of Federal income tax returns by Members of Congress and candidates for that office; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 12881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) over a 4-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12882. A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 12883. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a middecade census of population in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12884. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution to welcome to the United States all Olympic athletes and authorized Olympic delegations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person shall serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court or as Chief Justice of the United States, nor as a Member of Congress, after having attained the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the establishment of the National Gerontology Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent elimination of the 2-percent allowance in lieu of certain provider costs under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12885. A bill for the relief of Antoni de Januszkowski and Maurice Lemee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12886. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Gosnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 12887. A bill for the relief of John A. Avdeef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12888. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rustico C. Polutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12889. A bill for the relief of Mr. Michele Trotta and Mrs. Reparata Trotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12890. A bill for the relief of Mario and Anna Maria Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

178. The SPEAKER presented a petition of United Steel Workers of America, Local 2063, New York, N.Y., relative to tax reform, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower, soldier and statesman, general, and President, who dedicated his life to serving our country. His death brought great sadness to all Americans, especially to those who served in Congress during the 8 years of his Presidency.

His warm smile, his dedication, his honesty, and courage endeared him to to the world and kindled in Americans patriotism and statesmanship, in the finest sense of the words.

Ike lived a full and rewarding life, inspiring faith in the democratic process in his fellow Americans. His heroic and courageous struggle to continue living under adverse and often painful conditions was itself a memorial to his great personal integrity and unyielding spirit. Distinguished men require no tributes; their actions, decisions, and character cannot possibly be heightened by any additional adornments. Simply because of their existence the world is changed, and continues to improve.

All men of the world will continue to express their affection and admiration for Dwight David Eisenhower, a true citizen of the world. His unselfish and dedicated leadership in times of war and peace will never be forgotten. Ike will be remembered as an outstanding example of leadership in a world which could certainly use many such examples.

OUTSTANDING YOUNG SCIENTISTS—TWO FROM EACH STATE—HONORED AT NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP LUNCHEON, HOSTED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH—DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, ISSUES MEANINGFUL CHALLENGE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the National Youth Science Camp is sponsored by the State of West Virginia and was begun in 1963 during our centennial year. Two young men, who have just graduated from high school, are chosen by their State superintendent of schools on the basis of academic achievement to attend the 3-week camp in the beautiful mountains of West Virginia.

On July 9, I had the privilege of hosting a luncheon for the delegates on their visit to the Nation's Capital, as I have done since the camp's beginning.

Each year they spend a short time in Washington. This year the boys toured the Capitol, the White House, Goddard Space Flight Center, and the Naval Research Laboratory.

The Senate luncheon was attended by 47 Senators—some of whom were able to be with us briefly and others who dined with and greeted the delegates from their States. West Virginia Members of the U.S. House of Representatives were present—Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Hon. JOHN M. SLACK, Hon. KEN HECHLER, Hon. JIM KEE, and Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN.

Special guests of honor included Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education; Hon. John H. Shaffer, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; Drew Pearson, noted columnist and commentator, who is a leader in the Big Brothers youth program; Dr. Randal Robertson, Associate Director, National Science Foundation; Lee A. DuBridge, science adviser to the President; Dr. Richard Strombotne, special assistant, Office of Research and Technology; Prof. Charles N. Cochran, camp director since its inception, and Rev. Dr. Edward L. Elson, Senate Chaplain.

Mr. President, when I am with such young people, I am not dismayed. I am encouraged by their eagerness to participate in solving problems, by their attentiveness and by the knowledge they possess.

These students did not represent the hippies, yippies, rabble rousers, or offbeat militants. Instead, they represented the youth in America who will lead. They were young men with a vision—a vision of a better America. They were young scientists eager to quest for answers in a complex society. And, Mr. President, I was heartened and impressed by my talks with these youth.

Dr. Allen's address was meaningful and challenging. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Dr. Allen's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE: TO WHAT END?

(Address by James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education)

It is an honor and privilege for me to be with you today. I am pleased to be here both as United States Commissioner of Education, commending you young people who represent the best of our educational effort, and as a native West Virginian, sharing a long friendship with Senator Randolph and proud, as he is, that the State of West Virginia is the host of such a distinguished group of students.

It would be much more valuable to me if I could listen to you for I believe that the younger generation of today has a keen and penetrating insight concerning the needs and problems of our time that can be truly enlightening.

If you spoke of science, I'm not at all sure I could understand you, for we have advanced so rapidly into the age of laser beams, computers, nuclear power, walking on the moon, etc. that the oft-cited generation gap is probably wider in the field of science than most anywhere else.

One of the most interesting things about you as a group, however, is the breadth of your interests—music, poetry, social service—which indicates your awareness that science does not stand apart as a remote, laboratory-centered occupation but is rather a part of the whole substance of man's endeavor, needing to be so understood by both scientists and non-scientists alike. Thus, I am sure that your ideas would be valuable on a wide range of subjects.

You are fortunate indeed, however, to be so talented in the field of science in an age such as this. Emerson said that "Men love to wonder, and that is the seed of our science." Certainly man's sense of wonder has never had a wider scope of opportunity than today—nor have we ever witnessed such spurts of growth from those seeds of wonder in the minds of men.

Achievement in the whole range of scientific endeavor—medicine, electronics, space exploration—has been so brilliant and so boundless as to give the feeling that nothing is impossible. Next week a man will walk on the moon—the sense of wonder that made the moon a goddess to primitive man, caused Gallileo to persevere with his determined probing, now flowers into a part of man's direct experience.

But the most exciting and hopeful aspect of this achievement, as of all other scientific advance, is that it only serves to recreate and strengthen the wonder that is the seed of scientific progress.

If, however, science is not to stand apart from the whole substance of man's endeavor, it must serve. Albert Einstein once asked "Why does the magnificent applied science which saves work and makes life easier bring us so little happiness?" His answer was "Because we have not yet learned to make sensible use of it."

Sensible here implies, I believe, much more than practicality or material application—it goes beyond the questions of "how" to those of "why" and "to what end." Science to serve mankind must be in the context of the great philosophical question of the nature of life, of man's reason for being.

Since the first Cartesian doubt prompted man to think empirically, rather than abstractly, there has been a widening chasm between science and philosophy. Too often men relegate philosophy to a world of fiction—a world that has little or no relationship to the "real" world of the computer, industrial technology, the ABM, etc. But the relationship exists, recognized or not, and the happiness of mankind that Professor Einstein spoke of—the resolution of conflict, the achievement of justice and equality—will be more hopefully within our grasp if we will seek human advancement in a union of the scientific and the ethical.

I again congratulate you on your achievements and hope that the sense of wonder which has already prompted you to learn so much will lead to the full realization of your great talents.

The world you face is hard—its problems and evils many. Each must share in trying to eliminate them for all—and so may you bring to your future work not only your scientific ability but a warm and compassionate heart that will recognize the broad needs and hopes of mankind and accept a responsibility for helping to fulfill them.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 10, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, after I was elected to Congress, a group of my colleagues and I traveled to Gettysburg to speak with Dwight David Eisenhower. I had met the former President previously, but in that summer of 1967 I was so impressed with his clarity of mind and perception of world politics, I felt the United States would be remiss if we did not put Ike's knowledge to use. After consultation with the general's aides, and after being assured that he looked favorably on the idea, I drafted the following resolution:

H. CON. RES. 476

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower has served the United States of America with distinction for more than fifty years as soldier, President, and statesman; and

Whereas as President of the United States he has gained great knowledge and understanding of this Nation's relations with other nations; and

Whereas he has rendered this Nation and the free world invaluable service as Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force in Europe during World War II, and, later as Supreme Commander Allied Powers Europe, and, because of this service he knows well the aspirations, potential, and problems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas during his eight years as President of the United States this Nation cemented its ties of friendship and understanding with free world nations through a policy of mutual defense binding these nations together against the common threat to their security; and

Whereas developments in recent years have seen a disturbing deterioration in the close ties among members of the Western alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower should be requested to undertake a factfinding mission to investigate and report to the Congress and the President on the state of the relations of the United States with other nations of the world, with particular attention to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the politicomilitary effort in defense of the Republic of Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the general took ill 2 days before 80 other Members of the House of Representatives were planning to introduce the resolution with me; out of respect for this great leader, we delayed our plan. After that first weekend in August 1967, Mr. Eisenhower never regained the good health and robust constitution with which he was blessed for most of his life; the resolution was never formally set forward. I wanted to record it here, Mr. Speaker, because I think it articulates most clearly how I felt about Dwight David Eisenhower. I mourn his passing, as do millions of people around the world; I particularly regret that in times such as these Dwight David Eisenhower is not here to offer us wisdom, counsel, and a firm, guiding hand.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ON STATEN ISLAND

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 59th annual Independence Day parade in Travis was a stunning success. This community once again demonstrated its pride in itself, the city, the State, and the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent newspaper narrative in the Staten Island Advance and the order of march as follows:

The Travis festivities began with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Spanish-American War veteran William Gaylor. It was followed by speeches by Congressman John M. Murphy and Borough President Connor, who also spoke at the Elm Park parade.

Murphy commended the community on the great pride it was showing in itself, in the city, in the state and in the nation. He said the parade was an example of the way to have a "safe and sane" Fourth of July.

Connor said the spirit shown by the people in Travis was "typical of Staten Island," a place where "the Flag is flown proudly, law and order is respected and the police are not called 'pigs'."

He concluded with a quote he felt befit the day: "My country right or wrong; but always my country."

QUEEN CROWNED

In a ceremony following their speeches, Murphy and Connor looked on as Miss Lois Okraszewski was crowned queen of the parade. She and her court, the Misses Rosealie Marchese, Jean Roberge, Theresa Sablowski, and Katherine Morris, were then presented with trophies and flowers and, after the Star Spangled Banner was played by the Staten Island Musician Society Band, led to their float and the parade began.

As the crowd lining Victory Blvd. cheered, a Police escort and Auxiliary Police, followed by the Staten Island Musicians Society Band, the U.S. Naval Reserve, and James Smith, Grand Marshal, led the colorful marchers and musicians in a circular route back to Schmul Park.

Beside the bands already mentioned, the Travis parade featured music by the Royal Eagles Drum Corps. Marchers included the VFW, American Legion, Fire Buffs, Improved Order of Red Men and the Boy Scouts.

There were several special features, beside the 40 and 8 locomotive and the candy-dispensing clowns, including the Spirit of 76 Banner and 13-star Flag, antique cars, fire trucks, a military order of Cooties wagon with a firing mortar, and the Sheriff's Mounted Posse.

The marchers stepped smartly, the bands played with precision, the fire sirens wailed, the Cooties' cannon boomed, the clowns danced, the Red Men whooped, and the crowd applauded as the sun beat down. A few of the bystanders cooled it a little in a local tavern but, in general, the people of Travis seemed oblivious to the heat.

DANCING FOLLOWS

The parade ended in Schmul Park, where the children received refreshments and where, in the evening, residents of Travis danced from 6 until 10 o'clock.

Driving back from a full day of parades through the streets echoing the report of firecrackers and bearing the stench of gunpowder, the parades did seem a "safer" and certainly a "saner" way to enjoy Independence Day to an observer.

TRAVIS FOURTH OF JULY PARADE, 1969—ORDER OF THE MARCH

Chairman: Joseph Chociemski.

Perennial Standard Bearer: Porky Torotra.

1ST DIVISION (M. LARNEY, J. DECKER)—VICTORY BOUELEVARD IN FRONT OF THE SCHOOL

Police Escort and Auxiliary Police.

S.I. Musician Society Band.

U.S. Naval Reserve.

Grand Marshall: James Smith.

Committee and Officials.

William Gaylor Car.

Spirit of 1776 Banner: Frank Peters and Alan Blanchard.

Spirit of 1776 and 13 Star Flag: Robert Scully, Richie Brennen, Eddie Minto, and John Scully.

Miss Liberty: Janel Modzelewski.

Uncle Sam: Kevin Blanchard.

Colonial Girls: Jackie Straub, Janice Atlak, Helen Decker, and Susan Reid.

Betsy Ross Car: Victoria Peters, Sheri Ann Smidhum, Judy Saladis, and Teddy Mutschler.

2D DIVISION (JOHN KIRBY, RAY GOFFIN)—VICTORY BOULEVARD

Sea Cadets.

P.S. 26 Girls Flag Bearers: Jeffrey Stanley, Paula Thomson, and Mary Scully.

P.S. 26 Boys Flag Bearers: Robert Percoco, Linda Saladis, and Sandra Petersen.

3D DIVISION (MR. NEYLON)—MELVIN, OPPOSITE THE SCHOOL

Royal Eagles Drum Corps.

V.F.W.

Cooties.

W.W. I Barracks.

Knights of Columbus Alhambra.

4TH DIVISION (VINCENT KASPROVITZ, RICHARD RAJEWSKI)—MELVIN SCHOOL SIDE

S.I. Community Band.

American Legion.

40 & 8.

Antique cars.

5TH DIVISION (JOHN GLEN)—ROSWELL AVENUE

Our Lady of Perpetual Help Ridgeman.

Volunteer Firemen.

Fire Buffs.

Fire Trucks.

Order of Redmen.

6TH DIVISION (JIM BRAHN)—SCHOOL SIDE WILD AVENUE AND VICTORY BOULEVARD

S.I. Pipe Band.

St. Anthony's Cheer Leaders.

Queen's Float: Lois Okraszewski—Queen. Attendants: Rosealie Marchese, Jean Roberge, Theresa Sablowski, and Katherine Morris.

Sing Along Group: Up With People.

7TH DIVISION (AL HUGHES)—BAKERY SIDE WILD AVENUE AND VICTORY BOULEVARD

Our Lady of Perpetual Help Corps.

De Molay Boys.

Boy Scouts.

Sheriffs Posse.

SALUTE TO APOLLO 11

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to all my colleagues and the people of this Nation that the advances the United States has made in both manned and unmanned space exploration is a great gift to not only this country, but to all mankind. I remind all parties that all of this development work has been accomplished here on earth with the people reaping the benefits whether it be in prestige or economics.

There is an unlimited future evolving out of our space program today with unknown achievements and further economic conquests just ahead for the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, I, too, will stay in Washington, D.C., and watch the flight of Apollo 11 on television, listen on radio, and read about it in the newspapers and magazines, and I assure you that my hopes and prayers are with the astronauts on this flight when man makes his first step onto a celestial body.

On behalf of my State of Nevada, myself, my family, and staff, I wish astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, Jr., Michael Collins, and the entire technological staff and all the other members and contributors to the NASA program, the very best in this historic voyage.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS INITIATES PROJECT "GET WITH IT"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Indianapolis has taken a major stride in developing and mobilizing the resources of voluntary community action by its new Project "Get With It." The following describes the project:

GET WITH IT

"Get With It" is the slogan adopted for a new project of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee designed to stimulate citizens' awareness and participation in the problems of metropolitan Indianapolis. The program is directed toward the final goal of eliciting citizen volunteer action in the operations of both public and private service organizations.

The first step in "Get With It" is a continuing and comprehensive publicity campaign enlisting the help of the local communications media. Five advertising agencies, including McQuade, Wilkens, & Bloomhorst, Garrison, Jasper, & Rose, P. J. Finneran & Co., Ruben-Montgomery & Co., and Caldwell-Van Riper & Co., are voluntarily contributing TV, radio, and newspaper material.

Topics to be covered are summer employment, housing, health and sanitation, education and black pride, and the Mayor's Upswing program. Each topic will enjoy two weeks of special concentration during the summer, with additional announcements of Upswing events distributed as they occur. A phone number and address for "Get With It" central control have been established for those citizens who wish to donate time or money toward the solution of problems depicted in the advertising.

Time and space for the "Get With It" advertising have been donated by various radio and television stations, and the city's daily newspapers. Additional exposure is being sought through the media of weekly newspapers, billboards, community bulletins, public signs, etc. The estimated value of the material, time and space contributed by the agencies and media is in excess of one million dollars.

The second phase of the "Get With It" effort involves the channeling of citizen volunteers into service organizations which are interesting to the individual worker and useful to the city. Working closely with the Progress Committee in this regard is the Volunteer Bureau of the Community Service Council. This agency serves as a clearing house for some eighty service groups in the Marion County area. The "Get With It" central office in the City-County building is open daily to receive inquiries and volunteers. Staffed primarily by CSC workers, this office attempts to suggest satisfactory areas of service to prospective volunteers, and schedules appointments for placement with the appropriate private agency, city department, Progress Committee Task Force, etc. It is hoped that a rapid and efficient process of referral will preserve initial volunteer enthusiasm and provide the best distribution of manpower to the participating groups.

The philosophy underlying the "Get With It" idea assumes that the problems of a modern city cannot be solved by government alone; on the contrary, truly lasting solutions require an aware, concerned, and active citizenry. The success of the Progress Committee in getting people "with it" can take Indianapolis a long way in the area of citizen action, and can produce the sort of community involvement that makes public programs vital and effective.

[From the Indianapolis News, June 24, 1969]

Volunteer Drive on City Problems Starts—Lugar Announces "Get With It" Program

(By Hugh Rutledge)

A campaign to obtain widespread citizen volunteer action to help solve problems of greater Indianapolis was announced today by Mayor Richard G. Lugar.

Using the slogan, "Get With It," Lugar said the aim of the new program is to stimulate citizens' awareness and participation in the operation of public and private service organizations.

The first step in "Get With It" project, according to the mayor, will be an extensive publicity campaign developed by the communications task force of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee and five advertising agencies here.

Lugar estimated the value of material, time and space being contributed by the agencies and newspapers, radio and television at about $1 million.

Topics to be considered in the campaign include employment, housing, health and sanitation, education, recreation and black pride.

Lugar said citizens wishing to donate time or money toward the solution of some of these problems should either write to "Get With It" Central Control, Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633-2888.

Will Guide Volunteers

The second phase of the project will involve channeling volunteers into 80 service organizations under the direction of the volunteer bureau of the Community Service Council and the progress committee, Lugar said.

The "Get With It" headquarters in the City-County Building will be staffed mainly by council workers directed by Kenneth I. Chapman.

Lugar said the philosophy underlying the "Get With It" idea "assumes that the problems of a modern city cannot be solved by government alone. On the contrary, truly lasting solutions require an aware, concerned and active citizenry."

The mayor also announced at the press conference that C. LeRoy Eldridge, retired director of public relations at Stokely-Van Camp Inc., will serve without pay as executive director of the communications task force.

As task force executive director, Lugar said Eldridge will give community relations assistance to all GIPC task forces and establish liaison with neighborhood organizations in an effort to improve communications.

The agencies which have donated time and people for the campaign are:

McQuade, Wilkins & Bloomhorst.
Garrison, Jasper & Rose.
P. J. Finneran & Co.
Ruben-Montgomer & Co.
Caldwell-Van Riper & Co.

Many Volunteer, More Sought by "Get With It"

More than 75 persons answered Mayor Richard G. Lugar's call for citizen volunteers to help make Indianapolis a better place to live.

Fifty responded by telephone and another 25 called in person to say they were eager to join the city-wide "Get With It" campaign, Mitch Daniels, an intern in the mayor's office, reported.

Lugar and C. LeRoy Elderidge, executive director of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee (GIPC) communications task force, said they were highly pleased with the opening response.

Volunteers of all ages and from every social and economic level are being sought to help solve the city's problems of health, housing, unemployment, education and recreation.

"The more volunteers we get, the more we can accomplish," Eldridge said. "For that reason, we are asking everyone to respond. If every resident of Indianapolis volunteered, we'd be overjoyed."

Eldridge said the persons who have volunteered already indicated a desire to do everything they could to help solve the city's many problems.

"The more people with ideas we can get, the more people who are anxious to work, to make personal contributions, the more certain we'll be of achieving success," he said.

"All we want is their enthusiastic determination and ideas," he declared.

Activities of the campaign are being coordinated by the GIPC's task force and the Community Service Council. These two groups will interview the volunteers and decide where among the 80 affiliated groups their talents would best fit.

Most of the first volunteers appeared to be college students or high school pupils anxious to find ways of spending a constructive vacation season.

Citizens wishing to volunteer may either write the Get With It Office, Post Office Box 800, Indianapolis 46206, or telephone 633-2888.

Five advertising agencies are volunteering their services to help plan the program. They are Caldwell-VanRiper Inc.; Garrison, Jasper and Rose; McQuade, Wilkins and Bloomhorst Inc.; P. J. Fineran and Company and Ruben-Montgomery and Associates Inc.

The city's newspapers and television and radio stations will aid the drive with time and space.

Eldridge, retired director of public and industrial relations for Stokely-Van Camp Inc., is serving as executive director without pay.

Firemen and College To "Get With It"

Bridgeport-area volunteer firemen and an Indianapolis business college yesterday revealed plans to aid the "Get With It" community improvement drive.

The firemen, members of the Wayne Township Volunteer Fire Department, will invite about 300 inner-city children to attend without charge a fish fry and carnival to be held July 23-26 in Bridgeport.

The firemen's young guests will be able to enjoy free fire truck and carnival rides during the festival which will be held at the fire station at 8800 West Washington Street.

The children also will be able to watch pulling contests featuring mules and work horses.

Meanwhile Mrs. Mary H. VanBuren, manager of Consolidated Business College, 445 North Pennsylvania Street, offered to let 30 persons take courses at the school without charge.

Courses available include typing, accounting, business English and shorthand.

"Get With It" officials received calls from about 50 prospective volunteers yesterday, bringing the four-day total of calls to more than 200.

---

100 Ready To Join "Get With It" Plan

Mayor Richard G. Lugar said about 100 offers were received to assist with the "Get With It" program yesterday.

Lugar appealed for donations from individuals and companies to assist with promotional and operational aspects of the program. He said the money would be used to purchase more "Get With It" buttons and posters to advertise the program, among other things.

Volunteers or persons wishing to donate money may call 633-2888, or write Get With It, Box 800, Indianapolis, 46206.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 30, 1969]

Wanted: People and Ideas

The problems of Indianapolis and practically all modern cities are big and many, and there is much complaining about them. But complaining will not solve these problems. Good ideas and hard work can.

No element in the population of our city has a monopoly on good ideas or the capability for the kind of hard work that can make solid progress toward solving the city's problems of health, housing, unemployment, education, recreation and positive racial relations.

The ideas must be presented if they are to be weighed and put to the test.

The people who have the time and energy and enthusiasm to make personal contributions to the city's progress must offer their services.

The city-wide "Get With It" campaign is aimed at galvanizing people who have ideas and people who are ready, willing and able to tackle urban problems firsthand.

"The more people with ideas we can get, the more people who are anxious to work, to make personal contributions, the more certain we'll be of achieving success," said C. LeRoy Eldridge, executive director of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee communications task force, which is coordinating the opening phases of the campaign.

Mayor Richard G. Lugar's call for citizen volunteers has brought a promising response so far.

But many more volunteers and ideas are needed.

There can be no denying that the potential of this program is tremendous.

Citizens wishing to volunteer may write to the Get With It Office, Post Office Box 800, Indianapolis 46206, or telephone 633-2888.

Those who have something to offer will be opening a door to adventure as well as valuable service to their fellow citizens.

FIFTY WILLING TO "GET WITH IT"

Calls continue to come into Mayor Richard G. Lugar's "Get With It" office at the rate of about 50 a day as citizens respond to the challenge to take part in solving metropolitan problems.

Mitch Daniels, an intern in the mayor's office, said about 50 volunteers will meet with Community Service Council personnel to determine where the volunteers could be most valuable.

Lugar issued the challenge Tuesday, calling for volunteers to help seek solutions to growing dilemmas in health, housing, employment, education and recreation.

Volunteers may call 633-2888, or write Get With It, Box 800, Indianapolis, 46206.

GETTING WITH IT

Mayor Richard Lugar's newly announced campaign to enlist volunteers for social service work is a promising venture.

The new "Get With It" program is proceeding on a sound basis. It recognizes a fact which is frequently ignored but essential to progress: Motivated citizens working together of their own free will can go where the compulsions of government cannot.

Genuine community improvement comes not from government but from the good works of dedicated individuals working in concert.

Many citizens interested in community betterment wonder what they can do and how their efforts would be related to those of others. The "Get With It" program seeks to provide a comprehensive answer.

It will suggest where a person's talents can be put to best use, and it will give the co-ordination which is necessary for the volunteers to feel they are working as part of a city-wide team.

Anyone who wishes "to get with it" can write to Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633-2888.

He will be making a meaningful contribution to the city's progress.

VOLUNTEER AID SOUGHT FOR CITY

Formation of a city-wide campaign to enlist volunteers to help the city solve the problem of health, housing, unemployment, education and recreation was announced yesterday by Mayor Richard G. Lugar.

Lugar said every citizen will be asked to volunteer his services through work in various service organizations in the city.

The mayor, at a press conference, said the slogan, "Get With It," used by the Teen Guide Council in its fight for good citizenship earlier this year, will be the guiding theme of the campaign.

The mayor said the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee's Communications Task Force and the Community Service Council will coordinate activities of the campaign.

Five advertising agencies here have volunteered to work on the "Get With It" campaign and newspapers, radio and television also will devote time and space to the drive.

The agencies are Caldwell-VanRiper, Inc.; Garrison, Jasper and Rose; McQuade, Wilkins and Bloomhorst Inc.; P. J. Finneran and Company and Ruben-Montgomery and Associates Inc.

Lugar said more than $1 million in time and space will be used in asking citizens to help solve the city's problems.

The Volunteer Bureau of the Community Service Council will work closely with the Progress Committee in channeling citizen volunteers into various service organizations, he said.

Citizens wishing to volunteer their services may either write the Get With It Office, Postoffice Box 800, Indianapolis 46206 or call 633-2888.

Lugar also announced the appointment of C. LeRoy Eldridge, retired director of public and industrial relations for Stokely-Van Camp Inc., as executive director of the Progress Committee's Communication Task Force.

Eldridge, who was with Stokely-Van Camp from 1946 through 1968, will serve in the post without pay.

Eldridge will assist the task force and will establish liaison with neighborhood organizations in an effort to improve communications.

PLACEMENT IN 80 GROUPS—CITIZENS OFFER THEIR SERVICES TO "GET WITH IT"

(By Barry Henderson)

Volunteers to "Get With It" in the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee's appeal for citizen participation in solving metropolitan problems began offering their services today.

Mitch Daniels, an intern in the office of Mayor Richard Lugar, said at least 50 phone calls were answered or monitored in the first 18 hours after the program was announced.

Callers are being assigned interviews with either the GIPC's communications task force or the Community Service Council's volunteer bureau to determine where, among the 80 organizations and groups affiliated with the CSC, summer assistance might best be utilized.

Most of the initial volunteers are college or high school students off for the summer, grouped with a smattering of business and professional men and housewives, according to Daniels.

Among those offering to participate were a sales correspondent on his vacation, a chef who said he was free to help during the evening hours and a DePauw University student who said he'd like to do anything he could. There were only a couple of negative calls.

The offers are channeled into four basic areas where volunteer services are needed. They are:

Neighborhood centers: including religious and recreational centers, social service associations, Parks Department, Model Cities and Project Renewal project offices and the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A.

Health agencies: including associations and societies sponsoring disease control research and rehabilitative activities, the hospitals, neighborhood health centers and Indiana University Medical Center.

Education and cultural groups: including public schools, the zoo, the Children's Museum, Camp Fire Girls, Girl Scouts, preschool centers and nurseries and the Urban League.

Welfare groups: including Goodwill Industries, The Red Cross, The Salvation Army, nursing homes and correctional and juvenile aid institutions.

"It was boredom. I decided I was wasting myself, so I called," said Kit Mayberry, 19, of 7470 N. Central, a Smith College student home for the summer. She said she worked with Flanner House, taking children to parks, one summer while a student at Tudor Hall. She was one of the first to respond.

Dr. Alvin Schutzbank, a Northside podiatrist, said professional groups were urging participation in community affairs, and thought, "It's a good idea to meet people and exchange concepts . . . with the changes coming on.

"Indianapolis has people with latent ideas that could develop into an effective work force," Dr. Schutzbank said.

Cathy Writt, 14, of 1728 Wishmyer Road, a Warrent Central High School junior, said she thought it would provide something useful to be doing and might lead to a paying summer job. "I want to be a nurse," she said, adding she probably would enjoy working in health services.

"There are a lot of people in Indianapolis whose resources are untapped," said Mrs. Michael Stevens, 7835 E. 56th, a teacher for three years at St. Luke's grade school. "I'd decided to take a rest, but I'm restless already," she said. "This sounded good."

BUCHWALD TAKES ON THE BANKERS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bankers' Alice-in-Wonderland logic about interest rates is providing much fodder for the humor columnists.

Art Buchwald, in his syndicated column which appears in the Washington Post and other major newspapers across the country, points out the absurdities of the banks' position on their current lending practices. Mr. Buchwald's column is about the only funny thing that is happening over these high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD Mr. Buchwald's column of Tuesday, July 8:

TRUTH-IN-LENDING IS TAKING FUN OUT OF LOAN BUSINESS

(By Art Buchwald)

You can read all you want to about high interest rates and the problem the banks are having with "truth in lending," but it's only when you try to make a loan these days that you realize how tough things really are.

My friend Kalshiner went into a bank a few weeks ago to make a $1000 loan. The assistant vice president said, "Yes, I'm sure we can do something."

"That's fine."

"Now the prime rate for loans is 8½ per cent."

"That sounds a little high," said Kalshiner, "but I'll take it."

"I said that was the prime rate. That isn't the rate you get. The prime rate is for our large clients who borrow over $1-million. Our rate to you would be 10 per cent."

"Wow, they should call that the prime rate," Kalshiner said. "It's higher."

"No jokes, Mr. Kalshiner, "we're not in a laughing mood these days."

"Things are tough?"

"You don't know the half of it. Everyone wants money, and we don't have any money. Our safes are practically empty. We just don't know what we're going to do."

"I know what you're going to do."

"What?"

"You're going to raise the prime rate."

"You've been talking to David Rockefeller."

"As a matter of fact, I haven't," Kalshiner said. "But can we get on with my problem?"

"Of course. Now I must warn you that

although we tell you the rate on your loan in 10 per cent, it's really 18.65 per cent."

"Why did you have to tell me that?"

"Because," the vice president said as he put his hand on a Bible, "of the truth-in-lending bill, which requires us to tell you the actual amount of interest as opposed to the interest we advertise."

"Well, why don't you tell the people the actual interest rate in the first place?"

"Because, under the truth-in-lending bill we're not required to do so. Wouldn't you rather think you were paying 10 per cent than 19 per cent?"

"I guess so."

"Now under the Truth-In-Lending Act, I am also required to tell you that we will deduct the first payment and the interest out of your $1000 loan, which will add another 1.94 per cent to your interest charges."

"I knew you'd get over 20 per cent before I got out of here."

"Mr. Kalshiner, if you don't want this loan we can give it to somebody else."

"I'm sorry. I see you still have your hand on the Bible. Is there anything else you want to tell me?"

"There are certain bank handling charges for putting through the loan which will add another 2 per cent."

"Bonnie and Clyde were amateurs compared to you guys," Kalshiner said.

"Mr. Kalshiner, that wasn't a nice thing to say. Do you think we like telling people the truth about our loans? Do you think it's fun to have to keep my hand on this Bible every time someone wants to borrow money? We didn't want the truth-in-lending bill. We fought it, because we knew how unhappy it would make everyone. But it's the law of the land and all the fun has gone out of the loan business."

"I'm sorry," Kalshiner said. "Heck, if I have to pay 23 per cent for a loan it's fine with me."

The vice president put his hand back on the Bible. "Now let me tell you about the postage charges."

LAW AND ORDER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently we have been hearing that the results of the mayorality campaigns in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York could be the prelude to an orgy of "law and order" campaigning in cities across the land this coming election year.

I think the words which were expressed by AFL–CIO President George Meany during last year's presidential campaign on the "law and order" issue are especially timely today in view of recent mayoral elections.

Mr. Meany said:

No believer in democracy can condone crimes of violence, no matter what the provocation. Riots, assault, arson, looting, and murder are not avenues of protest, they are attacks on society.

But law and order alone, without regard for justice, can be corrupted into a pretext for tyranny. True law and order is not served by equipping police with tanks and machine guns as though the ghetto were the enemy and not the handful of criminals inside it. Yet, better police work is needed, but the way to get it, is through better-trained and better paid policemen operating in a center of justice, not through the indiscriminate use of force against innocent and guilty alike. Nor, is true law and order served, by ill-advised legislative attempts to dilute the constitutional rights of all Americans in the name of police power.

By all means, let there be law and order. Let there be law and order in the cities, but not by the creation of a garrison state.

Let there be law and order in the enforcement of civil rights, in statues and the application of other social welfare legislation.

Let those who cry for more police in the slums cry also for more jobs, more housing and more schools for the prisoners of the slums. Those, too, are the tools of law and order.

As we reflect on the huge problems confronting our cities today, I feel it will bear well for us to keep Mr. Meany's thoughts in mind.

STAN COVELESKIE ELECTED TO BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on July 3 many friends of Stanley Coveleskie, the great major league baseball player of the 1920's, honored him at a parade and dinner in recognition of his induction into the Baseball Hall of Fame later in July.

It was my privilege to attend this testimonial to a man born in 1888, but who has the vigor and appearance of someone in his early sixties. Mr. Coveleskie is a remarkable figure, with his amazing energy, and abounding optimism for the future. Here is a man who started to work as a lad of 12, 6 days a week from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., at a wage of $3.75 a week. He stated he was concerned about signing his first baseball contract for $250 for the entire season since he felt it was such a vast sum of money. From these meager beginnings, Stan Coveleskie blossomed into one of baseball's real giants, having served in the major league for 14 years. He pitched for the Cleveland Indians and in the 1920 World Series against Brooklyn; Stan allowed 2 runs in 27 innings; thus allowing his team to win all three games. During his years in the American League, 214 games were won over 141 losses. The earned run average was 2.88.

I know Cleveland could not be more proud of their former star hurler than the people of his hometown, Shamokin, Pa. They gave him an enthusiastic ovation during the testimonial and I felt privileged in joining in the salute to Stan Coveleskie. The Shamokin News Item gave the event excellent coverage and I should like to include a portion of the column from their July 5 edition:

STANLEY COVELESKIE FETED DURING PARADE AND PROGRAM IN SHAMOKIN

Residents of the twin communities of Shamokin and Coal Township turned out in force Thursday night to pay tribute to a native son, Stanley Coveleskie, who recently was named to Baseball's Hall of Fame.

Over 400 persons, including young and old, attended the program in Pleasant Hill Lodge, Ranshaw and proudly honored their "distinguished son," a former pitcher for the Cleveland Indians, with gifts and words of praise.

Among the highlights was an informative talk by Coveleskie who fascinated the audience with his vivid memory of the many events that led to his stardom.

He amused the crowd when he said "I did not have enough nerve to sign a contract to play baseball for $250."

Area residents honored Coveleskie with a day of appreciation that will probably linger with the "Hall of Famer" for many years. The day of festivities began with a parade through the business district in his honor.

Coveleskie displayed his warm feelings toward the community when he hinted his desire to return to Shamokin. "I'll come home again sometime," he promised.

The dinner and testimonial program climaxed many weeks of planning by members of the Stanley Coveleskie Day Committee, headed by Alderman B. Lee Morgan, general chairman and long-time friend of Coveleskie.

The native of Shamokin brought wide recognition to the community when he was "finally" given the highest recognition a baseball player can achieve, being named to the Hall of Fame. Coveleskie is one of only 114 major league players in the United States to earn that distinction.

The gala affair took on a carnival atmosphere as the entire group joined in the singing of "For He's A Jolly Good Fellow" and "Take Me Out To The Ballgame." Coveleskie received several lengthy standing ovations from the spirited crowd.

Many gifts were presented to the guest of honor, including a plaque of coal containing pictures of the Coveleskie brothers, who also participated in the national sport. The presentation was made by Edward F. Cove on behalf of the entire Covelskie family. A large number of the family was in attendance.

REPRESENTATIVE CHET HOLIFIELD SPEAKS AT COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "NARWHAL"

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*—SSN 671—was commissioned during impressive ceremonies at the U.S. Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn. Highlight of the event was a major seapower speech delivered by our colleague and the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD of California. The vision and determination of Chairman HOLIFIELD and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have done much to insure that we do have the beginnings of a modern nuclear Navy. And the existence of that Navy has done more to convince the Soviet Union to be civilized than any number of conferences, treaties, agreements, and ambassadors. Chairman HOLIFIELD's speech follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, AT THE COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "NARWHAL" (SSN671), GROTON, CONN., JULY 12, 1969

It is with particular personal pleasure that I speak today at the commissioning of the NARWHAL, for I feel a special attachment to this ship. Three and a half years ago I helped to weld my initials into the keel of the *Narwhal*, and I have followed her progress with interest since. Nearly two years ago, on September 9, 1967, my colleague Senator Pastore, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, gave the principal address at the launching of the *Narwhal*. You will recall that he called for full speed ahead on building an antiballistic system. He also, on behalf of all of us on the Atomic Energy Committee, made some important statements on our nuclear submarine program which I plan to go into later.

You who have given your skills and energies to the development and construction of the NARWHAL can feel justifiable pride in the completion of this outstanding ship. I am sure her performance at sea for our Navy will be a continuing source of pride to us all.

Just 15 years ago, the world's first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*, was commissioned at Electric Boat. Today, we have 43 nuclear attack, and 41 Polaris submarines in operation, a total of 84 nuclear submarines. Also, our naval surface fleet has four nuclear powered surface ships in operation. These ships have steamed over 13 million miles. An additional 22 nuclear powered attack submarines and three nuclear powered surface warships have been authorized by Congress, including the turbine-electric submarine being developed by Electric Boat.

The NR-1, the first nuclear powered oceanographic research submarine, is nearing completion at Electric Boat. Because of the vastly increased endurance made possible by nuclear power, the capability of NR-1 will be an order of magnitude greater than that of any other oceanographic vehicle built or planned.

At the same time, development continues on advanced nuclear propulsion plants and longer-life nuclear cores for both submarines and surface warships. The Joint Committee had to give another boost to the AEC's authorization bill this year by adding $4 million for development work on greatly improved nuclear propulsion plants for submarines. This progress in naval nuclear propulsion in the United States in the fifteen years since the *Nautilus* went to sea is remarkable.

This is an accomplishment we are all justly proud of—it was a Herculean task. The difficulty and importance of designing, building, and operating the propulsion plants of our nuclear submarines cannot be overestimated. The very safety of our country may depend on them. For this reason it is essential that centralized responsibility is continued and that doctrinaire administrative practices are not permitted to interfere with the effort.

But as remarkable as our progress has been, the growth of Soviet naval strength in the last few years has been even more remarkable. It is now ominously clear that the Soviet Union is far down the road on a massive naval and maritime program designed to make it the predominant sea power of the world. Since World War II, the Soviet Navy has undergone a far-reaching modernization program, including construction of missile-armed cruisers, helicopter carriers, and many new classes of conventional and nuclear powered submarines. The hard fact is that in less than 25 years Russia has become a major naval power and is determined to be second to none on and under the oceans of the world. At this moment, for the first time in its history, the Soviet Union is using a deployed naval force in support of its foreign policy in areas distant from its own borders. The Soviet force in the Mediterranean includes warships armed with surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles, amphibious ships with naval infantry, as well as torpedo attack and missile-armed submarines.

Speaking specifically about submarines, the present Soviet submarine force is a significant threat to our use of the seas and to our country itself. In comparative terms, the Soviet Union now has about 375 submarines, all built since World War II. We have 143, including diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. In *nuclear* submarines, the United States presently has an advantage of 84 to the Soviets' "65–70" which is all we can say publicly about the Soviets' nuclear submarine fleet; however, it is estimated that by 1974 the Soviets will add about 70 new nuclear submarines to their fleet, while the United States will add but 24. In the last year alone, the Soviets put to sea several new types of nuclear attack submarines and a new type ballistic missile submarine. In contrast to this, we will have completed only one new design submarine in a ten-year period.

In the case of ballistic missile submarines, the Soviets have undertaken a vigorous building program to surpass our *Polaris* fleet of 41 ships. Eight or nine of their new *Polaris*-type submarines have already been launched and a number of these are thought to be operational. It is estimated that today the Soviets have the capability to turn out *Polaris* submarines at the rate of one a month. Since we have no new *Polaris* submarines under construction or planned, we must assume that by the 1973–74 period they will be on a par with us in nuclear propelled *Polaris* type submarines.

At this point let me recall Senator Pastore's remarks at the launching of the *Narwhal*. At that time, he called for a serious consideration of an expanded *Polaris* program and more effort on advanced nuclear attack submarines. In light of Soviet developments in the field of *Polaris* type submarine construction and evidence we now have that the Soviets are actively engaged in a determined effort to acquire the capability to neutralize or destroy our *Polaris* force, the need for getting on with the development and construction of improved attack submarines to protect our *Polaris* fleet against this threat is more urgent than ever.

Though the numerical superiority the Soviets have in submarines is important, the capability of their new submarines is even more significant. We are impressed with the operating characteristics and performances of these new design submarines—in some cases equal to or better than ours.

Although I have singled out the advancements made by the Soviets in the field of submarines, the story in certain other areas of their navy is the same. These facts must lead us to the obvious conclusion that the Soviet leadership has made the decision to build a powerful navy and use it as a means of spreading their influence throughout the world.

I call for a vigorous program to develop and construct improved nuclear submarines, both attack and *Polaris* type. The construction program should be limited only by the capacity of our submarine building facilities. Every one of our obsolete diesel powered U.S. submarines built before and during World War II should be replaced by modern high speed nuclear propelled attack, or *Polaris* type submarines. We can do no less for the sake of National security, in the face of the startling Soviet nuclear submarine building program.

In contrast, let us look to our own shores and see what we are actually doing. It is indeed a sad commentary that the Congress and, in particular, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had to struggle with the Defense Department over the years in order to get a nuclear navy. This was true with the *Nautilus*; it was true with nuclear powered aircraft carriers and frigates; it has been true with just about every new development in the nuclear navy. For example, approval to proceed with two new and critically needed submarine designs—the quiet turbine-electric drive and the high-speed submarines—was bogged down for several years in Pentagon studies and academic analyses. While we "studied," the Soviets steadily improved their nuclear submarine force. As late as last year, despite the evidence I have just cited on the Soviet naval buildup, the Defense Department recommended to the Congress that the United States not build any additional submarines after those authorized in fiscal year 1970. Congress turned that decision around. In addition, Congress authorized and appropriated funds to begin work on the high-speed submarine after Secretary McNamara turned it down. Had it not been for the initiative of Congress in providing such funds, the Defense Department would probably still be studying the pros and cons instead of proceeding with the high-speed submarine design as it now is.

Getting back to our legislative action on the nuclear warship program, again this year the Defense Department's budget request for fiscal year 1970 did not include the full nuclear warship building funds requested by the Navy. However, the Joint Committee has again taken a strong position in support of a vigorous nuclear warship building program. In our report, we summarized our position as follows:

"The committee, in addition to urging the support of a vigorous research and development effort, wishes to commend to the Congress a strong nuclear warship construction program. In the committee's view, such a program should include as a minimum authorization of the funds necessary to build three high-speed nuclear attack submarines and advance funding for five more; funds to complete the second *Nimitz* class nuclear aircraft carrier, advance funding for the third carrier of this class, and funds for space nuclear propulsion plant components for the entire class; funds for two nuclear frigates, and advance funding for three more.

"Historically, the development of nuclear propulsion has been accomplished largely through the efforts and insistence of the Congress. As recently as last year, while the Department of Defense debated and vacillated over whether to initiate development of a high-speed submarine and to proceed with the quiet electric-drive submarine program, the Congress acted—affirmatively. The Defense Department belatedly but finally recognized the vital importance of these programs and is now supporting them. However, had it not been for the initiative of the Congress in authorizing and appropriating funds for the high-speed submarine program, the Defense Department would not be in a position to proceed with it now. Similar affirmative congressional action is called for now to insure against any slowdown in the development of advanced nuclear propulsion plants—a slowdown that could have a significant adverse impact on our future submarine program."

Today, our military expenditures are being subjected to an unprecedented degree of critical public scrutiny and debate. This is proper and useful, provided the arguments are based on fact. But we must not base our national security policies on wishful thinking or look to academicians for military advice. I can tell you that if the Joint Committee and the President of the United States had taken the advice of the intellectuals and academicians in 1950 we would have been behind the Soviets in developing the hydrogen bomb.

The Soviets did not merely *wish* their submarine force into being, and we cannot wish it away. We must treat it as the hard reality it is. And I wish I could recommend to you a cheap, easy way to insure the continued security of our Nation in the face of this threat. However, the only way I know is to provide the best submarines and surface ships and other military weapons this Nation can develop—and that path is neither cheap nor easy. The Nation and the Navy are at a turning point in their history. The Congress of the United States must take the initiative to insure that the new warships we build for our first line naval striking forces will have nuclear propulsion and to insure that the program for improving and building nuclear submarines is aggressively pursued.

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its establishment over 23 years ago. I am particularly proud that the Joint Committee, since its inception, has vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion and the construction of new and better nuclear powered ships.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S TENURE

In this connection there is another subject which has had the continued vigorous and determined support of the Joint Committee. This is the continuation of Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program.

Earlier this week I was delighted to hear that the Secretary of the Navy with the strong urging of Admiral Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, had decided to continue Admiral Rickover on active duty for a period of two additional years. I made mention of this on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I commended my former colleague, now the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin Laird. I am confident that his advice and counsel, based on his experience on the House Appropriations Committee where he had an opportunity to review Admiral Rickover's contribution to the security of the Nation, were effective in the decision announced by the Secretary of the Navy.

ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN NATIONS IN THE FIELD OF NUCLEAR PROPULSION

There is another subject I would like to mention. Over the past decade, the United States has received numerous requests from friendly governments that we sell them nuclear powered submarines or provide them with our technology to enable them to build their own. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as other Congressional groups, is firmly opposed to disseminating this sensitive information abroad.

First, we believe this invaluable and hard-earned technology must be given the greatest possible degree of protection against compromise to hostile powers—this would not be the case if it were made available to other countries. Second, we do not believe it would be prudent to increase the number of countries possessing this vital element of the *Polaris* delivery capability. Finally, since few, if any, of our allies have the resources to build more than one or two nuclear ships, even with our help, the military advantage to the allied mutual defense would be extremely slight.

The Joint Committee does not consider this small advantage justifies the considerable risk of our nuclear propulsion technology being compromised. This is particularly true during this critical period of an ever increasing Soviet threat. I can assure you there is no change in the Joint Committee's position on this important question.

I am hopeful that this Administration will provide the leadership and initiative necessary to build and maintain an adequate nuclear submarine force and surface fleet for the critical period that lies ahead. I am confident that such a program will meet with the approval of the Congress. I assure you that it will have the vigorous and determined support of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

To the officers and men of the *Narwhal*—smooth sailing and Godspeed. Each of us shares the hope that you will sail in peaceful waters and will never be called upon to fight. But if you are, we also share an absolute confidence in your capabilities. This ship is the finest product ever constructed by our shipbuilding industry. Her officers and men along with those who man our nuclear navy are the most carefully selected, the best trained and educated, and the most dedicated naval seamen the world has ever known. We will continue to provide you with the best ships and weapons possible. But it is in your patriotism, courage, and dedication that we truly place our confidence. It is these ingredients which are the true strength of the Navy and our Nation.

A LETTER OF INTEREST

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Mr. Tim Hostiuck, which I feel is worthy of note by all Members of this body. I include his letter in the RECORD:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1969*.

DEAR SIR: I would like to comment on President Nixon's recent commencement addresses at Beadle State College and the Air Force Academy. With respect to the former speech on student unrest, I feel well qualified to comment, since I am a student myself and am just now ending my seventh year of college life. If we were to resort to traditional political dichotomism, I would probably be classified by others as a conservative, though I personally object to the term in its current connotation. To compound this, I live in a conservative city (Columbus) in a conservative state (Ohio) and attend a conservative university (Ohio State University). Indeed, I am probably a perfect representative of the silent and so-called apathetic majority of college students. To live in such an environment, however, is not to distort my perceptions to the point of ignorance as some might want to claim. Rather, my environment tends only to color my opinions; and in this regard I am no less human than any other student, for none is exempt from this external influence.

Having so characterized myself, let us now get back to the President's comments. You see, Mr. Nixon suffers from a socially imposed affliction similar to my own. He is a traditionalist or a conservative of what have you—or at least this is what he is commonly held to be among laymen. But to label him as such does not get at the true value of what he says. The question is not whether he is a conservative or a liberal; the question is whether he is right or wrong or more accurately whether he is heading in the right direction or the wrong direction.

From his personal value system, the President must judge the nation's youth, and no one would question his belief in the vitality and promise of the majority of our youth. Many do question, however, the beliefs he holds regarding a minority of our youth. This country has unquestionably become youth oriented—perhaps too much so. Leaders everywhere are bending to their will, gaining short-run relief to the sacrifice of the long-run good.

To be sure there is legitimate complaint in the campus movement—too long have students been on the short end of communications while professors struggle for professional survival in a system which tangibly rewards research while recognizing excellent pedagogy with but a pat on the back. There is, however, illegitimate complaint on the campus which is aimed at nothing less than the demise of our educational institutions. It is aimed not at responsible and internally generated reform but unresponsible and externally imposed destruction.

Administrators steeped in shortsightedness are reluctant to stamp out the bad for fear of obliterating that intermingled bit of legitimacy, despite the fact that both can be dealt with separately. In addition, they act in accordance with the aforementioned youth phobia and fail to recognize that there is nothing inherent in the youth movement that makes it right. True it is for change, but often only change for the sake of change or for the sake of destruction and not change for constructive purposes. The President is right in recognizing this movement for what it is and in calling for college administrators to consider the long-run consequences of their acts.

Now to move on to the closely related question of recent attitudes toward defense—closely related in that it concerns the opinion of the nation's youth. The reaction on the part of much of the news media to the President's Air Force Academy address was appalling. For the first time in his presidency, Mr. Nixon attacked major political figures. Immediately the news media (notably NBC) reacted irresponsibly. Unlike the era of the Johnson Administration when they were content to report only what was said, the news media judged Mr. Nixon's speech from their own political frameworks. They attacked what he did not say, contorted what he did say, accused him of reverting to his "pre-election" ways and of interjecting his own value system into the defense question.

To this press reaction let me first say that some of the news media have failed in their responsibility in that they have unduly distorted and misinterpreted what the President said. They have also demonstrated a lack of restraint in attacking the President's first really scorching words—it's as if they were lying in wait. To this end they have done this country a disservice, for the President desperately desires to, is trying to, and must communicate with the citizenry in his terms—instead his communications are distorted by the news media.

Some reporters say that the President showed his colors in his defense address. Is not this why the people elected him—to exercise his beliefs which supposedly reflect their own. Must a President become a meaningless mold of all public opinion and try to accommodate everyone and thereby accommodate no one. Did we not have enough of this leaderless leadership in the Johnson era. The President is supposed to take a stance—that's why he in particular was elected. Responsible dissent may object to the stance taken but not to the act of taking a stance.

Some reporters also say that the President created a straw man, that no responsible leader is calling for unilateral disarmament and that there is no field day on the defense establishment. Of course, the President knows that no responsible leader is explicitly saying these things. But this is not the point and it demonstrates the extent to which Mr. Nixon feels the pulse of the nation while others blindly condemn him. Of concern to the President is the image held by the public of the attack on the defense establishment; i.e., their perception of what is happening, particularly the perceptions of college students.

Despite the actual words being said, the grandiose fashion in which such weighty figures as Senator Fulbright are criticizing military spending gives the impression of an impending military state. The President, as he explicitly remarked in his speech, is for constructive criticism but he is against the fear and distrust of the military being built into the citizenry, especially young radicals who are anxiously waiting to branch out from the Fulbright-type base to more extreme positions. There is no straw man then; there is a very real negative image of the military's purpose which fortunately the President is perceptive enough to see.

Mr. Nixon, despite how one feels about his opinions and values, should be applauded by *all* for attempting to exercise an *active* leadership and for having the courage to come face to face with reality and not some self-centered microcosm of it.

Respectfully yours,

TIM HOSTIUCK.

WISCONSIN GUIDANCE SYSTEM TO CONTROL FIRST MOON LANDING

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. B. Paul Blasingame, general manager of the AC Electronics Division of the General Motoors Corp. of Milwaukee, has provided me with information on the Wisconsin-produced guidance system which will be used by the astronauts in their first history-making moon landing.

I believe this information will be of interest to the millions of Americans and others throughout the world who will be "in the gallery" for this epochal event. I include Dr. Blasingame's information in the RECORD:

GM GUIDANCE PROGRAMED TO CONTROL FIRST MOON LANDING

The first manned landing on the moon and liftoff from it are programmed to be controlled by the space-proven Guidance and Navigation (G&N) system in the Apollo Lunar Module (LM).

To begin the dramatic landing sequence, the General Motors-AC Electronics system controls the Descent Orbit Insertion (DOI) firing of the LM descent engine behind the moon, out of touch with Mission Control in Houston. DOI lowers the orbit of the LM, so that its eight mile low point comes some 15 degrees and about 260 nautical miles before landing site two.

As the low point approaches, Apollo 11 Commander Neil A. Armstrong and LM pilot Edwin E. Aldrin will enter Program 63 (P-63) into the G&N computer, calling for the Power Descent Initiation (PDI) firing of the throttleable descent engine, to start the LM down toward the landing site.

Seconds before planned PDI ignition, the computer's display and keyboard (DSKY) will flash its "proceed" button, asking the astronauts if they agree the engine should be fired as planned.

The push of that button will permit a completely automatic descent and landing under G&N control, which incorporates landing radar readouts. Meanwhile the astronauts monitor G&N and double check to be sure they are headed for a reasonably smooth, flat area. Thrusting in program 63 reduces relative ground speed to some 350 mph before the program switches automatically to P-64 and at 150 feet altitude to P-65 for the gentle, two-mile-per-hour final approach and touchdown.

Though it is planned that Armstrong and Aldrin will leave the G&N in its automatic mode until the final portion of the descent, they still can use hand controllers to make minor corrections of spacecraft attitude, basing their corrections on instruments driven by the G&N system. Rate of descent and total attitude are regulated automatically.

During the final portion of the descent, the crew can exert more direct control over the final touchdown point and velocities by selecting from two other programs: P-66 (semiautomatic) or P-67 (manual), though once they choose either of these programs—via DSKY entry—they cannot return to the automatic sequence. In P-66, total attitude is handled manually. The G&N system controls the rate of descent, though a flip of an instrument panel switch provides a one-foot-per-second variation in the descent rate. Complete manual control is provided by P-67.

The AC Electronics G&N systems in both the Command and Lunar Modules will be put to the test throughout the Apollo 11 lunar landing mission—from launch to splashdown.

During launch the AC Electronics Command Module (CM) system backstops the launch vehicle guidance package, and is able to turn over manual control of the rocket to the astronauts if the primary unit should fail.

In addition to the ascent and descent burns, AC Electronics systems control all other major firings of main engines in both spacecraft—the big service propulsion system (SPS) of the Command and Service Modules (CSM) combination, and the descent and ascent propulsion systems (DPS and APS) in the LM.

Four of the most critical of these firings—two lunar orbit insertion burns (LOI-1 and 2), DOI and transearth injection (TEI)—are controlled by G&N behind the moon—out of "sight" of NASA radar tracking and radio communication.

The astronauts will use the Command Module G&N System to determine their position in space and in lunar orbit, as a correlation with NASA's radar tracking. Should communications fail, the G&N would become the only position reference for the trip home.

While Armstrong and Aldrin are performing separate maneuvers with the LM, Command Module pilot Michael Collins uses the G&N optics to track the landing vehicle, during descent and ascent should a rescue rendezvous of the landing vehicle be necessary.

Each G&N system also maintains the attitude of its spacecraft when the two vehicles are separated. When they are docked, one of the systems (usually in the Command Module) will control attitude. Thus, the systems will be in control of both spacecraft virtually at all times during the mission.

Finally, the AC Electronics G&N system guides the spacecraft through the critical entry corridor at the edge of the earth's atmosphere, to a point just before drogue parachute deployment.

Heart of the G&N system is the inertial measurement unit (IMU), which consists of a gyroscopically stabilized platform mounted within gimbals which allow the spacecraft to move in any direction while the platform remains fixed in inertial space. Accelerometers, which measure changes in velocity, also are mounted on this platform. From the stable platform, all changes in the spacecraft's attitude, speed, and direction are measured and accumulated by the system's guidance computer. The computer controls the overall G&N operation, and issues guidance commands based in part on information from the IMU.

The optical subsystem, consisting of a one-power telescope and 28-power sextant in the CSM, is a very precise refinement of seafaring navigational instruments. In the LM, only a one-power alignment optical telescope (AOT) is provided. The CSM optical subsystem permits the astronauts to find their position in space relative to the moon and the planets, and to realign their stabilized inertial platform to star references. In addition, spacecraft attitude is verified periodically by sextant star sightings.

During the mission the astronauts will use the optics in both spacecraft to realign the stable platform several times, because:

Even the most precise gyroscopes accumulate minor errors or "drift" over a period of time, but alignment can correct for this drift.

For the most precise measurement of velocity change during a major thrusting maneuver, it is best to have the accelerometers properly aligned for the burn. Usually alignment is performed before every engine firing to accomplish this.

Normally the platform is aligned to its most convenient reference. For example, at launch, alignment is to a launch pad reference; in mid-course, to the stars; at the moon, to the landing site; and near entry, to certain entry coordinates.

Accelerometers also can develop some minor errors, or inherent bias. But as is the case with gyros, the bias usually is a known quantity, a definite signature developed through exhaustive testing of the instrument from the day it was built right up to mission time. The bias factors are programmed into the computer, which compensates for them when computing velocity change.

On their way to and from the moon, the astronauts correlate their position with the ground's radar tracking estimate by using the G&N system's sextant to make star-horizon or star-landmark fixes. The sightings are used to update their onboard state vector—position and velocity estimate—which would become critical if communications failed.

When the LM guidance and navigation system is powered up, the LM's IMU will be aligned initially using coordinates voiced from the CSM. After the two spacecraft separate the astronauts in the LM will take star sightings to perform IMU alignments. One of their first duties after landing on the moon is to perform optical alignment.

LAUNCH AND ORBITAL INSERTION

The CSM guidance and navigation system will be turned on and aligned to a launch pad reference at T-48 hours, and will not be powered down during the mission—until just before splashdown some 240 hours later. Here is a G&N mission sketch:

During launch and earth parking orbit insertion by the Saturn V rocket, guidance and control normally are the responsibility of the system in the instrument unit (IU) of the S-IVB third stage, while the AC Electronics system monitors IU guidance performance and displays for the astronauts the spacecraft's attitude and velocity.

If the launch vehicle inertial platform should fail, the AC system can provide the astronauts with a means to assume steering control and either continue or abort the mission as required.

TRANSLUNAR INJECTION (TLI)

During the second revolution of the 100 nautical mile high circular parking orbit the instrument unit will control a restart of the S-IVB to place the combined vehicles in a free return trajectory to the moon (so that if no lunar orbit were attempted, the spacecraft would merely circle the moon and return to earth). The AC system monitors this maneuver, and again provides takeover capability should trouble develop in the launch vehicle inertial platform.

TRANSPOSITION, DOCKING AND LM EXTRACTION

Soon after TLI, the astronauts will control separation, transposition and docking with the LM, then ease the moon vehicle from its S-IVB adapter. After the docked spacecraft makes a short evasive burn using the Service Propulsion System (SPS), the S-IVB's remaining fuel will be vented, accelerating it into a solar orbit.

TRANSLUNAR COAST (TLC)

On the 73-hour coasting flight to the moon, the AC G&N system will control up to four mid-course corrections, though on past missions most of these adjustments have not been required.

LUNAR ORBIT INSERTION (LOI-1 AND LOI-2)

At the moon the G&N system will control insertion of the two Apollo spacecraft into a 60 by 170 nautical mile lunar orbit. Two revolutions later, it will direct the SPS engine to fire again to circularize the orbit at approximately 60 nautical miles. Both burns will be behind the moon with no coverage by NASA's Manned Space Flight Network (MSFN). LM pilot Aldrin will enter the LM for the first time toward the end of the third lunar orbit for a two hour check of communications systems and general housekeeping chores, while CM pilot Collins performs orbital navigation, tracking landmarks with the G&N optical subsystem.

DESCENT ORBIT INSERTION (DOI)

In the eleventh orbit, after a rest period in the Command Module, spacecraft commander Armstrong and LM pilot Aldrin will occupy the LM. This time they will power up and check all LM systems and align its IMU for the first time. Collins will perform more landmark tracking from the CSM. In the 13th lunar revolution the two spacecraft will separate and the LM descent will begin, under G&N control and without MSFN coverage. The DOI-descent propulsion system (DPS) burn will lower the LM altitude to 8 nautical miles as its closest point. During the LM coasting descent, Collins will track it from the CSM with the G&N optics.

POWERED DESCENT AND LANDING

With the astronauts again in contact with earth, the G&N system initiates the key PDI burn which begins the vehicle's powered descent toward a gentle landing on the surface. If the astronauts wish, the guidance system can control the entire landing sequence automatically, while they monitor the progress of the descent. The G&N system processes and displays range and range rate information from the landing radar and attitude data from the IMU. In the latter phase of descent the astronauts can take over manual control and fly the LM to touchdown.

Soon after landing, the G&N's IMU is realigned using AOT star sightings, so that a G&N-controlled liftoff can be performed right away if necessary. Alignment is repeated again before the actual liftoff.

ASCENT AND RENDEZVOUS

When the lunar stay is concluded, the G&N system will automatically control the firing of the LM's ascent engine. The descent stage will be used as a launch pad for liftoff, to start Armstrong and Aldrin toward a rendezous in orbit with the Command Module.

After the LM is safely in orbit, the G&N system controls the three firings of the small LM reaction control system rockets to enable the spacecraft to rendezvous and dock with the CSM. Further braking burns are under manual control as the LM G&N system displays rendezvous radar data during the rendezvous sequence. Between rendezvous burns, the Command Module pilot again will use the G&N system's sextant to track it. Rendezvous manuevers are calculated by the G&N computers aboard the CSM and LM.

After the two LM astronauts finish their tasks in that spacecraft and crawl back into the CM with their lunar samples, the LM will be jettisoned and left in orbit around the moon.

TRANSEARTH INJECTION (TEI)

In the 30th revolution, the G&N system will control the SPS burn behind the moon which propels the CSM out of lunar orbit and back toward earth.

TRANSEARTH COAST (TEC)

During the two-and-a-half day trip home, the astronauts may make up to three mid-course corrections, though on Apollo 8 and again on Apollo 10, the transearth injection was so accurate that only one minor correction was needed.

ENTRY

The AC Electronics guidance and navigation system will control the 25,000 mile per hour entry into the earth's atmosphere automatically. The system will continue spacecraft guidance until just before drogue parachute deployment, as it did with such great accuracy on previous Apollo missions. On Apollo 9 and 10, the world watched as the spacecraft drifted down within range of television cameras aboard the recovery aircraft carrier.

The system controls speed and attitude during entry by rotating the spacecraft about its offset center of gravity, thus changing the direction of the aerodynamic lift. The system calculates how much and in which direction the spacecraft should be rolled to achieve the desired parachute deployment point. The system also calculates and shows the astronauts their anticipated splashdown point, the only variable being surface winds in the landing area.

AC is prime contractor to NASA for manufacture, assembly, subsystem integration and testing of the Apollo G&N systems. Major subcontractors are the Equipment Division of Raytheon Co., Sudbury, Mass., for the digital computer and associated displays and keyboards; and Kollsman Instrument Corp., Syosset, N.Y., a division of Standard Kollsman Industries, for the optical subsystem.

CUSTOMS COURT REFORM

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill to improve the judicial machinery in the customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters.

Over $3 billion in customs duties were collected last year. This is a very sharp increase over previous years. It reflects, of course, the great increase in imports into the United States. But one clear consequence of this situation is an upward trend in challenges by importers to duties assessed against them by the Bureau of the Customs.

The caseload of customs cases is very impressive. In fiscal 1963, the Customs Court received about 35,000 new cases; in fiscal 1968, this figure had increased to 108,000.

At the end of fiscal 1963, 186,000 cases were pending in the Customs Court; at the end of March 1969, there were over 439,000 cases pending.

The Bureau of Customs and the Customs Court are presently operating under outmoded procedural arrangements that hamper them in dealing with this great volume of work. The bill I am introducing will, I believe, provide new procedures that will reduce the volume of new cases and will permit the court to act more effectively and expenditiously on the cases that are filed.

Many hands have contributed to the present draft. Former Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, Chief Judge Rao of the Customs Court, Treasury, and Justice officials, and representatives of interested groups, such as the importers and members of the bar have all worked together to produce these much needed reforms.

PRESS FAILURE AT THE PENTAGON

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Clark Mollenhoff has again done a fine piece of reporting. He has pointed the finger where it should be pointed.

Mr. Mollenhoff is no stranger to this body. He has been with the Washington Bureau of Cowles Publications since 1950, and is a Pulitzer Prize winner.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the story he wrote for the Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors entitled "Press Failure at the Pentagon."

I know my colleagues will be much enlightened by what he has to say:

PRESS FAILURE AT THE PENTAGON

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

In the spring of 1969, it was fashionable to assign a reporter or a group of reporters to do what was considered "an in-depth series" on the military-industrial complex, and the multibillion-dollar Pentagon bungles of the last few years. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television suddenly were busy trying to catch up with the important task of reporting, interpreting and policing a department that had been spending between $40 billion and $80 billion a year for a decade.

In the light of the handicap imposed in being suddenly tossed into this impossible job, many of the reporters did a useful but somewhat tardy job in calling public attention to a decade of corruption, mismanagement and waste in the operations of the Defense Department.

The research was not too difficult on the major problems, for a few of us have written books and extensive articles spelling out the details of the blundering on the TFX, the X-22, the decision to make the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy a conventional carrier and a wide range of cases of minor blundering, "conflicts of interest" and misrepresentations to the public and Congress on military problems. The hearings and reports of Congressional committees, and the debates on military budget provided considerable information that many of us had been writing about for years.

The public and many editors were suddenly hit with a shocking picture of the misuse of the tremendous power of the Pentagon's multibillion-dollar budget. There appears to be a sudden realization that regional political favoritism, "conflicts of interest" and cozy dealings with big and little defense contractors can be a drain on the taxpayers and detrimental to the goal of producing the best weapons systems for the best price. There could have been an understanding years earlier if the press had done its job.

There was a sudden realization that there are certain inherent problems in any easy flow of personnel, military or civilian, between the major defense industries and the highest policy positions in the Pentagon. And, there was new understanding of the evil influence across the entire Defense Department when the highest officials—some civilian and some military—give false testimony under oath, force subordinate officials to give false or slanted testimony and use the full power of the bureaucracy to demote, discipline or fire the dissenters who insist upon telling the truth.

Also, a part of the power picture that is now appearing in many publications is the interplay of forces in the Congress and the Defense Department, with cooperative senators and congressmen receiving favored treatment, while uncooperative senators and congressmen are punished and maligned.

While the picture of corruption and mismanagement at the Pentagon is shocking, it is equally shocking to examine the record of the American press during the last decade. Why has it just dawned upon the press—newspapers, magazines, radio and television—that the spending of half of the national budget and the status of our national defense is worth covering week by week? Why did the press permit itself to be dominated and overwhelmed in many cases by the propaganda of a centralized Pentagon press office that claimed a new scientific "cost-effective" system was saving billions of dollars every year?

It would be rather easy to do a devastating series of articles on the superficiality and the laxity of the American press in dealing with the corruption and the mismanagement in the Pentagon. Congressional investigations of Pentagon corruption and mismanagement were virtually ignored by the wire services, Washington specials and radio and and television. Where there was coverage it was usually short, superficial and more confusing than enlightening.

The editorial comment by most major newspapers was influenced by the lack of coverage in the news columns, or the superficiality of the coverage by commentators on radio and television, the columnists or the barrage of propaganda flowing from the new centralized Pentagon press office. The self-serving declarations of the Defense Secretary were accepted and printed as truths, even when they were clearly contradicted by a body of testimony and documentation. The evidence of the clearest "conflicts of interest" was ignored or excused by reporters and by the editorial writers who found it easier to accept the unsupported statements or conclusions of a President, a Defense Secretary or other political figure with an obvious stake in the story than to be concerned with the other evidence.

Editors cannot come to grips with the Pentagon from a point several hundred or several thousand miles from Washington unless they have reliable and tough-minded channels of information. Many influences have cluttered and contaminated those channels in recent years. Not the least of these has been the radio and television coverage.

While radio and television can do a great job on some subjects, there has been a glaring weakness in the manner in which the broadcast industry has dealt with the hard problems of covering corruption, mismanagement and waste at the Defense Department as well as in other government agencies.

Television is show business, and the show business aspect influences news coverage and public affairs programs. A big news story may get two or three minutes, which is for the most part confined to the most colorful or provocative statements on one or on both sides of an issue. Corruption or mismanagement is charged and denied with no real effort to explore the depth of proof beyond the self-serving statements of the spokesmen for the two sides. Viewers are influenced by the looks, the brief comment or by the facial expression of the commentator as much as they are by facts and depth of proof. It is not unusual for such programs to be devoid of facts or documentation on even the most important Defense Department issue.

While most editors are aware of these weaknesses in broadcast journalism, they are (like most of us) influenced to some degree by this most powerful medium in their assessment of the wire services and their own Washington correspondent.

While television seldom leads the way in challenging the press office of a government agency, particularly the Defense Department, it can be a tremendous influence in the way it takes up the fight on some issue or treats the issue as inconsequential and unworthy of air time.

Seldom do editors give any thought to the influences that have tended to keep the network newsmen and commentators from challenging the Defense Department's bosses or the White House. Broadcast journalism requires special access to the Defense Secretary, other high Defense officials and White House personnel. Certainly everyone can cover the regular press conferences, but it is a coup to arrange one of those "special" interviews on an exclusive basis. Such "specials" go to a favorite network or even a favorite newsman, usually the apologists. Specials seldom are arranged for men who question the honesty, integrity or judgment of high officials of the Defense Department.

Since there is really no effective way to change this system, editors should in most instances disregard the television news shows in making their judgments about either the wire service coverage or the coverage by their own Washington correspondent.

Wire service reporters assigned to the Pentagon, are usually overworked with routine and faced with ground rules that make it difficult to dig beyond the self-serving statements of the Defense press office.

The penalties for being a few minutes behind on a routine newsstory are such that they force bright, able and energetic reporters to accept Pentagon discipline and avoid rocking the boat. Aggressive independence can represent a serious handicap with too few compensations.

The Washington special correspondence operating out of a one- or two-man bureau, can lead an even more harried life than the wire service reporter who is permanently assigned to the Pentagon. Editors who would never expect one local reporter to be expert on city, county and state affairs, think nothing of expecting "instant expertise" from the one or two men they assign to Washington. Most correspondents understand their inability to be instant experts on all they are asked to do, but do develop a fine facility for quick research and fast, smooth writing that often passes for expertise.

But this kind of an operation is superficial and relies too much upon quick information from government press offices or Washington lobbyists. It is easier to go along with the viewpoint of the White House or a big agency in most cases, and it can take tremendous time and energy to carry the burden of an assault on the opinions or decisions of a government agency. The task can seem overwhelming when it involves a challenge to the biggest and most complicated Washington establishment, the Pentagon. A few make periodic challenges to the Pentagon propaganda position, but most give up in frustration after concluding that few in the press really see or care about the implications of mismanagement, corruption and waste that have been unearthed.

Although I am sympathetic with the problems faced in covering Defense spending. I do not want the sympathy to be interpreted as a justification for a continuation of the incompetence and superficiality of the past press performance. While the problems of covering an $80-billion-a-year agency are too numerous to mention here, we cannot afford to let the size of the problems be used to excuse future press failure. The press has a great responsibility that cannot be brushed aside.

The Pentagon spends half of our federal budget and has the responsibility for providing a modern defense system to protect this nation from all its enemies. Every bit of corruption, political favoritism, mismanagement or waste steals money from the taxpayers. More important, it cuts into the muscle of real defenses, saps the strength of the nation and could leave us as a second-rate power even as we spend our way into bankruptcy.

In the face of a host of international problems, and the turmoil at home over real and imagined wrongs in our society, it is essential that we take stringent measures to eliminate corruption. Honest government is not only practical, it is vital to our future. It is time for the press to eliminate some of the smart cynicism that tolerates corruption and mismanagement. It is time to exhibit some outrage at dishonest or political administration or the Defense Department, or any other agency of government including the courts.

Every story of Defense Department corruption is worth total pursuit by the press until the corrupter pays a penalty, or the mismanager is exposed and labeled for what he is.

Those who lie or misrepresent to hide the corruption and mismanagement should be exposed and criticized for precisely what they have done as accomplices after the fact. The point must be made that liars and falsifiers cannot be tolerated in high government office, and that the higher the office the man holds the higher the price he must pay for his falsification. This has not been the case.

The political defenders of those engaged in either crime or the cover-up of crime should be held accountable for either lack of judgment or for knowingly condoning dishonesty in government. Nothing less than such a massive assault on corruption and mismanagement will have any more than minor impact upon the problem facing the United States today.

The present press emphasis on coverage of the Pentagon might lead one to believe that newspapers, magazines, radio and television have finally learned the vital lessons after a decade of swallowing big chunks of Pentagon propaganda. Certainly no one can now say that the press is "soft on the Pentagon," but even that coverage is superficial. Week after week the stories pour out on the evil "military-industrial complex" with statistics on the number of generals and admirals who work for major defense contractors, and statistics on the increased concentration of defense contracts in the hands of fewer and fewer contractors. Always there is mention of the billions wasted through cancellation of major defense contracts that failed to meet standards, and there are the stories of the $2 billion overruns on the C-5A cargo plane contract, the mismanagement on the Cheyenne helicopter contract, and of course, the multibillion-dollar bungle on the infamous TFX contract. But there is little effort to report details of specific crimes and trace the responsibility.

Reporters who should know better have painted with a broad brush of truth, half-truth and distortion. There is a lack of precision in placing the responsibility for the Pentagon decisions on the civilian boss or the military officer who sold out the public trust. Usually there are only the broadest hints that something is wrong without specifying the crime.

With the broad sweep and lack of precision of a cartoonist, reporters have placed the blame for waste, corruption and mismanagement at the feet of "the military-industrial complex." Without using names, admirals and generals are pictured as corrupt or stupid. Senators and congressmen are often characterized as incompetent or corrupt parties to the waste of millions or billions, though no details are spelled out.

The facts are usually accurate, but a close reading of many of these series shows continuation of much of the same superficiality that permeated the Pentagon coverage in the period prior to 1969. Some of the writers seemed bent upon proving a preconceived notion that the generals and admirals, the senior men on the Armed Services committees of the House and the Senate and the bosses of defense industries, have conspired to push the United States into the Vietnam war and other confrontations for the sake of business profits, promotions and political deals.

Certainly there has been waste and mismanagement, but the evidence hardly sustains the general conspiracy theory. There are instances of corruption and mismanagement involving generals, admirals, members of the Senate and House, officials of defense industries and the politically-appointed civilian bosses of the Pentagon. But, somehow many of the stories either ignore the dominant role of the political bosses at the Pentagon or tend to absolve them from blame for what has gone wrong.

Often the reporting of scandals is handled in such a loose manner that blame is placed on "the Pentagon" or "the Air Force" or "the Navy." The impression is given that the Nixon Administration or Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has the responsibility for what has taken place in 1963 or 1968. Seldom, if ever, is the name of former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara mentioned in a critical manner, even when he was personally involved in the questionable decision or when the decision was dictated out of his office under some much-heralded new system that was to save billions of tax dollars.

Frequently, the whole mess of scandals originating under the Kennedy or Johnson administrations are lumped together and presented as evidence of a general Pentagon laxity. Then this Pentagon laxity is projected into certain waste of money if President Nixon's Safeguard antiballistic missile program is permitted to move forward. Certainly past scandals should serve as a warning about what could happen to the ABM in the future, but unless there is direct connection these should not serve as arguments for rejecting a program that the President and the Defense Secretary believe is essential.

The merits of constructing the Safeguard ABM should be considered by the press and the public without regard for scandals of an earlier administration, unless there is some evidence of misjudgments or misrepresentations of the Safeguard decision that are clearly linked to the past scandals.

The press cannot be permitted to plead that secrecy hid the scandals that originated in the McNamara years. Certainly the Defense Secretary and his press office tried to hide the record, issued orders to bar honest disclosure of the record and even misrepresented the facts to the committees of Congress.

However, over a period of months the facts did become available on such major scandals as the award of the TFX contract, and a dozen lesser scandals. The implications were obvious. The facts were available in the hearings of the McClellan Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, and in the testimony of Secretary McNamara and other high Defense Department officials who reluctantly testified under oath. I wrote detailed accounts on the TFX, the X-22 and the nuclear carrier dispute in a book called "Despoilers of Democracy" that was published in 1965, and covered a host of other scandals in depth in "The Pentagon" published in 1967. Millions of words were written for The Des Moines Register on these and other Pentagon problems.

This reporter was not alone in writing of detailed evidence of scandals and mismanagement. Hanson Baldwin, the distinguished Pulitzer Prize-winning military analyst of The New York Times, reported periodically on a host of serious Pentagon problems under the "McNamara Monarchy." George Wilson, of Aviation Week, and later with The Washington Post, did a consistent, tough-minded job on the TFX and other Air Force projects despite the propaganda flow from the Pentagon press office. Sanford Watzman of the Washington Bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer did a brilliant and thorough job of exposing the manner in which the McNamara Pentagon was failing to enforce the so-called Truth-in-Negotiations law of 1962. Charles Nicodemus of the Chicago Daily News was persistent as well as imaginative as he unearthed the entire series of scandals that poisoned the M-16 rifle program. Richard Elliott of Barron's Weekly did a great job of following up on the TFX contract and exposing the troubles that plagued the Navy version, the F-111B, until it was killed by Congress in 1968.

If there had been a dozen more reporters digging into the Pentagon to pull out the facts on scandals and reporting on the top level responsibility, for those scandals it could have forced some early assessment of many of those programs and would have resulted in better decisions on later programs. As it was, the critics of the McNamara Pentagon were drowned out by the noncritical and fawning coverage of McNamara by many magazine writers, columnists, and Pentagon specialists who apparently believed they needed a continuing pleasant personal relationship with the Defense Secretary.

It is the job of the American editors to create the conditions in which reporters covering government can exhibit aggressive independence without having their heads chopped off because they do not have rapport with the Defense Secretary for the intimate backgrounders. Wire service executives and the editors who deal with them must make certain the Pentagon reporter is motivated more by the necessity for doing a tough job than with the necessity for being fed routine stories at the same time a competing service receives it.

If the reporter believes he works for an organization that believes in aggressive independence, then the reporter will probably be aggressive and independent. If editors want the routine bunk that is fed out through the press office, then that is what they will get from the wire services and from their own specials.

The record of past press blunders has been available for years:

1. Control of the Pentagon was centralized in the Office of Defense Secretary. Instead of examining this action with a critical eye the press applauded it and viewed it as some move that would put the professional military men in their place.

2. The press office was centralized under the Office of Defense Secretary, and a broad range of practices instituted that tended to crush dissent. There were a few whimpers by the press, but many were unconcerned.

3. The TFX was awarded arbitrarily to the high bidder with the second best plane and over the unanimous recommendations of the Pentagon source selection board. Many editors bought the McNamara explanation without close examination and even managed to applaud an arbitrary award to General Dynamics (the embodiment of the military-industrial complex) as a blow against the complex.

4. The "conflicts of interest" in the TFX contract were documented fully as early as 1963, but most newspapers ignored it. Some even defended it editorially and followed a line that was right out of the mouth of the top Pentagon press spokesman.

5. Defense Secretary McNamara's claim of billions in savings were accepted and praised without careful examination, yet there was little or no coverage by most newspapers of the details of House hearings that proved most of the claimed "savings" were hogwash.

6. There was wide coverage of McNamara's establishment of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and acceptance of the fact that this was to be a big money saver. There was little attention to the huge costs this added to the Pentagon budget, and no concern over the fact that the existence of the Defense Contract Audit Agency was used to justify cutting the scope of the outside audit by the GAO.

These are only a few of the blunders of the Defense Department and of the press in the last decade. Although I have hit them briefly here, I have covered them in detail in books, speeches and in news stories over the last eight years.

I believe it should be sufficient here to make the point that the press let itself be caught up in depth coverage of a lot of glamour projects, but failed to do a thorough job of going behind the Pentagon press line on the vital issues of honesty and integrity.

GOVERNOR REAGAN'S AEROSPACE-AVIATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, it was my privilege, as chairman of Gov. Ronald Reagan's aerospace-aviation education task force, to join him in launching this vital and dynamic education program in California. In view of tomorrow's launch of Apollo 11, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the remarks made by both Governor Reagan and myself, since the subject matter of aviation and aerospace technology is of such timely interest.

This task force established by Governor Reagan is a first in the Nation. Once again, he has demonstrated that he is a man of vision—one who strongly believes in constructive, creative, and innovative programs that are designed to motivate our young people to broaden their perspective and enhance their ability to help themselves toward a better understanding and way of life.

The members of the task force and I are proud to be associated with him in this program. I suggest that my colleagues read the content of these remarks made by Governor Reagan and myself because it will be my intent to advance this concept nationally sometime in the near future. The remarks and address follow:

TEXT OF GOVERNOR REAGAN'S REMARKS TO THE AEROSPACE-AVIATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of our Task Force for Aerospace-Aviation Education. I want to personally thank each of you for taking time out from your busy schedules to meet with me here today, and to participate willingly as members of the Task Force. The press of other duties has prevented our meeting together earlier, but I understand that the organizational meeting at San Jose went well. I am deeply interested in education, in all of its aspects, and it is my earnest conviction that aerospace-aviation has a place of prominence in our educational system. Your presence here today attests to a similar conviction on your part. I commend you for your public spirit and your progressive outlook on life.

This administration is wholly in accord with the aims and objectives of the Task Force. The complexities of this air age demand that our educators bend their efforts toward adapting space and aviation concepts to the task of furnishing our young people a sound basis of understanding of the world around them. As I see it, the function of an educational institution—or educational system—is to produce citizens who are totally aware of life, and who are capable of assuming productive and meaningful roles in the modern community. In the full realization that aerospace-aviation is the largest non-agrarian user of manpower, it becomes abundantly clear that adequate preparation is required if our young people are to take on their responsibilities when they leave our schools. We need competent citizens in the fields of management, administration, operations and maintenance. We need the engineers, the designers, the transportation specialists, and above all, we need the generalists—that is—those who have a degree of familiarity with many aspects of aerospace-aviation, and who can blend aviation into an integrated system to accommodate movement. For movement is the essence of modern communication and the exchange of ideas. While a number of our schools and colleges now offer aviation courses—more than 61 colleges, and 79 high schools—we are still not reaching the majority of our students. We are seeking ways of broadening the opportunities for aerospace-aviation education to reach increasing numbers of our young people. Not just any course, however, will satisfy the need. What is required is quality in education, delivered by those competent to impart the knowledge—and that is one of the areas in which we are seeking help from this Task Force. Curriculum content, source materials, and instructor qualifications are vital considerations if our aerospace-aviation education efforts are to bear fruit.

Working carefully with Congressman Clausen, a most persuasive and astute gentleman, you members of the Task Force were chosen for your expertise and background in aviation. I am going to rely heavily on the advice and assistance you ladies and gentlemen come up with during the course of your work on this Task Force. I understand some committees are already organized and working on the various aspects of the situation, and I want to assure you that you can count on my support. Aerospace-aviation education will occupy a prominent position in the creative society so necessary in this modern air age, and I am deeply gratified by your efforts in this endeavor.

The school administrators, faculty members and advisors to our schools and colleges have achieved varying degrees of success in the educational programs they have fostered. We have noted with interest that some of our smaller communities have been able to generate greater interest in aviation education than our larger cities. This applies to school boards, school officials, students, and their parents. Some of the schools have full-blown programs of many years duration, and others are just getting started. It would not be possible to publicly recognize every one of these programs, and so we have singled out just a few to be honored on the basis of the excellence of their aviation education programs. From the more than 140 high schools and colleges, we have selected eleven. These eleven are typical and their honor should reflect on the others who were not selected this time. On behalf of the Task Force, I wish to publicly commend the eleven institutions for their continuing efforts in this vital field of education, and to cite them as proper examples for others to follow in establishing similar aerospace-aviation education programs. It was difficult to do so, but we narrowed the field of 140 down to 6 colleges and 5 high schools. I would now like to present to representatives of the chosen eleven a certificate attesting to their honor in the field of educational endeavor.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN TO THE AEROSPACE-EDUCATION TASK FORCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., JUNE 16, 1969

It is, indeed, a very real pleasure for me to be here today to have this opportunity to address such a distinguished aviation-oriented group—and to have the distinct privilege of helping to officially launch Governor Reagan's Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force.

At the outset, Governor Reagan—I want to preface my remarks here today by thanking you personally and commending you highly for your forward-looking attitude regarding aviation in general, for your vigorous support of aviation education, and for your bold initiative in authorizing and creating this Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force.

I wish, also, to express my sincere and profound appreciation to you ladies and gentlemen, the members of the task force, who have so generously given of your time and rich talents to be with us here today, to lend the many benefits of your vast knowledge and expertise to this project which, I believe, presents untold challenges and opportunities for each of us.

As many of you know, I have devoted more than 20 years of my life to, and feel very strongly about, aviation education and the massive potential it holds, not only for aviation itself—but for the young people of California and for America as a whole. This, I believe, blends well with the concepts embodied in the Governor's "Creative Society" and, as Chairman of this Task Force, I am proud to be part of this effort and proud to be associated with such distinguished people as are assembled here today.

California has long held a commanding and leading role in America's economic growth, and as Californians, we should take both note and pride in the fact that our State is:

First, in total number of civil aircraft registered (23,000);

Second, in total number of airports (more than 684);

First, in total number of registered pilots (more than 80,000);

First, in total number of operational helicopters;

First, in aerospace-aviation technology; and

The home of America's aerospace-aviation industry.

Leading in so many categories as we do, the point is that we now have a golden opportunity to also take the lead in aerospace-aviation education. This, I'm convinced, is the primary challenge of the goal of this Task Force, and this—we must do!

At this point, it might be well to briefly review the goals and objectives of the Governor's Advisory Task-Force on Aerospace-Aviation Education, which are:

1. To develop within the California public system of education, a planned and coordinated aerospace-aviation education program, which embodies all phases and all aspects of aviation, aeronautical, and space education.

2. To serve all levels—elementary, secondary, higher and adult education on a continuing basis in the State of California.

3. To serve the curriculum areas of general education, vocational education, adult, and in-service education.

4. To study, evaluate, and implement the findings of the California Aviation Education Advisory Commission established by the California State Department of Education in 1967.

5. To encourage and stimulate the formation of County Aerospace-Aviation Advisory Committees to better coordinate the implementation of programs through established and contemplated educational facilities and their administration.

6. To afford particular recognition and consideration to the recommendations of the Vocational Education Director and the aviation consultants to the Department of Education on how best to coordinate the integration of aerospace-aviation educational materials into the general and vocational education curricula—consistent with the demands and requirements of the jet and space ages.

7. To draw particular attention to the extraordinary advantages of including aircraft control manipulation as an integral part of the vocational and general education programs through the use of stationary classroom flight simulators in elementary and secondary schools, and through actual flight training programs in high schools and junior colleges where easy access to airports is available.

Aviation and air transportation now play, and will continue to play, a dominant role in the movement of goods, services, and people throughout the State of California, the United States, and indeed, throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. As the jumbo jets, the SST, and other fixed and rotary-wing aircraft go into commercial use, world-wide air marketing programs will expand tremendously. In addition, there is growing interest in the future uses of STOL (short take-off & landing) and VTOL (vertical take-off & landing) aircraft to supplement the present air-carrier fleet. And business aviation and general aviation aircraft usage is expanding at fantastic rates of growth.

This, basically, is the direction in which we are moving when aerospace-aviation programs and objectives are viewed collectively.

But what are the more immediate benefits and advantages to be gained from a dynamic and future-oriented aerospace-aviation education program in the public schools of California?

What, specifically, is in it for the young people—the students of our State?

Over the years, successful aviation education programs have repeatedly demonstrated that they are, in fact, significant motivating factors in stimulating poor students to become honor students and inducing potential "drop-outs" to remain in school and complete their educations.

Therefore, and based on years of personal experience, I am convinced that aerospace-aviation education is not only an effective and viable "anti-drop-out tool"—but a highly motivating force that will provide the kind of a challenge that many young people desperately need early in life, especially during their school years.

I have proven to myself, during my 23 years of "experimenting" with this program of aerospace-aviation education that I can "capture the imagination" of *any* student from *any* home environment—by exposing him or her to the challenges of flight—be it in the classroom, the stationary Flight Simulator, or actual flight in an aircraft.

The cost? This is something that we must all be concerned about!

Let me state categorically, however, that the implementation and insertion of this type of program into or associated with the established curriculum of our schools, will actually save money, when considered in conjunction with our total public sector budgets.

Some sceptics might say, "How can you, Congressman Clausen, make this kind of statement?"

Here again, permit me to relate some of my personal experiences.

During my service as a Member of the Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County for seven years, I reviewed, perused, and carefully scrutinized the annual budget of the various department heads. Among them, of course, were the budgets of the Judge of the Superior Court, the District Attorney's office, the Probation Office, the Juvenile Hall, the Sheriff, a Bar-"O"-Boys' Rehabilitation Camp, the Welfare Office, etc.

After observing the large percentage of dollars of overall budget requested and required to finance the function of these offices, I decided to conduct research in the specific area of costs to our taxpayers for juvenile delinquency and probation problems, as well as minor and major criminal problems.

The cost factors revealed were, to say the least, shocking, and they prompted me to relate them to the high school principal, the Judge, the Superintendent of Schools, and Committee members of investigating Grand Juries.

I found that each boy or girl committed to the Youth Authority or Department of Correction cost the taxpayers approximately $13,000, and those individuals committed to penal institutions, as convicted criminals, cost an average of $35,000.

My candid comment to local officials at that time was, "Save *one* boy from the Youth Authority—you've bought one airplane or simulator—save *one* boy or girl from a life of crime, and you've paid for the entire program."

Once exposed to these economic facts of life, these key community leaders and many previously sceptical parents could readily see the reasonableness and the rationale of my suggestion to "continue and broaden the exposure to the challenging program of aviation education in Del Norte High School."

Therefore, I submit, we can better invest our tax dollars in the kind of innovative programs that I like to refer to as "preventive maintenance."

Believe me, I can refer you to many parents who are willing to testify to the success of our efforts. Once our program was underway, an Assembly Committee on Education held hearings in Crescent City, California, for the purpose of evaluating our results. The testimony of some of these parents and students is available in the public hearing record.

Mine, of course, is but one experience. There are thousands of other examples, and one that bears repeating took place in the Richmond Unified School District.

Here, a "flight experience program" was tested for students from the ghetto areas, and this experiment dramatically demonstrated and proved the motivational potential of the kind of program that will broaden their perspective through exposure to something new and challenging.

From this experience it was determined that learning performance was significantly improved for those students in the program who had been previously classified as "disciplinary problems." Thus, the value of this particular program was recognized not only by the students, and the school authorities, but more noteworthy, by the students' parents.

Thus, we see that the heart of the problem lies not so much in not having adequate or suitable aviation education programs—but rather, in the fact that we just don't have enough of these logical and constructive programs in existence.

We know, for instance, that 46 colleges and 77 high schools in California have some type of aviation education program, but from these figures, it is obvious that there are far too many areas where such programs just don't exist at all.

This, then is the challenge and the opportunity.

The time has come for all Californians, all Americans, and in particular, our educational institutions to broaden their perspective to eliminate "tunnel vision"—to seek broader horizons in this, our jet and space age.

For economic, social and security reasons, California must move forward dramatically and creatively through the updating and implementation of aerospace-aviation education programs in the schools of California—especially if we are to maintain the leadership in aviation and aerospace technology which has contributed so much to California's and our Nation's overall economy.

I believe that continuing social change and the challenge such change presents to our people, young and old alike, demands this undated, innovative, and provocative type of program so that education is tied to the real experiences of everyday life.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the energies of our youth, which we have witnessed in other and less constructive ways recently, can be directed toward this challenging concept of aerospace-aviation education. An experience, I might add, that results in the stimulation of a new sense of pride, purpose, and direction toward participation in a creative and constructive environment—and away from the demoralizing and destructive elements of our society.

Coupled with the expanded use of audio-visual techniques, these programs can focus new interest on the applied science fields by clearly demonstrating to the student why the basic fundamentals of education are essential and vital in furthering his learning process.

As we all know, our young people have a wisdom all their own. They know where "the action is"—they have jet-age ideas and ideals—and they recognize the potential offered by aerospace-aviation education for future job and business opportunities for their generation.

I've seen these programs in action, and now the Aviation Section of the Federal Aviation Administration has recognized the 50,000-member Experimental Aircraft Association's program for suggested airplane construction courses, such as that of Bay View High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and the famed "Flying Grandfather," Max Conrad's "Winona, Minnesota Experiment" of yesteryear, as the type of program that should be considered for recommendation by our Task Force.

The varied experiences gained would serve as excellent orientation for advanced study in science or engineering, or could be the basis for additional vocational training for business or industry.

In the construction of the plane, the students would feel the need for information and the desire to develop skills in the machining and fabricating of wood, layout and drawing, welding and machining of metal, and the mathematics and science affecting both the design and materials of the plane.

Situations are provided demanding ingenuity and resourcefulness that utilize the best creative efforts of the entire group involved. The project demonstrates the need and provides opportunity for careful and individual and group planning.

The facilities of our existing educational institutions can and must be utilized more effectively and advantageously for young people *AND* their parents in helping to close both the so-called "Generation Gap" *and* the "Communications Gap."

Too often, I feel, we tend to overlook the true objectives of the education process. One primary objective, in my judgment, is to produce enlightened and motivated graduates capable of assuming a productive and useful role in modern society—and I want to stress the word "modern." We must produce graduates who are not only aware of what is going on around them, but capable of balancing their high sense of idealism with a proportionate share of balanced realism.

The younger generation must know and keep pace with the technological changes taking place around them—beginning at the elementary school level.

Such innovations as:

1. Operational supersonic jets of many types.

2. The capability of revolutionized long-range air movement of goods, services, and people.

3. Electronic computers able to perform mathematical tasks and control complex operations far beyond the capacity of men and mechanical systems.

4. Miniaturized electronics that allow computers and the most sophisticated controls to be carried aboard aircraft.

5. New types of electronically-steered radar and a variety of sensors that have extended man's senses to a degree totally unpredictable in 1950.

6. Worldwide communications on almost an "anytime, realtime" basis, including the use of satellites, allowing Washington to participate in planning and evaluating daily operations in any part of the world.

7. And, the use of reconnaissance satellites to foster the involuntary termination of other nation's total secrecy; thereby giving the United States planners a reasonable amount of intelligence information, no matter how hotly it may be disputed at times.

Seemingly, this inventory would indicate that many organizations and many persons, especially those in the aerospace industry, have done an excellent job of staging a technical and technological revolution of vast proportions.

Thus, we see the need for a virtual army of administrators, managers, pilots, mechanics, crews, service personnel, aeronautical engineers, designers, air transportation specialists, and controllers. But, where will we find the personnel required to fill these upcoming vacancies if we don't "get off the dime now", and get your people moving in the right direction?

I say—the time is now!

This, then, brings us "full around" to the point of why we are all here today. We recognize the need for action and for expertise in establishing a vigorous, progressive, and far-reaching program of aerospace-aviation education.

By the same token, we know that each of you is busy—but over the years, we have come to know that, if you want something done, your best bet is to go to the "involved" individual—the busy man and woman—and enlist their help. Governor Reagan has selected each of you for your role in this task force, based on your skills, your knowledge, your proven and demonstrated ability—with the full knowledge and deepest faith that you can organize the effort required to produce a viable, dynamic, and creative program of aerospace-aviation education here in California.

As Chairman, I have appointed Gene Little, Vice-President for Education and Training for World Airways, as Vice-Chairman; and named as our Northern California Chairman Dr. Myrl Rupel, Superintendent, Tehachapi Unified School District; and Southern California Chairman, Miss Harriett Porch of the Rand Corporation.

Each of you on the Task Force, however, can and will fill a vital role.

We need a number of active committees to fill specific roles. We need committees to work with curricula, textbooks, classroom facilities, equipment, teaching aids, finance, and public information. We need an environmental committee to devote effort to educating the public on noise levels, compatible land uses, air pollution, and similar problems, and on what is being done in each of these areas, and we need a committee to decide on the appropriate qualifications for instructors.

The exploits of the astronauts in the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo flights have gripped the interest of our people, and fired the imagination of our youth. What we have to do is to see that interest and imagination are channeled in the right direction. We can do no less. It is our obligation, and with your very capable assistance, I am sure that we can take up the task.

As President Nixon said, "When an American is the first to place his foot on the moon this next month, every one of us, as proud Americans, will stand a little taller."

Today, we are taking that first step toward building a better educational system through aviation—we are, in my judgment, taking a major step toward character building and indeed, nation building, through aviation.

I'm proud to be associated with our great Governor Reagan in this effort.

The challenge of change, in our everyday living, demands that we commit ourselves to this worthy task.

We can, as dedicated and creative people, recapture the American dream—through aviation.

We can rekindle the spark of hope and faith in America—through aviation.

We can stimulate, motivate, and accelerate the learning process—through aviation.

We can broaden the horizons—we can broaden the perspective of individuals—through aviation.

We can open up "opportunities unlimited" for this generation and future generations—through aviation.

We can "Revitalize Rural America," and "Build Countryside, USA"—through aviation.

We can provide relief from the overcrowded "pressure cookers"—the "high rise ghettos"—the "concrete jungles" of urban metropolitan areas—through aviation.

We can better coordinate the movement of people, goods, and services—through aviation.

We can improve the "environment for future living"—through aviation.

Governor Reagan, we, the members of your Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force, are deeply grateful to you for "launching" this timely space-age education proposal, just one day before the arrival of the Apollo 10 astronauts—Stafford, Young, and Cernan—here in California.

In six months, we hope to have before you the best recommendation California's aviation "brain power" can formulate. Like you, "we want to make the best—better."

LEGION OF MERIT TO MISSISSIPPIAN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in today's RECORD a copy of a citation accompanying the award of the Legion of Merit to Lt. Col. John H. Napier III. Colonel Napier is a native of my home State of Mississippi and has been assigned to the Secretary of the Air Force in the Pentagon for a little over 2 years. A career military personnel, Colonel Napier was presented the Legion of Merit upon being transferred to a new assignment. The citation accompanying his award reads as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE LEGION OF MERIT TO LT. COL. JOHN H. NAPIER III

Lt. Col. John H. Napier, III has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service as Chief, Policy Analysis Branch, Research and Analysis Division, Office of The Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force from 20 February 1967 to 6 June 1969. In this important assignment Col. Napier played a major role in preparing the annual Military Posture Statement and other public statements for the Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary. He has consistently demonstrated a unique understanding of national and international affairs and their impact upon United States military policies and strategies. In particular, his depth of knowledge and penetrating insights in the field of counterinsurgency operations have contributed substantially to coherent policy statements in this critical area. By virtue of his outstanding performance and professional competence, Col. Napier has materially contributed to the security of his country. His exemplary conduct and total dedication reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

RECENT MOVES TO SECURE PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed and disgusted with the efforts of a few prominent politicians erroneously labeled "doves," who apparently will seize any opportunity to carp against this administration's efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam. Now they have chosen to assault the magnanimous and courageous offer of President Thieu to allow free elections—in his dramatic bid for settlement of this tragic conflict.

Such rantings on the part of a few pompous politicrats can only serve to endanger more American lives. I am sick and tired of this kind of partisanship; for one American's life is worth more than the political career of any politician, and it always will be.

Let me cite the record of recent moves made to secure peace and halt the killing:

First. Prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NLF, as well as the governments of Hanoi and Saigon.

Second. We remained at the table and refrained from resumption of the bombing despite Hanoi's shelling of South Vietnamese major cities, its violation of the demilitarized zone and its refusal to deal with the Saigon government.

Third. On March 25, President Thieu offered to meet with the NLF for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

Fourth. On May 14, with President Thieu's support, President Nixon put forward an eight-point plan for peace. It included the renouncement of reliance on a military solution, the offer of withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces within 12 months under international guarantees, and emphasis on our desire only to secure the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future without outside interference.

Fifth. On June 8, President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

Sixth. At Midway, both President Thieu and President Nixon declared their readiness to accept any political outcome arrived at through free elections.

Seventh. President Thieu has now offered a concrete program by which free elections can be held and the will of the South Vietnamese people can be determined.

Such efforts on the part of this Nation's leadership are responsible. Their acceptance and support by President Thieu is courageous as well. These men are the real peacemakers of today, and they deserve our support.

THE APOLLO DREAM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all the world will be watching and focusing its attention on Cape Kennedy, tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1969, as man prepares to take his first step on the moon.

The courage and skill of our brave astronauts who are about to realize one of man's oldest dreams is unquestioned. There are many heroes in this exciting space drama. I rise to pay tribute today to the many laborers, workers, engineers, and technicians across the land who have worked so hard on our space program. I am proud to say that many of the workers employed by the North American Rockwell Co., a major Apollo contractor, reside in my district, the 17th Congressional District of California.

On Thursday, July 10, 1969, North American Rockwell placed a full-page message in the Washington Evening Star which accurately reflects the sense of pride and accomplishment all Americans feel about the Apollo dream.

I now submit in the RECORD this article, as follows, so that my colleagues and others who may have missed this message can refer to it as the entire world prepares to observe the culmination of a goal that President Kennedy outlined for America almost a decade ago:

AMERICA IS ABOUT TO PUT MEN ON THE MOON—PLEASE READ THIS BEFORE THEY GO

Perhaps the best way for anyone to try to understand the size of such an undertaking is not for us to list the thousands of problems that had to be overcome, but for you to simply go out in your backyard some night, look up, and try to imagine how you'd begin, if it were up to you.

But our reason here is not to talk about the technicalities of the Apollo project. Rather, it is simply to ask you to think, for at least one brief moment, about the men and women who have applied their heads and their hearts and their hands—and a good many years of their lives—to putting a man on the moon.

Many of these people have worked for less money than they could have made in other places, and it is safe to say they have worked through more night and weekends and lunch and dinner hours than they would have anywhere else.

And the astronauts, the brave men who will fly again down that long, dark and dustless corridor of space, this time to set foot—to walk upon the surface of the moon—they know the price that's often paid in setting out for lands uncharted. They know the price their fathers' grandfathers paid just to walk across the wilderness of America for the first fifty years.

For a long time now, we have been involved with the people who are the thinkers and the designers and the builders and the pilots of America's man-to-the-moon dream, of America's man-to-the-moon determination. We have worked with them, eaten with them, lived with them.

Yet our appreciation and admiration for them, continues to grow each day—for their energy, for their imagination, their confidence, for their patience, their resourcefulness, for their courage.

We ask you, in the days ahead as we wait for the big one to begin, to understand this fantastic feat for what it is and to put it in proper perspective, a triumph of man, of individuals, of truly great human beings. For our touchdown on the moon will not be the product of magic, but the gift of men.

In James A. Michener's novel, "The Bridges at Toko-Ri," an American admiral stands on the deck of his carrier early one morning and ponders the subject of his brave men. And thinking to himself, he asks a question of the wind which we believe all of us should ask as we think of the men who will finally make it to the moon and of the men who got them there: "Why is America lucky enough to have such men? . . . Where did we get such men?"

NORTH AMERICAN ROCKWELL.

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the action of the President of the United States in reorganizing our national drug problem and proposing constructive action to combat it. In today's message to the Congress, President Nixon said:

> The habit of the narcotics addict is not only a danger to himself, but a threat to the community where he lives.

I can but agree and pledge my support to the 10-point program transmitted by the White House.

Who among us has not heard from a constituent whose child has run away from home because of drug addiction? Who among us has not seen the effects of narcotics in our district's schools and courthouses? Who among us has not been asked for assistance in stopping drug traffic?

Every Member of this body owes it to his constituents to work for and vote for enactment of the two legislative proposals submitted by the President. First is a comprehensive revision of the Federal drug statutes to tighten regulation, assure greater accountability, and strengthen the hand of law-enforcement officials. Second is an interim measure to insure that the Marihuana Tax Act is constitutional. Both of these laws are essential; both have been carefully drawn by the Attorney General.

The remainder of the President's message discusses the entire field of narcotics control including State and international efforts to control drug abuse, Federal efforts to educate our citizens on the dangers of drugs, research programs, new rehabilitation ideas, and training programs and conferences for local law-enforcement officials.

A comprehensive Federal attack on this growing menace—active from coast to coast, in urban ghettos and rural farms—is desperately needed. Today the President has outlined his plan for mounting that attack. It is a well thought out, workable program. I am certain it is not the total answer, but it is a tremendous stride in the right direction. I urge support of the legislative proposals; I urge support of the request for appropriations which will be needed to carry the program forward.

MASSIVE DOLLAR FLOW TO SWITZERLAND TO NUMBERED BANK ACCOUNTS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have been very much concerned with the flight of U.S. hot money to Switzerland. The extent to which American dollars abroad went into gold speculation and currency raids last year is a scandal. While that situation has stabilized, thanks, in part, to action of the U.S. Government and the Congress, there is still serious cause for concern in the massive dollar flow to Switzerland.

Naturally, a lot of this flow is under the table so that there is no record of it. But, there is some startling factual data that cannot be ignored. A recent issue of Green's Commodity Market Comments, which is published biweekly by Economic News Agency, Inc., reports that the total assets of the three biggest Swiss banks increased by $3 billion in 1968. As they describe it, this is just the "top of the iceberg" because the figures do not reflect securities, gold, or other values purchased. It is startling to note further that the combined total assets of the big three Swiss banks has risen by 34 percent at the end of 1968 as compared with the end of 1967. One bank showed an increase in assets of 47 percent.

When we consider that the gross national product of Switzerland is $16 billion, we begin to get some idea of the massive nature of these flows into Switzerland. The three banks showed a combined total of $5.3 billion in assets in 1946. By 1958, this had risen to $11.6 billion. By the end of 1968, it had increased by more than four times to a figure of $50.9 billion. Obviously, this has to be outside hot money and unquestionably a good portion of it is American money.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Banking and Currency Committee of this House will make further inquiry into this matter of American dollar flows to Swiss banks. To leave the situation as it is, is to encourage serious instability in world monetary markets, as well as great difficulties in our own domestic monetary management. I submit for the RECORD an excerpt from the aforementioned market letter, Green's Commodity Market Comments:

GREEN'S COMMODITY MARKET COMMENTS

> The extraordinary dimensions of the dollar flow to Switzerland can be easily discerned when one analyzes the annual reports of the big three Swiss banks. During 1968, the total assets of the big three Swiss banks increased by approximately $3 billion. Switzerland's total dollar intake, however, must have been incomparably greater because the figures disclosed in the three annual reports shows just the top of an iceberg. The most prominent private banks in Switzerland do not publicize their balance sheets. Furthermore, the $3 billion increase in the total assets the big three Swiss banks do not reflect securities and/or gold and /or other values purchased by their clients in 1968. The combined total assets of the big three Swiss banks approximated $12 billion as of the end of 1968—a 34% increase over their total assets at the end of 1967. In the case of Union Bank of Switzerland, this increase amounted to 47%. No one can argue with a straight face that this increase in the total assets of the three Swiss banks could have been caused by other than U.S. citizens. The Swiss Gross National Product is less than $16 billion and this country has a chronic Balance of Trade deficit. The real Swiss GNP rose by 3½% in 1968 as compared to an increase of 1.9% in 1967. The 1968 Swiss trade deficit amounted to $483 million, about $100 million less than 1967. Comparative total asset figures of the three Swiss banks are shown below:

TOTAL ASSETS IN SWISS FRANCS ($1=FR. 4.31)

	1946	1958	1968
Swiss Bank Corporation	2,139,391,000	4,129,805,000	16,879,990,702
Union Bank of Switzerland	1,318,972,000	3,524,550,003	18,467,358,146
Credit Suisse	1,893,758,000	3,982,867,252	15,560,833,523
Combined total	5,352,121,000	11,637,222,255	50,908,182,371

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, we are learning all too fast that a price must be paid for an industrial society—contamination, pollution, and the other effluents of a mass industrial society.

Indeed, we have been rudely awakened by cries of "We are fouling our own nest," and prophecies of doom. I do not quarrel with those who warn us because the warnings are necessary if man is to take the active measures that will permit the maintenance of an ecological balance between the works of man and nature.

What I do not agree with is the Cassandra nature of their warnings; the negative attitudes that foreordain our fate.

I believe that we as men with free wills have the means of saving ourselves. In fact I think it possible to develop processes whereby the pollutants that threaten to destroy us may be put to use for the benefit of mankind.

Up to this point very little has been done with such an approach. There have, however, been beginnings at both the theoretical and practical levels.

Especially exciting about the idea of salvaging the wastes of the human species is putting them to work to solve another crisis that faces mankind—the population explosion.

Mr. J. Leon Potter is one who has explored the possibilities that lay in this area. Therefore, I ask that at this point an article of his, "Use Pollution to Benefit Mankind," which appeared in the May 1969 issue of Ocean Industry be inserted into the RECORD.

The article follows:

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND

(By J. Leon Potter)

Among the problems facing mankind are maintenance of a nutritious food supply and prevention of environmental pollution. Only with proper planning is it possible to feed the people and clean up after them while allowing the essential biological life cycle to continue unbroken.

The population of the world is about 3.5 billion people. Conservative estimates say the world will have from 5.3 to 7.4 billion persons by 2000 A.D—with 80 to 85% of this population being in the underdeveloped countries.

In part, this means we need (1) more efficient food production; (2) more efficient utilization of the now-wasted organic compounds as byproducts; (3) new sources of food and food supplements, such as algae, yeast and fish protein concentrates, and (4) development of the efficient techniques of protein production by maximum utilization of our resources.

Approximately half the world's population lives on diets dominated by cereal crops which fail to provide protein of either the quantity or quality needed for adequate human nutrition. Chronic protein deficiencies will become one of man's most threatening problems because it can cause irreversible mental damage and premature death due to a low resistance to infectious diseases.

The alternative is to provide a nutritional supplement of 10 to 20 grams of animal protein per day to the diet. The world-wide problem of increasing need for protein and the great changes expected in the world food economy in the next 20 years emphasize the need for future development of the sea's food resources.

Instead of considering organic waste, thermal effluents, oil spills, sewage nutrients and garbage only as pollution, we must demonstrate that these currently wasted organic compounds—if properly managed—can be treated as enrichments to estuarine areas. With controlled symbiotic systems, it will be possible to solve our protein deficiencies while improving our environment.

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM WASTES

Waste oil and other petroleum materials constitute a constant pollution threat to the estuarine system. In 1968, the California State Department of Fish and Game reported 181 oil spills in the Los Angeles and Long Beach areas.

The clean-up of oil wastes depends on the capability of containment, collection, onshore treatment and eventual disposal or utilization. To this end, each major port or oil producing area should have an oil waste task force to abate oil pollution by routinely inspecting and making recommendations for prevention of accidents, cleaning up minor leaks and spills and taking immediate action in case of emergencies. This task force also can be responsible for the storage, treatment and eventual utilization of the oil as a private enterprise. Such activity should lead to the next step—conversion of waste oil into protein compounds for marketing as animal feed supplement.

HOW A FRENCH PLANT HANDLES PETROLEUM WASTE

A plant at Lauera, France, is selling protein produced from waste, low-grade petroleum. Micro-organisms, growing on a diet consisting primarily of oil hydrocarbons, are producing an excellent high-grade protein. This concept has proven so successful that there is good reason to believe petroleum will become an important food resource for the earth's growing population.[1]

A pound of bacteria, feeding on crude so worthless that it is burned as waste, can grow fast enough to produce 10 lbs. of protein in a day. If a yearling calf were able to manufacture protein at the same rate, it would end the day roughly the size of a three-car garage and it would have consumed several tons of expensive grain in the process.[2]

The proteins produced by fermentation of waste petroleum are no different in quality than protein made by any other natural resource. Petroleum proteins are rich in B vitamins and include a well-balanced variety of amino acids. In particular, they have a high content of lycine which makes them a useful complement to the cereal grains.

YEAST FROM INDUSTRIAL WASTES

Another major source of estuarine pollution are the industries such as pulp and paper, food processing, etc., which produce organic compounds as a waste effluent containing primarily carbohydrates, sugars and organic and inorganic nutrients.

Plant-treatment systems should be used to collect the solids, concentrate them and convert them into compost fertilizers and animal feed additives. The soluble nutrients and sugar compounds can be collected and converted by selective fermentation by Torula yeast into marketable protein for use as food additives and animal feed supplements.

Protein production from carbon-containing compounds is not a new idea. For many years the growing of yeast for animal supplements and human foods has been an appreciable, though small, industry.

Yeast cells grown on carbohydrates have a high nutritive value, not only because of their protein content, but also because of the presence of vitamins and amino acids. Yeast cells grow rapidly. Torula yeast under optimum conditions will double in size and volume every 30 minutes. These cells can be grown in tanks or lagoons using only waste organic compounds for food.

USING DOMESTIC SEWAGE

Modern sewage plants are designed to destroy or render harmless the solid waste and oxide of the nutrients in solution.

Because most plants are over-loaded and, therefore, inefficient, the effluents are befouling our environment and high volumes are moving to our oceans. The waste effluents discharged from those plants are in both solid and liquid form. Sludge solids, if properly treated, can be used for compost soil additives and fertilizers. This sludge, blended with garbage wastes, can be developed into an excellent and marketable compost while the millions of gallons of nutrient-rich effluent can be utilized as food for the more efficient protein-producing plant life, such as algae and plankton.

Soluble nutrients contained in the millions of gallons of wasted fresh water need to be utilized, or at least managed, to gain an economic re-use. In areas such as water-short southern California, re-cycling or multiple use of water is becoming a necessity.

Work at the University of California and other institutions around the world has demonstrated the economic potential of recovery of nutrients and pollution abatement while producing a marketable protein for cattle, poultry feeds and fish food with unicellular algae and plankton in processes using controlled photosynthesis.

The cost of protein produced from waste effluents is approaching 3 cents/lb., compared with agriculture and animal protein at 10 cents/lb. Algae produces protein at a rate of 30 to 50 tons/acre/year, compared with the conventional agriculture of 3 to 5 tons/acre/year.

Algae is used for many purposes. Marine algae is processed to obtain iodine. Agar is produced from numerous genera and species of algae. Alginates (polymers of manuronic acid) obtained from marine algae are used as thickeners or stabilizers in the production of plastics, ice cream and candy. Marine algae also has long been used as fertilizer, livestock feed and human food—particularly in the Asian countries.

More recently it has been suggested that unicellular forms of algae, such as Chlorella, be used to alleviate protein deficiencies or for space travel food. It has been used to purify sewage and reclaim waste waters. The nutritive value of algae grown on sewage has been studied with rats and chicks.[3]

HABITATS NEED TO BE IMPROVED

Habitat improvement likely will play a major role in improving the productivity of estuarine systems. All future land fills, bay realignment and dredging projects should be designed around the principle of such improvement. The most productive zones for fish ecology are our rapidly disappearing estuaries. Irregularities in bottom topography—such as reefs, rock outcrops, vegetated cover, piers or artificial habitats—attract fish and the vertebrates in greater abundance than nearby flat, barren bottoms. Recognition of this fact makes it important to create artificial irregularities in the barren bay bottoms which have been dredged and worked. With a planned dredging program it is possible to make the changes needed and still improve the habitat of the lower aquatic benthos.

Abandoned cars and other refuse cluttering our cities and countryside have proven to be good material for building fishing reefs in the sea. Fish are attracted to the artificial reefs to feed off mussels and other organisms which attach themselves to the reef materials to seek protection in the crevices or simply to have a "home."

A major use of industrial water is as a coolant. For each kilowatt generated in a modern coal-fired power plant, approximately 6,000 Btu's of heat must be dissipated via cooling water through heat exchangers. Nuclear reactors are less efficient, requiring the dissipation of 1,000 Btu's per kilowatt hour generated. By 1980, the electrical power industry will require 200 billion gallons of water per day for cooling purposes.[4]

This water has great potential in the production of food through development of aquiculture and enhancement of biological life. Thermal energy can increase the growth rate of the lower forms of marine life to provide additional food for the higher forms.

AQUICULTURE COMES OF AGE

Th cultivation of marine organisms has been practiced for hundreds of years, but intensified farming using supplemental

Footnotes at end of article.

feeds and warm water discharges has just begun.

The Inter-Chem Corp. has an oyster hatching facility at Oyster Bay, Long Island, where oyster spat are raised to a shell diameter of 2 to 3 millimeters and then moved to the thermal effluent discharge channel of the Long Island Light and Power Co. plant for accelerated growth. The process has been so successful that Inter-Chem is expanding the hatchery and growth areas.

Scotland's White Fish Authority has found that to fully utilize the increased growth potential of fish via thermal enhancement, it is necessary to supplement their diet with additional food. Special thermally heated algae ponds are producing an adequate feed supply for the thermally produced fish by using the nutrient from sewage of a nearby town. The results are so successful that each new nuclear-fueled electric power station in the British Isles will be established with aquiculture areas being an important part of the plant design and siting.

To apply the full potential of thermal effluents for fish protein production, provisions must be made for feeding these aquafarms. The use of waste organisms from industry and domestic sewers to produce marine organisms is the answer.

SYMBIOTIC INDUSTRIES

In conclusion, I would like to suggest a utilization concept demonstrating one feasible recycling approach for converting waste materials into food.

By utilizing the nutrients available from now wasted organic compounds, enhanced by thermal energy from the power industry and combined with planned marine habitats, highly efficient symbiotic food production systems, as shown in Fig. 1, could be produced. Such systems, designed to utilize the waste of man for the production of the necessary protein for man, will be one of man's greatest scientific advances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Adapted from the paper "Beneficial Utilization of Off-shore Pollution" presented at OECON IV held in March 1969 in San Diego, Calif.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Champagant, Alfred, *Scientific American*, Vol. 213, No. 4, October 1965.

[2] *Life Magazine*, February 1968.

[3] Hintz, H. F. et al, "Nutritive Value of Algae Grown on Sewage," *Journal of Animal Science*, Vol. 25, No. 3, August 1966.

[4] Davidson, J. Banton and Bradshaw, Robert W., *Environmental Science and Technology*, February 1968. Page 618.

CONFUSION FELT BY THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial prepared by Ray McHugh, bureau chief of the Copley News Service. I think Mr. McHugh expresses the deep confusion felt by the American taxpayer. The editorial follows:

The anatomy of a mess became evident as American governments went through a series of financial contortions that have come to mark the end of each fiscal year.

The patient is obviously sick.

In Washington the Federal Government still is operating although the Congress has not approved a firm budget nor the revenue measures to support it.

In Sacramento the State of California has begun its fiscal year inauspiciously without a formally approved budget: with the executive branch obliged to sustain operations through fiscal manipulation.

And the uncomfortable fact is that this is just the surface chaos. If the evidence is to be believed, everyone from the Federal Government to the taxpayer is either broke or acting as if he were.

At their recent meeting, for example, the Nation's mayors insisted the cities could not survive without large infusions of cash from higher governmental authority.

Governors of the Nation, in turn, said the continued operation of States and the welfare of citizens depended upon greater unfettered assistance from the Federal Government in Washington.

And in Washington, it is likely the Federal operating budget—exclusive of the trust funds—will be in deficit this fiscal year regardless of what Congress does. It is not in much of a position to help anybody else.

And the low man on the totem pole is the taxpayer, who cannot understand what is happening. He is being told that the Federal Government must tax him more, which leaves him less money to pay higher prices for the things he needs. It is possible the Government will spend his money instead—which could drive prices still higher.

He is also discovering that he still has to pay the 10 per cent Federal Income Surtax although the measure has not been enacted into law.

From Sacramento, the taxpayer learns that in spite of the high taxes he is paying, the state government cannot spend the money because it has not approved a budget. He also is told that a 1-cent sales tax increase may be needed to "reform" revenue laws—while legislators are bitterly arguing about what to do with an estimated $395 million in state surplus funds.

And last year the California taxpayer was given "relief" by the state in the form of reduced property valuations—only to learn that his local government raised valuations sharply, and in many cases negated the "relief."

Is it any wonder the average taxpayer is confused, irritated, suspicious and resentful—a fertile field for severe reaction.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MASTON O'NEAL SPEAKS ON PROBLEMS FACING AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1969, the Fourth Annual Peanut Progress Day was celebrated in Tifton, Ga. My esteemed colleague and good friend, Congressman MASTON O'NEAL of the Second District of Georgia, delivered the main address.

Congressman O'NEAL is known for his efforts to improve the conditions of the American farmer, and particularly those engaged in the peanut industry. In his position on the House Agriculture Committee he has worked hard to alleviate the problems of rural America.

Also on this occasion, the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts paid special tribute to Georgia's senior Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, for his long and faithful service to the cause of agricultural advancement and for his interest in the development of the southeastern peanut agricultural economy. He was presented with a trophy which signified appreciation for his services. Unfortunately Senator RUSSELL could not attend because of duties in Washington. The trophy was accepted in his behalf by his brother, Dr. Fielding Russell.

I think this speech will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Pete Donaldson, other Officials and Directors of the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts, Ladies and Gentlemen attending this Fourth Annual Peanut Progress Day in Tifton:

Every person here today is greatly disappointed that recent developments in Washington have prevented Senator Russell from being with us. I know that he is no less chagrined himself that he could not personally receive the honor you are paying him and that he could not respond to the great tribute.

He scheduled his appearance from a grateful heart and a long standing desire to thank you face to face.

He also looked forward to what all of us who are at posts of duty in Washington look forward to, and that is the chance to just visit and exchange thoughts on our problems.

The Senator asked me to express his profound regrets over the circumstances which prevented him from being here today. I am highly honored to do so.

As all of you know, the matter of providing for our national security has somehow become a controversial subject in the United States Senate this year and it would have been impossible to predict as early as three weeks ago that much of the heat of this controversy would converge during this week and next.

The military procurement bill containing the authorization of funds for the important Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system is now the pending business before the Senate, and the hearings of the Defense Appropritions Bill over which Senator Russell presides are still incomplete as a result of two unforeseen delays.

These circumstances made this a most difficult time for Senator Russell to leave Washington without undue physical strain, which he is prudently trying to avoid. As a result, Dr. Pete and our other good friends on the Commission assured him that all of you would understand the necessity of avoiding making his schedule more strenuous than it already is.

Your tribute to the Senator speaks for itself. It is more eloquent than any words I might call forth. Its message—simply stated—is that Senator Russell is one of the great men of our age.

All too often we take for granted the benefits that result from the Senator's leadership and influence in Washington. We often fail to fully appreciate the Senator's ability, integrity and dedication—the qualities which make him a key member of the Senate and an outstanding national figure.

Public servants of Senator Russell's quality don't come along often. Therefore, it is a source of great pride to all of us that this giant of American government is a fellow Georgian.

Our Senior Senator began his political career at the age of 22 when he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1920.

He has set and broken many records since that first election. He was the youngest Governor ever elected in Georgia. He is the only Senator in the history of our country to serve more than half of his life in the United State Senate.

As President Pro Tempore of the Senate, he is third in the line of succession to the Office of President of the United States. In terms of national prestige, he has achieved equal status with many of our Presidents. In terms of character, integrity and ability, he has—in my judgment—eclipsed them all.

It is not necessary to enumerate the Senator's contributions to the progress of agriculture in Georgia. You are the recipients of his efforts, and you know better than anyone else that our distinguished Senior Senator has openly fought many battles and quietly used his influence on other occasions in your behalf.

As for his contributions to peanut farmers, I need only mention that our new National Peanut Marketing Research Laboratory in Dawson is now completed and ready for occupancy. Without Senator Russell's persistence and untiring efforts along with those of Tic Forrester, the site of our modern laboratory would still be a vacant plot of ground in Terrell County.

Let it suffice to say that Dick Russell is a true and loyal friend of the Georgia farmer. He is Georgia's greatest human resource. I know of no other person more deserving of the honor you have bestowed upon Senator Russell today.

Several years ago I had the honor and pleasure of introducing him to an audience on this very campus.

I told a joke in doing so but I thought it a peculiarly appropriate one.

A circus owner was displeased because one of his Star Acrobats was thinking of retirement. He was the one they shot out of a cannon. "I hope you won't quit," the circus owner said, "because I don't know where I can get another man of your caliber."

Senator Richard Brevard Russell is not a 22 rifle. He is more like the 16 inch guns of mighty battleships.

I am particularly pleased that in addition to honoring the Senator, your program today has placed special emphasis on the problems facing American agriculture.

Problems with the consumer and the Congress were discussed earlier in the program. However, I would be remiss in my duties as a Congressional Representative of Southwest Georgia farmers if I did not add emphasis to such critical areas of concern to rural America.

In this year that will close out the 1960's and launch the 1970's, there is much justifiable concern over the future of American agriculture and the related industries that constitute the agri-business community.

Basically, the problems of the farmer are three-fold, First, he receives about the same prices or less than he received in the past quarter of a century; yet he must pay production costs that generally have doubled over the past 20 years.

Secondly, the farmer, like the businessman, has been severely cramped by inflation and ever-increasing interest rates on the money he must borrow to achieve the efficiency to offset rising production costs. The Federal Government must take the lion's share of blame for this deplorable situation. It has spent money and thrown it away like the prodigal son until it has become far and away the biggest borrower in history with a public debt that a few weeks ago was over $364 billion. The private borrower must then compete in the money market with the seemingly insatiable demand of the government for the lendable dollar. We are moving ever so slightly in the proper direction to solve this problem—by cutting federal expenditures and attempting to balance the budget. But we have not moved nearly fast enough nor far enough in my opinion; especially not soon enough.

Last, but certainly not least in importance, is the fact that the farmer does indeed have an image problem. His story is not being sufficiently told to the American public. The steel people, the airlines, the giant corporations who produce synthetic fibers, and other groups are certainly telling their story about the wonders of their products and services. Agriculture is making small and inadequate efforts in this direction. That's where businessmen who have a vested interest in agriculture come into the picture. The farmers and their friends must tell the American consumer that food and fiber are the greatest bargains on earth, not only because government is subsidizing the consumer through the farmer, but because of the farmer's efficiency and willingness to work at great risk of loss and without punching a clock.

Our farmers have been able to produce with such efficiency and abundance that the American consumer now uses only 17-point-2 percent of his disposable net income for food, as compared with 25 percent by consumers in Western Europe and 40 to 50 percent by Russians.

Therefore, it is clear that the farmer must continue to receive fair prices and stay in business or he will be forced out and the consumer will pay more when the big corporations take over the foreclosure wreckage and it gets in a very few hands.

However, millions of our urban people and hundreds of their Representatives in Congress don't understand these simple economic facts. They, at least appear to believe that they can have their cake and eat it too.

Urban district Congressmen so dominate the Congress these days that they determine what becomes law. Of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, only 31 are from districts where as much as 25 percent of the constituency is made up of people residing on farms.

It is true that only six percent of nation's population is engaged in farming. But Department of Agriculture statistics show that 40 percent of the American people are either engaged in farming or dependent upon it through agri-business or by providing other goods and services to agriculture. That's including the man in Ohio who makes tractor tires and the railroadman in Jacksonville who makes his living on a freight train hauling agricultural commodities.

The farmer urgently needs the support of all his associates in industry and commerce if his interests are to be properly considered, as they deserve to be, in the Legislative and Executive Branches of Government. Only when the voice of agriculture is heard as clearly as the voices of labor, big business and other strong interests, will farm programs and other agricultural legislation receive proper consideration in Washington.

If Senator Russell were here he could testify to the inexorable changes that have occurred in the several decades of his services in the Senate. He would not say "Thank you" for what you have done for him but "Thank you" for what you are doing for America.

FABRIDAM, CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY, PA.

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies marking the dedication of the world's largest fabridam at Sunbury, Pa. The key address was given by Pennsylvania's secretary of forests and waters, the Honorable Maurice Goddard, who emphasized the practical aspects and potentials of this new project.

This manmade structure, composed of seven large inflated neoprene synthetic rubber-coated tubes stretches across the Susquehanna River. The 8-foot-high tubes provide a water barrier, thus creating a new 3,000-acre pool of water to a depth of 8 to 9 feet above normal. The tubes are anchored by concrete piers and seven of them total more than 2,000 feet across the river. The structure is a unique answer in the field of water control and it is a forerunner of other fish, wildlife, and recreation projects now planned elsewhere in the Nation.

Structures such as this are capable of being deflated, fully or partially, during storms or rainy seasons to pass flood crests and prevent upstream flooding. The fabridam can be used to impound water for a variety of purposes: conservation, recreation, irrigation, navigation locks, and hydrolecetric power head maximization.

The Federal Government did not contribute any financial assistance to the project at Sunbury—most of the money amounting to approximately $2½ million was supplied by the State of Pennsylvania and local sources. We in the 17th Congressional District are proud to have this innovation in water control and conservation. I should like to commend the Central Susquehanna Valley Chamber of Commerce and all civic officials for their foresight and willingness to undertake a project of this magnitude to benefit the local citizens.

AMENDMENT OF INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the Senate passed S. 2224, a bill proposing to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 in many significant ways. As I indicated in remarks when I introduced H.R. 8980 on March 13, 1969, many of the features of this bill will update the mutual fund laws and will provide more investor protection without interfering with the right of shareholders and directors to manage their mutual funds. However, some of the provisions of that bill are so far reaching in their consequences, that I thought it important to introduce my own bill in the House as a basis for discussion when this legislation comes before the committee of which I am a member.

The legislative process invites compromise and accommodation and we seek to resolve conflicting views in order to promote a broader public purpose and serve the common good. Now that I have studied S. 2224 in comparison to my own bill, I believe it will further advance the legislative process to revise my bill to include as much as possible of the bill passed by the Senate and introduced in the House by our committee chairman, JOHN MOSS, as H.R. 11995. The revised bill I am introducing today differs from the Senate bill in these important areas.

First, mutual funds which have at least 50 percent of the board of directors made up of unaffiliated and disinterested persons and which obtain approval of their management or distribution contracts by a two-thirds vote of outstanding shares and all of the unaffiliated directors within 1 year will be exempt from having the SEC and the NASD review management compensation and sales commissions if such approval is not obtained, these agreements will be subject to SEC review. Second, former SEC personnel along with lawyers and accountants will be included among a new category of "interested persons" barred from affiliation with mutual funds for a reasonable period of time. Third, incentive management fees based on performance and which increase and decrease proportionately will be encouraged, but will not be required to decrease below the level of no compensation or actual operating costs, if the parties agree. Fourth, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 will not be applicable to advisers' agreements between non-U.S. entities and U.S. investment advisers registered under the act. Fifth, U.S. investment advisers will not be prohibited from having incentive contracts including performance fees with unregistered companies. Sixth, penalties will be imposed on those who bring lawsuits against mutual funds without justifiable cause. Seventh, former SEC personnel will be prohibited for 2 years from suing mutual funds. Eighth, the existing exemption from the 1940 act—but not the 1933 and 1934 acts—for oil exploration funds will be continued. These funds are completely regulated under Federal securities laws, and I see no reason to try and treat them as mutual funds when they are not. Ninth, I have tried to treat front-end-load contractual plans a little more equitably. They must compete with insurance policies where salesmen get from 65 to 120 percent front-end load and sell with no prospectus.

There are other minor differences in my bill, most of which involve a requirement that the SEC conform to the Administrative Procedure Act in its administrative activities, and that its actions be reasonable. The SEC now is permitted to exercise its discretion without the checks and balances required by due process under the Federal Constitution. I am hopeful that Members of Congress will review my revised bill with care, as I believe it is important we bring the controversy surrounding this legislation to a close. High interest rates, uncertainties in our fiscal and monetary policy, and unsettled conditions in Vietnam are rapidly eroding investor confidence as reflected in the sharp decline in securities prices in recent weeks. Far-reaching policy changes in antitrust law enforcement have added to investor unrest, and have caused share declines in the prices of securities of conglomerates. Actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange respecting minimum rates, customer-directed commission sharing, access of nonmembers to the exchange markets, and reciprocal business arrangements, are all taking their toll of investor confidence. I urge my colleagues to be thoughtful and to be reasonable and above all to remember that securities salesmen are entitled to earn a fair living in these times of inflation along with everyone else. My bill will preserve their income at approximately the present level with an added opportunity for increased earnings. The Senate bill in its present form will, in my opinion, cut the income of mutual fund salesmen by approximately 50 percent. I think any such action by Congress at this time would be highly discriminatory and inconsistent with our ideas of equal protection under the law. I do not believe it is the function of the SEC or minority shareholders to second-guess majority shareholders or directors of companies as to the value of management compensation or the level of sales commissions. Competition in the mutual fund industry fixes the price of these services at a level considered reasonable by the buyers and sellers involved. My bill will protect this principle of corporate democracy and at the same time protect the right of investors to make their own decision as to the value of the services for which they pay.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ROTC IN AN ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last month at a ROTC commissioning ceremony, the very able president of the University of North Dakota, Dr. George Starcher, outlined his thoughts on the significance of the ROTC in an academic community.

Because of many recent distortions of the mission of the ROTC, I felt my colleagues would be interested in having the viewpoint of Dr. Starcher on this matter.

At this time I include his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS AT THE ROTC COMMISSIONING CEREMONY, JUNE 8, 1969

(By Dr. George W. Starcher)

Colonel Whye, Colonel Woodard, members of the faculty, candidates for commissions, parents, relatives, and friends; Today I want to say something about ROTC and the University because we hear again that ROTC must go, or that it should be moved off to the periphery of the campus and stripped of academic credit. As with any other course or activity we should ask from time to time, "What is the significance of the ROTC in an academic community?" First, a quick review of this University's involvement in military training.

The Act creating this University in 1883 provided that military instruction must be made available. Up to 1888 military instruction was by a retired colonel, W. H. Topping, who operated the Boarding Department, chaperoned the students, drilled the boys in calisthenics and directed the school of the soldier. One of the reasons given for not making Acting President Montgomery the President of the University in 1887, was his total neglect of both military and physical training. Colonel Topping was so poor as an instructor that he was discharged. The students organized themselves for a half-hour drill at noon—out of doors in good weather and up and down the halls of Old Main when it was bad. They talked the Governor out of 38 State Militia muskets for drill. In 1890 the War Department sent in Lt. Leon Roudiez from Fort Pembina to be PMST. He also taught French. A uniform of "Baldwin grey" was adopted. Springfield cadet rifles and other accoutrements were obtained. Lt. Roudiez made military science very popular. Students liked the uniforms so well that they talked of making it the official daily dress at the University. Even the girls organized their own military company in 1889 and, at their own request, Lt. Roudiez directed their drill.

In the spring of 1897 the military and physical education departments joined in staging a program of bugle calls, band music, saber drills, bayonet exercises, club swinging and tumbling. Hailed as a "brilliant and daring achievement," it became so popular that it was performed at the Metropolitan Theatre downtown, and the following year it went on the road to Grafton and Larimore. The military coronet band achieved rank along with the choral club, the mandolin and guitar club and the glee club.

The Spanish War of 1898 took all of the instructors and military science was suspended. In 1904 the military department was closed since there was no war threat, Indian or foreign, student instructors become indifferent, and the faculty were willing to see military science forgotten in favor of "physical culture."

The National Defense Act of 1916 revived the idea of military training. With the war in Europe, trouble on the Mexican border and increasing student enlistments in the National Guard, the faculty, after heated discussion, voted in 1917 to revive compulsory military training. With the declaration of war on April 6, 1917, military training was reinstated at once and made compulsory in September. Many students enlisted. By November there was only one officer left—Captain Charles McVey, brother of President McVey. Students provided their own uniforms and when Captain McVey left in May, the students conducted their own drill, with nothing but wooden muskets.

The Student Army Training Corps (SATC) opened in 1918 with 400 student soldiers. In fact the opening ceremonies for the University that fall were entirely military in nature. During the sumemr the University conducted a vocational program for 360 men learning how to advance the war effort. That year construction was begun on the new $30,000 armory which now, just 50 years later, houses ROTC. The *Dakota Student* was replaced by an army paper called *The Camp Barrage*. We changed to the quarter system and only courses having some bearing on the training of military personnel were offered.

The end of the war in November, and the great influenza epidemic, paralyzed the campus.

The issue of compulsory military training created a fairly even split in the faculty and among the students. The SATC was over. The *Dakota Student*, the *Education Record*, and the *Grand Forks Herald* reported the debate while another paper, the *Grand Forks American*, opposed what it called "the blight of militarism" and "the menace of Prussianism" posed by military training.

The faculty council finally voted to establish the ROTC in 1919. That year the ROTC department introduced the military ball.

Seven years later, in 1926, the *Dakota Student* furiously opposed compulsory ROTC but it survived. In the 1930's anti-militarism appeared in the form of occasional agitation (we would call it demonstration) against the military ball and two organizations referred to as "Scabby Blade" and the "Sons of Future Wars."

In 1937 the state legislature abolished compulsory ROTC at the University and enrollment fell off by half or more. Beginning with Pearl Harbor and World War II so many students left for service that by 1943 enrollment dropped to 775 students, mostly women. The University began to look like a military camp with all sorts of defense and war training programs organized to train engineers, glider pilots, civilian pilots, radio operators and the 304th college training detachment trained more than 2500 men here. In addition, there were many specialized pre-professional, medical and nurse corps trainees on campus. Almost every faculty member was involved in one way or another in carrying out a truly phenomenal war training effort.

Following the war the campus experienced what observers described as an atmosphere of good feeling and deep pride in the great achievement made by the University for the country. There was a revival of optimism that had been missing for a generation.

And so the 1950's saw compulsory ROTC with both Army and Air Force ROTC units established again. Students and faculty alike protested the compulsory feature and, since engineers were excused, the faculty council had no logical alternative but to make ROTC voluntary, which they did in 1965. Since that time officer production has actually increased and morale and quality also improved.

The history of ROTC at this University makes clear that the faculty does carefully evaluate the program from time to time. Orderly expression of views, and protest that does not interfere with the on-going University have always been protected—even encouraged.

Today some 350 colleges and universities have approved ROTC units, 97% of them give academic credit for ROTC. Some 100 other colleges and universities have requested ROTC units. Fifteen new Army ROTC units were established last year. Eight schools were notified that their ROTC units would be withdrawn because of low production of officers, but the students and faculty protested so vigorously in four of them and provided such convincing guarantees of increased enrollment, that the cancellation orders were withdrawn.

We support ROTC because you young men about to receive your commissions, and hundreds like you, want an opportunity to complete officer training along with getting a college education—some to prepare for careers in the military and others for more limited service.

We should all bear in mind that the national objective of ROTC is to provide for the simultaneous blending of military training with civilian academic pursuit. This provides a high type officer who is, by and large, more successful in performance than typical graduates of an officers candidate school, where training for a commission covers a much shorter time. Last year more than 21,000 young men were commissioned through the ROTC while some 50,000 officers commissioned through other programs.

The Army commissioned 35% of its officers through ROTC last year. The Air Force secured 28% of its officers from graduates of the ROTC Aerospace Studies. The service academies furnish only 3% of the commissions in the total military system each year.

Approximately ⅓ of the generals in the army today are products of ROTC. Half of the officers from the level just below flag to lieutenant are ROTC products. Indeed, the Defense Department could not get along without ROTC unless new and far more expensive schools and academies were built.

One of the principles by which this nation has operated from its founding is that there be civilian control over the military. That principle applies not only to having the President be Commander in Chief and a civilian at the head of the Defense Department, but it produces the leavening effect of having men enter the services through ROTC, and through the selective service, rather than hiring professional paid soldiers. If the services are denied their source of officers through ROTC, they would be compelled to hire professionally trained military personnel. Then instead of an orientation toward peace, humanitarianism and individual liberty we could well create a Prussian type military elite, infinitely more objectionable than anything critics find in the ROTC.

The ultimate aim of the ROTC officer is the protection of this nation and its citizens. As long as protection is a necessity we must recognize the obligation of everyone to share in that burden. Anyone who believes that wars are made by military officers and not by statesmen simply have not read their history books. When we hear of criticism, violence and disruption of colleges and universities over the ROTC issues, we might pause and be thankful that ROTC graduates are helping to keep this a country where people are free to criticize. However, there can be no tolerance of those who would destroy that very freedom itself by violence or otherwise.

Every one of you young men who is about to receive a commission knows that our own history, especially our participation in two world wars, shows how security may be threatened when we tolerate aggression; and that saving lives and helping people, then having to defend them, may be of importance to us for many reasons, not the least of which is that there are those who wish we would lose our morale and determination.

There are those who oppose anything military. ROTC is the most visible identification with the military on campus, therefore it is the thing they would first destroy.

One objection to ROTC is that it discriminates on the basis of sex. So does physical education for men, and there is high selectivity in engineering, nursing, and home economics.

There are those who insist that the ROTC poses a contradiction to the concept of academic freedom. On the other hand, the military is recognized as a profession of vital importance to peace and to the nation. Then, is it not entirely consistent with the purposes of a university to provide opportunities for young men to prepare for such careers? As long as ROTC is voluntary those who protest stand with those who would prohibit the reading of Karl Marx or listening to Gus Hall.

All of those involved in ROTC, and that includes those of you completing your training today, would do anything in their power to build an ideal world where no military is needed. You know full well that military science and activity diverts men's attention and action away from humanitarian goals into a regrettable, but nevertheless a most necessary, responsibility of protecting all of us against aggression from outside. At worse there may come a time when it is necessary to abandon all else for the law of the jungle—kill or be killed. I suspect that those most acquainted with weapons and the skills and arts of war would do anything possible to bring about a world where there are no military people around because that would be a world without hatred, greed, fear ignorance, misery, or want—the basic causes of war.

Unfortunately the world is not that way yet and even wishing it were so neither gives us that kind of world nor the kind of people who will dependably act that way. We still have an Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and all the rest because we have to have them if human freedom and dignity are to survive.

I do not know how many of you would be here had it not been for the pressures of the draft. But I believe you would all say that the ROTC has taught you a great deal about courage, unselfishness, and leadership—I would add also courtesy. To the seemingly growing number of young people who decry all war, those who have completed ROTC can probably confess a deeper abhorrence of war, and with better reasons, than any of those others engage in demonstrations of their belief, including a few who express themselves in more militant ways.

Every officer in the ROTC fervently strives to save lives and build a safer and more just world for all. It is precisely for this reason that they would also say that there must still be preparation for war if we are to avoid oppression, injustice, dishonor, and loss of freedom for all time to come. They know that military service is not something men live for and look forward to with pleasure. Rather they know it is a solemn duty.

We should remember that the academic quality of the ROTC program is reviewed every year by the military all the way up to the Pentagon, by civilian advisory groups of educators, and by curriculum committees and faculties in the universities themselves. Credit is determined by the curriculum committee as for any other course. The acceptability of military credit in each particular curriculum is determined by the dean and faculty of the college in which the student is enrolled. Some curricula permit including military credit in the minimum hours required, while some cannot do this and therefore, for them, ROTC credits are in excess of the degree requirements for other students. Students understand this and it is not a serious matter. The granting of academic credit is part of our contract with the Department of Defense, as is the provision of classroom and office space on the same basis as for other programs giving courses for credit. The Defense Department provides instruction, equipment, clothing, and pay for students.

The criticism that the University has nothing to say about the selection of instructors in ROTC is hardly valid. By agreement with the Department of Defense all instructors are nominated to the institution and we decide whether to accept or reject the individual so nominated. We have rejected several nominees and we have specified the type of officer and the background training we would accept. Our wishes in this regard have been honored. This arrangement is not different from that which we have followed in the appointment of faculty to the Department of Religious Studies, and in other areas here and at other universities. From year to year the ROTC program has been modified to include more regular university courses in lieu of some of the courses formerly taught by ROTC instructors.

ROTC gives one a greater consciousness of history, and of revolution, going back to our own American revolution, to secure freedom to do whatever we want except destroy that freedom itself. Through ROTC a man also achieves a little deeper consciousness of the moral revolution going on. The ROTC officer has no less compassion than the demonstrator. He only knows more about himself, about other people and about the world. He is perfectly capable of participating in those activities that a morally aroused youth demands. But with the training and leadership that ROTC affords, with the vision of man as master and the role of ideals in building a new world, you who receive your commissions today, more than any others, are prepared to build a new world in the tradition of freedom, justice, and peace that has been a basic motivation of Americans from the very beginning of that revolution that was intended to make such a world possible.

I congratulate you. We are proud of you. You are our single best reason why the ROTC is good.

AMENDMENT TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING LAW

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an amendment to the truth-in-lending law to correct an inequity which exists because of the ruling of the Federal Reserve Board in regard to the right of rescission. The difficulty has arisen primarily from the Board's interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) on the floor of the House. The gentleman's amendment was aimed primarily at the fly-by-night door-to-door salesman, but has been interpreted by the Board to apply to the legitimate businessman who has a stake in his community.

GENERAL EXPLANATION

Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, better known as the truth-in-lending law, went into effect July 1. Most sections of the act deal with the new Federal requirement that all businesses which charge consumers for the right to defer payment must disclose both the amount and the annual percentage rate of the credit charge. However, in addition to this requirement, Congress also enacted, in section 125 of the act, a highly innovative provision which grants consumers the unilateral right to rescind any credit transaction, including a retail sale, "in which a security interest is retained or acquired in any real property which is used or is expected to be used as the residence of the person to whom credit is extended." Under this provision, the consumer need give no reason for his decision to cancel a transaction. He need only notify the creditor of his intention to cancel within 3 business days following either the day the transaction was consummated or the day all credit disclosures were given him, whichever is later. If the consumer has purchased property in a credit sale and has taken it home with him or has had it delivered to his home, and then he decides to rescind, the creditor must go after the property within 10 days after it is tendered or the title to the property automatically vests in the consumer without any obligation on his part to pay for it. Clearly, this is a very rigorous provision. As will be seen below, however, it was not intended by Congress to apply to most businesses. Its purpose was to end a very serious, but specific, wrong which had been brought to the attention of the Congress, and indeed to the entire country. However, by the time the effective date of the act rolled around this very rigorous, but narrow, provision had, by administrative interpretation, been made applicable to literally millions of American businesses. This interpretation is contained in the truth-in-lending regulation—regulation Z—which was drafted by the Federal Reserve Board. The interpretation—section 226.2(z)—provides that the term "security interest," which was not specifically defined by Congress in the act, includes: "mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's, and other similar liens, and any lien on property arisng by operation of law."

As the following will show, this interpretation, as applied to section 125 of the act, was promulgated in disregard of: First, the express language of section 125, second, the clearly indicated purpose for which section 125 was enacted, and third, the admittedly severe burden which it places on millions of businessmen who were never intended to be covered by section 125.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

(1) THE EXPRESS LANGUAGE OF SECTION 125

As indicated above, section 125 of the act (subsection (a)) provides that a consumer shall have the right to rescind any credit transaction "in which 'a security interest is retained or acquired' in any real property which is used or is expected to be used as the residence of the person to whom credit is extended."

It is this general language which the FRB relied on in defining the term "security interest," to include mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's, or other liens, arising by operation of law—hereinafter referred to as "liens arising by operation of law." Admittedly, it is possible to interpret the language "security interest retained or acquired" to include liens arising by operation of law. However, in choosing this general language to justitfy its extension of section 125, the Board disregarded the more specific language of section 125(b). That subsection, which deals with the effects of a consumer's rescission, states that upon a consumer's giving notice of his intention to rescind "any security interest given by the obligor becomes void."

Liens arising by operation of law are not, of course, given by an obligor. They are, and have been for many years, provided by State law as a means of security performance of obligations arising from the purchase of services or goods which improve real property. Thus, when stating in section 125(b) that any security interest given by the obligor becomes void, Congress could not have had in mind liens arising by operation of law. Since one of the basic rules of statutory construction provides that specific language shall take procedence over more general language, the definition of the term "security interest" contained in regulation Z constitutes an erroneous interpretation of the act.

(2) THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH SECTION 125 WAS ENACTED

The error contained in regulation Z is made even more clear when the purpose of section 125 is considered.

What is now section 125 originated in a floor amendment. The discussion surrounding the introduction of the amendment clearly indicates that the purpose of section 125 was to end the fraudulent schemes of second mortgage racketeers and other fly-by-night operators who victimize homeowners with their fast-sell and quick-exit schemes. The methods used in these schemes are no secret. In the words of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL), who introduced the amendment which later became section 125:

> A central feature of these schemes *is the assignment of the note and mortgage by the fraudulent mortgage lender* to the finance companies which, by callous disregard of the fraudulent underlying transactions, can claim the privileged status of holder in due course under State law. [Italics added.]

Liens which arise by operation of law are not generally assignable under State law. Thus, for the second mortgage racketeer to operate effectively, he must acquire a lien by contract, in other words a security interest given by the consumer. This is clearly what the Congress intended to protect against when it enacted section 125, and unlike the interpretation in regulation Z, the language of section 125(b) is both consistent with and a clear indicator of that intention.

3. BURDEN ON LEGITIMATE BUSINESSMEN

At least one member of the Federal Reserve Board readily admits that the consumer's right to rescind provided by section 125 is expected to cause the most problems in the application of the truth-in-lending law; and he has also indicated that an amendment to the statute might be necessary.*

Most of these problems, however, would not arise if section 125 were made to apply, as it was clearly intended to apply, only to liens acquired by contract.

The problems created by the right to rescind (as interpreted in regulation Z) result primarily from the fact that virtually every State has a law granting mechanic's, materialmen's, artisan's or other liens where services or property is purchased to improve real property. Because these laws are in effect, the FRB's interpretation has made section 125 applicable to sales by literally millions of legitimate businessmen. In some businesses, for example in lumber and building material retail establishments, virtually every product sold can be used to improve real property, including residences of consumers. Hence, the vast majority of the sales made by these businesses could conceivably be rescindable. The burden on these businesses is clear. Most of their customers will want them to begin performance of the transaction immediately, for example, they will want to take the property or have it delivered to their home. Yet, if the property is taken or delivered before the rescission period is ended, the creditor faces the risk of losing that property without compensation. Many of these businesses would be willing to waive their liens in some cases, for example, for small purchases, but this in itself is a burden, as a waiver may well require the signing and/or filing or a formal document. Moreover, even a waiver of a lien does not protect a business from a rescission if some other party to the transaction, such as a contractor or workman, retains a right to acquire a lien. The FRB has ruled that in such a case the transaction would be rescindable by the consumer regardless of the fact that the creditor's lien was waived. Again, the burden on these businesses is clear. Yet, as indicated

*See testimony of Hon. J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in hearings before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Part 2, March 6, 1969, p. 391.

above, the legislative history of the act shows that they were not even intended to be covered by the section. These businesses are not fast-sell, quick-exit operations. Very few make door-to-door sales, and even those that do maintain permanent establishments which stand behind their sales.

CONCLUSION

The language of section 125(b) clearly shows that the consumer's right to rescind was intended to apply only where a security interest in a consumer's home is given by him to a creditor. This is made even more clear when the legislative history of the act is considered, for it shows that the practices for which section 125 was enacted to end are effective only where security interests are acquired by contract, that is, given by the consumer. In view of these considerations, it is advocated that section 125 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act be amended to provide in definite terms that it does not apply to transactions where the only lien involved is a mechanic's, materialmen's or other lien arising solely by operation of law.

OBSCENE MAIL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, although we have protested, we have investigated, and we have introduced corrective legislation—the flood of obscene mail has not been abated. Our mails are still open sewers filled with filth that makes a circus of sex.

Yesterday, my colleague from Texas JACK BROOKS, brought new revelations into the matter of unsolicited obscene mail. Mr. BROOKS has grown weary of excuses and inaction by the Post Office. To counter complaints that Congress was doing nothing, Mr. BROOKS called his Government Activities Subcommittee into a special meeting July 8 and responded with a specific recommendation that I urge the Post Office to enact.

Mr. BROOKS contends, and I agree, that the Post Office has sufficient authority, and certainly the responsibility, to implement regulations stopping this sick material from reaching home delivery. To augment his position, Mr. BROOKS proposed expanding section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, to restrict obscene illustrations from being sent unsolicited through the U.S. mails. This regulation is limited in purpose and does not violate the tenets of our Constitution.

The simple-minded deliberations on what is or is not "obscene" have reached the point of the absurd, while the raw mail goes on. Mr. BROOKS' regulation would not involve itself in semantics; it does not require any subjective tests which have weakened convictions under present obscenity laws. The regulation does not even include any written material or matter that is solicited by the person receiving it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Post Office to respond to the complaints of its patrons and to the criticism of Congress. There is no excuse for apathy; there is no excuse for inaction by the Post Office. I would strongly recommend some of the funds to be derived from the increase in postal rates be channeled into concerted efforts to bar pornographic materials from the mail. This is not a simple matter to control, and we all know it, but that is no reason why no action is taken.

I would call your attention to the two bills I have introduced which would put muscle into existing obscenity laws. This proposal of Mr. BROOKS, would certainly supplement this overall objective. The main thing is that positive action must be taken on all fronts.

A RESPONSIBLE CENSUS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, which I have the honor to chair, of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee unanimously reported out H.R. 12825. This bill, which was introduced on behalf of myself and Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. MESKILL, and subsequently supported by Mr. SCOTT, amends title 13 of the United States Code to strengthen and improve the census law.

This legislation is the result of many weeks of investigation into the controversy surrounding the 1970 census.

The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics initiated this investigation, which was aimed at determining what changes, if any, were necessary in the census, more than 4 months ago. As chairman of the subcommittee, I scheduled the testimony of the various interested groups to provide a comprehensive and a balanced presentation of all points of view.

During the hearings I continually emphasized that our subcommittee was not out to harm the census—was not out on a witch hunt—but was concerned only with dealing intelligently and fairly with the controversy that developed. I pointed out that "at least in part, much of the outcry appeared to have been deliberately fomented through the issuance of news releases designed to distort and exaggerate the census programs in order to play upon our natural fears of 'Big Brother' and inflame our righteous indigation over governmental snooping into our private lives."

It was a tribute to the members of our subcommittee that during the course of our investigation they did not permit themselves to be swayed by the emotionalism of a public outcry. However, their refusal not to be swayed did not equate with a refusal to be concerned and, in the opinion of the subcommittee the allowable scope of the 1970 census questions and the extent to which mandatory replies to the census questionnaire are required were vital areas of concern.

It is, of course, true that any question asked under penalty of law—even if all that is being asked is the person's name—is an invasion of the individual's privacy. So, too, are the laws requiring that most people file an income tax return. The real question is whether the value of the action being taken justifies the restrictions upon the individual's privacy; whether the value of the statistical information provided by the census is of sufficient importance to warrant the question—all the questions—being asked.

The hearings which the subcommittee has held have been most comprehensive and have covered a wide cross-section of opinion and interest throughout the country. Beginning with Mr. A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Bureau of the Census, each witness, whether representing State or local government, a scientific or professional organization, the business community, or just himself as a concerned citizen, has added to the subcommittee's knowledge of the Census Bureau and the 1970 census program.

Our hearings produced both supporters and critics of the census. Yet, most all of the witnesses testified to the vital need of the census.

It was, therefore, clear that our subcommittee's assignment was to draw up legislation that would, on one hand, strengthen the census and, on the other hand, guarantee the rights of our citizens.

I sincerely believe that the legislation we have introduced indicates that we have succeeded.

As reported out of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, H.R. 12825 would modify the census law to: First, eliminate the requirement that the census must include questions on unemployment and housing, directing the enumeration of a census of population only—though authorization is provided for the inclusion of unemployment and housing and other census information as deemed necessary; second, encourage the use of more sampling; third, provide the Secretary of Commerce with specific authority for conducting special census for States and local communities; fourth, direct the Secretary to prevent duplication of effort by using existing data; fifth, incorporate into title 13 present administrative procedures for guaranteeing confidentiality of census information as well as strengthening these procedures; sixth, increase the fine from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and the jail sentence from 2 to 5 years for any employee of the Census Bureau who divulges confidential information; seventh, eliminate the jail sentence penalty for citizens who refuse to answer the census questionnaire; eighth, eliminate the jail sentence penalty for citizens giving false answers to a census question; and ninth, direct the Secretary to submit the proposed census questions to the appropriate committees of Congress for review and approval 3 years before the census date.

I wish to emphasize that our bill not only tightens the confidentiality provision of title 13, but removes a never used and unneeded jail sentence penalty which has served only to irritate our citizens. We have also assured a review and approval of the proposed census questions by the appropriate congressional committees—the people's representatives. This provision was based on a similar proposal made by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee has worked long and hard to develop legislation which would maintain the rights and privacy of our citizens and yet not deny to Government and society the information needed to make the intelligent and responsible decisions required in these difficult times. That we believe that we have done so is evidenced by the unanimous support of the subcommittee—many of whose members had previously supported strongly restrictive census legislation. I believe also that when those of my colleagues who do not serve on the Census and Statistics Subcommittee have had the opportunity to study our legislation and read the printed testimony they too will want to support our position.

TELEVISION NEWS, GOVERNMENT CHECKED?—NO

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Republic, one of Arizona's distinguished newspapers, on July 7, 1969, published the following editorial, "Hogtying TV." I fully agree that the guidelines for news fairness and accuracy being administered by a Federal agency would be a major blow to press freedom. Certainly, I have frequently questioned the accuracy of some television news presentations. A vigilance on the part of the viewer and a diligent attempt by television officials for honesty is what is needed, though—not some governmental or quasi-governmental regulation.

The editorial follows:

HOGTYING TV

We have seldom hesitated to criticize television shows which we felt presented an unbalanced picture in the guise of news. Indeed, we have criticized more shows than we would have liked to criticize.

But we have never joined the wolfpack sniping at the heels of network television, agitating to have TV editorial content approved by some sort of ill-disguised government commission.

We say ill-disguised because those who hope to subject TV to government control seldom admit to favoring such a radical policy. Instead, they propose guidelines, or restrictions, or codes—but all to be administered through a federal agency.

In a recent candid and illuminating speech in Ottawa, before the International Press Institute, CBC President Frank Stanton said his network categorically rejects this idea: "If the agency were related to the government, no matter how distantly related, honest journalism simply could not long survive."

We are not opposed to guidelines, restrictions, or codes—for television, the movies, or the press. But they must be voluntary guidelines, restrictions, and codes, established by the industries themselves—not by government advisors (e.g., censors).

The most fundamental fact of democratic life, said Stanton, "is that the press cannot share its responsibility for news judgment and still fulfill its basic role." The proposal to invest editorial responsibilities in bureaucrats, even enlightened bureaucrats, is a proposal for press suppression and censorship. They, in turn, are open invitations to political oppression.

From the dawn of recorded history, there have always been those who were sure they knew exactly what people should be told, how they should be told, and when. By and large, those attitudes prevail in most of the countries of the world today, imposed by government fiat.

The U.S. press—and by press we of course include broadcast journalism—springs from a tradition of freedom . . . the freedom of editors to decide what constitutes news. Like Frank Stanton, we pledge to resist any effort to alter that indispensable tradition.

OCEANOGRAPHIC EXPERIMENTATION ON THE EVE OF OUR TRIP TO THE MOON

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning American scientists and astronauts will make Jules Verne the science prophet of all time. It is most significant that on the eve of mankind's most notable scientific achievement, the flight of Apollo 11, that our scientists are also exploring another environment about which Verne wrote so prophetically.

The Navy Sealab program, although not as extensive nor as imagination-capturing as the space program, is nonetheless exploring a scientific frontier about which almost as little is known: the undersea "inner space."

Today, the Navy's Experimental Diving Unit and Duke University's Medical Center began an experiment in the university's hyperbaric chamber. The experiment in which five aquanauts will simulate an undersea dive to a depth of 600 feet, will last for 14 days. The main purpose of the "dive" is to test new diving and breathing equipment which, if successful, will overcome the major barriers to man's penetration of the ocean depths. Another mission will be to simulate the conditions existing at the time of the death of Aquanaut Berry Cannon last February 17. Cannon died of a seizure shortly after leaving a diving capsule 600 feet beneath the surface of the Pacific. The exact cause of his death has never been determined; the dive will aid in revealing the cause.

The hyperbaric chamber, originally developed as part of the treatment for heart diseases and other ailments, is playing a significant role in undersea exploration and experimentation. The chamber, the medical center, and the entire university are integral aspects of North Carolina's rapidly emerging role in the vast field of oceanography. This role is made possible by the unprecedented cooperation of the State of North Carolina, the State's major educational institutions, and the Research Triangle, itself a unique cooperative venture by State government, three major universities, and private industry. All of the facilities and resources of the State of North Carolina are poised to assist this mighty Nation in making a giant step toward undersea exploration comparable to the reach into space which we shall witness tomorrow.

THE PASSING OF J. HANLY MORGAN

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of J. Hanly Morgan of Huntington, W. Va., will be around to cheer us in many different ways despite his recent passing. A tall man, straight as an arrow, you could always spot him with that wonderful old-fashioned string tie, and the cheery greeting accorded to one and all: "Hi, old Buddy-bud!" Hanly Morgan was a gentleman of the old school. His chuckle and soft answers turned away many pointed political assaults.

Renowned as a host, he annually or even more frequently than that opened his vast farm on the Mason County banks of the Kanawha River to the party faithful of the Democratic persuasion. There he presided over providing enjoyment and relaxation for a motley collection of Governors and ex-Governors, Senators, committeemen, working Democrats, and shaky Republicans. The festive board groaned with goodies. Children and grandchildren romped through the fields and barns. Grandfather Hanly proudly showed his visitors through the solid mansion, pointing with pride to the crib where he slept, the chamber pots, the oaken beams, the great relics of a bygone era, displaying the pride in his ancestry, and the hope for his progeny—all done with a rollicking humor and love for all mankind.

Many early churchgoers marveled that the ribald story-spinner Hanly escalated his Fifth Avenue Baptist Church Sunday School class into prodigious size. In later years, he came a couple of doors down Fifth Avenue and was a pillar of the church at Trinity Episcopal. There I was privileged to share with him membership in the same congregation.

County chairmen traditionally do not survive long in Cabell County, but Hanly Morgan outlived the reigns of two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. He served from 1961 until his death, always genial, always ready with his soothing sirup to pour on fiery arguments, and ever ready to spin a steady stream of stories and jokes when frequently called upon to repeat his many performances as master of ceremonies at dinner. Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser of recent date:

SOLID CITIZEN OF GOOD HUMOR

Those who had talked with J. Hanly Morgan and shared his hearty good humor and robust enjoyment of life during the last few days were especially shocked to learn of his unexpected death.

Mr. Morgan was a solid citizen, a highly successful businessman, a churchman, an influential leader in various organizations and enterprises, a vice mayor for four terms and chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee since 1961, but he was perhaps best known as a raconteur of bubbling humor and enthusiastic geniality.

He was a favorite toastmaster of many organizations because he could always offer a series of funny yarns and anecdotes while threading his way even through a serious program.

His genial disposition was particularly notable during the occasional differences that arose among factions of the Democratic Party while he was serving as committee chairman.

No matter how heated the arguments, he remained calm and good-humored in his efforts to sooth ruffled dispositions and restore harmony to the party.

As president of Morgan's, Inc., a Huntington office supply firm, Mr. Morgan conducted a thriving business. During the years he accumulated extensive realty holdings and became interested in a number of other enterprises.

As a churchman he taught for many years one of the largest Sunday school classes in the city at the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church.

His varied activities, his genial good humor and his efforts for community improvement gave him a wide acquaintance and an extensive circle of warm friends who realize that his death will leave a void that will not soon be filled.

He will be greatly missed in the downtown business community, in the religious activities of the city and area and in county and state councils of the Democratic party.

But most of all he will be missed and long remembered for the cheerful good will that he spread along the way of life at a time when so many people were depressed by the bewildering array of complex problems confronting the nation and the world.

EDITOR WANTS MOON WITH A CAPITAL M

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, David T. Hayhow, publisher of the Dowagiac, Mich., Daily News, writes in an editorial July 12, 1969, that earth's satellite has no proper name; and he calls for an immediate declaration that the moon be named Moon—with a Capital M. He wrote the President pointing out the urgency of giving that celestial body a proper name forthwith, before Neil Armstrong sets foot on its surface.

In the English language, our satellite has been called the moon for many centuries. It has different names in different tongues. The first definition of the word moon in our dictionary is the earth's only known natural satellite. When satellites were discovered circling around some of the other planets of the sun, it was convenient to describe them as moons. It is possible that our satellite, the moon, may be losing or have already lost its age-old proper name through a process of synonymy. Following is the editorial:

STOP THE APOLLO 11 COUNTDOWN

Attention Cape Kennedy: Halt the countdown. Stop the blastoff. All systems are definitely not "go."

It hasn't occurred to anyone yet, but in a sense we're sending our astronauts almost a quarter of a million miles to a nameless orb which shines in our starry skies, makes love bloom and rhymes with June.

That hunk of rock is earth's moon. That's right, little m—moon. Our boys aren't going to Venus or Mars or Jupiter or Saturn. They're going to a moon. Earth's moon to be sure, but still one of many moons.

The only solution is to give it a name—quickly. We can't have Neil Armstrong stepping from his spacecraft July 21 in one of mankind's most dramatic moments and planting an American flag on a moon with no name.

Perhaps, in the tradition of most exploration, it should be christened Orbarmstrong or Vonbraunsphere on that historic day.

Would you care to hum a few bars of "By the Light of the Silvery Orbarmstrong" or "Vonbraunsphere Over Miami?"

A mod label might be more in keeping, with the times. How about Alphamoon or Apollolune. Kicky but not very romantic.

'Tis a quandary. It's been called the moon so long, no one could really make a transition. So the least we can do is give it legitimate status.

We're asking President Nixon, the United Nations and the heads of all governments in the world to decree, on the moment man steps foot onto the moon's surface, that its name become Moon. Moon—as in silvery, love in bloom and June.

Then in your newspaper on July 21, you'll read:

HOUSTON.—U.S. astronaut Neil Armstrong stepped onto the surface of Moon at 2:17 a.m. (EDT) today, realizing a pipedream of man almost as old as the species homo-sapien.

Armstrong's exhilarated voice was heard and his blurry image was seen around the world as millions shared the historic moment which turned centuries of fantasy into fact.

"Thank God" were Armstrong's first words as he was momentarily overcome by emotion and excitement. Then, more matter of factly reporting to mission control in Houston, he described his first footsteps on Moon, dispelling all notions of green cheese, or marshmallow or quicksand.

"It's like walking in a hayfield," Armstrong said of Moon's surface, "I feel like x x x."

As at that moment, earth's unique shiny orbiter will become Moon. Future dictionaries will have to be changed to indicate this stature. And future generations will have to call other moons something else. There is only one Moon.

U.S.S. "HEPBURN" (DE-1055) COMMISSIONED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, named for Adm. Arthur J. Hepburn, U.S. Navy, the DE-1055 was commissioned at Long Beach Naval Shipyard at impressive ceremonies on July 3. She is the second of the *Knox*-class destroyer escorts to join the fleet.

This new class of escort ship is especially designed to locate and destroy submarines and therefore, is capable of assuming the various missions and tasks assigned to the modern naval destroyer. *Hepburn* can operate as a unit of a hunter-killer—HUK—group, screen amphibious or underway replenishment forces, patrol coastal waters for missile firing submarines—continental defense—conduct naval gunfire support missions, or escort military convoys. Like the destroyer, the escort ship is more than capable of successfully completing missions of search, patrol, rescue, evacuation, blockade, visit-and-search, or surveillance.

The keel layup of *Hepburn* took place on June 1, 1966. She was launched on March 25, 1967, and delivered on June 27, 1969. *Hepburn* is cosponsored by Mrs. Arthur J. Hepburn, widow of the late Admiral Hepburn, and Mrs. Joseph R. Barse, granddaughter of the ship's namesake.

Hepburn has an overall length of 438 feet, a beam of 47 feet and a full load displacement of about 4,000 tons. She is equipped with an integral, bow-mounted long range sonar, surface and air search radar, an antisubmarine rocket—ASROC—launcher, antisubmarine torpedo launchers, and a 5-inch, 54-caliber gun mount. She also has space and weight reservations for a self-defense missile system, a manned helicopter capability, and variable depth sonar.

Hepburn will carry a normal complement of 15 officers and 212 enlisted personnel. She also has accommodations available to carry a unit commander. When she joins the Cruiser-Destroyer Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, *Hepburn* will be assigned to Destroyer Division 132, homeported on Long Beach, Calif., as one of the "Black Cats" of Destroyer Squadron 13.

The *Hepburn*'s commanding officer is Cmdr. Stuart D. Landersman, U.S. Navy, an able and experienced naval officer who received his first commission in 1953. The ship's executive officer is Lt. Cmdr. Victor P. Peri, U.S. Navy, who enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1946 and was commissioned an ensign in 1958.

It was my pleasure to be the speaker at the *Hepburn*'s commissioning and the remarks I made at that time follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER, OF CALIFORNIA, AT COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "HEPBURN" (DE 1055), LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD, JULY 3, 1969

Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn was a Naval officer of superb brilliance. In the late 1930s he and a very small number of associates became architects of the United States Navy of World War II, the most powerful naval force the world has ever known.

So it is appropriate that this ship bear his proud name, especially because she and her *Knox*-class sisters are a new generation of the finest products of the naval shipbuilding art.

But I need not remind you that up to just moments ago the *Hepburn* was, after all, nothing more than a splendid tribute to her designers and builders.

Then, as she was commissioned and her first watch was set, she became something quite different—she was transformed into a Man-of-War of the United States Navy.

From that moment forth the *Hepburn* became the product of her Commanding Officer and the some 225 officers and men who man her—officers and men who are the most carefully selected, the best trained and the most highly motivated seamen the world has ever known.

Crew and ship together represent a new advance in Naval power—each is a fitting match for the other.

But in matching them we must appreciate and understand that for all her splendid design and engineering and for all the painstaking labor which went into her—the vessel itself is, after all, an inanimate weapon. She lacks what her men have—courage, resourcefulness, pride, faith and patriotism.

And it is these ingredients which are the power and the heart of the Navy—indeed, even of our country.

These men and this ship—together—have just become one of the basic elements of

United States national power. And that power, to my way of thinking, is one of the few hopes for peace and freedom left to mankind anywhere on this small planet.

Hepburn joins the fleet at a time when the challenge to our nation's power is great—and at a time when threats to peace and to freedom abound. For example:

Even now a fierce war rages across this ocean, and in other parts of the world situations are tense and explosive.

For some time it has been apparent the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has engaged itself upon a massive naval and merchant fleet expansion—a program designed to wrest control of the world's seas.

And, if there be doubts of this, I quote to you these recent boastful and provocative words of the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Sergei Gorshkov:

"The flag of the Soviet Navy now flies proudly over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

And, in the face of these circumstances, and despite additions such as the *Hepburn*, today nine-of-ten ships of the United States Navy are over ten years old, while nine-of-ten ships of the Soviet Navy are less than ten years old.

The *Hepburn* constitutes a portion of our alternative to submission to the challenge on the seas. But only a portion. Those of us who have reckoned this matter carefully see our full alternative to submission as no less than a 10-year 4-billion-dollar a year Naval shipbuilding and modernization program. Total, 40 billion dollars.

Though these sums may be large, to me they seem small when compared to the possible alternative cost to ourselves and the free world in terms of independence and freedom that is implied by Admiral Gorshkov's challenge.

In relations with such expansionist adversaries, our country needs to follow two consonant courses of action:

First, we must encourage peaceful change by working with them where interests converge;

And second and simultaneously, we must create and maintain a relationship of forces favorable to the deterrence of adventurism and aggression.

As the *Hepburn* soon leaves her artificial home near land to live where she belongs—in the bosom of the sea—let her be a symbol that a sovereign America will do what she must to preserve the peace—and that America can be relied upon—and that America will, indeed, stay the course.

If wishing could determine the manner of our lives, then I would wish for those who sail the *Hepburn* only missions of mercy, fair winds and following seas. And these I do wish.

But realistically, this ship joins our service at a time of national peril. She well may sail in harm's way.

So we must place our trust in the firm hands of her officers and men and hope for their safety, pray for their victory in battle if ever they are called upon to fight, and wish them Godspeed.

APOLLO 11 FLAGS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news releases from NASA:

[News Release, NASA, July 3, 1969]

APOLLO 11 FLAGS

When Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., lift off from the Moon after their lunar exploration July 21 they will leave behind three items in commemoration of the historic event.

Armstrong will unveil a plaque attached to the descent stage of the Apollo lunar module. The plaque is signed by President Nixon and the three Apollo 11 astronauts—Armstrong, Michael Collins and Aldrin.

The plaque bears images of the two hemispheres of the Earth and this inscription: Here men from the planet earth, first set foot upon the moon, July 1969, A.D., we came in peace for all mankind.

Another memorial to be left on the Moon will be a 1½-inch silicon disc bearing messages of goodwill from heads of state of many nations. The messages will be placed on the wafer using the technique of making microcircuits for electronic equipment. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration invited the heads of nations to submit messages for this purpose.

The third item is the flag of the United States of America which will be erected on the Moon.

The flag is three by five feet and is made of nylon. It will be erected on an eight-foot aluminum staff and tubing along its top edge will unfurl it in the airless environment of the Moon. Plans are for the event to be recorded on television and transmitted live to Earth.

The planting of the flag is symbolic of the first time man has landed on another celestial body and does not constitute a territorial claim by the United States.

In addition, the Apollo 11 crew will carry four-by-six-inch flags of other nations of the world, the 50 states, District of Columbia and territories of the United States and the United Nations. These flags will be carried in the lunar module and brought back to Earth. They will not be deployed on the Moon.

Two other United States flags will be carried in the Apollo 11 command module. These measure five by eight feet and are to be presented to the two Houses of the Congress of the United States upon return to Earth. They were flown over the U.S. Capitol before the mission and will be flown again over the Capitol after their return.

The plaque is made of stainless steel measuring nine by seven and five-eighths inches and one-sixteenth inch thick. The finish has the appearance of brushed chrome and the world map, message and signatures are in black epoxy which fills the etched inscription.

It will be attached to the ladder on the lunar module descent stage of the landing gear strut between the third and fourth ladder rungs from the bottom.

To fit properly around but not touching the strut and to allow room for the insulation material which covers much of the lunar module, the plaque will be bent around a four-inch radius.

Covering the plaque during flight will be a thin sheet of stainless steel which will be removed by Armstrong during his activities on the surface of the Moon.

The plaque was made at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston.

The disc upon which the messages of good will from heads of state will be carried is being made by the Sprague Electric Co., Semiconductor Division, Worcester, Mass., under the direction of NASA's Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Mass.

The process used to make this wafer is the same as used to manufacture integrated circuits for electronic equipment. It involves making tiny photographic images and depositing metal on the images.

The Stars and Stripes to be deployed on the Moon was purchased along with several others made by different manufacturers at stores in the area around the Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston.

In order to attach the flag properly to its aluminum staff it was necessary to remove the binding and labels. For this reason the name of the manufacturer cannot be determined.

For its journey to the Moon, the flag will be wrapped in plastic and carried in a thin aluminum container attached to the left side ladder down which Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin will descend to the surface of the Moon.

It will be erected after both astronauts step on the Moon and several feet away from the landing spacecraft sufficiently distant to minimize possible damage from the spacecraft's rocket engine as it leaves the Moon on its return trip to Earth.

Armstrong will erect the flag as Aldrin photographs the event. First Armstrong will place the lower four-foot section of the aluminum staff in the ground. He will then swing out a telescoping tube which runs along the top of the flag to keep it unfurled. The flag is riveted at its top two corners to this tube and is attached at its lower corner to the top portion of the staff. When the flag is properly unfurled, Armstrong then will slide the top portion of the staff into the bottom portion in the ground.

The aluminum staff and tube which holds the flag unfurled is gold in color.

The flag during its journey to the Moon will be wrapped in several layers of insulating blanket and attached by two brackets to the left handrail of the ladder. The packaged flag extends from the first step of the ladder upward to where the ladder bends inward toward the lunar module.

The flag and staff are removed from the stowage position by pulling retaining pins as the astronaut stands on the Moon's surface.

Weight of the flag and its wrapping is nine pounds, seven ounces. The flag and its staff and deploying tube weigh three pounds. The upper four-foot section of the staff slips into the bottom section for four inches making the length of the assembled staff seven feet eight inches. The staff will be stuck into the lunar surface from six to nine inches.

The small flags are to be carried in a plastic vacuum pack and stowed in a Beta cloth pouch with a Teflon outer wrap. Total weight is 10 ounces.

[News release, NASA, July 10, 1969]

UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN FLAGS ON APOLLO 11

The flags of 136 nations, the 50 United States, the District of Columbia and four U.S. possessions will be carried by the crew of Apollo 11 to the Moon and back.

These banners will be in addition to three U.S. flags—one to be planted on the Moon's surface, one each to be returned to Earth for presentation to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives—and the United Nations Organization flag.

Foreign nations whose flags will be aboard Apollo 11 are:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium and Bhutan.

Also, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada and Central African Republic.

Also, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland and France.

Also, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy and Ivory Coast.

Also, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Malta and Mauritania.

Also, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Muscat and Oman, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines and Poland.

Also, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somali, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tanzania and Thailand.

Also, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vatican City, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Western Samoa, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

The U.S. possessions whose flags will be carried are Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

The Apollo 11 mission is scheduled for launch from Kennedy Space Center, Fla., July 16.

SCHADEBERG ON CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, our able and respected colleague from Wisconsin, Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, recently made an address in Kenosha, Wis., on Captive Nations Day.

In order that all Members of Congress and other interested parties may have the benefit of Reverend SCHADEBERG's outstanding remarks, I am submitting them for the RECORD, as follows:

Reverend clergy, Fellow Americans, and, most personally, my friends: I am sure that those of you present here today who have followed my activities not only as a Member of Congress but before that as a clergyman know of my intense interest in the cause of freedom not only for those of us blessed with the privilege of living in this great and beloved America but in the cause of freedom of men everywhere with a special emphasis in finding means to recapture the precious freedoms lost to those who are members of the so-called Captive Nations. I view with deep concern the loss of freedom and present threats to freedom both here and abroad because I believe, as is so clearly stated in this nation's treasured historic documents, that Almighty God is the Author of liberty and that He has endowed all of us with unalienable rights among which, but not limited to, are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Briefly, (1) let me say that life, as here referred to, does not mean only the right to be alive, but the right to make a life, to live as free men; and, (2) liberty means not merely to do as we please but to have freedom within the framework of law, that reserves for everyone the right to his freedom and that not at the expense of the freedom of others; (3) the unalienable right of the pursuit of happiness is not the right to be happy nor is happiness a gift anyone can give us but the right to pursue happiness and to attain it, if living according to the laws of God and man, it should be ours to grasp.

There are many and varied reasons men lose their God-given freedoms to tyrants who themselves play at the game of being God. While I mention a few, I do not intend to dwell upon what cannot be changed. I do hope that in mentioning these we who are recipients of the heritage of freedom might reassess the direction in which we are facing and might pause to review our present status as a nation standing as the impregnable bulkhead between those who would be tyrants and those who might be the victims of tyrants if this barrier is penetrated.

How does a nation lose its freedom? Some, but not all, perhaps, of those I will mention apply to those nations we refer to as Captive Nations. In a very real sense they apply in varying degrees for all nations.

First. Nations may lose their freedoms as a result of unwise political decisions made by leaders of larger nations who, while their primary interest is in peace, accept a status of Peace for themselves while the freedoms of countries outside of their own special areas of responsibilities take a less critical role. Some of the leaders of our own nation of the past have made such unwise decisions. Certainly, I do not stand in criticism of them since I do not know, nor do any of us know, the special circumstances that existed at the time these unfortunate decisions were made. I suggest that, for myself, I stand firmly on the conviction that no man's freedom, regardless of his color or race or creed or nationality or ethnic background or what-have-you, is a legitimate object for bargaining. No man's freedom is a pawn to be moved at will by those who play the game of political chess. I stand on this conviction and have made my decisions in Congress on this conviction, not only (which, incidentally, would be reason enough of itself) because freedom is a God-given right which no man has a right to deny but because history is replete with the memories of great men, known and unknown, great even if they occupied but common status in society, who have laid their lives on the line, who have been beaten and tortured and tested and tried, who have given their lives on the battlefield and in the prison cell and on the street because they believed that there was no substitute for liberty; that this God-given right was not a fit object for negotiation for any reason.

No one can find fault with the desire to keep the peace of the world. Surely in a time in which man holds in his hand the awesome power with which to literally wipe civilization off the face of this earth, we cannot be indifferent towards our search for peace. But peace without honor is no peace and peace without freedom is worse than hell itself. Surely, we must find a means to bring this world to an era of lasting peace but we cannot do it and we must not do it by being satisfied to see half the world living in chains. For freedom cannot survive in a world half slave, and half free. If freedom is lacking anywhere, it is in grave danger of being lost everywhere!

Second. Nations lose their freedoms when they abandon the moral principles of self-discipline, obedience of the law and respect for self and family; when they permit the home to be a mere convenience instead of a place of love and honor and harmony.

The moral laws laid down in the Ten Commandments, later interpreted in terms of the spirit by Jesus Christ are clear and unmistakable. They cannot be abandoned without paying a penalty for our disobedience. God's moral laws abide—they stay in force whether we insist they do not exist and choose to ignore them, or knowing they exist we choose to disobey them. God's laws apply no matter what attitude men have toward them.

As we look out upon our great land, we see around us a growing disregard for moral principles in high and low places. We see those who throw the concept of self-discipline to the winds and interpret freedom to be license (to do what we please regardless of its ill-effect on others). We see an utter disregard for law and order on the part of a minority who choose to make demands but who repudiate any sense of responsibility; we see politicians and educators and office-holders, and responsible men in business and industry—yes, even churches giving in to these demands for fear a confrontation would upset their little kingdom of affluence or their place in the sun.

As we look about us we see respect for self and others deteriorate to the point at which dirtiness of body and clothes and dirtiness of mind and speech become a status symbol of what is mis-named the new morality—which, in effect, is no morality at all. We see the home being reduced to what, for some, lacks even the decency of the animal den. And we see all this happen, not only with the permission of the courts of our land, but actually encouraged by some of their tortured decisions.

All the laws on our books are meaningless unless they are respected by the citizens, properly interpreted by the courts, and fairly and firmly administered. All the laws on the books are meaningless unless they are accepted and supported by a sense of morality (on the part of the people) that gives the power and standing in an orderly society.

True freedom is lost to the degree that morality is repudiated by the individuals who make up our society.

Third, Nations lose their freedom when they abandon their faith in God. While those of us who are capable of reasoning only in the finite sense, question the justice of the loss of freedom of God-fearing people along with those of a nation who have turned their backs on God, nevertheless in a very real sense this is a fact of life and in God's wisdom it is permitted. Jesus said, "Render unto Caesar that which belongs to Caesar and unto God that which belongs unto God." God does have an interest in human affairs and if God can weep [and I am sure He does], He must weep in His heaven as He looks down upon those whose faith has been so tempered by material things that the cause of freedom is lost in the rush for that which brings pleasure to the flesh. In one of his hymns of praise to the Creator, King David writes: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord and the people whom He hath chosen is His own inheritance. Behold the eye of the Lord is open upon them that fear him; upon them that hope in His mercy to deliver their soul from death and to keep them alive in famine."

Bryant once said, "That nation that is not ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants." When it comes to our faith in God, there is and can be no compromise if we are to survive as free men. Those who are suggesting that we should look the other way while other humans suffer under the yoke of tyranny; that we should learn to co-exist with evil without serious effort to overcome it, need to read again the words of the Apostle Paul written to the Christians at Corinth: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, 'I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.'"

We here in the United States are witnessing a determined effort to shut God out of the life of the individual, the nation, our schools. Some of this effort is made by those who would destroy America but a large part of it is a result of indifference towards the things of God. Unless we as men of faith prevail, freedom could well be lost here and should the light of freedom, being dimmed now, go out completely, freedom's cause throughout the world will fail and we may well experience in coming generations a dark age that will make the Dark Ages of the 12th and 13th centuries seem bright in comparison to the depth of darkness we could experience. It is not my intention to preach, but I make no apology when I say that faith in God must be strengthened, if freedom is to survive. Those in the Captive Nations who have become martyrs to the cause of freedom are the lights that keep alive the cause of freedom in the midst of darkness.

Fourth. Finally, freedom is lost by indifference to our responsibilities as citizens. Many of you who cherish freedom have lost it yourselves for a time or you know personally those who suffer under the yoke of tyranny. You who have the experience of the loss of freedom either yourselves or in your families have not only a responsibility but an opportunity and a challenge to lead the way toward the extension of freedom here where you live. Those who have known nothing but freedom in their lives cannot appreciate what the loss of it may mean. (1) We do not appreciate the value of a thumb until it is cut off. (2) We do not appreciate our health until we lose it. (3) We do not appreciate the value of love until it is denied us. (4) We do not appreciate our affluence until we have experienced poverty. (5) We do not appreciate freedom until it is no longer ours to enjoy. And so, to you, who know firsthand what the loss of freedom really means, is the responsibility to help others who have not had this experience to appreciate the values they possess. This is the greatest service you can perform as citizens of this nation and as friends and relatives of those to whom freedom has been denied. Do not be weary of welldoing. Repetition is necessary because we forget so easily. Only when the people of this nation truly appreciate the great gift of freedom they enjoy will they be inspired and challenged and moved to help extend this freedom throughout the world, not by reckless abandon to force but by every means available to them—diplomatic, social, political, economic, religious to create the environment in which tyranny cannot survive.

In a very real sense there can be no peace on earth until first there is peace in the hearts of men, the peace the Apostle Paul says is a "peace that passeth all understanding" (because we have faith in God and His purposes). And there is no peace within our hearts until the purpose of God is fulfilled—which is the freedom of His children.

While much of what needs to be done must come from you as individual citizens, yet it is not without reason that we look to Washington for guidance and support in our causes. I would be less than honest if I did not say to you that some of our problems have been caused by poor judgment regarding foreign aid. You and I know we cannot buy friendship. What is needed is for America to support our friends, tried and proven, not by offering dollars but by providing opportunities for them to help themselves. (1) Our goal is not to relieve them of the necessity for sacrifice but to relieve them of the causes for loss of hope. (2) Our purpose is not to keep them alive but to give them something for which to live. (3) Our purpose is not to remove difficulties from their paths but to help them make these difficulties stepping stones in the dangerous currents of Marxism that would sweep them into a sea of impersonal collectivism.

I am very happy to report to you that the Administration in Washington is making a serious reappraisal of our foreign policy as it relates to diplomatic decisions and economic aid. Our President is urging a greater emphasis on private enterprise and individual initiative in struggling and developing countries which, in their birth, might be added to the list of captive nations before they have learned to walk. He is doing this by trying to stimulate and channel additional investment by American businesses into the key growth sectors of these nations. A greater emphasis is being placed on technical assistance programs, the aim of which is to raise the quality of our advisory training experience in the fields of agriculture and education. As for me I shall continue to oppose the giving of aid through your tax dollars to any nation that gives aid and comfort to the Communist effort to rule the world.

I am happy to report to you that while the present Administration has made peace its primary goal, the President has assured us that it will not be a peace without honor and that it will not be a peace that might necessitate the sending of troops all over the world in a few years hence to settle difficulties arising from a hasty retreat or repudiation of our responsibilities to the freedom of others.

I close with this thought: this is a great nation in spite of what we may feel is wrong with it. What is right far outweighs what is wrong. America is the hope of freedom for people all over the world; especially in these days when Congress is debating the matter of the ABM System we need to be reminded that as the world's best hope for freedom we have a moral responsibility to remain strong and to defend these shores. We cannot be a second-class nation defense-wise in view of the expressed intent of another nation's leaders who boast they are out to bury us. Certainly I believe we must not overextend ourselves in the capacity to make war against another but common sense dictates that we cannot underextend ourselves in terms of our defense. To do so would be to invite disaster and all of our efforts to solve the social and economic problems would go down the drain because we, as a people, would no longer have a voice in them.

We as a nation must remain strong. We must remain a world leader. We must carry our heavy burden.

If for no other reason. we must remain a torch—not unlike Lady Liberty's torch in New York harbor which is a symbol of hope for freedom-loving people who are oppressed throughout the world.

America must remain strong and free as a deterrent to those forces in the world today who would move to enslave, to chain and to capture the minds and spirit of free men everywhere. We cannot afford to be less the world leader, less the champion of freedom.

Our country is beset by problems, unrest, suspicion. There is strong talk in the land today that we are through, that we are licked, that we are dead.

I shrug this off. I turn a deaf ear to it. I ignore it when I can. I have found it untrue, a falsehood. I share with you the enthusiasm you have shown on this great day, for this fine and glorious country which we all, together, call our own.

A LETTER TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HARDIN

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, because of hearings in which I was deeply involved this morning in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on legislation I have instigated dealing with navigation safety on our inland waterways, I was unable to listen in on the opening hearing of the House Committee on Agriculture on the many bills pending before that committee dealing with a general farm program and with the food stamp program. I was particularly anxious to hear the testimony of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin on the food stamp program. I have now had an opportunity to read his testimony, and I am glad to see his general endorsement of the purposes of the food stamp program and read his ideas for improving it. I do not agree with all of his proposals, but I certainly agree on the need for a substantial increase in funds to bring about greater participation and provide greater benefits, as both the present and the previous administrations have recommended.

On June 23, 1969, after the administration had announced its plans for changes in the food stamp program if sufficient funds are made available, I addressed a long letter to Secretary Hardin on this issue, and also on the fat-in-hot-dogs issue. Because of the relevance of portions of this letter to the Secretary's statement yesterday on the food stamp program before the Agriculture Committee, I have decided to make public the text of that letter, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1969.

Hon. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since meeting your charming wife at a recent reception where the crush of guests made it impossible for me to find you and express my willingness to work with you on issues of mutual interest, I have been hoping to have an opportunity to meet with you to discuss the future of the food stamp program. I believe you were advised of the several speeches I have made in the House during the period you and your associates in the new Administration were weighing your course of action. Now that your decisions have been made and the Administration bill forwarded to Congress, I will, of course, do my best to help you obtain those provisions which conform to my own long-held views on the important potential of this program, but there are some features of the Administration bill which I am not convinced are good policy, including the proposal for free stamps. At the same time, I recognize that this would mean very little in actual dollar cost. I am just afraid of the possible psychological consequences to public support for the expansion of the program and for the necessary increases in appropriations if moderate-income families, paying admittedly high taxes, see very low-income families using the stamps extravagantly (as some undoubtedly do out of lack of experience in food buying) and not having to pay even as little as 50 cents a person or $3 a family for the equivalent of $25 worth of food purchasing power per person per month.

One woman wrote me recently incensed at the idea of welfare families in the District of Columbia being allowed $132 a month for food for a family of six when she feeds her family of six on substantially less. (She was referring to Senator Hart's wife's experiment in staying within the D.C. Welfare food budget for a month—and the amount was $132 for a family of eight, not six.) The woman who wrote to me, and whose husband earns in the neighborhood of $10,000 a year, said she was feeding her family on $30 a week. When she learns that under the Administration Food Stamp bill, a family of her size could obtain about $150 a month in food stamps, and pay absolutely nothing, I am sure she will be indignant all over again. I use her only as an example of the kind of public outcry to be expected in making more food available free to very poor people than moderate income families feel they can afford to buy. While I can defend the food stamp program in terms of allowing people to eat properly for the same amount of money they would normally be expected to spend for food, I fear the reaction to the idea that it is to become just a handout program, like the much-abused and discredited direct distribution program where the only needs test has often been one's willingness to stand in line for the commodities each month.

However, I assume these factors were fully taken into consideration in reaching your decision on the free stamp issue, and there is not much value in attempting retroactively to dissuade you from a firm position. I cite my feeling on it only so that you will understand why I oppose this feature of your bill. On most of the other features—not all, but most—I believe that the basic need is not so much for language changes in the 1964 Act Preamble or in details of Administration to be written into the law, but in assurance that sufficient funds can be and will be appropriated. Thus, I am pleased to see your decision to seek open-ended authorizations for the three fiscal years after 1970. This is what I fought for in the House last year, and won—only to lose the battle in the Senate-House Conference.

Now I would like to mention another matter, on which the official Administration position has not been solidified. It is the "hot-dog" issue. I have received numerous complaints about the difficulty of patients on doctor-imposed low-cholesterol diets being able to know what foods are suitable—or safe—for them to eat. My own feeling is that the "juiciness" defense for the high fat content of frankfurters is like the old "artificial ham" problem confronted some years ago by your predecessor. The argument then for wanting permission to include added water at ham prices was that hams sold only in intrastate commerce could get away with this practice while inspected hams could not, and the public was expressing preference for the "juicier" product. My proposed solution then was to prepare a bill to extend meat inspection to intrastate commerce. That eventually came about, but Secretary Freeman solved the added water labeling problem in hams more directly, and with wisdom, by dropping the misleading requirement that they be labeled as "artificial," and requiring instead the label words, "water added."

It seems to me that in economic fairness to the public, and out of consideration for people required by their doctors to eschew fat in their diet, a similar solution could be found in the frankfurter issue by requiring the labeling words "fat added," and *preferably with a percentage figure*. Many consumers complain to me about the tastelessness of frankfurters, and the speed with which they spoil or become slimy. Undoubtedly, the added fat contributes to that. If the telltale words, "30% (or any specific percent) fat added" were required on the label, I am sure some processors would then decide to market all-meat no-fat-added frankfurters, and the public could then make a conscious choice. At present, this choice is not available.

While it might appear to be a minor issue, I remind you, from a foreign trade standpoint, that the justification for the high imports of Australian beef has rested in the need for this product for processed meats such as frankfurters. It makes sense for the State Department to enlist our support against beef import quotas on the argument that Australian beef is needed for processed meat because of its low quality grade, compared to the concentration by American cattle raisers on choice steers, when the low-fat Australian beef in frankfurters is then larded with 30 or 35 percent, or any other high percentage, of fat. The question might well be asked, why not just use more American beef, which is already fat enough for juiciness in frankfurters? And, of course, the answer to that question would appear to be that Australian beef is cheaper than American beef, and the added fat is cheap, and you thus reduce processing costs compared to using American beef. From the standpoint of your Department, undoubtedly a higher fat content in frankfurters would increase the usability of American beef for this product. But I am sure you are also obligated as an Administration official to look at it from its foreign trade aspects. Australia is a major U.S. customer. What are we to buy from them if we cut off their beef? This could well happen through quota legislation if we now officially designate a fat content in our processed meats which eliminates the major technical argument for continued large supplies of Australian beef. I would appreciate having your thinking on this aspect of it. I am also going to write to the Secretary of State along the same lines, because I *did* help in previous years in staving off highly restrictive quotas on imported meats, but I feel I need some assurance that in doing so, we were being told the whole truth.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. John B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, 3rd District, Missouri.

(P.S.—In authorizing use of chicken in frankfurters, without requiring they be labeled as "Chicken Dogs", what restrictions does your Department impose on the types of chicken parts used in the frankfurters? My information is that the "chicken" is merely waste skin scrapings.)

McCLELLAN DENIES NERVE GAS TESTS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good bit of publicity given to a report released by the Army Friday outlining nerve gas testing it has been carrying on. One of the installations where the Army indicated it was testing this gas was at Fort McClellan, Ala., which is located in my district.

I made it a point over the weekend to discuss this matter with Col. William McKean, commander of Fort McClellan. Colonel McKean told me emphatically that no nerve gas is being tested in the open air at that installation. I am convinced that there is no danger whatsoever in the academic-type tests that are being conducted at Fort McClellan.

Reports such as those made by the Army Friday can be dangerous, especially when the public is given only the basic facts by the news media. I would hope that any Government agency which makes reports such as this public, as rightly they should, will be more careful in the future. It should be made clear what the facts are, and not allow conjecture by the reporters covering such releases.

I am pleased that reporters for the Birmingham Post-Herald and the Birmingham News took the extra time to check out this report before printing it. I would like to include these stories from the Post-Herald and News respectively in the RECORD at this point.

The stories follow:

McCLELLAN DENIES GAS TESTS

FT. McCLELLAN.—A spokesman at Ft. McClellan denied late Friday that open air testing of lethal nerve gas is being conducted here.

A statement released by the Department of the Army through the Ft. McClellan Information Office, refuted an earlier disclosure by the Pentagon Friday that the tests were being carried out at Ft. McClellan, at Dugway Proving Ground in Utah and Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland.

The spokesman for McClellan said small amounts of lethal chemical agents only—no biologicals—are used here in defensive training exercises to train personnel in decontamination, detection, and explosive ordnance demolition procedures.

"As an example, a toxic chemical agent such as mustard gas, would be poured on an empty artillery shell and EOD (Explosive Ordnance Detection) Teams undergoing training would be directed to decontaminate the shell."

"There has never been open air biological testing at Ft. McClellan," he added.

The Pentagon said the gases being tested include Tabun, Sarin, Soman, VX and mustard. VX was responsible for accidentally killing 5,000 sheep last year when deadly gases were tested at Dugway Proving Ground in Utah.

The military also unveiled Friday the extent and nature of its program in documents supplied to a House government operations subcommittee.

The documents are the first admission that open air gas testings have been conducted at locations outside Dugway, committee sources said.

The Army said it tested 67 different gas weapons at Dugway and 47 at Ft. McClellan between April and June of this year.

ARMY SAYS NO OPEN AIR NERVE GAS TESTS HELD AT McCLELLAN

FT. McCLELLAN.—The Army has emphatically denied that any testing of nerve gas is being conducted at Ft. McClellan.

"Any such statement is completely in error," a Department of the Army announcement said Friday night following reports that open air tests were being conducted.

The reports originated in Washington at a House operations subcommittee hearing, in which Army officials were questioned.

Col. William McKean, commander of Ft. McClellan, said the only testing being conducted at the post is the academic type, by scientists.

"It's all on paper, however," he said, "not for real."

The post uses small amounts of mustard gas in training operations. Mustard is not a nerve gas.

Nerve gas is odorless, colorless, and would be fatal unless a victim received medical attention quickly.

According to the subcommittee report Friday, open air tests were also being conducted at Dugway, Utah, and Edgewood Arsenal, Md.

It was near Dugway that 6,000 sheep were killed by nerve gas last year.

The Department of the Army announcement said that no biological testing has been conducted anywhere since 1967, and has never been conducted at Ft. McClellan.

A supply of nerve gas and other gases are stored at the nearby Anniston Ordnance Depot. It is contained in shells and mines which are stored in sealed concrete vaults.

Col. Sam Burney, commander of the depot, said the gas presents no threat.

The depot is one of several storage areas in the United States. Methods are now under study to find a safe way to remove the gas and either bury it at sea or chemically deactivate it.

The Army said mustard gas is potentially lethal. It is being used in small amounts at Ft. McClellan for decontamination training.

"As an example," a spokesman said, "a small amount—and we emphasize the term 'small amount'—will be poured onto an empty artillery shell. Then the explosive ordnance demolition team would be told to decontaminate it."

There are no tests, the spokesman said, where mustard gas is released into the air.

Rep. Bill Nicholas, D-Sylacauga, said today that, "I am convinced there is no impending danger from any work being done at the Chemical Warfare School at Ft. McClellan."

Nichols, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, said he had consulted with Col. W. A. McKean, of Ft. McClellan. McKean said no nerve gas is tested in the open air.

Nichols said that only academic studies are conducted such as theory and lectures.

In Washington, congressmen already concerned about chemical and biological warfare research expressed more alarm upon being told the Army has an open-air, nerve gas testing program.

Rep. Henry S. Reuss, D-Wis., chairman of the House Government Operations subcommittee investigating such programs, said, "I am concerned about this and not convinced of the necessity of all this environmental testing."

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, R-Md., said he would ask for immediate suspension of the nerve gas testing. He also called for full reports on the testing from the Army, including details of safety precautions taken to protect surrounding areas.

Rep. Clarence D. Long, D-Md., whose district includes Edgewood, said he wants the testing stopped until Congress is fully informed.

"Frankly, I'm getting awfully tired of the military plunging ahead on so many fronts without consulting Congress," Long said.

Secret testing at the Dugway installation in Utah drew nationwide attention last year when some 6,000 sheep were killed in the area. The commander of the test center which administers Dugway said last Dec. 6 he didn't believe the Army nerve gas caused the death of the sheep, but he said aerial testing had been stopped.

WAYNE GUTHRIE ASKS NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wayne Guthrie, of the Indianapolis News, wrote a thoughtful and incisive commentary on the Declaration of Independence in the News of July 4, 1969. In his masterful style he shows the emptiness and hypocrisy of so-called new thought that has permeated so much of American society. And he shows how it might very well destroy all that the Founding Fathers sought, and all that we hold dear.

Mr. Guthrie's article follows:

NEW DECLARATION COULD REINFORCE OLD

(By Wayne Guthrie)

On July 4, 1776, our forefathers issued the Declaration of Independence which made possible this great nation and its countless blessings.

Isn't it about time Americans issued another declaration of independence—declared their independence from many of the current ideas, philosophies and practices that not only contravene the dreams, hopes, aspirations and intentions of those forebears but also threaten and imperil the very existence of the nation they founded?

Shouldn't they discard, banish and eliminate them entirely before, leech-like, they strangle and squeeze out the last drop of freedom and liberty Americans enjoy?

What are some of those fuzzy notions that are alien to the factors that made America great? You can recognize them. Here are some of them.

That freedom is free. It is not. It is a jealous mistress. Its price is eternal vigilance.

That liberty is a carte blanche license to do whatever one wishes without regard for its consequences or for the rights of others. It is not. It cannot be divorced from the responsibility for one's acts.

That people have a right to disobey laws they do not like and spurn and defy courts in constituted authority by taking into their hands the law or what they think the law should be. They do not. That would invite chaos and anarchy.

That people have a right to preach defiance of law. They do not. That would tear down our legal structure, the only instrument that assures people of their rights of due process, equal protection and freedom from abuse.

That people seeking relief from grievances—either real or imagined—have a perfect right to hurl firebrands, bombs, stones or other missiles at passing cars or persons or into buildings or to commit arson, assault, mayhem, other bodily injury or other acts of violence. They do not. If condoned or not checked or stopped, such acts can lead only to anarchy which is the doorstep to dictatorship.

That the prohibition of indecent, libelous or blasphemous public utterances injurious to public morals or private reputations abridges the right of free speech. It does not. Otherwise the result would be unbridled defamation and undermining of character and respect for persons, institutions, officials and governments.

That the right of peaceful assembly sanctions mob rule. It does not. Otherwise, nothing but chaos would result and there would be no security for life, limb or property.

That the rights of free assembly and speech give anyone a license to break into, disturb or disrupt and break up the peaceful assembly of and by others. They do not. Those rights are two-edged swords that apply to all and cannot be denied to anybody by anybody.

That patriotism is completely passe. It is not. The brave men, living and dead, have proven that, as Abraham Lincoln said, "beyond our poor power to add or detract."

That society can and should look after one's children. That is not so. One of the greatest contributors to juvenile delinquency is that children are alone at home so much of the time while mothers are away at gainful employment, extra-curricular activities or social functions.

That America owes every one of its citizens a living. The opposite is true—each person owes every loyalty to it because he just happened to be lucky enough to be born in it.

That inflation is a bugaboo and not anything real that should cause any worry or concern. That is not true. It can break down the nation's currency and solvency, can lead to utter financial confusion and collapse and can result in repudiation of all debt. It is very real.

That maybe, after all, Communists are not as bad as pictured but are, perhaps, simply humanitarians who, in their own way, are planning reforms. Nothing could be farther from the truth. If they are humanitarian reformers, why do they resort to mass murders and unmentionable tortures? That is their barbaric way of removing all liberty and reducing mankind to endless slavery.

That we can trust Communism and its pledges. We cannot. History has proven that. The purpose of the present dream of that evil force is to disrupt, ruin and destroy the free world and reduce all men to helplessness, leaving a dictatorial band in control.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM DORN

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and South Carolina colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, delivered a splendid address recently before the South Carolina General Assembly.

Mr. DORN speaks eloquently of the cooperation of Federal and State Government with private enterprise and the academic community in making and keeping America No. 1 in space, economics, and promoting world peace.

Congressman DORN's speech is worthy of the attention of all Americans, and I am proud to submit it for the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

Thank you, Governor West, for your very gracious and warm introduction. Speaker Pro-Tem Carter, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Joint Assembly, and my friends, it is a great honor to be extended this opportunity. I am flattered and honored beyond measure by your gracious invitation to be with you today. The training and the inspiration which I received in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of South Carolina have been my best education and have proved most beneficial to me in our service in the National Congress. I am very proud of the fact that I served here in both bodies and am proud to be one of your Representatives in Washington. I feel that as one of your Congressmen, I represent the people of South Carolina and this great General Assembly in Washington. Our State Capitol Building here in Columbia is one of the most beautiful Capitol Buildings in the entire world. I commend you for keeping this great symbol of liberty, justice, and progress in our State in such splendid condition.

It has always been a great pleasure to know your distinguished Lt. Governor West and to be associated with him. I feel a very deep affection and love for Senator Edgar Brown, who seconded the motion to seat me in the Senate here when I was a little bit younger than my friend Mike Laughlin. I know of no one in the history of South Carolina who has contributed more to progress in our State and the cause of good government than Senator Brown. Mr. Carter, I regret that our beloved Speaker, Sol Blatt, could not be with us here today. Speaker Blatt has served as Speaker longer than any other Speaker in the United States, national or state. Your Congressmen in Washington are proud of the South Carolina General Assembly. You have provided for South Carolina a good image, and you have maintained a good and respected State government. Our South Carolina government compares favorably in integrity, devotion, and dedicated public service to any other government in the world. I know that you have the honor and respect of your fellow citizens. We want to move forward with you, forward with our great State and our Nation.

The house where I live in Greenwood County was built in 1852, and it was then in Abbeville County. The man who built that house, Dr. John Perkins Barratt, was a scientist and a doctor. He predicted in 1850 in a speech at Erskine College that someday man would go to the moon. In Italy, early in the 17th century, Galileo thought along similar lines and was ostracized by some of his contemporaries for his interest in space, in the moon and the planets. Just a few weeks ago Colonel Borman and his splendid crew went into orbit around the moon ten times and return to earth. People ask: Why put a man on the moon as we will do this year? Why spend these billions of dollars? Why spend this money when there is so much disease and poverty in the world and in our own country? Why spend this money on the moon? Why not look at the American ghetto in the great cities of the Country and to the many things that need to be done? Why?

Columbus discovered a new world despite the fact that people in his day and time thought the world was flat. He refuted the theory of his contemporaries, went into the great unknown of the Western Sea, and discovered a new world. Out of Columbus' discovery has grown the great arsenal of democracy that we know today as the United States of America, which is not only the heart and core of freedom, but also a Nation with emphasis on the dignity and the worth of the individual. Our Nation gave birth to a great capitalistic system, which has meant so much not only to the people of our great country, but to the peoples of the entire world. Columbus took that great step and gave us new horizons. John F. Kennedy, in a message in 1963 to the first Presidential Prayer Breakfast in San Jose, Costa Rica, said that Columbus was the forerunner of our American freedom of worship, of Christian ethics and Christian morality, lending emphasis to the worth and dignity of every single individual. Columbus was the forerunner; he was the man who took the risks, who believed in tomorrow, who did not look back but sailed straight into the Western Sea.

Charles A. Lindbergh in 1927, as some of you remember, flew the Atlantic in a single-engine aircraft nonstop to Paris, a distance of more than 3,000 miles. He held the key that opened the door to a new generation of thought and progress. He opened that door to tomorrow, a door to science and technology undreamed-of before, and thrilled and challenged the people of the world. Unfortunately, the Nation soon slipped into the greatest depression in history. Men who were dedicated to science and technology in the research labs and in our great academic communities had to dig ditches with pick and shovel. The United States was stagnated, floundering socially and materially. Scientific and educational progress in America was strangled in the grip of that great depression with 14 million unemployed. We didn't know which way to turn; we could not see over the horizon. Then out of the mist of the North Pacific the Imperial War Lords of Japan struck Pearl Harbor and exploded forever the theory that we, as a nation, could stand still. The American people were threatened with disaster and slavery. Our Government called on business leaders, the academic community, the military, and government agencies to all work together.

When Franklin Roosevelt said that we had to have 50,000 planes in one year, we produced almost 100,000 in one year. We had underestimated our technology, our science, and our capabilities. When the freedom of the American people was challenged, we rose to the occasion. Out of the necessities engendered by this attack, synthetic rubber, antibiotics, a whole world of industrial development, new jobs, new opportunities, medicine, nuclear science, and jet propulsion came into practical use. We entered an entirely new era. Many of the products developed during World War II were the direct results of that challenge to our freedom and national security.

In the '50s and '60s these industrial developments thrust our Nation into prosperity unprecedented in the history of the world. I remember after the war we again began to slip into complacency, patting ourselves contentedly on the back. I recall being at the White House in 1947 with a group of your Representatives, and the question was asked of the President of the United States, "What about Soviet Russia?" The President laughed and said, "Soviet Russia will never be a threat to America in your lifetime." "What about atomic science, Mr. President?" "In my opinion the Russians will never master atomic science, but if they do, it will be in the late '50s or '60s," he answered. I want to say to that President's credit that when Russia exploded an atomic bomb, just a few months after that meeting, he immediately, against the advice of many so-called experts, ordered the construction of the hydrogen bomb. We beat Russia by barely six months with the hydrogen bomb. This jolted our Nation and jolted the free people of the world. Again, we had to tighten our belts and with our great team of industry, government, and the academic community, we met that challenge and pulled ahead of Russia in sophisticated armament.

We then began to get complacent again, and I remember so well the day in Washington when Russia launched Sputnik in 1957, and then, only a few months later, Gagarin, the Russian astronaut, circled the globe in space. Shocked again, just as we had been by Pearl Harbor, we had to go to work again, and we inaugurated our space program. Since that day it has cost in excess of twenty billion dollars and is costing approximately five billion dollars a year. Again, why? American prestige, for one reason; military security, for another—and let's look for a moment at industrial development. I am informed that on Apollo 8, there were five million parts and that American ingenuity, American know-how, American science and technology reached a perfection ratio of 99.9999 on the Apollo 8 flight. This expresses more eloquently than words could the stimulus that our space program is giving to industrial development.

When people tell you that "everybody makes mistakes," I want to tell you today that in the space world there are very few mistakes made. Apollo 8, a flight that orbited the moon ten times, is a tribute to American science and technology. Credit goes to the team that I want to keep emphasizing: government, industry, the academic community, and most important, the American people who pay the bill and support such efforts. We have unlocked that door that Galileo dreamed of hundreds of years ago. We hold in our hands today the key to exploration and utilization of space. We are indeed a nation and world with unlimited horizons.

What are some of the by-products of our endeavors in space? Nonflammable materials are significant products affecting our textile industry. Computers and all types of electronic equipment have come into prominence and a battery which is superior to anything that we know today will soon be on the market. Yes, in fact, 80% of the computers in the world today are manufactured in the United States of America. When one surveys our overall balance of payments, we are losing billions of dollars a year. Yet a look only at the space-related areas of electronics and computers shows that the United States regularly achieves a trade surplus of well over a billion dollars a year; stated simply, the United States exports much more electronic goods than we import.

We are producing and manufacturing as a result of scientific and technological programs during World War II and in the 1950's 70% of the world's civilian jet aircraft. This is an eight billion dollar business in this country. Two hundred universities here worked in our space program; at the peak of our efforts, 400,000 people in every State in the American union and twenty thousand different industries were making parts for our space program.

Why the space program? We hear the question about poverty and disease. What is the real answer to poverty and disease? What has been the answer the last few years? Salk vaccine and other medicines have demonstrated what can be done. We have made more progress in medicine in the last ten years than in the previous thousand years of the history of the world, and we must not turn that clock back. We have heard that song about "One More Tomorrow." Members of this great Assembly, you can look forward to millions of tomorrows. This is the most fantastic age and the greatest era in all the history of the world. Yes, virtually every university in this country contributes to this program. Thousands of doctors and Ph. D.'s are working on research in order to put America first in space and to put our men on the moon. What about South Carolina? What about our great Aiken plant, an investment of over three billion dollars by the American people in the Savannah River plant? Some of the men who helped make this possible are here. It is related to our space programs. Yes, we had to have material that wouldn't burn. They are doing reseach there on cancer and heart disease. If you haven't been to this great plant I hope you will do so at your first opportunity.

Consider our nuclear generation of power, another billion-dollar project in the Western part of our State. South Carolina is a part of this program, is a part of the future. We are just beginning to unlock that door, and it is a source of energy which will benefit man more than any other development in our history.

A young man, a South Carolinian, came into my office not long ago and said, "I want to thank you, Mr. Congressman, for sending me to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs." He said, "I am proud of these silver wings—I can fly anything in the world." He added, "I have already been selected for the team to land on Mars in 1981." He was happy. He wasn't like these extreme right-wingers and left-wingers that I run into around this country. He smiled, threw his shoulders back, and said, "Yes, I am going to Mars, and so I am studying medicine, the same courses you have at the Medical College in South Carolina. After all the other courses that I have taken, I am studying medicine in order to know the effects of space on the human body so that I can medically treat men on Mars." He said, "I am going, and I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity."

I wish time would permit my reporting to you about the accomplishments of South Carolina students in national and world affairs. We had one from our District, a student at the United States Air Force Academy who ranked fourth in the graduating class, first in thermo-dynamics, and you know I don't think I could make 5% on that course of study. This student from South Carolina is flying today in the Pacific. Yes, we are looking to tomorrow. We are confident of the future. We are not afraid of the future.

What is the best way to fight poverty and disease? The best way is to create more wealth, more opportunity. This can only be done by such great endeavors as our space programs and our nuclear programs. These programs demand a team that reach the point of perfection mentioned a moment ago. They can and will eliminate poverty, as completely as it can be done, by the creation of new wealth, just as Columbus led the world out of the darkest of times.

We have as a nation created a high standard of living, developed an unprecedented philanthropy, and most importantly, have a genuine concern for our fellow man. When Colonel Borman circled the moon for the last time, he saw out in space the most beautiful sight he had ever witnessed. The Colonel saw the earth, and he told me in Washington, as he had told some of you over the air, that when he saw this world at that moment he realized more than ever before that the world is one community, and one brotherhood of men. He realized that what goes on in one part of the world will affect the future of all the world.

One day not long ago, an American missionary called the President of the Pharmaceutical Society in Washington on a Sunday—you know we do get calls sometimes on Sundays and in the middle of the night, just like you do. He wanted millions of dollars worth of medicine for children with leprosy and smallpox in Africa, and Monday morning the one million dollars of medicine was pledged and soon on the way. America does care—America is concerned. We are a compassionate people, and this is why we have to press forward with our programs regardless of the cost. We know that the balance of world power is about 50-50, and we could lose our associations and friendship with the people of Africa or South America or Asia. Our freedom and independence is at stake. We know that you are aware of it, and we know that Americans are concerned. We are concerned about the millions of people in places such as Calcutta, India, who do not have sewerage and who do not have running water. We are concerned about those who are born on the sidewalks of Calcutta, and who die on the sidewalks of Calcutta without ever knowing a home. America is concerned. We do care, and we are developing our programs to preserve the freedom of the American people and of all people throughout the world.

If the Soviet Union should reach the moon first—if the Soviet Union should reach Mars first—it would be difficult for you and me to sleep nights in this world. We must go there in the name of freedom, to secure peace in this world, for the dignity of man and the worth of the individual, and in order to preserve our inalienable rights. I am one of those who remember those depression years of the 1930's, when a troop of cavalry passed the high school and the principal of Greenwood High turned us all out to see those gallant men riding from Georgia to Fort Jackson. I wondered then how those men would stand up to armored tanks and bombs from the sky. The gallant Polish Cavalry taught the world a lesson when they charged the German Panzer divisions. They were mowed down like wheat in the harvest.

We must advance with science and technology to preserve our Nation and to preserve the freedom that we enjoy. The Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain, these artificial barriers cannot, in this age of communications with television and radar and all of the electronic marvels, hide the progress of a free people. Someday the people behind the Iron Curtain are going to find out about individual freedom and private enterprise. You can't keep ideas out. Truth will make them free. They are going to find out about America and our standard of living, and they are going to change the governments of those nations because men inherently want to be free.

In the lifetime of our young people, I believe there will be no nuclear war. Freedom will advance on earth and seep through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. The world will be free. In the meantime, we must move forward with our space program and continue as the "arsenal of democracy", and as the heart and hope of mankind. We must preserve the freedom and opportunity that we enjoy in this great Country today and export it to the ends of the earth.

Yes, you live in a great State. You represent a great State, a great Southland, the nuclear center of the world. With Cape Kennedy in Florida, Marshall Space Center in Alabama, and Houston Space Center in Houston, Texas, our capabilities are ever expanding. And I might mention the great men whom you sent to Congress during and before World War II. It was these great men, Committee Chairmen, most of them, like Dick Russell and Carl Vinson who sat in on every major decision during and since World War II, and Congressmen from the Southland whom the President of the United States called in during World War II and said that he had to have two or three billion dollars for a project, but he could not tell anyone the details. These men, without a moment's hesitation, gave the go-ahead signal for experimentation with nuclear energy. We split the atom, and we are free and secure today because they made that effort and took that step.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I believe in tomorrow, and I believe in our great State. I believe in the future of our Country. I think we are just on the dawn of the greatest era in the history of the Southland and the history of South Carolina. We stand to benefit by these great programs of government, science, industry, and the academic world working together and cooperating for freedom, for security, for wealth, for job opportunity, and for the capitalistic system. We now know the way to eliminate the problems of our society.

On the walls of the United States House of Representatives in Washington, we have placed over the Speaker's chair in gold letters "In God We Trust". Then above these words are placed the immortal words of Daniel Webster, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART VII

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week, human life will have reached out into the universe to touch a future as fathomless as infinity. In this soaring moment of history, Apollo 11 astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin will become earth's first emissaries to another planet. In his excellent series on the history and events leading to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, Mr. Bloom records the sum of centuries of learning and experimentation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Bloom's revealing article:

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE: A LITTLE BUG CONCLUDES A SCIENTIFIC JOURNEY THAT BEGAN 2,500 YEARS AGO

(By Mark Bloom)

"When man has conquered all the depths of space, and all the mysteries of time, then will he be but still beginning."—H. G. Wells

It will be early morning on the long, hot lunar day when human life first reaches the moon.

The first sign will be hardly noticeable, just a tiny, black shadow flattening itself against some hilly, brown and gray lunar landscape.

But as it skims rapidly toward the west, the shadow will grow ever larger until it begins to resemble an elongated, four-legged insect.

Finally, just above a smooth patch of the moon in the Sea of Tranquillity, the shadow will halt its westward course.

And moments later, as the shadow reaches its full size, it will be touched by four, bowl-shaped pieces of shining aluminum.

At this instant, Apollo 11's lunar module will be on the moon. Aboard: Neil Armstrong and Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin, earth's first emissaries to its satellite

At this instant, the human spirit, as indefinable as faith or love but as real as the moon, will have swept man to another victory in his never-ending quest for accomplishing what has not been accomplished, for learning what has not been learned, for traveling to where he has never been.

In this soaring moment of history, human life will have reached out into the universe to touch a future as fathomless as infinity.

Like all explorers from the dawn of time, the banner of discovery will be carried by men who live by the subtle thrill of danger. Armstrong and Aldrin, highly trained and supremely confident of their skill, will trust their lives on the airless wastes of the moon to countless others. Despite the smooth, almost mechanical efficiency of their mission, the dangers are very real. In this most hazardous of all voyages, they risk a horror no other men have ever known—that of being marooned on another world.

Yet the promise of victory outweighs all, for man will at last be touching another planet, spearheading the conquest of the solar system and beyond to search for life in other worlds.

Though it will be two Americans who land, Armstrong and Aldrin will not simply represent the United States, but all men down through the centuries whose dreams have reached beyond their grasp.

"The question of the meaning of the lunar landing is a serious point," said Thomas O. Paine, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"We in America think it is based on science of all mankind over the centuries. We in the United States are proud and pleased that it is given to us to be the first to land on the moon. But . . . it is being done in the name of all mankind."

In a sense, the Russians deserve much of the credit. It was the first dramatic Soviet accomplishments in space, and the blow they gave to our national pride, which spurred President Kennedy to urge that we land a man on the moon before the end of the decade.

But man's desire to walk upon the stars did not begin in 1957 with Sputnik 1, or with the flight of Yuri Gagarin four years later. It is thousands of years old, possibly as old as mankind itself.

The voyage of Apollo 11 is a crowning achievement of the human imagination, the sum of centuries of learning and experimentation, as man slowly and painfully pieced together the secrets of his world.

Slowly but surely, almost 2,000 years before Columbus and Copernicus, the Greeks began to unravel the basic structure of the solar system.

Aristarchus of Samos (310–230 B.C.) concluded that the earth revolved round the sun in a circular orbit, an observation which was received with about as much enthusiasm as it was when Copernicus brought it up again 18 centuries later. Man was far from ready to accept the idea that the earth—at least physically—was not the center of the universe.

The next great step was made by Johannes Kepler, who published in 1609 the laws of orbital motion—showing that planets do not move in circles around the sun, but in ovals.

At last, the apparent wandering movement of the planets across the sky could be calculated by a mathematical formula—a formula that holds as true for the earth or Jupiter or the moon as it does for Apollo 11.

Early in 1610 there was an event which had more significance for man's understanding of his universe than any other—until Apollo 11. Galileo pointed a telescope into the sky.

In rapid fashion, he saw wonders which man had never seen before. He saw four moons circling Jupiter, ending forever the concept that everything in the universe circled earth. He saw the rings of Saturn. He saw the vast cratered stretches of the moon, and realized it was another world—a terrestrial body like the earth. The great astronomer spied the valleys, mountains and craters of the moon.

He saw enormous dark areas which he thought might be seas. One of these, along the moon's equator, is now called the Sea of Tranquility. It is there Apollo 11 will land.

After Galileo, man's awareness of his place in the universe was never the same. Man could no longer be sure he was king, even of his own solar system. If the moon looked like the earth, did it follow that it was populated by human beings? If not the moon, were the planets populated? The stars?

Some day, man had to find out the answer to the basic question: Is there life somewhere else?

In 1687, Newton published his theories on gravity and motion which, among other things, explained why the moon orbits the earth and why the earth orbits the sun.

With his knowledge, the countdown began for man's first trip to the moon less than 300 years later.

But one major detail was still to be worked out. What in the world was powerful enough to hurl man past the earth's tenacious forces of gravity?

In 1899, a popular book called "Half Hours in Air and Sky" offered the hope that some discovery would be made to allow "a visit to our neighbor, the moon."

"The only machine independent of the atmosphere we can conceive of," said the book by an unidentified author, "would be one on the principle of the rocket. The rocket rises in the air, not from the resistance offered by the atmosphere on its fiery stream, but from internal reaction."

It was a remarkably accurate assessment of how men would travel into space, especially since it appeared four years before Russian scientist Konstantin Tsiolkovsky published his paper showing, for the first time, that a rocket would work in the vacuum of space.

American physicist Robert H. Goddard, (1882–1945), considered to be the father of modern rocketry, was still in high school, in Worcester, Mass., when he wrote an article called "Navigation in Space." It suggested that heat from radioactive materials could furnish sufficient power for a rocket to navigate a spacecraft across interplanetary space: In effect, a nuclear rocket, more than a half-century ahead of its time.

Current NASA studies show that a Saturn 5 nuclear upper stage, currently in an early phase of development, would be the only practical way to send men to Mars in the relatively near future.

Goddard's paper was rejected by Popular Science News, Scientific American and Popular Astronomy.

By 1909, two years before he received a doctorate in physics from Worcester's Clark University, Goddard had concluded that multi-stage rockets would be required for space flight, and that the most efficient rocket fuel would be a combination of oxygen and hydrogen.

Sixty years later, a three-stage Saturn 5, with the upper two stages powered by liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen, was poised to hurl Apollo 11 toward the moon.

On March 16, 1926, on a farm owned by Goddard's aunt near Auburn, Mass., he staged the world's first flight of a liquid-fueled rocket. Goddard's rocket climbed to a maximum altitude of 41 feet as it sped 184 feet across a field at an average speed of 60 miles an hour. Total flight time for the 10-foot-tall rocket was 2.5 seconds. It was an historic step on the road to the moon.

While Goddard's contributions to rocketry were enormous, and he occasionally received front-page notice of his experiments, the full worth of his contributions were unrecognized until after he died.

German rocket scientists who surrendered to American troops in 1945 were amazed at the questions from U.S. intelligence officers. "Why are they asking us this?" they asked. "You have Goddard."

As it turned out, Goddard's work was so advanced that fifteen years after his death the Air Force, the Army, the Navy and NASA were forced to turn over a total of $1 million for infringing on his patents in the development of Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, Redstone and Vanguard rockets. The money went to the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation of New York which, at the urging of Charles Lindbergh, had financed Goddard's rocketry experiments in the 1930's.

While Goddard's work aroused mostly derision in the United States, a Rumanian-born German scientist named Hermann Oberth was highly interested.

In 1922, he wrote Goddard for a copy of a paper called "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," commenting: "I think that only by the common work of scholars of all nations can we solve this great problem . . . to pass over the atmosphere of our earth by means of a rocket."

In 1923 Oberth, recognized along with Tsiolkovsky and Goddard as one of the three great rocket pioneers, published "The Rocket into Planetary Space," which advanced many of the ideas of Goddard and Tsiolkovsky, and discussed the problems of space flight more exhaustively than had been done before.

In 1927, the famed German Rocket Society was founded, and Oberth became president two years later. A founding member was another rocket pioneer, Willy Ley, who came to the United States in 1935. In 1928, a young student named Wernher von Braun joined the society.

By 1932, however, a small nucleus of the society's members, most prominent among them von Braun, had been absorbed by the German army for rocket work. As it turned out, it was aimed more at the heart of London than at the stars.

While Oberth went back to teaching, von Braun, though still a student working toward his doctorate, became chief rocket development engineer for the German army ordnance department. The military man in charge was Capt. Walter Dornberger, who rose to general by 1945.

In 1937, the von Braun-Dornberger team moved to Peenemunde on the Baltic Sea where the V–2 was developed to bombard England.

When the war ended, in what was known as "Operation Paperclip," the cream of the German rocket team was whisked to the United States—von Braun, Dornberger, Kurt Debus, Arthur Rudolph and many others.

Von Braun is now director of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., where the Saturn 5 moonrocket was developed; Dornberger recently retired as vice president for research of Bell Aerosystems, Buffalo, N.Y.; Debus is director of NASA's Kennedy Space Center at Cape Kennedy; Rudolph recently retired as project manager of Saturn 5 development at Huntsville.

On July 28, 1960, NASA announced—all on the same day—the start of projects called Apollo, Surveyor and Ranger. Later would come Lunar Orbiter. These four projects, plus Mercury and Gemini, made up America's drive for the moon.

Rangers 7, 8 and 9 sent back to earth the first close-up photos of the moon, scouting potential manned landing sites. Five Surveyers soft-landed on the moon, sending back to earth thousands of ground-level views of potential manned landing sites. Five Lunar Orbiters, circling the moon as low as 30 miles, sent back hundreds of photos, mapping the surface for manned landings.

Six one-man Mercury flights showed man could function in space near the earth. Ten two-man Geminis showed man could live in space for up to two weeks, maneuver a vehicle to a rendezvous, and return to earth with pinpoint accuracy.

And then Apollo, a project of such stupendous magnitude and complexity that it virtually bars comparison. Comparing Apollo to Gemini, for instance, would be equivalent to matching a supersonic transport against a DC–3.

Apollo required a Saturn 5 rocket, a booster four times mightier than any previous one, so powerful that even Goddard would have gasped at its strength.

It required a three-man command cabin and a two-man lunar landing vehicle, both outstripping the imagination in complexity.

It required a world-wide tracking and communications system so efficient that astronauts and ground controllers would be able to chat easily from 240,000 miles away; so efficient that men on the earth would know virtually to the inch where Apollo was flying in the void of space every instant; so efficient that the ground would know at all times how every component on the spacecraft was working.

It required a management system that could trace every wire or switch or solder back to the ore where it was mined; a system that would keep track of a project which involved 20,000 companies and more than 300,000 persons.

It required $24 billion.

It faltered once, badly. On Jan. 27, 1967, a fire in the Apollo 1 capsule killed astronauts Gus Grissom, Ed White and Roger Chaffee during a pre-launch test. But the lure of the moon grew no less strong because of this tragedy.

"If we die," said Grissom a few weeks before the fire, "we want people to accept it. We are in a risky business, and we hope that if anything happens to us it will not delay the program.

"The conquest of space is worth the risk of life."

WILL DURANT: A LAST TESTAMENT TO YOUTH

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there are few men with the gift of intellect and perception of Will Durant. There are few men, too, who can match his experience, his literary flair, and his judicious optimism.

In a recent girls school commencement oration, Mr. Durant addressed himself to our moment in history. He came away noting that we are making progress. We have not achieved Nirvana, but we are making progress:

In Mr. Durant's own words:

Do not let the pessimism of contemporary thought darken your spirits; this is the passing mood of a transitional age, when we have waged a shamefully barbarous war, when the blackest sins of our history demand atonement and when some of our fairest myths have faded and left a somber emptiness where once they chastened our conduct and warmed our hearts.

Above all, Mr. Durant is a man who appreciates civilization, and one who fears that its fruits may be lost. His caution should be heeded.

I include an excerpt from Mr. Durant's speech at this point in the RECORD:

WILL DURANT: A LAST TESTAMENT TO YOUTH

(By Will Durant)

(NOTE.—At 83, Will Durant, an elder statesman of American letters, has seen vast changes occur in the United States. In a recent commencement address to the graduating class of the Buckley School for Girls in Los Angeles—of which his granddaughter was a member—the noted philosopher-historian gave his views on the current turbulent American scene. Following is a partial text of the address, entitled "A Last Testament to Youth.")

It is good that the young should rebel and the old should resist; it is essential that minorities shall be heard; and one of the admirable aspects of the contemporary scene is the patient maintenance of free speech and minority rights by democracies tempted to answer force with super-force, joining in the martial march of authoritarian governments.

But the time has come for old and young to realize that civilization is endangered in its very foundations, that the social order that tamed us from savages into citizens is weakened in all its supports, and that the fruits of democratic progress may in a generation be lost in a contest between permissive anarchy and a police state.

What can we oldsters do about it? We can listen to the cries of the disadvantaged and dispossessed, and open the ways to controlled experiment with new ideas. We can check our racial antipathies by realizing that whichever side wins in a violent clash of races of classes, democracy, humanity, and security will disappear.

We can try to cleanse the avenues and halls of politics so that one need not be a millionaire to be eligible to the presidency. We can join the young in restraining our government from undertaking to police the world instead of bringing hope and health to the poor.

If we can check our rush into imperialism we have the resources to educate every American for profitable employment even in our ever more automated and computerized society. We have been clever and generous enough to spread the benefits of our inventiveness, enterprise, and skill to 80 per cent of our people—the greatest achievement in economic history; we are learning to let consumption keep up with production.

Two more generations, given enlightened leadership in government and industry, may reduce the impoverished 20 per cent to 15 per cent, to 10 per cent to 5 per cent to zero. That would be the fulfillment of Amos and Isaiah; it would be the resurrection of Christ.

And what can you privileged youngsters do? First, continue to study. It is not true that education will merely plunge you into a coarsening race for material rewards; it will enlarge your understanding and make you more patient with complex problems and the shortcomings of men.

Study the roots of our crime and corruption, our economic inequities, and our political failures; see how strong these roots are in the processes of biology, in the nature of man, and in the centuries of history.

Reconcile yourselves to modest and gradual improvements after your proposals have faced the necessary test of conservative resistance. Continue to express your dissent and your needs, but remember to remain civilized, for you will sorely miss civilization if it is sacrificed in turbulence of change.

Beware of those who take their vocabularies and privies; they are trying to cover up their lack of confidence in their own manhood by leveling you with themselves. Wear your hair and your feet as you like, but keep them clean, and do not add to the pollution of the air. Watch your sexual freedom that it bring no hurt to others or yourself. Lasting affection—the most precious gift of life—is rarely won by hasty accommodation to irresponsible desire.

Do not let the pessimism of contemporary thought darken your spirits; this is the passing mood of a transitional age, when we have waged a shamefully barbarous war, when the blackest sins of our history demand atonement and when some of our fairest myths have faded and left a somber emptiness where once they chastened our conduct and warmed our hearts. Do not yield to the mechanistic philosophy that grew from a physics long since rejected by physicists; man can make marvelous machines, but he is not a machine; let not the work of your hands conceal the miracle of your minds. Every one of you is a mystery of rational consciousness; every girl among you is a temple and glory of creative life.

Do not believe those dispirited spirits who call progress a delusion; progress is intermittent but it is real. A hundred advances that I pleaded for in my youth—like higher wages, more humane employment, governmental checks on private industry, the partial redistribution of wealth through the welfare state, the spread of comfort and leisure, the extension of education, the multiplication of colleges and universities, the freedom of speech, assemblage, and the press, the access of every American to the ballot, to public office, to the professions, to the Supreme Court—all these have become accepted parts of the American system since my wife Ariel and I agitated for them in our political puberty. If the founders of our republic could return from their graves they would marvel at our advances, and would brand our pessimists as ingrates whinning because perfection has not been laid at their feet.

I believe that we shall solve, or dissolve, within the limits of our nature, one after another of the problems that harass us today. Already our government, through a maze of difficulties, is seeking to end a disastrous war. Our ethnic minorities will enter in ever greater number into our high schools, colleges, and universities, they will get the courses that their pride may claim, and those that their adjustment to technology requires; they will rise in industry, in the professions, in the arts and sciences, and in public office; they will become established parts of the American scene as did our German-Americans, our Irish-Americans, our Italian-Americans, our Polish-Americans, our Jewish-Americans, even a French-Canadian-American like me. And, like their predecessors, they will lower their birth rate as they raise their income; and the urban ghettoes will relieve their pressure and their poverty by following a hundred outlets into American life. It will take more time and patience than before, but it will come, or America will lose its meaning in the history and aspirations of humanity.

HALT TO TESTING OF MIRV'S

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, is presently holding hearings on legislation calling for a halt to U.S. testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles—MIRV's.

Those hearings were stimulated by House Concurrent Resolution 259, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). I share Congressman BINGHAM's concern that testing and deployment of a MIRV system at this time would not only seriously escalate the costly and increasingly dangerous arms race, but may jeopardize the possibilities of reaching a meaningful strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. It is for that reason that I have joined with more than 30 Members of the House in cosponsoring his resolution.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD, Mr. BINGHAM's testimony before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments, on the opening day of the hearings, and commend it to the Members of this body as a most convincing and impressive argument for a sane initiative to halt this new spiral of armament:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

As the sponsor of the first Resolution introduced in the Congress (H. Con. Res. 259) calling for a halt to U.S. testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs), I wish to express my appreciation to this Subcommittee, and particularly to you, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling these hearings. I'm certain that the 31 other members of the House from both parties who have co-sponsored my Resolution, or who have introduced identical Resolutions, join me in that regard. The Committee's response to this situation, which many of us view as critical, is most gratifying. I share what I'm certain is the hope of this Subcommittee—that these hearings will spur a conscious and carefully considered decision on our further national action in the short-term future with regard to the development of MIRV weaponry. Some officials have argued that we have already made our decision on the MIRV. I personally disagree with that view. But whether or not it is accurate, I feel that we have nothing to lose and everything to gain from continuing to appraise and even reappraise, in the face of changing national and world conditions, our commitments to develop weapons systems of such great significance, and involving such great resources, as the MIRV system.

The expense and sophistication of the American and Soviet weapons arsenals have increased almost without interruption over the past several decades. The Congress and a great many capable and well-intentioned officials of the Executive branch, from the White House on down, have proved essentially powerless to divert this trend—so powerless as to lead to the regrettable conclusion that as soon as new and more expensive weapons become technically feasible, their development and deployment become practically inevitable. Not even the unprecedented determination with which the current Congress is examining and evaluating defense expenditures and procedures promises to produce more than a partial and perhaps momentary flutter in the rising costs and efficiency of the super-powers' capability to destroy.

Not only has our national preoccupation with death-dealing forces diverted valuable resources in ever-increasing amounts from efforts to improve the quality of our lives, it has failed significantly to improve our arms advantage relative to the Soviet Union—if such an improved advantage is necessary. Each increase in the total capability of either nation sets off a counter-reaction, allowing no more than a fleeting gain by either side and leaving relative capabilities essentially static.

The only ray of hope in the rather dismal picture of the future this situation portends is the possibility that agreement can be reached between the Soviet Union and the United States to limit armaments.

Several times in the past two decades the United States has attempted to reach strategic agreements with the Soviet Union.

Since 1958 we have had five instances of significant mutual restraint. They are: the nuclear test moratorium of 1958–1961; the Antarctic Treaty of 1959; the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963; the treaty for Peaceful Use of Outer Space, in 1967; and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968.

The record of successful arms limitation efforts is clear. In each of these five cases, acts of restraint preceded formal negotiation. The United States and the Soviet Union suspended objectionable activities before initiating talks. To a degree, discussions and treaty-writing only formalized existing moratoria. The real restraint, the suspension of actual or potential arms-race activities, came about through independent self-restraint by one or both of the great powers.

Unsuccessful arms limitation efforts have followed a contrasting pattern. In the cases, for example, of possible foreign base cut backs and the reduction of bomber forces, negotiations began before either side began practicing voluntary restraint. When negotiating partners feverishly conduct an activity which they say they are interested in negotiating to suspend, the talks predictably flounder, or fail even to begin. Neither side can afford to risk being left at a lasting disadvantage by the other's latest advance.

This record, I think, clearly disproves the contention that it is useless to try to reach agreements with the Soviets—that such agreements cannot be reached, and if reached will not be honored. The record shows, however, that negotiations are difficult to convene, and agreements—once negotiations are underway—are particularly difficult to achieve in the absence of prior restraint by one or both sides. Therefore, if we are to achieve further arms control agreements, we must improve our ability as a nation to tailor our national policies and operations to achieve and maintain an optimum environment for negotiation and accord.

The courage to take reasonable risks by refraining from acts which may be regarded as provocative or "destabilizing" is certainly essential in assuring an international environment conducive to fruitful negotiations.

Continued testing of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles is both provocative and "destabilizing". The very psychology of the arms race requires that each major new weapons system or concept developed by one side be duplicated with all haste by the other. Furthermore, Soviet military leaders, like their counterparts in this country, must be assumed to plan and act on the basis of the worst possible implications of each new development in the weapons field.

MIRV was first introduced by Defense Secretary McNamara as a counter to the now obsolete Soviet Galosh system of ABMs around Moscow. By increasing the number of warhead reentry vehicles, it was thought we could outnumber and overwhelm any Soviet ABM city defense, and thus maintain the credibility of our deterrent.

But the purpose of the MIRV, and the Defense Department's arguments for it, have shifted. As Secretary Laird clearly indicated in recent testimony (Defense Posture Statement, March 27, p. 36), MIRV guidance is now being perfected so that it will be accurate enough to destroy enemy missile sites. The Defense Department has announced its intention to improve the accuracy of the Poseidon missile, for example, "enhancing its effectiveness against hard targets." As early as 1968 it announced that MIRVs would be "far better suited for destruction of hardened enemy missile sites than any existing missile warheads." If it is not a first-strike capability, therefore, it is the closest thing we have to such a capability.

As counterforce weapons, MIRVs would be far more deadly than single-warhead missiles, even though the single warhead has greater explosive power. Some physicists have calculated that a MIRVed missile would do 70% more damage to an enemy's hardened missiles than a single-warhead missile. With further refinement of the guidance system, MIRV missiles could be many times as effective against an adversary's hardened weapons as our current Polaris-Minuteman force.

To the Soviets, therefore, the purpose of our MIRV program may well seem to have shifted from maintaining the credibility of our deterrent to providing a first-strike capability. Thus, from the worst-contingency view that must be assumed by Soviet leaders, MIRV development can only be regarded as provocative and threatening. Each step we take toward making this system operational, the greater the pressure we exert upon the Soviets to step up and carry through to completion their own efforts in this area.

There is disagreement as to whether the development of MIRV weapons systems to the operational stage will make an effective arms control agreement impossible. But there is little disagreement that the development of MIRV weapons to the operational stage will make an arms control agreement much more difficult. As I'm sure the Subcommittee is already aware, when there is only one warhead to a missile, the deployment of land-based warheads can be observed by satellite surveillance. Once the factor of multiple warheads is introduced, such verification becomes impossible without intense and extensive on-site inspection.

That being the case, one would think that there would be agreement among all those who want to achieve arms control agreement that the development of operational MIRVs should be deferred pending the SALT talks. One can only suspect that those who argue otherwise do not really want to see the SALT talks succeed. I am making no charges here, but it has been commonly accepted in Washington for a long time that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are basically hostile to arms limitations.

If we can agree on the proposition that deferment of the development of operational MIRVs would be useful, then surely it follows that flight testing to that end should be suspended. The question then becomes: how can we achieve such a suspension of testing?

I submit the simplest, quickest, and easiest way is for the U.S. to announce its suspension of such tests together with a statement that the suspension will continue as long as the Soviets also suspend their testing program. Obviously, the Soviets would be advised in advance that we were to make such a statement so that they would not be taken by surprise, but there would be no need for them to make an explicit agreement to suspend their tests also.

While I have the greatest respect for Senator Brooke and for our colleagues who have sponsored the Brooke resolution in the House, I believe that it would be a mistake for us to continue our testing program until we can achieve some kind of explicit agreement with the Russians that they will do likewise. Even if we were to attempt to reach such an agreement privately and informally, the effort is almost certain to mean delay, when time is of the essence. Moreover, to talk in terms of an informal agreement is bound to arouse the opposition and fears of those among us, who, with some justification, are skeptical of the trustworthiness of the Soviets.

Whether we have an explicit agreement to suspend testing, or whether we take the first step, inviting the Soviets to follow suit, our own suspension of testing would presumably not continue if the Soviets did not suspend testing, or having suspended, then resumed. Thus, a mutual moratorium following our initial suspension gives us just as much protection as an informal agreement. The advantage of the initial suspension, of course, is that it involves no delay whatever. And the sooner the testing can be suspended the better. We may not be in as good a position to succeed in the SALT talks as we were a year ago, but we are undoubtedly in a better position than we will be three or six months from now. The further the MIRV tests have been carried, the more likely it is that the talks will founder over the issue of verification.

Under H. Con. Res. 259, of course, if in his judgment the President felt that the best way to proceed would be to try to reach an informal agreement with the Soviets to halt MIRV testing prior to the convening of formal talks, he would be in a position to do so. It seems a mistake to me, however, to seem to suggest, as the Brooke resolution does, that no suspension can be achieved unless the Soviets are willing to make an explicit agreement for a mutual suspension.

What would my friends, Messrs. Anderson and Cohelan, recommend we do if the Soviets indicate a willingness to follow our lead in suspending tests, but not to make any explicit agreement until all the SALT talks issues can be resolved at once?

While H. Con. Res. 259 did not so state, it was my interpretation of it that the U.S. would have to resume testing if the Soviets went right ahead with their testing. It has been suggested that the second operative paragraph of the resolution should so specify. I am prepared and intend to introduce a revised version of my Resolution adding this stipulation.

To fail to show maximum restraint now, or to complicate the procedures for achieving restraint by imposing an unnecessary and possibly troublesome condition of U.S. action may well put us on the same road that has proved in the past to lead to failure at the negotiating table. I therefore respectfully urge the Committee to report favorably a Resolution which will provide the clearest, most unconditional directive to the President to halt MIRV testing by the United States and to continue to refrain from such testing so long as the Soviets do the same until a mutual halt has been fully considered in projected formal negotiations with the Soviet Union.

PATTERN OF CONCESSION FAMILIAR TO COMMUNISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we encounter further disappointments in the quest for peace in Vietnam, realistic appraisals of foreign policy contacts with the Communists are essential to the understanding of the problem.

A renown expert on communism is Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Copley Press writing in the South Bay Daily Breeze, Wednesday, June 25, drives home a point of special significance:

PATTERN OF CONCESSION FAMILIAR TO COMMUNISM

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

BRUSSELS.—The creation of a "provisional government" in South Vietnam to replace the Communist National Liberation Front has an ominous ring to anyone who has studied Communist tactics over the years.

Although the United States officially dismissed its importance, the Reds' announcement proves again their intention to take over the whole of Vietnam.

They seem convinced that what they haven't been able to win on the battle front will be handed them by a Washington that is hopelessly entangled in dissent.

Precedents give the Reds good reason to be optimistic.

The Lublin Committee set up by Stalin in Poland in 1944—in opposition to the legitimate Polish Government in exile operating from London—became a "provisional government" of Poland and finally took over, though it was non-representative.

In Yugoslavia Tito formed a provisional regime that took over from the legitimate government in exile.

It happened in Romania, in Hungary, in China and it can happen in Vietnam.

In their confrontation with the Communists the West has shown a lack of staying power. It has always been goaded to alternative solutions.

When President Nixon made his Vietnam speech in May and talked of "free election," South Vietnam diplomats and government officials were shocked. The President, they said, had put doubt on the legitimacy of the Saigon regime and had seriously weakened it.

Secretary of State William Rogers' statement that the United States was not "wedded" to any regime in South Vietnam sent another shudder through the Saigon men. The announcement that 25,000 U.S. troops would be withdrawn immediately contributes to the belief in Europe that the Americans are on the way out.

Many political observers I have talked to during a month in Europe predict that the Reds will now use every means to increase pressures on the Nixon administration for a quick solution in Vietnam.

A new wave of anti-war activity may erupt in the United States.

Although U.S. and Western diplomats pooh-pooh the creation of the "provisional government" as "a not terribly new wine in old bottles," and a propaganda trick, let no one minimize its importance.

It was immediately recognized by Algeria and the Communist countries. It will get recognition not only from the Communist bloc, but even perhaps from countries like Sweden.

It is sure to get endorsement from left-wing, liberal and pacifist groups in the United States who will clamor for recognition of its legitimacy, and for merger with the Saigon regime.

It is the seed of confusion and demoralization.

If the Communists are right, it will mean that we have learned nothing from the history of the last 30 years and the war will have been fought in vain.

Coalition with the Communists has never worked. Why should we think Vietnam is different?

A WAY TO ATTACK THE DRUG PROBLEM

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the President's message yesterday is a welcome bright spot on an otherwise dim horizon.

Daily, our news media recount alarming narcotics and drug abuse problems throughout the country, and the increasing incidence of crime to which the narcotics and drug abuse trend contribute greatly.

To my mind, the President's initial move to checkmate this scourge on the American scene attacks the problems on many fronts—all of which must be considered if the increasing drug abuse problem is to be dealt with effectively. Federal and State legislation are essential; international cooperation is a must; increased manpower and money and a commitment to effective enforcement are required; education, training, and research are basic; and the interchange of ideas and information among knowledgeable Federal and State officials must necessarily be productive. Anything less than the combination of all of these elements would be inadequate.

I look forward to receipt by the Congress of the legislation which the Attorney General is to submit and to the sympathetic, full consideration by the Congress of this legislation and the requests of the administration for the wherewithal to carry out the President's imaginative 10-point program.

With the cooperation of the public, our educators, our researchers and scientists, our lawmakers at all levels of government, our law-enforcement personnel and courts, and our corrections personnel, the drug abuse problem can be licked.

ALLIED PEACE PROPOSAL REJECTED

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's news carried the unhappy report that the North Vietnamese have rejected out of hand the latest allied peace proposals. This is particularly disturbing to those of us who had hoped that if the United States and South Vietnam went halfway toward accommodation, the other side would respond with at least some movement toward a compromise solution to the Vietnam war. The continued inflexibility of the North Vietnamese raises the question of how much further the critics of the President would have him go without expecting at least some reciprocation from the other side.

A few months ago, many of us in this House rose to commend the President for the reasonableness of his Vietnam bargaining position as outlined in his May 14 address to the Nation. Last week the allied position was set out more clearly and reasonably by President Thieu. It is obvious then that in the past few months the President and our allies have bent over backward in preparing a bargaining position which is both flexible and cognizant of the continued suffering of the Vietnamese people.

This country has halted all bombing of the North and has refrained from reinstituting this action despite provocations by the enemy, and despite the inflexibility of the other side at the Paris talks. In a further effort to bring peace to Southeast Asia, the President announced on May 14 an imaginative eight-point peace plan. Under the arrangements outlined in this position statement, the United States pledges to withdraw all troops from Vietnam shortly after a settlement is reached. Nevertheless, the other side continues its inflexible insistence upon a U.S. withdrawal prior to a settlement, without reference to the presence of North Vietnamese troops in the South.

In subsequent actions the President has further underlined the sincerity of his peace program. Our withdrawal of 25,000 troops is clearly a signal to the other side that we desire no American hegemony in the area. Additionally the administration has announced its willingness to accept any political arrangement which might be forged for South Vietnam through free elections. And just last week President Thieu was even more specific, proposing that an internationally supervised election be held in South Vietnam with the opportunity for participation by all political factions.

By the allied offer of free elections we confirm the altruistic nature of our commitment to South Vietnam. By the North's rejection of this offer, they confirm the weakness of their hold on the loyalty of the people of South Vietnam. By our offer we are consistent in espousing the rights of all individuals in South Vietnam to participate in the political process and determine their own destiny. By the North's denial of interest in this opportunity and responsibility, they are admitting the undemocratic nature of their cause.

Clearly then, the United States and our allies have been generous and flexible in approaching a peace settlement. Now it remains for the other side to respond with the same flexibility and with the same sense of compassion for the ordeal of Vietnam's people.

MINTING OF 100 MILLION SILVER DOLLARS TO COMMEMORATE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, PROPOSED

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday 145 Members of the House joined me in the introduction of legislation which would authorize the minting of a 40-percent silver dollar bearing the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower. Over on the other side of the Capitol, Senator DOMINICK and 26 of his colleagues sponsored an identical bill.

The proposal is a simple one—requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a minimum of 100 million Eisenhower dollars annually for a period of 3 years. Most coin authorizations cover a minimum period of 25 years, but my proposal is deliberately pegged at three in order that Congress might review the silver situation at that time. The Treasury has a sufficient amount of silver to fulfill a 3-year commitment. We can then decide whether or not to continue issuing a coin of prestige quality or whether we should switch to metals of lesser value. In any event, it is assumed that Mr. Eisenhower's likeness will remain on the coin for at least the traditional 25-year period.

The metallic content of the proposed coin is proportionately the same as in the Kennedy half-dollar. There is a growing commercial need for a coin dollar. The vending industry, in particular, is interested. It is true that coin collectors will undoubtedly grab up the initial minting. But just as the Kennedy 50-cent piece began to circulate after a time, the Eisenhower silver dollar will also circulate.

A couple of years ago, the Treasury Department decided it was no longer interested in silver as a reserve metal. So, 165 million ounces were transferred to the strategic stockpile and holders of silver certificates were given an opportunity to redeem their holdings. Now, the remaining stocks are sold to foreign and domestic users at a rate of 1.5 million ounces a week. These sales are always made at prices below the prevailing market and have gone as low as $1.51 an ounce recently.

On the other hand, the Eisenhower coin monetizes at $3.16 an ounce and would give the taxpayer more than twice the profit on the silver than is now being realized.

Finally, a word must be said about using this method as a vehicle for honoring President Eisenhower. Few men in our Nation's history had the opportunity or the capacity to serve their country in so many ways. Fewer still were held in such high esteem by their fellow man. The Eisenhower coin should be of the same quality as the one it seeks to honor—as solid, as genuine, as prestigious as the man himself.

I will be happy to submit additional bills should any more of my colleagues decide that they would like to join me in paying tribute to our late President in this fashion. If you care to cosponsor, please call my office—extension 6611—and notify any member of my staff.

RAILROAD DISCOURAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LAMENTED BY AMERICANS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, many times I have taken the floor of the House to lament the increasing disappearance of passenger trains from American life, and I have authored legislation which is directed at correcting some of the problems in this matter.

However, passenger train service, in many cases, continues to decline except for the new Metroliner between Washington, D.C., and New York City which is carrying, I am told, capacity passenger loads.

The success of the Metroliner is reportedly having a positive effect on other rail service to New York. Recent figures have indicated an increase in passenger service on the older trains on this run since the Metroliner service began earlier this year.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that a great number of Americans want good train service, yet it is difficult to find.

I call particularly to the attention of my colleagues five letters to the editor in the Christian Science Monitor from persons also concerned about passenger train service. These letters appear at this point in the RECORD:

RAILROAD DISCOURAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LAMENTED BY AMERICANS

To the TRAVEL EDITOR:

Your recent article concerning a trip on the California Zephyr and particularly your experience making reservations for it prompt me to write this letter. First, it is irresistible to reminisce. In 1949 I returned from San Francisco to Boston by rail, having driven an automobile to San Francisco.

Never will I forget that Zephyr trip (coach, too): the three spectacular canyons, the Nevada desert by moonlight, and even the prairies in broad daylight—all seen from the Vista Dome—were an unforgettable American epic.

And I distinctly recall a train employee traversing the coach aisles dusting and polishing the metal trimming on those comfortable seats with leg rests; the pleasant surprise of finding a luncheon coach where one could purchase sandwiches, salads, soups, and beverages instead of the usual diner serving the multicourse meal at outrageous expenditure of time as well as money. Such memories refuse to die.

I still am unconvinced that "passenger railroading is hopeless," as a railroad official recently stated. (As an amusing contrast, we limped into Boston on one of the Boston & Albany's wooden coaches with green plush seats—remember those reversible backs?)

But it was your experience with the reservations that provides the real impetus for this letter. About four years ago I attended a convention in Cleveland, a distance of only 250 miles from my native Cincinnati. Complications at both ends of this short trip led me to take the train as the most convenient solution. I secured a roomette with no difficulty; there was one other roomette occupied in our entire coach. A gentle porter of the old school felt talkative, and I found his information interesting.

He asked me if I knew what railroad people were doing to discourage passenger traffic. Beyond the discourteous attitudes of some railroad personnel, I replied that I did not.

He said that when prospective passengers went to ticket offices to buy tickets, they were told that no space was available on the train they wished to take. Having turned people away by this method, railroaders then showed government officials their blank reservation records as "proof" that a certain train was unpatronized, therefore unneeded, requesting permission to discontinue service.

The porter cited another tactic used to dishearten passengers. He said that a crack train from the South, well patronized for years, made an excellent connection in Cincinnati with a northbound train. The schedule was changed so that a several-hour layover in Cincinnati was necessary. The desired effect was brought about—a great falling off of passenger volume on that route. When I mentioned the Western trains, he said wistfully, "Oh, yes, they still give good service."

What a wonderful way it would be for Americans both young and old, as well as European tourists, to see the U.S.A. by train—even as Americans are discovering how desirable it is to see Europe by rail! Why don't we plan for the future? If we can believe what we hear and read, more leisure is certainly on the way for all of us. It seems to me that railroads could have a place in this picture. Why all the hurry? Need passenger railroading be financially hopeless?

MISS GRACE E. SHERWOOD.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

To the TRAVEL EDITOR:

I have noted with considerable approval the positive attitude of your newspaper toward attempting to stimulate the passenger service offered by American railroads today. The number of articles written about good train service and the true joy of traveling by rail attest to this positive approach.

In today's Monitor (June 24, 1969) the several letters written by readers from throughout the nation reinforce a belief I have that many people prefer train travel and would still be on trains if service were provided. The railroads, at least a good many of them, seem determined to "dump" the passenger and frankly I think the passenger has a right to protest through proper channels to the national government.

May I suggest that readers write to their congressmen about the situation. The Honorable Harley O. Staggers of West Virginia is the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and letters to him would be helpful in bringing to the attention of the national government the fact that many people in this country want, and feel our nation needs, good passenger train service. In addition, the National Association of Railroad Passengers is waging a campaign to save our trains but needs support, financial and moral. Their address is: 41 Ivy Street, S.E., Washington, D.C., 20003.

I have written to both Senators from Illinois as well as my Representative from this district, the Honorable Charlotte T. Reid. Their response has ranged from polite to mild interest. If more interested citizens of this country who prefer relaxed rail travel to hectic, nerve-shattering air travel, would write to their appropriate members of Congress perhaps we can collectively still save a seemingly dying mode of travel.

Any comments your paper or readers have on this subject, would, I think, be of considerable interest. Thank you for your attention to this letter.

JAMES E. DIESTLER.

AURORA, ILL.

To the TRAVEL EDITOR:

May I take just a moment of your precious time to tell you how much my sister Katherine and I enjoyed your article on railroads in the June 10 issue of the Monitor. This one seems particularly beautiful—all the "pleasant" aspects of train travel—every detail of it given to us in such a fascinating way, showing your appreciation of all those little niceties we all love to hear about.

But best of all that lovely paragraph of the "wail" of the locomotive and of the engineer "who was guiding his train with the utmost concern for his passengers' comfort." When we read that, we couldn't help but capitalize that "Engineer" for the moment, remembering our "take off" for Lisbon and two months abroad on June 29. It was a very comforting thought to us and we just had to tell you about it.

We haven't words to express our appreciation for those lovely articles you give us every Tuesday. They are always so fresh and full of delightful enthusiasm such as your description of Luxor—that sleepy little town and the clop-clop of the horses. We loved it!

MISS HARRIETT HUNDLEY.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

To the TRAVEL EDITOR:

The question you pose in the June 10 issue of the Monitor—"Are U.S. railroads trying to discourage passengers?"—certainly should be answered in the affirmative. The difficulty you describe in obtaining a roomette proves this point conclusively, since in reality several were available.

My own experience in this regard has been somewhat similar. For 10 or more years I have been spending summers in Vermont and the winter months in Texas or California, traveling via the New York Central and Southern Pacific Railroads.

A few years ago I thought I would change my itinerary and go by way of the Canadian Railways. The Montreal Ticket Agent's reply to my request was a genuine "classic" and was phrased in this exact wording: "I don't know what you want to travel by train for. Why don't you go by plane?" Now the Southern Pacific is no longer running between Chicago and El Paso, and no longer carries roomettes between El Paso and Los Angeles. In addition, the commuter train (Santa Fe line) runs no train between El Paso and Belen, New Mexico, from where I traveled to San Francisco.

There's something about this situation which almost defies analysis, since many persons prefer to travel by train, and also the fact that the airports are reportedly overcrowded. I wish to thank you for your excellent articles, and hope that you may help to uncover and correct this problem.

Mrs. W. B. KING.

EL PASO, TEX.

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

I read your interesting article "Are U.S. railroads trying to discourage passengers?" My answer is a big "yes." Last year we went up to Alaska—so before we left by car we phoned the Southern Pacific Railroad and asked them if we could get a train from Los Angeles to Vancouver, B.C. They told us not to bother with the railroad, but to fly up there. At first they said the train we wanted was already filled—then we called their bluff and said we were going higher up—then they made the above statement about taking the plane. It's really a shame that the railroads have to sink so low.

I believe that your paper should go further into this subject and find out just who is in back of this. I would even go further—I would deny any more freight rate increases until something was done about the passenger train. It could be vastly improved. When someone takes the train from here to the East Coast they must get off at Chicago and go across town in Chicago—it's a mess.

In the near future we will need the railroads more than ever when our roads get overloaded.

RUSSELL MAHAFFEY.

LOS ANGELES.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., INDUSTRY HAVE VITAL ROLE IN SPACE PROGRAMS WHICH LEAD TO THE HISTORIC LAUNCH OF APOLLO 11

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body must take some measure of pride in the accomplishments which are leading up to the historic launch tomorrow of Apollo 11 and its gallant crew—Neil Armstrong, Mike Collins, and Buzz Aldrin.

Apollo 11 is the culmination of a national commitment never before equaled in our planet's history. Success of our efforts will prove that this Nation's ability to accomplish tremendous feats is only limited by imagination and determination.

Anytime this Nation makes a commitment, gives it the proper leadership, and follows through with the necessary resources, it can meet that challenge.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon stated the problem clearly as he said we are "reaching with magnificent precision for the moon but falling in raucous discord on earth."

This magnificent precision, so well proven by Apollo, must also be used to spur our efforts in other endeavors on earth. The message of Apollo is clear—total national commitment is the only course to rebuild our towns and cities, eliminate poverty and crime, and improve the lives of our people.

The people of my district in the Greater Rochester area of New York State can take special pride in our space program. More than a dozen firms are directly involved in providing services or equipment for the Apollo program.

I would like to share with my colleagues my praise for the Gannett newspapers, with its headquarters in Rochester, a part of my district. Under the leadership of Paul Miller, Gannett president, and Allen R. Neuharth, executive vice president, the Gannett Co. has made a deep commitment to the space program and the people of the Cape Kennedy area.

In an era when newspapers are dying at an alarming rate, Gannett moved to build a space-age daily newspaper to serve our country's space center. This vital commitment is also shared with the people of my own district.

I would also like to share with my colleagues two articles in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle of July 13 detailing the efforts of the Greater Rochester industry in the Apollo program. The articles follow:

ROCHESTER GOES TO THE MOON—"O" RINGS AND RADIOS

(By Greg Conderacci)

About three minutes before closing time July 3, the telephone rang at Garlock Inc., Palmyra.

The voice at the other end spoke from a little peninsula on the Florida coast from which they fly rockets to the moon.

Apollo 11 would like five sheets of glass-filled fluorocarbon gasketing material designed for cryogenic application, please. Make them up in 48-inch squares three thirty-seconds of an inch thick—and make them fast.

The sheets, similar in composition to the slippery coating that keeps scrambled eggs from sticking to the bottom of frying pans, left Garlock July 10, only six days before scheduled liftoff at Cape Kennedy.

Garlock wasn't the only local business to contribute to the Apollo effort, nor was it the only one that had to hurry production to keep a date with the moon.

NASA paid Eastman Kodak $1,250,000 for a camera to take 100 pictures of the dirt on the moon—and gave the company six months to design, build, and deliver it.

Kodak came up with a device that looks like a jet propelled pogo stick. It will take one roll of pictures, in color and stereo, and will be left on the moon.

The nine-and-a-half pound camera is about as big as a cigar box and is attached to the end of telescoping cane so the astronauts won't have to bend to take close-ups of the ground. (It's even harder to do that in a space suit than it is in a mini-skirt).

NASA actually ordered 16 of the special cameras for which Web Seal Inc., 15 Oregon St., made 16 "O" rings. An "O" ring is a little bigger than, but not unlike, the rubber washer that stops the drip in the kitchen faucet. Cost: about $10.

When the pictures from that camera return they'll be viewed through a Bausch & Lomb Zoom 240 Stereoscope. The stereoscope is used to view them in 3-D.

Apollo 11 will land quietly on a pre-selected spot in the Sea of Tranquility, thanks to a "sophisticated TV set" designed by RF Communications Inc., 1680 University Ave., a Kodak subcontractor.

The "TV set" translated the transmissions from the Lunar Orbiter satellites into pictures from which the landing site was chosen.

Before, after and while Apollo 11 lands on that spot, three rebuilt World War II tankers, crammed with instruments designed in Rochester, will cruise the three oceans as the floating eyes, ears and voice of the Apollo tracking, communication and command network.

General Dynamics was the prime contractor for the Apollo Instrumentation Ships, sleek seagoing electronic platforms, bristling bow to stern with huge antennas. To the Electronics Division of General Dynamics fell the task of planning eight of the 12 major instrument systems on board.

Communications within the ships are over intercoms and telephones built by Stromberg Carlson, a Rochester subsidiary of General Dynamics.

While General Dynamics equipment will keep track of Apollo after it leaves earth, a switching matrix created by J. Cunningham & Son Company Inc. of Honeoye Falls (a subsidiary of Gleason Works) will help watch it on the ground.

The matrix coordinates 60 television cameras on the gantry and arming tower with 100 television sets in the launch control center. NASA engineers can visually inspect their operating functions from the start of countdown to liftoff.

Much has been made of the elaborate sterilization and quarantine procedures the astronauts and their ship will undergo when they return. The idea is to prevent "moon bugs" (which nobody is sure really exist) from spreading a dread lunar plague across the globe.

But scientists were equally concerned that micro-organisms from earth (which everybody knows exist) might contaminate the moon.

The techniques for sterilization and decontamination of the space craft while it was being prepared were outlined by Castle Co., a Henrietta division of Sybron Corp.

On its way to the moon, Apollo will spend a lot of time in the sun. Electro-Optical Systems, a division of Xerox in Pasadena, Calif., helped develop NASA's solar simulator that made it hot for Apollo in order to study the sun's effect on the craft.

Bendix Corp. Vacuum Division, 1775 Mount Read Blvd., designed chambers that would reproduce the environment of the moon so that Apollo instruments could be tested under lunar conditions.

The Vacuum Division also manufactures cryogenic (for use in extreme cold) fuel lines with vacuum jackets that work like thermos bottles to transport the liquid oxygen that powers the Saturn.

On some of the earlier unmanned moon probes part of the payload was a magnetic electron multiplier which measured space radiation. The Vacuum Division also made the multiplier.

"O" rings, TV sets, sterilization techniques and electron multipliers: That's how Rochester is helping send man to the moon and bring him back—with pictures.

"MOONFILM" READY FOR BLASTOFF

The film the astronauts will use to take pictures of the moon will be identical to the film you can buy in the corner drug store—with a few modifications.

Apollo 11 will carry 23 rolls of Eastman Kodak film on a special Estar base that makes the film thinner and lighter. Also, a thinner base means more film can fit in the camera.

The astronauts will expose three rolls of 70mm, one roll of 35 mm and 10 rolls of 16mm Ektachrome MS; two rolls of 70mm and two rolls of 16 mm Ektachrome EF; five rolls of 70 mm Kodak Panatomic X recording film.

The Ectachrome is color film, the Panatomic is black-and-white.

Each roll of 70 mm film is long enough for about 160 exposures and will be used in a Hasselblad camera. The 35mm roll is good for 100 stereo exposures in the special lunar camera Kodak developed for the flight. Each roll of 16 mm film is 140 feet long and will be exposed in a Maurer picture-sequence camera.

HISTORIC APOLLO 11

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning—if all continues to go well—three outstanding Americans, Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., will set foot on the moon in what I believe will rank as one of the greatest journeys of mankind. As these fine young men ascend into the sky on their long journey to the moon the hopes and aspirations of the American people and the people of the world will be riding with them. Every member of the large NASA-industrial-university team who has contributed to this effort since 1961 will be working intently on the accomplishment of this goal of a lunar landing which seemed remote and impossible only a few years ago. The Apollo program has been built much as we build a good home with a solid foundation and painstaking and careful construction, piece by piece, until its completion. Eight years of effort have gone into the development of the engines, the flight vehicle stages, the instrument unit, the service module, the command module, and the lunar module which will make the actual descent and return from the lunar surface. Months and years of effort have gone into the training and development of the operations capability to make this mission possible. Thousands of man-hours have been devoted to the development of the techniques, to the research and development, and to the actual facilities that are needed to assure a successful operation. The United States has built a tremendous technological base which can serve well in the future.

At this moment in time it is important to reflect on what is the future of this major investment in human and material resources that this country has made in our national space program. The Apollo program reached a peak in 1966 when over 400,000 people throughout the United States and over 20,000 contractors and subcontractors were devoting their effort to the successful accomplishment of the Apollo program. Today this effort has declined to approximately 190,000 people involved in the effort. A further decline in this technological capability can ill be afforded. Our Nation and its progress is firmly based on our technological preeminence. The history of the growth of our industry and our total economy has been geared to scientific and technological achievement which brings new knowledge into fruitful use at an early time. Our national space program is making substantial contributions to this growth. We are all aware of the contributions to weather predictions and communications that have been made and the past flights of Mercury and Gemini have begun to open the door not only to the exploration of space but to its utilization.

In every respect the flight of Apollo 11 should be the beginning and not the end of our commitment to a vital and aggressive national space program. There can be no better statement than that which has been placed on a plaque attached to the leg of the lunar landing vehicle which says:

> Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon, July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind.

Indeed they do go in peace in the name of all mankind and may this be the beginning of further quests in the name of improvement of the lot of all people here on earth.

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART VIII

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, America's space program played catchup. This week, Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin will take that historic step to the surface of the moon. In his excellent series on the history and events leading up to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, New York Daily News Science Editor Mark Bloom tells us what it will be like during the crucial 690 seconds to touchdown. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Bloom's revealing article:

APOLLO 11: 690 SECONDS TO HISTORY

(By Mark Bloom)

CAPE KENNEDY, July 12.—Six hundred and ninety seconds pass virtually unnoticed in a person's life. But in this span of less than a quarter of an hour, barely enough time for a coffee break, Apollo 11 astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin will either make history or become footnotes to it.

In this 690-second period, Armstrong and Aldrin will either forge the final 50,000 feet to the surface of the moon, the historic step which was left to them by Apollo 10, or be forced to abandon the effort shy of their goal. During these 690 seconds, they will sweep 310 miles across the face of the moon toward the west, descending on a long graceful curve from 50,000 feet to touchdown.

They will be flying the four-legged lunar module called Eagle on the wings of batteries of computers and mathematical calculations and upon the back of a mighty braking rocket, slowing their descent from 3,800 miles an hour.

Unable to see where they are going for the first 480 seconds, they will be trusting the judgment of an on-board computer as it digests and reacts to streams of information from gyroscopes, accelerometers and a radar.

For this 480 seconds, all they will be able to do is react to warnings from the computer, react to alerts from a maze of dials and lights on their dashboard.

They will be riding on their backs because the legs of the lunar module must be pointed forward in the direction they are traveling, allowing the rocket to have full forward braking.

Not until the astronauts descend to an altitude of 7,600 feet—a point known as high gate—will the computer tip the spacecraft close to upright so that Armstrong and Aldrin can look out of their forward window to see what lies ahead and beneath them.

At this stage in the ride, the lunar module will have slowed its westward speed to about 370 miles an hour, and its descent to about 95 miles an hour.

If all is still going well, man will be 4.83 miles from a landing on a smooth patch of the moon, a spot on the moon which is safe.

In the next 75 to 100 seconds, Armstrong and Aldrin must decide if the lunar module is heading for that hospitable target. If it isn't, they have two choices.

They have about 20 seconds to fly Eagle to a safer landing site (away from a deep crater, for instance) either manually or by directing the computer to do it.

Or they may decide there is not enough fuel left in the braking rocket to handle the job, and choose to leave the honor of the first landing to Apollo 12.

In this case, they would push a button on their panel marked "abort stage." It would automatically separate the two stages of the lunar module, and fire the ascent rocket of the spacecraft, sending Armstrong and Aldrin back into lunar orbit.

There they would rendezvous and link with the command module called Columbia, manned by Michael Collins, for the trip back to earth.

But if everything still looks good during the 164 seconds between reaching high gate and the next critical stage of the descent, known as low gate, a landing is almost assured.

When Armstrong and Aldrin reach low gate, they should be 46 seconds from touchdown.

The lunar module will be 150 feet above and 53 feet west of the landing site. It will be descending at about two miles an hour and gliding west at four miles an hour.

The spacecraft will be tipped to a fully upright position, legs down. Once again the astronauts will lose sight of where they will land.

With the braking rocket still firing beneath them, the astronauts will be coming in to land like a hovering helicopter.

About 20 seconds before touchdown, the westward movement of the spacecraft will have finally stopped, and the astronauts will be descending straight down.

This is critical because forward movement of the spacecraft at landing could break one of its four spindly legs, tipping the vehicle over. If this happened, Armstrong and Aldrin would die on the moon.

During this entire descent from 50,000 feet, Armstrong and Aldrin may simply leave the whole problem up to the computer, which is designed to control a fully automatic landing.

It is more likely, however, that Armstrong, the commander, will take over part of the job during the last 150 feet, making sure the spacecraft has its legs pointed downward with his directional hand controller, but leaving the descent control to the computer.

He could fly the entire descent manually, but this is considered much less likely. It is up to him.

Finally, about two seconds before touchdown, one of the five-foot-long landing probes, dangling from three of the lunar module's four footpads, will make contact with the surface. It will trigger a light in the cabin.

A second later, Armstrong will press a button to shut down the braking rocket. A second after that, the lunar module will plunk onto the surface, falling with the impact of a hop off a three-foot-high wall.

It will be 4:19 in the afternoon on this part of the earth on Sunday, July 20, 1969, a date which will rank with Oct. 12, 1492 in the history of mankind's explorations.

Unless, of course, Armstrong and Aldrin are stopped even before they reach the critical 50,000-foot point above the moon.

"We will not hesitate to postpone the Apollo 11 mission if we feel we are not ready in all respects," said Thomas O. Paine, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after the Apollo 10 success in May.

"Once the voyage has begun," he added, "we have no commitment that would make us hesitate to bring home the crew immediately if we encounter problems."

The epic of Apollo 11 is scheduled to get underway at 9:32 a.m. on Wednesday with the roar of the gargantuan Saturn I booster. If there are countdown delays, the mission could slip to Friday or next Monday.

But if everything is not ready by then, the next chance to launch would be Aug. 14.

The most important factor in choosing these launch dates is the angle of the sun on the pre-selected landing sites. It must cast long shadows so that hazardous craters will be visible. In addition, the sun must be behind the astronauts as they head eastward toward a lunar landing site so they won't be blinded as they look out the window.

There are five pre-selected landing sites along the moon's equator, running from east to west. If Apollo 11 is launched July 16, it will attempt to land at site two, about half way between the center and the eastern rim of the moon as seen from earth.

If it is delayed to July 18, the sun angles would be right for site three. Site five would be the landing site for a July 21 launch. If the mission is delayed to August, site two would again be the first choice.

Assuming, however, that Apollo 11 gets off on time, the Saturn 5 will hurl the astronauts into a 115-mile-high parking orbit, allowing a trip and a half around the earth to make sure everything is go for the moon.

If it is, the third stage of the Saturn will reignite at 12:16 p.m. and power Apollo 11 toward the moon at 24,600 miles an hour, starting an almost replica of the mission of Apollo 10, which saw astronauts Tom Stafford and Gene Cernan swoop to within 50,000 feet of the surface.

After a cruise of 73 hours and 10 minutes, the Apollo 11 crew will fire their steering rocket to slip the spacecraft into lunar orbit at 1:26 p.m., July 19. The initial orbit of 70 by 195 miles will be lowered to a 62 by 76-mile high path about four hours later.

Here too, there is a point where Apollo 11 could become an also-ran. If everything is not functioning just the way it should, the astronauts will forget about the steering rocket and let the moon's gravity pull the spacecraft around, whipping it back toward earth.

Assuming again that things go well, the big day for Apollo 11—July 20—moves into high gear at 1:47 p.m. when Armstrong and Aldrin, having moved through the tunnel connecting the command module and lunar module, undock from the mother craft.

Just as in Apollo 10, the command module then makes the first move, performing a maneuver which in effect, flies a two-mile-diameter circle around the lunar module as the two spacecraft fly half-way around the moon.

This maneuver, called a mini-football, allows Armstrong and Aldrin to check out Eagle on their own, trying out communications equipment, guidance and navigation gear, and generally making sure all is ship shape.

At the same time, Collins in Columbia returns to the lunar module's vicinity at the end of the mini-football, ready to make rescue if Armstrong and Aldrin are in any trouble.

And if everything is still as advertised, Armstrong and Aldrin will keep on the trail of Apollo 10 by firing a burst from their descent rocket at 3:14 p.m.

This puts the lunar module into an orbit ranging between 50,000 feet and 70 miles, just like Apollo 10. At 4:07 p.m., they reach the 50,000-foot point.

When Apollo 10 reached this point, it continued in its lunar orbit. Armstrong and Aldrin, however, fire the descent engine again, starting the 690 seconds toward history.

Even if Armstrong and Aldrin land, however, they won't necessarily walk on the moon. The first two hours after touchdown are devoted to getting ready to fly off the moon, in case anything goes wrong. The first optimum chance is two minutes after touchdown; then nine minutes later; then two hours after landing.

And even if this period is passed, Armstrong and Aldrin won't be ready to take their historic steps. First they eat. Then they rest for four hours, possibly even catching a few winks. Then they eat again. Then, and only then, they get ready to emerge.

At 2:12 a.m. July 21—after 10 hours on the moon—Armstrong pops open the hatch, slides out of the cabin feet first, and climbs down a nine-rung ladder toward the surface, pulling a lanyard to turn on a black-and-white TV camera as he descends and giving the world its first view of men on the moon.

His first activities on the surface will be to test his footing and gait against the strange effects of one-sixth gravity, and then to gather about two pounds of rocks in the "grab bag" container.

This container, which he carries in his pocket, will be used to make sure Apollo 11 has some of the moon to show for its trip in case the walk has to be cut short.

About 30 minutes after Armstrong first emerges from the hatch, Aldrin follows down the ladder, and the pair proceed to lay out three scientific experiments—a seismometer and laser reflector to be left on the moon and a rare gas collector to be returned to earth.

They also collect up to 130 pounds of rocks and soil for return to several hundred scientists on earth, who hope to decipher from them clues to the origin and age of the earth, moon, solar system and universe.

For more than two hours, Armstrong and Aldrin will work on the moon, moving 100 feet or so away from the lunar module in temperatures of 215 degrees above zero in the sun, 250 degrees below zero in the shade of the spacecraft. Their specially designed suits will keep them comfortable in either extreme.

Finally Aldrin, then Armstrong, return to the lunar module cabin, and call man's first excursion on the moon's surface a day. The hatch is to be closed at 4:48 a.m.

A meal, a few hours of rest, another meal, and the astronauts begin the countdown for liftoff from the moon—a launch which must work if Armstrong and Aldrin are to return to earth.

At 1:55 p.m., the ascent engine of the lunar module blasts off, leaving the descent stage on the surface, and the astronauts head into lunar orbit for a rendezvous and linkup with the command module. Their stay on the moon: 21 hours and 26 minutes.

At all times during this intricate rendezvous, Collins in the command module will keep his computer crammed with guidance information should a rescue become necessary.

Space agency officials say that even if Armstrong and Aldrin are only able to reach the first stage of the rendezvous—a 12-by-51-mile orbit—Collins should be able to fly Columbia down to rescue his crew mates.

The only way back to earth is aboard the command module because, among other things, it is the only one of the two vehicles with a heat shield to protect against the searing friction temperatures of entry into the earth's atmosphere.

If all goes well, rendezvous and linkup will be completed by 5:32 p.m., July 21.

Seven hours later, the ascent stage undocked and discarded, the three astronauts fire the command module steering rocket and head back toward earth. It will be 12:56 a.m., July 22.

Splashdown in the Pacific southwest of Hawaii is scheduled for 12:51 p.m., July 24—ending a voyage of eight days, three hours and 9 minutes.

From the Pacific, the astronauts, their spacecraft and the treasure horde of moon rocks are placed in immediate strict quarantine to make sure some vicious lunar germ, the existance of which is highly unlikely, has not returned to earth with Apollo 11.

The concern is that our natural defensive systems and our drugs might prove no match against a germ from another world.

So anyone who comes into contact with the astronauts and all the equipment from the moon will travel by germ-proof van from the recovery ship to the lunar receiving laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston to sit out three weeks of quarantine.

There, too, the world of science will have its first look at rocks from another world—the end product of America's $24 billion project called Apollo.

COMPREHENSIVE NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND DRUG ABUSE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1969

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill that for the first time provides for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem. My bill is identical to that introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) on the floor of the Senate yesterday. Significantly, introduction in the Senate and House precedes the administration's proposals which are currently being prepared by the Attorney General.

Narcotic addiction and drug abuses are reaching epidemic proportions. No segment of the population is secure from the intrusion of these means to self-destruction and moral decay. The problem which was once fairly limited to slum ghettos can now be found as easily in suburban high schools and on the college campus. Perhaps the inability of middle-class Americans to identify the problem as being of relevance to their lives has brought about the situation with which we are now faced. In any event, the problem has been brought home for all to see and the consensus of public opinion has finally coalesced, demanding solutions now.

The proposed legislation that I have introduced today calls for the construction, staffing, and operation of treatment facilities, professional training and evaluations, drug abuse education, authorization for research and studies relating to drug use, abuse, and addiction and the control of dangerous substances.

In the facilities construction area, the Community Mental Health Centers Act would be amended to allow eligibility for Federal funding of operation and maintenance costs as well as construction and staffing expenses. It shall increase the allowable Federal participation in funding the costs of construction of treatment and rehabilitation facilities from 66⅔ percent to 90 percent, and in the costs of operation, staffing, and maintenance of these facilities to 90 percent for the first 2 years and 75 percent for the next 6 years. In addition, authorization for future funding appropriations would be granted by the promulgation of this proffered legislation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, as well as providing discretionary continuation grants covering fiscal year 1971 and each of the next 11 fiscal years.

In the area of professional training and education, provision has been made for development of specialized training programs and materials for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and for the training of personnel to administer such programs and services. Research and study relating to current and projected personnel needs in the field of drug abuse as well as planning and conduct of surveys and field trials to evaluate the adequacy of State drug programs will be undertaken. Fellowships and grants for individual studies will be made available under the supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the approval of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Grants will also be made available to the States and political subdivision, as well as public and nonprofit private agencies for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of educational materials and "for the development and evaluation of programs of drug abuse education directed to the general public, school-age children and other high-risk groups." Dissemination of information shall be channeled through the Secretary acting in coordination with the National Institutes of Health.

The legislative presentment devised by Senator YARBOROUGH would amend the Public Health Service Act by "authorizing studies of depressant or stimulant drugs as well as studies of narcotics."

This provision of the bill that I introduce today would obviate the need for the creation of a Commission on Marihuana and Other Hallocinogenic Drugs which I proposed in another bill, H.R. 11166. In addition, the provisions contained in this legislation are consonant with another piece of drug legislation that I have cosponsored this session of the Congress. That bill, H.R. 9313, the purpose of which was to authorize the U.S. Commission on Education to make grants to elementary and secondary and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, is complemented by the proposals put forward by me today and by Senator YARBOROUGH yesterday. A broad program of research into all phases of drug use, needed investigations, and surveys, shall be conducted. A National Addiction and Drug Abuse Research Center to be made part of the National Institute of Mental Health shall also be constructed.

Knowledge in this area will increase in geometric leaps and bounds and the root causes of the problem will be fully revealed for elimination by a now aroused citizenry. Drug abuse and narcotic addiction are national problems of such magnitude and seriousness as to call for the marshaling of Federal resources to meet the challenges that the use of these substances poses to our society. This challenge shall and will be met. The stakes are too high and the inability to surmount the difficulties in this area would portend serious consequences for our society, consequences that are more horrible since they first would be manifested by the deterioration and destruction of the physical and mental well-being of this Nation's youth. Rapid enactment of the "Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969" is a vitally needed step in the right direction.

BRITISH GERM WARFARE BAN AT GENEVA

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the British Government tabled, on July 10, 1969, at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, a convention calling on all nations to ban research on, production, storage, and use of biological warfare.

This convention, essentially the same as that proposed by the British last summer, is aimed at the control of a form of warfare that is repugnant to all the civilized people of the world. Biological warfare, sometimes referred to as public health in reverse, is the deliberate use of disease to kill or cripple an enemy. More than 100 diseases are considered potential weapons in this arsenal. Some of their names, such as the plague, anthrax, and yellow fever, have killed thousands of people in the past.

The proposed ban on biological warfare goes beyond the Geneva protocol in the following ways:

Bans research on biological agents;

Bans production and storage of biological agents;

Bans the use of biological warfare agents under any circumstances; and

Calls for the destruction of biological warfare agent stockpiles.

The Geneva protocol bans the first use of chemical and biological warfare. It does not, however, place a restriction on all use, stockpiling, production, and research. The major change that would take place under the British proposal would be the abandonment by agreeing nations of both the intention and the capacity to use disease as a method of warfare.

The proposed ban on biological warfare puts in concrete form a conclusion that an increasing number of knowledgeable people have reached. Many of those familiar with the nature and implications of this form of warfare believe that the dangers involved in testing and production and the uncertainty involved in its use make it an unacceptable armament. The hazards involved in the use of biological warfare were pointed up in Secretary General U Thant's recent report on this subject. The report states:

> The risk of residual effects with some bacteriological—biological—agents is potentially greater, mainly because they could lead to disease, which might become epidemic if man-to-man transmission occurred readily. Bacteriological—biological—agents might also find unintended hosts in the animals and plants of an area, or be transported by infected individuals over great distances to new environments.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel laureate geneticist, has said that there is a danger that if one of the deadly diseases were loosed on a country, it might spread to other countries, mutate-change form. On sufficiently widespread a scale it would be a pandemic, a world epidemic. And when the disease finally came back to the country that had used it in the first place, it might be in an entirely different form and vaccines designed to protect one from the disease would be of no use. Clearly, this is a double-edged sword at best.

Testing of biological agents also endangers the country that maintains a biological warfare capability. Accidental transmission of a deadly disease to humans or animals remains a constant possibility when these agents are tested in the open atmosphere. Who knows when a disease such as tularemia or anthrax might be spread by rodents or birds coming from a test area.

The proposed ban does not cover a major problem involving biological warfare. Toxins, poisons produced by disease bacteria, are not specifically mentioned in the Convention that has been tabled. Toxins are technically not bacteria—that is—they are not alive. Toxins are produced, however, by bacteria, and can be even more deadly than the most lethal nerve gas. One ounce of botulinus toxin, effectively spread, could kill every person in the United States and Canada.

In my opinion, toxins should be included in the ban on biological warfare because much of the biological warfare testing and production machinery and facilities would have to be kept if toxins are allowed. The deadly bacteria will have to be produced in order to further produce toxins. This would greatly complicate effective control of a ban on biological warfare weapons.

I believe that the complaint mechanism under which nations can protest to the United Nations if they believe that this convention was being violated is weak. Perhaps a standing U.N. committee of respected medical authorities could be called on to investigate any protest lodged to the Secretary General. The area of violations and methods of verification as to compliance deserves the most careful consideration.

I believe that adoption of the proposed convention, subject to the suggestions that I have made, is in the interest of all nations. Biological warfare deserves to be stricken from the list of arms that man employs. I strongly urge the United States to support the British resolution and to work for its adoption.

I have written to President Nixon urging that the U.S. Government pursue this course of action. I am including in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the convention that has been tabled. I am also including the replies on chemical and biological warfare public policy that I received earlier in the year for the information of my colleagues:

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE CONVENTION

The States concluding this Convention, hereinafter referred to as "Parties to the Convention,"

Recalling that many states have become Parties to the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925,

Recognizing the contribution that said Protocol has already made, and continues to make, to mitigating the horrors of war,

Recalling further U.N. General Assembly Resolutions 2162 B(XXI) of 5 December 1966 and 2454 A(XXIII) of 20 December 1968, which called for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocal and invited all States to accede to it,

Believing that chemical and biological discoveries should be used only for the betterment of human life,

Recognizing nevertheless that the development of scientific knowledge throughout world will increase the risk of the eventual use of biological methods of warfare and being convinced that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of mankind and that no effort should be spared to minimize this risk,

Desiring therefore to reinforce the Geneva Protocol by the conclusion of a Convention making special provision in this field,

Declaring their belief that, in particular, provision should be made for the prohibition of the recourse to biological methods of warfare in any circumstances, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes never in any circumstances, by making use for hostile purpose of microbial or other biological agents causing death or disease by infection or infestation in man, other animals, or crops, to engage in biological methods of warfare.

ARTICLE II

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes—

(A) Not to produce or otherwise acquire, or assist in or permit the production or acquisition of (1) microbial or other biological agents of types and in quantities that have no independent peaceful justification for prophylactic or other purposes; (2) ancillary equipment or vectors the purpose of which is to facilitate the use of such agents for hostile purposes;

(B) Not to conduct, assist or permit research aimed at production of the kind prohibited in sub-paragraph (A) of this Article; and

(C) To destroy, or divert to peaceful purposes, within three months after this Convention comes into force for that Party, any stocks in its possession of such agents or ancillary equipment or vectors as have been produced or otherwise acquired for hostile purposes.

ARTICLE III

1. Any Party to this Convention which believes that biological methods of warfare have been used against it may lodge a complaint with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, submitting all evidence at its disposal in support of the complaint, and request that the complaint be investigated and that a report on the result of the investigation be submitted to the Security Council.

2. Any Party to this Convention which believes that another Party has acted in breach of its undertakings under Articles I and II of this Convention, but which is not entitled to lodge a complaint under paragraph 1 of this Article, may similarly lodge a complaint with the Security Council and request that the complaint be investigated.

3. Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his authorized representatives in any investigation he may carry out, as a result of a complaint, in accordance with Security Council Resolution No. ——.

ARTICLE IV

Each of the Parties to this Convention affirms its intention to provide or support appropriate assistance, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, to any other Party to this Convention, if the Security Council concludes that biological methods of warfare have been used against that Party.

ARTICLE V

Each of the Parties to this Convention undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures to strengthen the existing constraints on the use of chemical methods of warfare.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing contained in the present Convention shall be construed as in any way limiting or derogating from the obligations assumed by any State under the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925.

ARTICLE VII

(Provisions for Amendments)

ARTICLE VIII

(Provisions for signature, ratification, entry into force, etc.)

ARTICLE IX

1. This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.

2. Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from this Convention, if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Convention, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to this Convention and to the United Nations Security Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

ARTICLE X

(Provisions on languages of texts, etc.)

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

(Statement of Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, April 21, 1969)

Early in February of this year the activities of the United States in chemical and biological warfare were brought to my attention by a disturbing documentary shown on NBC television. I recognized that I knew almost nothing about this aspect of our military capability and decided to inform myself. My main interest was in the public policy questions relating to chemical and biological warfare; why do we need a capability?; what sort of capability do we have?; what are our policies governing the use of these weapons?; what do these activities cost us each year?; what are the safety precautions taken to protect the public against accident?; and are our academic and private institutions being improperly involved in chemical and biological research?

In order to inform myself about our CBW program I asked the U.S. Army to brief those Members of Congress who were interested in this field. On March 4, 1969, the Army presented a briefing, most of which they insisted on classifying. I did not find that briefing satisfactory; it did not answer the public policy questions. So I then prepared a comprehensive set of policy questions which I sent to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Smith, Ambassador to the United Nations Yost, and Dr. Henry Kissinger of the White House staff. While waiting for replies I have made a rather extensive study of the information that is available in public; I have received assistance from several organizations that are involved in a study of chemical and biological warfare, and I have consulted a number of individuals who are very knowledgeable in the field.

I have now received replies from all of the departments and agencies that I contacted with the exception of Dr. Kissinger. His office said that they had hoped to prepare a reply to my March 20, 1969 letter by last Friday but had not had time to do so, which is perhaps as much a comment on the priority placed on CBW policy in relation to other matters as it is on the pressures of the Executive Office. I would like to comment at this time on the nature of the information that I have received.

Chemical and biological warfare activities are shrouded in secrecy, unnecessarily so in my view. The Army's unclassified briefing was perfunctory at best; the classified presentation was not much better. I get the impression that the security curtain is parted only when it serves the interests of the advocates of the program. I found the replies from the departments heartening in some respects, but more deeply disturbing in most others. By far, the most revealing information appears in sources available to the public such as occasional statements by public officials, open publications, and press reports, both domestic and foreign.

Perhaps the most immediately disturbing aspect of the replies that I have received from the departments is the contradiction between some of the replies and the information that is available to the public. These contradictions should be resolved; both the Congress and the American public deserve a full explanation if the credibility of our public officials is to be maintained. Some of these contradictions are:

1. Defense states that we maintain a limited offensive capability in chemical weapons; that the carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response.

Yet we have in storage about 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas at Rocky Mountain Arsenal and Tooele Army Depot. Col. S. J. Efnor stated that the gas from a single bomb the size of a quart fruit jar could kill every living thing in a cubic mile. The inventory of nerve gas seems to be more than that required for an adequate tactical response.

2. General Hebbeler in the unclassified briefing stated that biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Yet Defense says "although the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely . . .". There appears to be a contradiction between the Army's estimate of the threat and that of Defense.

3. Defense states that the U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device.

Yet I am informed that the Navy only purchases 1/10 of the quantity of atropine, the nerve gas antidote, needed for their total number of personnel.

4. State and Defense say that review has shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage, no significant permanent damage, to the ecology of Vietnam due to defoliation. Both Departments cite the work of Dr. Fred H. Tschirley as an authority; Defense cites a report prepared by Midwest Research Institute.

Yet Dr. Tschirley's report itself says that the mangrove tree, a source of food in Vietnam, is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangroves, a tree taking about 20 years to grow. He goes on to say that a single treatment with the defoliants Orange or White would not be expected to have a lasting effect but that a second application durin the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect. Press reports state we spray more than once in the same growing system.

Even more damaging, Dr. Tschirley, their authority, reviewed the Midwest Research Institute Report for Ecology, a professional magazine, and said, "Reading the MRI Report before visiting Vietnam left me with the feeling of having read a literature review that resulted in accurate general conclusions, but told me nothing about the ecological consquences of using herbicides in Vietnam." In summary, the MRI Report is a literature review of a subject for which there is a great deal of literature relating to temperate zones, but little relating to tropical vegetation. "The MRI Report is disappointing because its direct applicability to Vietnam is so tenuous."

Similarly, Professors Egbert W. Pfeiffer and Gordon H. Orians, professor of zoology at the University of Montana and professor of zoology at the University of Washington respectively, made the following report on April 3, 1969 after a two week visit to Vietnam.

They described in grim terms the effects of leaf-killing chemicals on Vietnamese plant and animal life. They made a 65-mile trip by armed boat down the waterway linking Saigon with the sea. They scarcely saw a living plant. Bird life, apart from fish-eating birds, has virtually disappeared. The justification for the program, one reminiscent of the Colonel's remark at the time of the Tet offensive last year that "we had to destroy the village in order to save the village", was also given by Professors Pfeiffer and Orians. They said that it was completely unrealistic to expect military commanders to forgo such measures. There is no question about it; they save American lives.

5. Defense states that each use of herbicides or defoliants is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Yet this must be a recent policy change if it is true because in February, 1967, Secretary McNamara told Congressional Committees that the decision on when and where to use chemicals had been turned over to commanders in the fields. Commanders in the area of South Vietnam can defoliate any time they think it will open up avenues of fire that are otherwise unavailable to them. Unless there has been a change in policy, this is a direct contradiction.

6. Defense and State say that the only gas used in Vietnam by U.S. forces is CS, a milder tear gas; Defense says that CN, a milder tear gas was also authorized some years ago. Both Departments justify its use by pointing out that it is often used as a riot control agent, State saying "the fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons."

Yet in 1965 Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance and Secretary McNamara said that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CN, CS, and DM. DM, otherwise known as Adamsite gas, was not classified as an incapacitating gas but rather as an irritant gas until relatively recently by the Army. Both Defense and State point out this gas often allows the Army to accomplish its aims with the minimum violence required, citing the case of civilians mixed with Vietcong that are subdued with gas rather than with explosives. Secretary Rusk spoke of the use of this gas as the attempt to use the minimum level of violence required.

Most disturbing, the New York Times reports that in 1966 helicopters dropped hundreds of tear gas grenades on a fortified Vietcong area in preparation for a B-52 bombing raid. Defense spokesmen are then quoted as saying that the purpose of the gas was to drive the Vietcong out of their fortifications so that they could be killed with bomb fragments. Gas has also been dropped prior to artillery attacks according to press reports. This clear use of gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons is chemical warfare. The extent of the use of this technique can be speculated upon when we find Defense procuring $81 million worth of riot control munitions—tear gas—in 1969.

7. Defense states that strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which work with CBW agents.

Yet Defense's overall safety record during the past two decades is poor. Fort Detrick, the Army's biological warfare research center has one of the poorest records among major biological institutions for infections. There were 3,300 accidents at Detrick between 1954 and 1962 according to the Phillips report. Half of these occurred in the laboratory, involving broken test tubes, accidental scratches from needles, etc. About 400 men were infected as a result of these accidents. And infections among its workers pose some danger to neighboring communities. In 1959 one worker caught pneumonic plague, a highly infectious disease. He also happened to be a lifeguard at a swimming pool and had been in contact with many people. Local residents that might have come in contact with Detrick personnel who could have been infected were not warned of the danger. Nor did the Public Health Service promptly report this to the World Health Organization as required by agreement. In 1951 an Army bacteriologist working at Detrick became ill at his home in Frederick, Maryland. He was placed in the local hospital where his disease went unrecognized. He was taken to the base hospital shortly thereafter and died of deadly anthrax. The dangers of failing to warn local populations so that the most careful observation can be made is clear to any health authority.

At another installation, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal where chemical agents are stored and produced, the Army has failed to prevent accidents. In the early 1950's leakage of toxic material from the Arsenal began to kill crops and animals on surrounding farms. Vigorous complaints led the Army to drill a deep disposal well to store waste products from their activities. This resulted in the first series of earthquakes that Denver had experienced in 80 years. In the immediate period after the well was drilled and used for storage, there were over 1500 earth tremors in the Denver area, some reaching up to 6 on the Richter scale. Some tremors destroyed property. As a result the Army discontinued using the deep well and began pumping material out.

At the Dugway Proving Grounds, used for chemical and biological warfare testing, despite a recent order emphasizing the importance of safety, more than 6,000 sheep in nearby Skull Valley were killed when nerve gas was carried from the testing grounds onto their pastures. I am informed that tests of sheep in a number of areas around Dugway showed low-level exposure to nerve gas. In another disturbing report, I learned that the local sheriff is occasionally asked by Dugway authorities to patrol the roads that pass the Proving Ground to insure that motorists don't slow down or stop beside the road. Candor is not the mark of the Army's treatment of these problems; they have refused to confirm that the sheep died of nerve gas although they paid over $300,000 to the farmer for his loss and only last Thursday, awarded him an additional $198,309 in damages.

At the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas, production center for biological weapons, contamination of a local stream leading into a nearby river with toxic material led the Army to buy up the land along the stream. Presumably the toxic material is diluted when it feeds into the river.

I do not find this safety record very reassuring.

8. Defense states that gases are transported according to rules established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service—that an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and absorb any leakage—that all shipments are accompanied by a trained escort—that routes are planned to avoid populated areas and to minimize time in populated areas—and that transported agents are not volatile.

Yet in the incident reported in the Denver rail yards, these statements appear to be contradicted. I rechecked the facts with Dick Kruse, the reporter for KBT-TV/KBTR in Denver and found that the gondola cars carrying large tanks of nerve gas that he filmed in the Denver rail yards on a siding had no sand under them; they were on a siding in the center of Denver for most of the night; that he had spent about 1½ hours filming the tanks both from the ground and up on the gondola cars and had seen no guards. General Hebbeler also stated that GB, presumed to be the agent in the tanks, is relatively volatile.

The movement of these agents by rail is fraught with danger; the Transportation Safety Board of the Department of Transportation has reported on the alarming increase in derailment and other forms of railroad accidents, up 85% between 1961 and 1967. As the Dunreith accident illustrated, the accident need not occur to the train carrying the gas; it might be caused by a passing train. If the accident were similar to that which occurred in Laurel, Mississippi, the explosion of the adjoining train might scatter nerve gas over a ten-block area of a city. Furthermore, the Transportation Safety Board will shortly announce some major revisions in transportation safety regulations because of their inadequacies, I am led to understand.

I also do not find Defense's reply that the statistical probability of a gas transportation accident is very difficult to determine because we have never had one. Certainly the art of safety and reliability analysis, as practiced by NASA and the AEC for example, has proceeded far enough to give some fairly good indications of the dangers involved.

I have come across information available to the public on the transportation of biological agents that causes me grave concern. In a December 1967 publication issued by Fort Detrick, procedures for the careful packaging of biological agents were described, including a crash of an aircraft with biological agent containers aboard. The packages are designed to protect the biological agents that are being shipped; the report concludes that "Any number of such packages is now acceptable in one aircraft for shipment by commercial airlines under the Official Air Transport Restricted Articles Tariff No. 6-D. Technical escort is not required. However, current regulations of the Armed Services require technical escort for any shipment in which the total volume of etiologic agent in all packages in one conveyance exceeds 3 gallons."

Although the containers survived a crash of an aircraft going 120 knots from about 40 feet up onto desert soil, it is highly questionable whether they would have survived a mid-air explosion with metal fragments being blown about or a crash at greater speeds into a mountain cliff. The biological agent might well have been vaporized, wind conditions might carry the vapor to a nearby community with disastrous results. As one expert has said, a fraction of a gram of purified bacteria or virus in aerosol form could be sufficient to infect anyone in a square kilometer.

The publication goes on to indicate that agents may be shipped to Fort Detrick, Maryland; Pine Bluff, Arkansas; Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland; Dover, New Jersey; Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland; Dugway, Utah; Desert Test Center, Utah; Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; Oakland, California; China Lake, California; U.S. Naval Base, Brooklyn, New York; Crane, Indiana; Fort McClellan, Alabama; and possible to Canada, Britain, and Australia.

8. Defense states that we have a CBW budget of $350 million for 1969. That budget includes $139 million for napalm, incendiary weapons, and the like, weapons that I will accept as not normally falling in the definition of CBW. It contains $81 million for tear gas or riot munitions. It contains $5 million for herbicides.

Yet I find it difficult to accept this budget figure. It is generally admitted that the U.S. spent about $100 million for defoliants and herbicides last year—I cannot believe that we will buy only $5 million this year. A McGraw-Hill investment newsletter states that Edgewood Arsenal would spend about $420 million in 1969 for CBW materials. And this is only one center.

9. Defense states that the Army does use discretion in placing CBW research contracts with academic and private institutions.

Yet it is reported to me that a number of biologists have been approached by an individual asking them to undertake certain specified research projects without identifying the source of the funds that would pay for the work—presumably the Army. Academic biologists have also indicated that they would not undertake research for the Army on CBW projects if it weren't for the great shortage of support funds in this field of science.

I also find use of the Smithsonian, even if not on CBW itself but rather in determining what areas might be suitable for CBW tests, of questionable discretion in view of the Institution's international reputation and need to keep clear of any doubt as to the nature of its work.

Going beyond the immediate contradictions which I have listed, some general comments should be made. First, the unnecessary secrecy surrounding our CBW activities from both Members of Congress and the public should be stripped away. A policy of evasiveness in responding to public inquiry only arouses more suspicion than already exists. I found Mr. Foster's reply an improvement over the information provided by the Army but even his reply has contradictions that require clarification. I believe that an inquiry calling on informed and expert opinion is required to resolve these contradictions. I am exploring with my colleagues in the House and Senate the possibility of an ad hoc committee of inquiry or a possible investigation by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. I expect to make a recommendation on this shortly.

Second, in comparing the replies of the departments I found a more thorough and comprehensive definition of policy in the reply received from Defense than I did from State. Defense at least says that we have a "no-first use" policy for biological warfare and implies that we have the same policy for lethal gas. The State Department says that it is up to the President to decide national policy and does not mention "no-first use" in reply to these questions. In contrast with Secretary Rusk's rather careful exposition of a no-first use policy in 1965, and a justification of the use of tear gases on humanitarian grounds, State now just says that it is the President's decision, almost an abdication of their responsibility in this aspect of foreign policy.

Third, although General Hebbeler defended use of incapacitating agents such as tear gas by saying they weren't invented at the time of the Geneva Protocol in 1925, it is well documented that tear gas and adamsite were extensively used in World War I. The records of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference meeting in 1931 which I placed in the Record on April 1st, also clearly show that the British, the French, the Spanish, the Yugoslavs, and others stated that they consider tear gas and other noxious gases, even if non-lethal, to be included in the wording of the Geneva Protocol. Significantly, neither the Defense nor the State reply justified the use of tear gas by saying that it is not included in the Geneva Protocol—a change in policy from General Hebbeler's statement and Defense and State's earlier justification for use of tear gas.

Fourth, I find the use of incapacitating gas in conjunction with B-52 raids and artillery attacks, and the use of defoliants as an anti-food weapon not "the minimum use of force required" or a herbicide or defoliant used for agricultural or industrial purposes in the United States and Russia, but rather chemical warfare. This is a change from our policy in World War II when President Roosevelt said, "Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

Following World War II Admiral Chester Nimitz was asked about the toughest decisions he had to make. He replied, "there were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines."

Similarly, in the Korean War we went to extraordinary lengths to refute Communist charges that we were using germ warfare. We recognized the grave impact that belief of this charge would have on world opinion.

Yet today, although we state that we adhere to the principles of the Geneva Protocol, we are using tear gas to aid in the killing of the enemy and we are using chemicals as an anti-food weapon and in a way that may well have long-term destructive effect on the Vietnamese countryside. This latter policy seems unlikely to win the battle for the minds of the uncommitted in Vietnam.

I ask who is responsible for this change in our chemical and biological warfare policy? Did the President decide? Has Congress agreed to this change? Do the American people accept this new policy as one in keeping with the principles and moral precepts of our Republic? This question demands the most thorough review and debate. I therefore ask President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to the United States Senate for ratification so that this review can be made. I, for one, would like to know where the United States stands on this issue today.

Fifth, I find it inconceivable that the United States would knowingly use biological warfare even as a matter of retaliation. Defense admits that we have no warning system to tell when and if such an attack were used against us. Biologists tell us that the purpose of biological warfare research is to develop vaccine-resistant strains of disease. Defense tells us there is no specific therapy available for most BW agents and that vaccination against the more than 100 agents is not practical and would probably harm the health of the individual.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel Laureate biologist, warns that loosing a biological agent on a nation might well result in a world-wide epidemic raging out of control with new mutant strains of the disease developing that might not respond to a vaccine even if one were initially available.

Dr. James D. Watson, Nobel laureate biologist at Harvard who served on a Presidential chemical and biological warfare advisory panel from 1961 until 1964 said in an interview that he thinks CBW programs should be discontinued because they are not a good way of winning wars—militarily they're a waste of time. He went on to say that the top people in the Department of Defense never gave a damn about it—it becomes dangerous with a suspicious, hostile military who are losing a war, so will try it to win.

With these comments in mind, I urge the United States to give full support to the proposal of the British to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference that biological warfare research and use be fully banned. Research on vaccines against diseases can be conducted—openly—with the results available to everyone. An open inspection system has been suggested, one in which all biologists would report by word of mouth any suspected violation of the ban on biological weapons research or manufacture. We would have little to lose and much to gain.

Sixth, I urge that a top-level panel of Department of Transportation, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Defense, and independent academic experts be convened to review transportation policies for chemical and biological agents and to establish the strictest transportation standards for their transportation, if indeed such transportation is needed.

Finally, I intend to comment further on our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices for I regard them as one of the benchmarks of our moral and ethical principles. There are those who say that it makes no difference how a man dies. I disagree. Let me draw from General Hebbeler's briefing; there is a principle of proportionality, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. I believe that chemical and biological warfare are not necessary for military purposes. Let the United States take the lead in seeing that they are banned from use. And let the United States refrain from using those chemicals which begin to break down the thin dividing line between the long standing principle of no-first use and chemical warfare.

The text of the answer from the Department of Defense follows:

"APRIL 15, 1969.

"Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

"DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of March 7, 1969, concerning chemical and biological warfare.

"Answers to each of your questions are attached. Copies of reports and other materials which are relevant to the questions are included. It is believed this information responds to your inquiries on an unclassified basis. There are areas which could be extended and amplified by classified discussion.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.,
"Director of Defense,
"Research and Engineering."

Question 1. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological (CB) capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind; and to continue a program of research and development in this area to minimize the possibility of technological surprise. This policy on CB weapons is part of a broader strategy designed to provide the U.S. with several options for response against various forms of attack. Should their employment ever be necessary, the President would have to authorize their use. The U.S. does not have a policy that requires a single and invariable response. Deterrence is our primary objective.

Chemical weapons, in many tactical situations, are more effective than conventional (high explosive and projectile) weapons. Accordingly, it is believed wise to deter their use. If two approximately equally effective military forces were engaged in combat, and one side initiated a CB operation, it could gain a significant advantage even if the opposing side has protective equipment. Neutralization of this advantage could not be achieved with conventional arms.

Question 2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. The U.S. policy and its rationale with regard to biological warfare is generally the same as that for chemical. As a matter of policy the U.S. will not be the first to use biological weapons, but we are aware of the capabilities these weapons place in the hands of potential adversaries. For this reason it is important to carry on our R&D program in BW, not only to provide necessary equipment, such as detection and warning devices, but to define and quantify more fully the potential threat to the U.S. from these weapons, and the hazards involved if they are ever used against us.

Question 3. If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinatory gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks, at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fall-out shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

Answer. The threat to the U.S. civil population from CB attack has been studied by the Department of Defense and these analyses are periodically up-dated. It is clear that the threat of CB attack is less significant than that of nuclear attack. For this reason, more emphasis has been placed in civil defense on the nuclear threat.

For logistic reasons chemical agents do not appear to pose a major strategic threat against the U.S. For example, it would require many tons of nerve agent munitions to carry out an effective attack against a city of a few million people. This may appear inconsistent with the high toxicity of the nerve agents, but for many technical reasons such as the difficulty in disseminating the agents in vapor or aerosol form, the dilution of the agent in the atmosphere, and their impingement on ground and vegetation, it is correct. For this reason, the U.S. does not maintain stockpiles of therapeutic materials for nerve agents. Although the possibility of the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely, it does not presently warrant the priority given to defense against the effects of nuclear weapons. Research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing, as is the review of the magnitude and nature of the threat.

The Office of Civil Defense has developed an inexpensive but effective protective mask for civilian use, and a limited production run was made to test production quality. No large scale production was undertaken because of the low estimate of the threat as described above. Should the threat to the U.S. population increase, this mask could be produced quite rapidly and, together with other necessary defensive measures, would afford protection against both chemical and biological attack. Filtration systems have been designed and tested, and these could be added to fall-out shelters to afford collective protection for groups of people. In addition, many of the emergency plans developed by the Department of HEW for post-nuclear attack medical support would be applicable. The emergency packaged hospitals, for example, provide for expansion of hospital facilities by the equivalent of 2500 hospitals of 200 bed size.

The U.S. does not maintain large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most BW agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible BW agents, and production and administration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures.

Question 4. We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

Answer. The U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device which is under development. U.S. soldiers and sailors generally have masks and protective clothing; and collective protection equipment for vans and communication centers is being developed and supplied. U.S. troops in Vietnam are prepared for possible enemy uses of chemical weapons.

Question 5. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer. There are *no* herbicidal chemicals used in Vietnam to destroy vegetation which have not been widely used in the United States in connection with clearing areas for agricultural or industrial purposes.

The term "defoliants" is used because it properly describes the purpose of its use; that is, to remove leaves from jungle foliage to reduce the threat of ambush and to increase visibility for U.S. Forces. This use of defoliants has saved many American and South Vietnam lives.

There are several distinctions between a chemical herbicide and a biological plant disease. The biological agents are living plant pathogens, and may be spread beyond the area of attack by winds, insects or animals. Chemical herbicides do not spread in this manner beyond the area of attack. Further, more is known about the effects of chemical herbicides because of their widespread use throughout the world. Each use of herbicides or defoliants in Vietnam is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Question 6. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer. The U.S. has a carefully limited operation in South Vietnam to disrupt the enemy's food supply. It is limited to the attack of small and usually remote jungle plots which we know the VC or NVA are using. Usually these plots are along trails or near their base camp areas. Each such operation is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam. Enemy caches of food, principally rice, are also destroyed when it cannot be used by the South Vietnamese. These limited Allied activities have never, in any single year, affected as much as one percent of the annual food output of South Vietnam.

The date surveys have shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage from the viewpoint of the future development of South Vietnam, attributable to the defoliation effort. The Department of Defense has supported the Department of Agriculture in studies of herbicides in analagous areas, and I am attaching a copy of their report "Response of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Woody Plants to Chemical Treatments." The Department of Defense also had a base line study of the forests of Vietnam prepared entitled "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico and Texas," a copy of which is attached. More recently a study "Assessment of Ecological Effects of Extensive or Repeated Use of Herbicides" was done by Midwest Research Institute, a copy of which is attached. This study was reviewed by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and judged by them to be an accurate and competent report. Last fall, the Department of State, with Department of Defense participation, made a survey of the ecology of defoliated areas. One of the scientists who made this survey, Dr. Fred Tschirley from the Department of Agriculture, published his report in *Science*. A copy of his report is attached.

At the end of active combat, it appears probable that there will be agricultural and forestry activities and other programs which will aid the South Vietnamese people. The Department of Defense would cooperate with the Department of States and the U.S. Agency for International Development as necessary in accomplishing these. The Department of Defense supports the concept of a comprehensive study of the long-term efforts of the limited defoliation program, and has endorsed, in principle, proposals by the American Association for the Advancement of Science for such a scientific study.

Question 7. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam, from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently, we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer. The only "incapacitating gas" in use by U.S. Forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent called CS, although CN was also authorized some years ago. Both are tear gases. There is no known verified instance of lethality by CS, either in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where it has been used to control disturbances by many governments.

Efforts to find the statement you attribute to the former Deputy Secretary Vance have been unsuccessful. A copy of an excerpt from his testimony two years ago before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (February 1967) is attached. The distinction he made is that the U.S. has never used biological weapons, nor have we used lethal chemical weapons since World War I, and that it is against U.S. policy to initiate their use, but that the U.S. has used riot control agents and herbicides. It is believed these distinctions are still valid.

Question 8. What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

Answer. Strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which do research on CB agents. Elaborate systems of airtight hoods, air filtration and waste decontamination are employed. These precautions and procedures are reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service as well as by Department of Defense safety experts. The equipment and building designs developed at the U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, for example, have been generally accepted throughout the world as the ultimate in safety for the investigation of infectious diseases.

With regard to the extremely unfortunate Skull Valley incident, the exact chain of events is still not completely understood. A freak meteorological situation was probably a major contributing factor. This matter has been carefully reviewed by a special advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army and chaired by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. A copy of this report is included for your information. This committee has made a number of recommendations concerning test limitations, toxicological and environmental investigations, added meteorological facilities, and a permanent safety committee. All of these recommendations are being followed.

Movement of chemical agents is governed by rules and procedures established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service. The material is shipped in special containers; these containers are put on pallets if necessary and fully restrained, and an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and to absorb agent in the highly unlikely event of leakage. All shipments are accompanied by a trained escort detachment equipped with decontaminating and first aid equipment. Routes are carefully planned to avoid populated areas to the greatest extent possible; and, where they cannot be avoided, to move through them carefully and with as little delay as possible.

The precautions taken—the use of special trains, careful routing, controlled speeds, and other measures—make a train wreck extremely unlikely. However, even further steps are taken to minimize any hazard that might result from an accident. Buffer cars are included in the train, the escort detachment is distributed in different cars to provide prompt full-train coverage in emergencies, and transit time through populated areas is minimized. Although the agents are not inert, it is important to note that transported agents are neither volatile nor in the gaseous state. They are liquid, and the most volatile is about eight times less volatile than water. The containers are not under pressure, and nerve agents are rapidly rendered harmless by fire.

The comparison of statistical probabilities of a railroad accident and subsequent discharge of chemicals or accidental explosion of a nuclear device is very difficult because of the differences between them. Extensive precautions are taken to provide safety in both. There has never been either an accidental nuclear explosion or an accidental discharge of chemical agent during shipment. This absence of data makes it impossible to calculate the respective probabilities of accident.

In the unlikely event of accidental discharge in a city or town, the first steps would be to secure the area; to decontaminate the liquid material, and to provide first-aid to any individuals who came in contact with the liquid. Supplies are carried in the train to accomplish this. Any alkaline material, such as bleach or quicklime, will rapidly decompose nerve agents. Because the agents have low volatility, there is little vapor hazard, however, people should not be allowed in the downwind vicinity as a matter of precaution.

Question 9. What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields? Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and reseach programs in ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

Answer. Total U.S. expenditures in the CB field, including smoke, flame, and incendiary weapons, is $350 million for Fiscal Year 1969. There is no procurement of lethal chemical agents or of biological agents. Details of expenditures are given in the table below.

CB expenditures, fiscal year 1969

	Million
Procurement:	
Smoke, flame, and incendiary	$139
Riot control munitions	81
Herbicides	5
Defensive equipment	15
Total	240
R.D.T. & E.:	
General and basic R. & D	9
Offensive R. & D	31
Defensive R. & D	30
Test and evaluation	20
Total	90
Operation and maintenance	20

Question 10. Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nation-wide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publicly stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the field of chemical or biological warfare?

Answer. The answer to the question, as stated, is no: the U.S. could not launch an immediate, massive, chemical and biological attack. The U.S. has the technical capability to do this, but it has not been judged necessary or desirable to procure and install the weapon systems for "immediate massive" attack. The carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response against enemy military forces; not for strategic or "nationwide" attack.

Question 11. Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

Answer. The U.S. has developed chemical detection and warning instruments which could provide the components for a national alarm system. They have not been deployed to build such a system. However, as noted above, it is believed that the threat of strategic chemical attack is not great. Warning against biological attack is much more difficult technologically. Recently, there has been success with a prototype instrument which would provide some biological warning capability. R&D efforts in this area will be continued.

Question 12. Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

Answer. The Army certainly uses discretion in selection of all of its contractors. The advice of the Smithsonian Institution was sought in identifying a suitable institute to do this work. As a result, they submitted a proposal, which was accepted. As a direct consequence of this work, there have been 45 papers written by Smithsonian scientists and published in the scientific literature. This has been a remarkably productive scientific investigation brought about by a coincidence of interests in the fauna of the area.

The Smithsonian Institution was never asked to do, nor did they do, any "military" chemical and biological warfare research. It carried out scientific investigations appropriate to its charter and objectives, and published the significant findings in the scientific literature. These results are available for use by the Army, by any other government agency, or by any nation or scientist wishing to do so.

Question 13. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer. It was pointed out in the discussion of Question 1 that CB weapons are, in many military situations more effective than conventional weapons. Thus, a nation which lacked CB weapons and could not deter or counter their use would have to consider more extreme measures. Unilateral CB disarmament would adversely affect a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability. The U.S. is committed, as President Nixon wrote recently, to "exploring any proposals or ideas that could contribute to sound weapons." The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of the Department of Defense will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meeting in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

Question 14. Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Answer. It is difficult to answer this question without knowing the context in which Dr. Lederberg stated his conclusion, nor the rationale he used in arriving at it. There are a number of technical uncertainties about the effects of biological weapons, but this does not reduce the vulnerability of the U.S. to them, nor does it negate the potential hazard they pose. Until such time as it can be proved that they are of little value to any nation, if that is indeed the case, or until reliable mutual arms control agreements are reached, it would be imprudent to dismiss them lightly.

April 7, 1969.

Hon. Richard D. McCarthy,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McCarthy: The Secretary and the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have asked me to reply to your letters of March 10 and March 20, respectively, in which you inquired as to our national policy with respect to chemical and biological warfare.

The answers that follow reflect those aspects of your questions that come within the responsibilities of the Department of State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For ease of reference, I have repeated the questions. Questions 3 and 7 can best be answered by the Department of Defense.

Question 1. It is our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. Should the nation be attacked with either gas or biological weapons, the President would decide upon an appropriate response. As you indicate, there are a number of responses available to the nation.

Question 2. Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer. My comment on Question 1 is equally applicable to this question.

Question 4. Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer. In 1966, at the United Nations, Ambassador Nabrit defended United States use in Vietnam of herbicides which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those domestically used in the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries, on the basis that such use was not prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 ("Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare"). Although not a party to the agreement, the U.S. is pledged to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol. The Protocol is not without ambiguity as to the range of prohibited chemical weapons. For example, few nations, if any, consider the use of smoke, flame and incendiary agents, all of which involve chemicals and are asphyxiating at times, to constitute chemical warfare or to be prohibited by the Geneva Protocol. Similarly, League of Nations records indicate that, in prohibiting poison gas warfare, the Protocol's drafters did not intend to prohibit the use of chemical anti-plant agents. While some nations believe that the use of chemical herbicides in war is prohibited, we have been candid about our use of these materials, and I see no credibility gap between our statements and our current practices.

In regard to your question on the use of chemicals to destroy enemy crops as compared with the use of plant diseases for the same purpose, the distinction is one of scale and control. Herbicides can be employed with some precision and since they do not spread, in the sense that plant diseases spread, they can be controlled. On the other hand, plant diseases are living organisms capable of causing epiphytotics (plant disease epidemics). Moreover, naturally occurring plant disease organisms have been known to be carried by winds and cause destruction of food crops many hundreds of miles from the original source of infection. This is not possible with chemical herbicides.

The U.S. has never used plant diseases, or any other form of biological weapon, as a weapon of war.

Question 5. Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer. There are two purposes served by the use of chemical herbicides in South Vietnam: one is to clear jungle foliage in order to increase visibility on the ground and from the air; the other purpose is to destroy only those specific food crops being grown by Viet Cong forces, thereby increasing the logistics burden on the enemy by causing him to divert human and other resources to non-combat activities. The same chemicals are used for both purposes.

With regard to the effect of the use of herbicides on the Vietnamese environment, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker established a special inter-agency committee in 1968 to make a comprehensive review of the program. The committee's task was to assess the military benefits of the program in relation to its costs, and to study its effects upon the ecology of the country. The review indicated that, in general, herbicide operations in Vietnam have been accomplished without significant permanent damage to the ecology of the country. In this regard, I am enclosing an article from the 21 February 1969 issue of "Science," which was written by Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Tschirley served on the review committee.

There is certainly much merit in a long range study of the ecological effects of herbicides in Vietnam. Such studies in combat are obviously difficult at present but should be initiated as soon as practicable.

Question 6. Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer. The only anti-personnel agent used by U.S. forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent CS, better known as tear gas. This chemical riot-control agent has been widely used by governments around the world for the control of domestic disturbances. We have no verified reports from Vietnam of any occasion in which this gas has been lethal. To the contrary, we have many reports of lives being spared by the use of tear gas. The fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

Question 8. Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer. The potential risk, if any, posed to the security of the U.S. and other states by dispensing with these weapons altogether continues to be a matter for our consideration. It will require particular study in our consideration of the proposed ban on all biological weapons introduced by Great Britain at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) last summer. It is expected that the results of the current study being undertaken by the United Nations Secretary-General, especially with regard to the security implications of these weapons, will provide additional insights into this problem.

Question 9. Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmament as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

Answer. The very nature of the threat posed by nuclear weapons required that the U.S. join with other nations in achieving agreement in this area on a priority basis.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has long been concerned with the problem of controlling lethal chemical and biological weapons. To this end ACDA has undertaken a comprehensive program of research on the verification aspects of possible arms control measures relating to these weapons. While the results of these studies have been encouraging, the research is not yet at the point where specific measures for international consideration could be recommended.

Question 10. Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

Answer. We would agree with you that it may be advantageous to focus new arms control arrangements on these weapons, beginning with biological weapons. Accordingly, the U.S. has expressed its willingness to give serious study to the British proposal banning microbiological methods of warfare which would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Submitted to the ENDC in 1968, the U.K. proposal called for a prohibition on the production, possession and use in any and all circumstances of microbiological agents.

Question 11. What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Answer. The U.S. has on numerous occasions expressed its interest in participating in discussions which may promote progress in achieving effective arms control measures in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Most recently, on March 18, 1969, President Richard M. Nixon instructed the U.S. Delegation to the ENDC to "join with other delegations in exploring any proposal or ideas that could contribute to sound and effective arms control relating to these weapons." President Nixon's message hopefully will lead each delegation to undertake new and productive approaches to the problem of controlling chemical and biological weapons. It should be recalled that the U.S. in 1966 co-sponsored the operative part of a UN General Assembly resolution which called upon all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Moreover, just last year the U.S. played a leading role in the creation by the UN Secretary-General of a consultant experts group to study the effects of CB weapons. (The U.S. is one of fourteen countries represented in that group.) The results of that study, expected by July 1969, should contribute to the ENDC's consideration of the problems associated with the control of chemical and biological weapons.

I hope that the above answers will help to clarify some of the policy issues about which you have expressed concern. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

MARCH 28, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: I have read your recent letter on the subject of chemical and biological warfare with great interest. Frankly I must say that many, indeed almost all of the questions you raise relate to national policy matters which do not come within the purview of my office. I have therefore taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to the Department of State so that an appropriate response can be prepared in the near future.

You ask about the degree to which the U.S. has shown initiative in this aspect of disarmament and you ask what our plans are at the UN for bringing up limitations on the use of these weapons. I am attaching to this letter a copy of Resolution 2454 which was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1968 with our support. Although the U.S. was not itself an original co-sponsor of this Resolution we worked actively behind the scenes in its drafting and along with 106 other members of the General Asssembly voted for it (none voted against it, only Guinea and Malawi abstained). You will note that by this Resolution the General Assembly condemns all actions contrary to the objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and calls for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives contained therein. It also asks the Secretary-General to appoint experts to prepare a report on the consequences of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and to transmit this report to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva by July 1, 1969, and to the members of the UN in time for consideration of the report itself at the next session of the General Assembly in September.

The Resolution further recommends that governments give the report wide distribution through all media in order to acquaint public opinion with its contents. Since the adoption of this Resolution the Secretary-General has designated the following consultant experts to assist in the preparation of this report:

Dr. Tibor Bakacs, Chief Director of the National Institute of Public Health, Budapest.

Dr. Hotse C. Bartlema, Head of the Microbiological Division of the Medical-Biological Laboratory, National Defense Research Organization, Rijswijk, Netherlands.

Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Former Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President of the United States, Washington, D.C. Currently Deputy Director New York University Medical Center.

Dr. S. Bhagavantam, Scientific Adviser to the Ministry of Defense, New Delhi.

Dr. Jiri Franek, Head of the Military Institute for Hygienic Epidemiology and Microbiology, Prague

Dr. Yosio Kawakita, President of University of Chiba, Professor of Bacteriology, Chiba City, Japan

M. Victor Moulin, Ingenieur en chef de l'Armement, Paris

Dr. M. K. McPhail, Director of Chemical and Biological Defense, Defense Chemical, Biological and Radiation Laboratories, Defense Research Board, Ottawa

Academician O. A. Reutov, Professor at the Moscow State University, Moscow

Dr. Guillermo Soberon, Chief of the Department of Biochemistry, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City

Dr. Lars-Frik Tammelin, Chief of Department for Medicine and Chemistry, Research Institute for National Defense, Stockholm

Dr. Berhane Tiumelisan, Bacteriologist of the Imperial Laboratory and Research Institute Addis, Ababa

Colonel Zbigniew Zoltowski, Professor of Medicine, Director of the Institute of Epidemiology, Warsaw

Sir Solly Zuckerman, Scientific Adviser to the Government of the United Kingdom, London

These experts held their first, organizational session in Geneva in late January 1969 and adopted their terms of reference as well as an outline for their study. It was further decided by the group that they would reconvene in Geneva on 16 April for a period of approximately two weeks.

I am sure you will agree with me that the background and expertise assembled in this group give grounds to expect that their report will contribute significantly to the further consideration of this subject at both the ENDC and the General Assembly.

I hope you will find this letter not only responsive to your request but encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. YOST.

POETIC TRIBUTE TO CHARLES RUSSELL

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Charles Russell, the great western artist is dear to the hearts of all Montanans. His legacy, a large collection of marvelous depictions of western life which captured the very soul of the pioneer West, is an inspiration to many a poet. In recognition of this, station KRTV of Great Falls sponsors annually the Charles M. Russell poetry contest. The 1969 winner is Don Ian Smith, a Methodist minister from Choteau. I realize that many of my colleagues have long admired Charlie Russell's paintings and will appreciate my sharing this poetic tribute with them. as follows:

CHARLIE RUSSELL

(By Don Ian Smith)

Wild, restless rider of an untamed land,
you held creation's secret in your hand;
deft fingers that could mould the yielding clay;
your brush could capture shades of night and day;
or mirror in a painted warrior's face
the pride and anguish of a hunted race.

You lived life simply, deeply, keen, aware
of beauty, distance, sorrow, toil and care.
Our hurried world has need of such a one
who paused to trace the footsteps of the sun.
You sensed the joy, the fun, the problems, grief;
of cowboy, Indian, miner, cattle thief.
You felt the hopeless rancher's naked fear
of winter in a starving horse or steer.

Beneath Montana's blue and boundless sky
a thousand priceless paintings pass us by
when with our minds on triviality
we neither paint, nor have the eyes to see.
O rider of a rough and rugged land
we do not share the talent of your hand;
but you can teach in words both sharp and quaint
the art to see the scene we cannot paint.

Yours was a creed of life accepted, shared.
In your deep love of earth you surely prayed.
And nature's gracious God must smile on one
who took such joy in all the things he made.

MAIL RUN TO THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from the Post Office Department, dated July 9, 1969:

MAIL RUN TO MOON

Apollo 11 will mark America's first mail run to the moon, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount revealed today.

An engraved master stamp die and a special "moon letter" will accompany America's astronauts on the journey through space and their historic lunar landing.

Upon its return to earth, the die will be used to produce a special jumbo-size, 10-cent airmail postage stamp commemorating man's first landing on the moon.

The "moon letter" will bear a die proof of the commemorative stamp and will be hand cancelled by moon explorers Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin with a special postmark reading "Moon Landing U.S.A., July 20, 1969."

The "Moon Landing" commemorative stamp will be issued with first-day ceremonies in Washington, D.C., late in August. It will be 50 percent larger than our usual stamp size, measuring 1.05 by 1.80 inches, and will depict a spaceman stepping from the space module onto the moon's surface. The inscription "First Man on the Moon" will appear across the bottom in capital letters. The pictorial portion of the first-day cancellation will be a replica of the postmark used in cancelling the envelope on the moon.

The hand-cancelled "moon letter" will undergo a 21-day decontamination period at Houston and then will be returned to the Post Office Department where it will be placed on display in the Philatelic Exhibition Room. It will later become a part of an elaborate traveling exhibit that will be shown throughout the nation and abroad.

Production of the master die that will be used to print the commemorative moon landing stamp was carried out in great secrecy by officials of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and had President Nixon's complete endorsement. There was no "paperwork" involved. Rather than the customary use of messengers, materials were hand carried between the two Departments by official staff workers.

Mr. Blount predicted the opportunity to buy stamps made from a die that actually was present on the moon will capture the fancy of stamp collectors and non-collectors alike around the world.

The stamp was designed by Paul Calle of Stamford, Connecticut, who also produced the art work for the twin space commemorative stamps in 1967. It will be printed on the Giori press and issued in panes of 32. The stamp was modeled by Robert J. Jones and engraved by Edward R. Felver (vignette) and Albert Saavedra (lettering). It is a horizontal stamp showing a spaceman emerging from the module. In the background to the right is the earth. Across the bottom in blue Gothic capitals is the inscription, "First Man on the Moon." Vertical, right, in the same type style in red is "United States." Upper left is "10¢ Air Mail."

Persons desiring first-day cancellations may send addressed envelopes, together with remittances to cover the cost of the stamps to be affixed, to the Postmaster, Washington, D.C. 20013. A close-fitting enclosure of postal card thickness should be placed in each envelope and the flap either turned in or sealed. The outside envelope should be endorsed "First Day Covers 10¢ First Man on the Moon Stamp." Orders for covers must not include requests for uncancelled stamps. The exact date of release of the stamp will be announced later. Collectors should bear in mind that this is an over-sized stamp and covers should be addressed low and as far to the left as possible.

GEN. LEONARD H. CHAPMAN ADDRESSES SAN DIEGO COUNTY NAVY LEAGUE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many people have asserted that our Nation is a troubled one. Not only divided by a war in Vietnam, but torn by student unrest at home. However, there is another side to this picture which is all too easily forgotten in this storm of protest. How is it possible for us as Americans to neglect the tremendous individual heroism which our Armed Forces have demonstrated so many times in recent years. Moreover, the student radicals who so zealously attempt to destroy military recruiting programs and military-sponsored research do not realize they are undermining the very force which on innumerable occasions has defended the right they hold to be so dear—the American right to dissent.

The following speech by Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps, before the San Diego County Navy League of the United States will, I feel, serve to further deepen our confidence in the future course of the United States.

REMARKS BY GENERAL LEONARD F. CHAPMAN, JR., USMC

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—Shipmates: I will *not* ask if everyone can hear me. The last time I asked an audience that question, a lady in the back answered "No"—well, a gentleman up front said he *could* hear me very well, and offered to trade places with her.

So, I won't ask.

It is a real pleasure to be here, in *old* San Diego. I guess a city, now celebrating its two hundredth year of existence on the American continent, does qualify for the dignity of being called old. I was going to say "a city now celebrating its two hundredth year of *establishment*. . . ." But you can't be too careful how you use that word, these days.

Well, the Navy-Marine Corps team has not been in San Diego for two hundred years, but it has been a long time. We first arrived in July of 1842, when sailors and marines from Commodore Stockton's squadron landed to assist Captain Fremont in securing the city. We've been here ever since, and we've enjoyed every minute of it.

San Diego is a nice place to be. A good home port. The location, the weather, the smell of blue ocean and good land joined together—and more importantly—the people; make this a snug harbor for all men who serve this country on the sea.

And you, shipmates of the Navy League of San Diego, you especially make us feel at home. Your interest, your concern, and your active work for the sea services, is as encouraging as it is vital. Your support, and involvement, have made you indispensable members of our Navy-Marine Corps team.

I am with you today as a fellow member, and spokesman for the Marine Corps element, of our team. I am here to address you on the subject of marines. Now, because of our Corps' heavy commitment in Vietnam, to speak to you of marines, is to speak to you of the war in that place. And in talking about that war, two theaters of action must be considered—the battlefield of Vietnam, and, the battlefield right here, in this country.

To make a report on marines on the battlefield of Vietnam, is a simple, and proud task. Their dedication, courage, and professional ability are everyday facts. These haven't changed.

And also, the operational and tactical situation in Vietnam has changed little. It is that kind of war. Within the borders of South Vietnam, we continue to keep the enemy's main force units away from the people, and generally out of the country. We have made great progress in rooting out the guerrillas, and the Viet Cong infrastructure. It is a fact that local Viet Cong units, as such, have all but ceased to exist. We find more and more that these guerrilla units remain Viet Cong in name only, and are actually cadred, and filled out with regular North Vietnamese troops and specialists. The few South Vietnamese left in these formations are carefully integrated with the people from the North, watched closely, and can hardly be classified as political zealots.

We also note that repeated acts of terror by the enemy seem to have reached their maximum value in coercion. Rather than submit to enemy control, the rural Vietnamese people are turning to a strengthened government. And let there be no mistake about it—the Government of the Republic of Vietnam is stronger. And as the enemy continues to apply pressure, and more Vietnamese from the rural areas turn to the government, it gathers even greater strength. That is the real heart of this war.

You all know this is a guerrilla war. There are no lines of battle, and key terrain is a matter of who holds it at any given time. It is a limited war, but only *our* prosecution of the war is limited. Not the enemy's. The enemy has very definite advantages. He moves to and from the sanctuary of his homeland as he chooses. It is up to him if there is to be a war at all. To stop the war, even for a short rest, he merely removes himself. The only means we have to stop the war is to destroy, or pre-empt the enemy in the area within which we have limited our operations. We continue to seek him in that area, and we continue to destroy him. This keeps him away from the main population centers.

The enemy maintains his advantage of free movement, and a stable rear, only as long as we choose to remain out of his country. If the situation were reversed, North Vietnam would not be able to withstand guerrilla warfare within her borders—without outside help—any more than is the Republic of Vietnam.

But our country, and our allies, did not choose the destruction of North Vietnam. Rather, our forces were committed to deny the North Vietnamese the destruction and conquest of the Republic of Vietnam. And we are attempting to do this, by limiting our action to the area of contention: South Vietnam.

This is a test, a severe test, to determine the feasibility of halting aggression, without the destruction of the aggressor nation. We have no desire to destroy a country—we only intend that another country be left to its own determination. And this war has been an effort to re-establish peace, and order, by making it unprofitable for one nation to impose its will on a neighbor. But it takes great restraint, and an extremely temperate application of power. This country, in the past four years, has shown an unprecedented ability to do just this. But it demands a high price. It demands time. And time demands the surcharge of patience.

The young men who have chosen to serve as a part of the Navy-Marine Corps team, in this war, have shown a remarkable ability to understand this. In ships that steam on humid station in the Gulf of Tonkin; in the Riverine Forces, South, in the delta; and in the III Marine Amphibious Force, North, in the I Corps Tactical Zone; young Americans of the Navy and Marine Corps, willingly fight this war at sea, in the air, along the narrow riverways, and in the rice paddies and mountains. In contrast to those Americans who talk of peace, and man's right of self determination—these young men actually fight for these ideals.

Now, at this time, the enemy has three courses of action he can follow, in his war of conquest.

First, he can continue his current action: Quick hit and run raids and ambushes; and rocket and mortar attacks on American installations. These provide him no tactical advantage, and even though he loses a great many men in their application, he knows that every American casualty he causes—though far fewer in number than his own—creates another chink in the armor of American patience.

Politically coordinated with these attacks against American forces, are his indiscriminate rocket attacks on Vietnamese population centers. Again, no tactical advantage is gained by creating civilian casualties—but as the people rally to the government of the Republic of Vietnam, the rocket attacks are one of the few ways left to the enemy to create an atmosphere of terror. This is *his* war of attrition. He is willing to trade Viet

Cong and North Vietnamese lives for American patience, and South Vietnamese determination.

A second course of action that the enemy might elect, would be to launch his main force units in an all out effort—as he did in his Tet aggression of 1968. Since the defeat he suffered at that time, he has rebuilt his formations with new men—retrained them, re-equipped them, and at present they are in an attack posture. They are poised, they are ready, and they can be launched at any time.

As happened during Tet of 1968, such an enemy effort could only hope for limited, and temporary tactical success. But the ensuing campaign would be a bloody one. And again, his objective would not be terrain—it would be American patience and resolve.

The third course open to the enemy rests in Paris. He can actually start doing business at the peace table. He could sue for the best possible terms, and wait for another day. Another chance.

All of these possibilities depend on three considerations:

The enemy's determination in the face of his waning assets;

The progress of the government of the Republic of Vietnam, and its armed forces;

And, the determination and patience of the people right here, in the United States.

Now, that last consideration is the most dangerous ground the enemy walks on. Of all the ordnance in the American arsenal, the determination and patience of the American people—and their loyalty to allies—have always been their most potent weapons in the final achievement of victory. This has not changed. The people of this country *will* do the right thing. We *will* honor our commitment to the Republic of Vietnam.

But we are a free society. We question, we examine, we speak—and we dissent. That is our right. That is our strength. A totalitarian enemy can't understand this. There is nothing in his psychological makeup that will admit to individual thought, moral reflection, and questioning voices. This is the eternal flaw of tyranny.

And this brings us to the other theater of action of this war. The battlefield here, in this country.

I think objective historians of the future will have a difficult time summarizing *this* theater of action, and the motives of the participants. Because, at this time, the main point of contention is the one thing all Americans, everywhere, agree on—and desire above all else. An end to the war in Vietnam.

This war is now well into its fifth year. The battles being fought today are, more likely than not, being fought over the same ground as the battles of last year, and the year before. Americans grow weary of war. And not just this war, but the very idea of war, and the need to be prepared. Now, when reference is made to the anti-war sentiment in this country, it is a general statement, covering four entirely different groups:

There are those who oppose all war, regardless of purpose—on moral or religious grounds.

A second category includes the sincere watchdogs of our economy, who oppose big defense spending, and desire to divert the funds saved, to solving internal problems.

Yet another group is opposed only to our involvement in *this* war, in Vietnam.

And, a fourth group. A group of anti-government organizations who oppose our involvement in this war, only because they are in accord with the principles of the enemy. They employ some of the vocabulary of the pacifists in speaking of this war—but wave the flag of the Viet Cong, burn our own flag, practice violence, and preach their own war as a means to destroy our present society.

The first three groups are a traditional interchange of our free society. They disagree, and as Americans they practice dissent. It is this right *to* dissent that we fight to preserve. And it is because we believe in such a right that we must be prepared to fight other aggression.

The fourth group hides behind this right of dissent. Like our enemy in Vietnam, they fight a guerrilla war. They too have a freedom of movement, and the advantage of doing battle when and where they choose. Their sanctuary is the honesty, and integrity of the other three groups—and the knowledge that this is truly a free country.

Now they are on our college campuses. Now they have forced identification with today's generation. The same generation that serves so well in today's Navy and Marine Corps—and, indeed, in today's Army, Air Force, and Coast Guard. The young Americans who fight this war, who choose to serve this country at a time that service is not an expected act of conformity, but an individual act of faith.

How does the young veteran of Vietnam see his association with these people? How does he feel about being inducted into the "turned-on, dropped-out" set? Does he feel that all of his courage, and sacrifice, and faith has been in vain? If it has, ladies and gentlemen, then so too, has the service of all Americans who fought in the American revolution, and all other wars this country has had to fight in the defense of freedom.

You well know of the problems of the ROTC at some schools. I think you know too, of the problems faced by the Marine Corps and other services in recruiting young officers on college campuses. We have had no problems attracting young college graduates to the service as officers. Our problem has been getting on campus, and getting in touch with those who wish to serve.

At some schools our Marine recruiters have been confronted by radicals who resent—in fact reject—the presence of those who defend their freedom. And there are some college administrators who will not afford suitable space to conduct recruiting efforts. Other administrators have given in to militant demands, and ordered the recruiters from the campus.

Where did this generate? How did it start? Last year, the Students for a Democratic Society published an operation order. It is not secret, it was made abundantly available. The title of the plan is: "Smash the Military Machine in the Schools." Among its objectives it lists the destruction of ROTC, campus recruiting for the military and defense industries, and Government sponsored research. It further commands and explains: "It is necessary to make students fight the universities, not as students, but as radicals attacking American imperialism."

Is this dissent? Is this active pacifism? I think not. I think it is an effort to destroy this country's defense establishment. And the effort has had its influence, not only on some students and educators—but on other Americans, sincere, and respected.

This has hurt the Marine Corps. For a number of years we have depended upon recruiting on college campuses to provide nearly 85 percent of all new Marine officers. This gave us a valuable cross section of educated young Americans. Young leaders from every part of this Nation who brought with them fresh skills, and new ideas. Their influence was important not only to the young men they command, but to us, the senior career officers who command them.

Because of this continuing difficulty, the Marine Corps has opened a program to offer the opportunity of officer candidate school to young men who have completed two years of college—aiming primarily at those who have completed a junior college course.

But this does not mean the standards of junior officer leadership, and intelligence have been lowered. Nor does it mean the quality of officer training will be affected. And it has not meant an end to college graduates continuing to seek service as commissioned officers. Like the young Americans who willingly take their places in the enlisted ranks; these young men continue to offer their education, skills, and leadership.

Because of this situation, a new relationship has developed between young officers and their men. There is a silent equality they both acknowledge. Not a lack of discipline, but a warmth of understanding. An unspoken agreement of allegiance and service. And this is the stuff that has made this country.

When this nation was established, it was under an almost forgotten concept of ancient philosophy. The concept that a man owes his allegiance and service not to a sovereign, but to his country. And the sovereign owes his allegiance, and his service to the people. This is the American military tradition, too. We serve our country. We serve the people. We are *not* a cult-of-the-gun. We are citizens who, like all other citizens, demand citizen control of our defense. Our common defense.

In this country, there is a defense establishment, and there is a military industrial complex. That they exist is not as important as *why* they exist. All of the polemics, and turn-about adjectives of the anti-defense dialogue will not change the fact that other men, in other countries, still speak of face to face confrontation, and destruction of this country. And they do not speak of destruction of the rich, the middle class, or the poor. They do not say that they intend to destroy the American way of life. They speak of destruction of this country, this people.

That is why we exist. There is an enemy, and we exist for the defense against that enemy.

Because we tire of war, and the expense and burden of maintaining a strong defense, does not mean our enemies weaken, and wither away. We have had two wars since world war II. How many more have we averted? How many wars have *not* been fought because of our strength, our defense?

In the heart of this country is a small town. Its population rounds out to approximately 250 people—men, women, and children. This village has felt the war in Vietnam. Five of its young men have been killed in action. Not long ago the townspeople petitioned to stop any further drafting of young men from their town. They felt they had given enough. But what of the five who have died? Have they died in vain, now that their town withdraws from the war?

And again, what of all the young men who have given their service in this war? How do they see it? Do we leave them a country weakened in its defense because it grows weary of what it sees on television, and reads in the press?

They are Americans too. And they know this war, not from television, but from day to day dedication and sacrifice. How do they really feel about it? Ask one of the thirty-four thousand marines—young officers and enlisted marines—who have requested to serve an additional 6 months in Vietnam. Ask the young marine who constructed the sign I saw just outside his foxhole at Khe Sanh.

"For those who fight for it," the sign read, "Life has a special flavor the protected never know."

Well, to date, more than three million men have come from the war in Vietnam. Over three million young Americans who have fought in every branch of our armed forces in that war, and indeed know that very special flavor of life.

Except for the return of the 27th Marines to this city last summer, they have come home as they left. Quietly, in small groups, without fanfare, without ticker-tape parades, and without promises. And in the mad rush to ask the youth of today how they feel about everything—these three million young men have somehow been overlooked. But they will not remain silent forever.

These young Americans are deeply proud of the service they have given. They believe in freedom for all men. They have proven that fact by fighting for it. They believe in freedom for themselves, too, but have remained quiet about it because it was an assumed right—to be preserved by their elders. But now they question the preservation of that freedom—and the more they question the more they find voice. In a recent letter to a weekly newsmagazine, a young American soldier expressed a growing feeling:

"Many of us here in Vietnam, have been following the stories about unrest on the Nation's campuses with subdued anger. It is demoralizing to read about our underprivileged counterparts vandalizing campus buildings, manhandling institution leaders, and generally making fools of themselves."

He goes on to say:

"Someday this war is going to be over, and millions of angry young men are going to descend on the 50 States with dreams of homes, and families, and education, and jobs. And when they hit the campuses, I sincerely hope someone tries to stop a marine from going to class, or that some sorry, social reject tries to plant a Viet Cong flag next to the artificial leg of a Seabee, or spits in the burned face of an Army medic. I guarantee that it will only happen once.

Do these fine American fighting men deserve a country in order?

Do they deserve a sound defense?

They do. They have payed for it richly.

And I believe that with their spirit, their patriotism, their energy—and with the backing of men and women like you, they will get the wonderful kind of country they deserve.

Thank you.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS CONFRONT OUR PRIVATE HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nathaniel H. Rogg, executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, in his statement before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the recent increase in the prime interest rate, reports that the private homebuilding industry is facing a fight for survival. Unfortunately, Mr. Rogg's analysis of this tragic situation is all too true. To all who are concerned with finding meaningful solutions to the critical problems confronting our private homebuilding industry I commend Mr. Rogg's most excellent statement, which follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. ROGG

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Nathaniel H. Rogg, and I am Executive Vice President of the National Association of Home Builders. Our Association represents a membership of over 51,000 builders and associates. We appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before you today to present our views on the recent increase in the prime interest rate to 8½%.

Gentlemen, the private home building industry is facing a fight for survival. We are told that if we wait two or three months things should get better. We are told that the Federal Reserve is giving some consideration to a program of voluntary credit restraint. We are told that the surtax extension and investment credit repeal will reduce inflation's flames to flickers.

In our opinion, we cannot wait longer. The prime lending rate of the private banks must be rolled back.

The Fed should immediately call on its member banks—as it did in the money crunch days of 1966—to slow their loans to business. The privilege of dealing at its discount window, and it is a privilege, not a right, should be re-emphasized.

We also urge that—

The Fed maintain its current rate on time deposits under Regulation Q, in order to forestall any further outflow of savings from savings and loans and mutual savings banks;

The FHA interest rate not be now raised until there is a clear demonstration of the absolute necessity to do so;

FNMA continue and expand its present level of support of federally backed mortgages;

Lending institutions voluntarily ration scarce credit resources to the end that home builders—as well as small business generally—be given an opportunity to continue operating and make their vitally needed contributions to the economic well-being of our nation. This we urge, not only for the small businessmen we represent, but especially for hard pressed American families seeking to buy or rent housing today and tomorrow;

The Fed be urged to purchase obligations of FNMA and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in order to support, at a reasonable rate, this essential component of housing financing;

Treasury and HUD take immediate steps to resolve their differences and make operational the authority for GNMA to guarantee mortgage-backed securities issued by FNMA and private mortgage holders;

Adequate funding at full authorized levels, be provided for the government-assisted housing programs, such as enacted in 1968;

Full use be made of available GNMA special assistance funds, possibly in conjunction with FNMA purchase, at the going market price, of mortgages acquired by GNMA at par.

These suggestions deal primarily with the immediate crisis. Beyond this, a much longer look and study should be undertaken. The history of recent economic activity indicates to us that much is wrong with the Nation's financial structure, its management, and its regulation.

Certainly the money crunch of 1966, as well as that of today, clearly indicates the present structure and the present regulatory system together are simply inadequate to meet the Nation's declared needs, particularly those of the housing sector.

The Nation's financial structure has evolved over many years. Its current form and regulatory system were established early in this century upon the heels of several monetary panics. It has been improved upon over the years and, certainly in the first two-thirds of this century, has made an enormous contribution to economic growth, though not in the housing field particularly. However, the system, as presently constituted is simply not geared to cope with recently emerging problems, and particularly those we will encounter in the last third of the century.

We therefore urge that a head-to-toe examination of the financial machinery and the regulatory system be begun immediately with a view toward making the system more responsive to the Nation's requirements. Unless this is done, we foresee continuing and intensified problems in satisfying our national aspirations.

But what the Nation needs now is a massive exercise in self-restraint, but this restraint should be more evenly applied, more equitably shared. The home building industry and home buyers seem to be the only ones being restrained, in fact, strangled.

We are now building housing at a rate lower than five years ago. Yet this is a time when—in relation to housing needs and goals—we should be producing at least 50 per cent above our current level.

The severe effects, felt by the home building industry in recent years as a result of the significant increases in interest rates, serve to spotlight the precarious situation it finds itself in relation to the economy as a whole. The least fluctuation severely affects our industry. It may be of some interest to the Committee to examine the chart attached to my statement which demonstrates the percentage of the gross national product that new residential construction has shared since 1915. This chart shows very vividly how our industry has not kept pace with the economy in recent years.

At the minimum, we believe that new residential construction should represent 4.5% of the gross national product. At present it is only 3.5%. Except for the severe credit shortage period experienced in 1966, this is the lowest since the Second World War. A 4.5% level would assure greater stability in times such as we are now experiencing.

Spiraling inflation, fed by record-high interest rates, is pricing a large segment of our population out of the market. This latest hike must be rolled back. And, on behalf of our industry, I so wired the President on the day following the first press stories on the increase.

Unless immediate steps are taken to counteract these rising interest rates, the cost of mortgage money soon will be so high that even middle income purchasers will not be able to afford to buy homes, nor will middle income renters be able to afford to pay the rents made necessary by these high interest rates.

Already the hopes of low and moderate income families to obtain decent housing have been cruelly crippled. It has become increasingly harder to obtain short-term construction money or long-term mortgage money at any rate.

This increase means further loss of manpower to our industry, already seeking desperately to preserve its skilled workers. It means less use of materials. It means fewer jobs in related industries. It means loss of revenues to local communities.

This present situation is especially galling for our industry because we have consistently backed measures in the Congress and the Executive Branch to curb inflation. Home builders have supported—and still support—proposed anti-inflationary measures such as continuation of the surtax, removal of the investment credit, and reduced Federal expenditures. We have supported such measures, knowing full well they will have an impact on our industry. But knowing, too, they are necessary to contain inflation if the overall economy is to survive.

By contrast, we think the banks' recent prime rate increase disregards the lending industry's social and economic responsibilities to the Nation. The banks say this recent increase, and perhaps even further increases, are essential in the fight against inflation. This is illusory. The constant increases in lending rates have only fed an inflationary psychology. Borrowers, especially big corporate businesses, fearing further increases have continued in competition with each other to get at all available funds.

There is simply no evidence in recent experience to support the view that ever higher interest rates hold back inflationary fires of the kind we are now experiencing. They have not cut back the demand for business loans, they have not lowered prices, they have not freed more money for social purposes. Nor will they. Rationing credit, as is now being done by ever-increasing interest rates, results merely in excluding the weaker competitors for scarce creditors and not the less meritorious borrowers. In short, it leaves no room for attention to using our credit resources for our Nation's needs.

Obviously, when it comes to competing for scarce funds, the home buying consumer is a much weaker competitor than are corporate giants, like General Motors. A statement in the June 20 issue of *Time Magazine* vividly illustrates what we are talking about:

"Big companies will be able to pay the new price of credit . . . mortgage rates immediately moved up to 9¼% in California and Colorado, and lenders in many cities raised the fees by which they increase their take from mortgage loans, without actually changing the interest rate. For the immediate future, the higher money rates will add to the upward pressure on prices. Companies figure interest charges as part of their cost of doing business, and the consumer must ultimately pay the bill."

An economic time bomb is ticking. High interest rates have so driven up yields on other obligations that commercial banks have suffered a net outflow of $600 million in savings during the first 5 months of this year as compared to a net inflow of $6.2 billion during the same period in 1968—a difference of nearly $7 billion.

Fortunately, and unlike the situation in 1966, the Federal Reserve Board has not increased maximum interest rates payable on time deposits; this has minimized a potentially significant and adverse effect on the savings inflow to savings and loans and mutual savings banks, thereby avoiding the disastrous results that occurred in the 1966 credit crunch. We welcome this and urge that it be continued, since such an action would only serve to unbalance the economy even more.

In urging a prime rate rollback, we believe that the full influence of the Congress, as well as of the Administration, must be brought to bear on the commercial banks. Such a rollback is necessary to stifle the call now being heard in some quarters for more direct Federal intervention in the allocation of economic resources. We, along with many others, abhor Federal controls. However, we also recognize that for the first time we are engaged in a major military undertaking without some type of controls on the use of credit and on prices and wages. It could well be argued, of course, that general monetary restraints of the kind we are now experiencing are actually a form of selective credit controls imposed on small businesses and the housing industry.

Certainly, of extreme importance now is quick passage of the tax legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee last week. The continuation of the surtax, the repeal of the 7% investment credit, and a continued effort to hold down unnecessary Federal spending are essential in the fight against inflation.

We are prepared to shoulder burdens in the fight against inflation in order to preserve a healthy national economy. Others should shoulder their share.

RUSSIA BECKONS OLD BUDDY UNCLE SAM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent gestures by the Russians indicating the desires to lure President Nixon to the summit and to obtain U.S. economic and political support must be analyzed in the light of results of previous dealings with the Soviets.

The Chicago Tribune's editorial commentary this morning discusses the possible Sino-Soviet split and the U.S. relation to it in a most practical fashion, as follows:

RUSSIA BECKONS OLD BUDDY UNCLE SAM

Frank Starr, our Moscow correspondent, has got within 30 miles of the troubled Sino-soviet frontier, where there have been recent exchanges of fire, and discovers that the Russians are counting every American to do his duty to the Soviet Union in the event of all-out war.

The Russians have a convenient memory, and they expect the same of us. They were happy to have lend-lease and the United States as an ally when they got embroiled with Hitler's Germany, but once the enemy was beaten soviet propaganda represented the "Great Patriotic war" as solely a Russian endeavor, with the United States deserving no credit.

Now that the pot gives signs of boiling over again, the Russians say that if there should be war with the Red Chinese it will be our war as well as theirs. Talking to people in Khabarovsk, in the soviet far east, Starr heard such sentiments as these:

"If there's a war, other countries like yours will not be able to ignore it. They'll have to join, and if they do that it will be a world war—the third. You have a responsibility to the well-being of mankind, because such a war would be a tragedy for all humanity."

But out of the same mouth came the usual soviet propaganda condemning the United States for intervening in Viet Nam, altho the reverse of that coin is that Washington could not stand aside and do nothing in a Chinese-Russian war.

Much the same line was enunciated by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in his speech last week to the supreme soviet, the hypothetical soviet national assembly. Gromyko said:

"The United States has been waging war against the Vietnamese people for five years now. By invading South Viet Nam with an army half a million strong and thus grossly violating the international Geneva agreements on Viet Nam, the United States acted as an aggressor.

"The Soviet Union is giving and will continue to give assistance to the fraternal Vietnamese people in their just struggle."

Gromyko proposed that American forces get out and accept a blow to prestige in the form of qualified surrender to communism.

On the other hand, he was solicitous that the United States show sympathy with the Soviet Union in its protracted dispute with communist China, and the warnings he addressed to Peking were couched in harsh language.

The experience of the United States in Franklin Roosevelt's crusade to make the world safe for communism certainly should give pause to any inclination to repeat the experiment, which 25 years ago led to the communization of eastern Europe and China.

As former President Herbert Hoover prophesied in 1941, "If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world." He said an alliance with the Kremlin tyranny would reduce Roosevelt's crusade for the "four freedoms" to a "gargantuan joke," and that America's interest was to let the totalitarians exhaust one another.

That is the policy that is in America's interest today.

BROOKVILLE RESERVOIR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, economic progress in the predominantly rural, 16-county Ninth District of Indiana depends in no small part upon the control and conservation of the water resources of the area.

Through a series of reservoirs, watershed control programs, rural water and sewer lines, a new climate is being created in southeastern Indiana, one which is attractive to industry, which improves health and education standards, which brings about a better standard of living, and improves agricultural production.

I was dismayed to learn last week that the partially completed Brookville Reservoir on the East Fork of the Whitewater River was being made the victim of another construction delay—one of many recently.

I disagree with this thinking and I have stated my objections in the following letter to President Nixon:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: I write to express my shock and dismay at learning the Brookville Reservoir project in Southeastern Indiana has been delayed again.

You dealt this project a crippling blow by reducing President Johnson's Brookville construction allocation for Fiscal Year 1970 from $3.9 million to $1.4 million. Your order for a further deferment of the work brings a new sense of frustration and uncertainty to the residents of the area.

I was assured only last month that advertisement for bids for the construction of a dam and spillway would be going out in mid-July. I am informed now, however, that advertisements have been deferred indefinitely.

I find it incredible that this partially-completed and critically-needed project has been delayed again in the name of economy. Allowing this reservoir to languish in its partially-complete state is not saving money, but creating a costlier project.

These continuing delays are permitting a deterioration of already-completed segments of the project . . . creating a personnel problem with the Corps of Engineers in retaining people familiar with the project . . . allowing rising construction costs to push higher the total project cost . . . discouraging public-minded citizens from participating in conservation projects . . . and permitting spring floods and summer droughts to continue to wreak the economic hardships on Hoosiers which this reservoir was designed to alleviate.

I know and appreciate the need for economy, but it becomes false economy to delay a partially-completed project, disrupting mail and school bus routes and farm-to-market roads; to move people off their land, then rent it back to them, and to create a sense of uncertainty which affects the economic climate of Southeastern Indiana.

I am informed that the Corps of Engineers became aware of the report on the Second Supplemental Bill, containing Congress' spending limitations on Friday, and on this basis, ordered the delay. That legislation was passed by both Houses of the Congress on Wednesday.

I find the Corps of Engineers' reasoning unacceptable, and I find the continued delays in the name of economy unrealistic.

I urge you to order the immediate reinstatement of construction on the Brookville Reservoir project.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

THE NEED TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has met with severe setbacks and has to date been unable to meet its potential.

This program of low-interest insured loans to qualified college students is a commendable one. It was intended to assist middle- and low-income families in financing college educations for their children.

The loan program provides that all qualified students are eligible to receive insured low-interest loans regardless of family income, and that those students from families having an adjusted income of less than $15,000 would have all their interest paid by the Federal Government while they are in school and 3 percentage points of the 6-percent total during the repayment period which begins 9 months after the student leaves college or graduate school.

The loans may be made to students by banks and other lending institutions and insured by State loan guarantee authorities or by private nonprofit agencies. A Federal loan insurance program is authorized on a standby basis, if adequate State and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students. To date the Federal Government has not guaranteed any student loans.

The Federal Government advances money, known as "seed-money," to strengthen or to help establish State and private nonprofit agencies' insurance funds.

This loan program which got underway during the summer of 1966 has provided about $1.4 billion in loans to an estimated 1.6 million students—a praiseworthy achievement, but unfortunately not adequate to the student demand for these loans.

The average cost of attending a public college or university is estimated by the Office of Education at $1,122 an academic year—and for a private college or university at $2,389 a year. Many writers and economists have arrived at considerably higher estimates.

The latest estimates of the Bureau of Census put the median money income of American families with heads under 65 years at $7,974. Clearly those families with incomes of $7,974 or less would find it very difficult if not impossible to support one, let alone two or more children through college. Therefore it is imperative that we, in a nation that honors equality of educational opportunity as a basic principle of justice, aid those families who have present difficulties in sending their children through college.

It has been obvious for several years now that the problems besetting this program have resulted in a reluctance on the part of many private lenders to participate and a refusal of others to accept more than a very limited number of applications for insured loans to students.

Consequently many students have been unable to obtain these loans, and have been unable to continue their educations.

There are two main problems, Mr. Speaker, that have prevented this program from functioning fully. First, the banks and other lenders contend that the maximum interest rate of 6 percent does not cover the cost to the lenders in today's tight money market.

When this maximum interest rate was arrived at 4 years ago, it was considered a "break-even" rate for the lenders. The banks and other lending institutions insist that this was never a realistic appraisal, and 6 percent maximum has proved to be a "loss" rate for them.

Student loans are given for comparatively long terms. The loans do not contribute to bank liquidity through repayment of principle in the way that other loans, including installment loans, do. Repayment of principle on an installment loan—which is comparable to a student loan—begins within a month after credit has been extended, whereas repayment on student loans may not begin until at least 9 months after the borrower completes his course of study. Loans are repaid within 5 to 10 years after graduation. This creates a long time-lag in the "roll-over" time of this money.

This 6 percent interest maximum is 2.5 percent below the rate that many banks charge their prime business borrowers.

Second, there is a burdensome amount of paper work involved in making and processing these loans. Student loans, because of the extra paperwork and the extra time involved, cost more than most other types of loans.

These pressing problems must be remedied before the lenders will decide in favor of allocating their limited funds for student loans.

I will be introducing a bill to increase the effectiveness of the guaranteed student loan programs. This bill will amend provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and of the National Vocational Loan Insurance Act of 1965 to encourage banks and other lenders to participate fully in this timely and much needed student loan program.

Since the main obstacles to the functioning of this program are the maximum interest rate allowable on loans and the cumbersome and costly paperwork involved in making these loans, my amendments concern themselves largely with these two areas.

My bill will permit the President of the United States, after consultation with the Federal Reserve Board, to set interest rates, by Executive order, in excess of 6 percent when the President has determined that such a rate is necessary for this program to be fully realized, and would provide for Federal payment of the additional interest cost.

I am aware of the fact that 11 States—Delaware, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia; have usury laws which set contract rates at a 6-percent maximum. These States could, however, amend their usury laws to make an exception of the long-term guaranteed student loans as many States now make other exceptions to their usury laws when it serves an important public purpose.

This interest rate, set by the President in an Executive order, will not be mandatory. A lending institution could charge less than the maximum. But this variable ceiling would prevent the establishment by the Federal Government of any arbitrary interest figure which might become a bar to the effectiveness of this program. It would enable the President to assure that, insofar as the Federal Government would be concerned, there would be no arbitrary barrier across the road of higher education.

I further propose that the private lenders will be entitled to charge certain fees to be set at an appropriate basis by the Secretary, to cover the costs of making these loans that are not adequately compensated for by allowable interest charges.

Private lenders would be permitted up to $35 for processing each approved student loan application and up to $35 for work involved in consolidation or other conversion fees when the repayment period begins. A servicing fee of up to $1 for each installment payable by the borrower will also be permitted. All processing, consolidation and other conversion fees will be paid for by the Federal Government.

The passage of these amendments will insure fulfillment of the great potential of the guaranteed student loan program by giving it a greater appeal to those lending institutions that have to date been reluctant to commit themselves to this program.

Today we are faced with the problem of ever-spiraling costs to the student and his family for attendance at an institution of higher learning. Over the past 10 years the cost of attending a public institution has risen 19 percent and there has been a 41-percent increase in private school costs.

If we are to make meaningful financial assistance to all students willing and able to benefit from a college education, then we must amend the guaranteed student loan program. This program is based on sound principles and with the adoption of my amendments it could make a major contribution to the financing of undergraduate, graduate, and vocational education for students of low-and middle-income families. A democracy must invest in the education of all its young people if it is to flourish.

THE GREAT SHOE IMPORT THREAT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak of an extremely serious situation, that of the potential disaster facing the American shoemaking industry. Foreign imports, cheap and of decent quality, are flooding the American market. If we do not act quickly, the damage may be irrevocable.

By all marketing indicators, shoemaking should be among the fastest growing American industries. Considering that U.S. footwear consumption has for many years amounted to approximately 3½ pairs per capita, then on the basis of our population increase alone the market should be growing by 10 million pairs annually. If this in itself were not sufficient, we must note that in the last 10 years we have seen the total integration of footwear into the current fashion outlook. And our booming economy has provided for even further growth.

Of course, I am really not contending that the market has not grown. It has grown considerably from sales of 740 million pairs in 1966 to over 830 million pairs in 1968, but domestic production has not grown at all. The entire net growth of 2 years, more than 90 million pairs of shoes, has gone to foreign imports.

In the "nonrubber" area, imports totaled approximately 34 million pairs in 1959. By 1967, they had climbed to 129 million pairs, and in 1968 they climbed another 35 percent. Overall imports constituted over 20 percent of domestic sales in 1968. Estimates for 1969 run up to 35 percent, with sales to date indicating that this figure is indeed attainable. It appears that by 1975, foreign manufacturers will have taken over at least 50 percent of the U.S. footwear market, and if present trends continue, the foreign share could be as great as a staggering 90 percent. From second-rate competition to dominance in 15 years.

The reason for these changes is not style, nor quality, nor product features. One cannot berate the foreign products; although they are no better than American footwear, they are equivalent in many cases. The great different is in price, and the great difference in price is in labor.

We all know that cheap foreign labor has been a problem for many American industries. In this case, average foreign rates are about 75 cents per hour, or roughly one-third of the present U.S. rate. In the shoemaking industry, this difference is of greater significance than is generally the case, since labor accounts for up to 35 percent of the cost of each unit. Further, because the industry is highly competitive, profit margins are very narrow.

The footwear producers of the United States are not asking for economic isolationism or latter-day protectionism. They are merely asking for a chance to compete fairly. Rather than assisting them positively, or even providing a stable situation, in the last few years we have permitted import duty reductions that have averaged out to about 30 percent. It seems to me that we have unfairly neglected these people, and unless something is done quickly we will witness the accelerating deterioration of a large American industry.

I have already joined over two-thirds of the Members of the House in petitioning President Nixon to negotiate voluntary limitations on shoe imports with those nations sending the bulk of the imported footwear to the United States. I think this is a healthy recognition of the problem at hand, but it is not enough. I take this opportunity to urge the Committee on Ways and Means to make an early and favorable report on H.R. 12466, my proposed Orderly Footwear and Marketing Act of 1969.

The act would provide for negotiated quotas on imports of footwear into the United States and will assure foreign manufacturers and domestic producers alike their fair shares of the expanding U.S. footwear market. Under this act, the President would be empowered to seek agreements with other nations limiting imports of footwear in any category to the average share of U.S. consumption in that category during a 3-year period before 1967. After 6 months, imports not covered by the agreement would be limited to the average amount brought in during the 1962–66 period. This quantity may each year thereafter increase up to 10 percent of U.S. market growth, and the President may adjust any nation's share of imports to accommodate changing economic patterns and developing countries.

I firmly believe that this is the best means of dealing with this astounding import deluge, and I urge committee action as soon as it has finished work on income tax reform, which is now occupying its working hours.

POPULATION GROWTH AND ITS CONSEQUENCES TO SOCIETY

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, this past week the House Republican Research Committee task force on earth resources and population, of which I am chairman, was honored to have Mr. Arthur A. Campbell and Dr. Norman A. Hilmar of the National Institutes of Health and Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the Science Adviser to the President, testify before us on the question of population growth and its consequences to society.

All the testimony before us has emphasized again and again the need for immediate coordination of existing programs and expanded funding in this most crucial area. We have had studies in untold abundance—now we need positive action. In this light I was heartened by the comments of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch on CBS' "Face the Nation" Sunday afternoon when he stated:

> In an era when we had to cut back from many other areas, we made a quantum jump in our allocations for family planning, because we just simply have to come to grips with this. We're kidding ourselves if we think we can make changes in a creative way in these other areas if we're overpopulating ourselves.

In order to keep the Members informed of the progress of our work, I wish to include the highlights of these two meetings at this point in the RECORD:

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1969

National Institutes of Health: Mr. Arthur A. Campbell, Deputy Director, Center for Population Research; and Dr. Norman A. Hilmar, Chief, Program Liaison Branch, Center for Population Research.

Members present: Bush, Carter, Horton, McCloskey, Pettis.

The Center for Population Research has three major functions: first, it is the coordinating body for all population research presently being conducted by the federal government; second, it is responsible for conducting contract research programs; and third, it authorizes and oversees research grants. Mr. Campbell explained that the President's Health Message of March, 1968 gives the CPR the authority to assume this coordinating function.

For fiscal 1969, the NICHD budget totals over $10 million, of which $8.2 million has been designated for research contracts and grants. In addition, NICHD has received $1.5 million from AID for specific research.

Within NICHD the research priorities are determined by the members of the Population Research Advisory Committee. The members of this committee are trained experts and paid by NICHD as population consultants.

Mr. Campbell explained that the CPR projects must be viewed within the context of various national cultural patterns. For instance, a single injection which would protect women for as long as a year and would eliminate human oversight would be a more satisfactory control method. Mr. Campbell admitted that to be realistic, such a project will need 5–10 years of development.

The CPR feels it must continue to deal with basic research which pertains primarily to reproductive processes, and leave the research of product development and distribution to the private sector as well as to the other offices of NICHD.

Mr. Campbell explained the need for complete national statistics studies. The National Center for Health Statistics was refused funds in 1967 and 1968 by the House Appropriations Committee to complete the type of family survey NICHD feels is essential.

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1969

Office of Science and Technology: Dr. Lee A DuBridge, Director, OST; Dr. John Buckley, Technical Assistant, OST; Dr. Eric B. Ward, Executive Secretary, Federal Council on Science and Technology; and Dr. Donald R. King, Technical Assistant, OST.

Members present: Bush, Gubser, Horton, McCloskey, MacGregor, Mosher, Pettis, Vander Jagt, Schneebeli.

Dr. DuBridge indicated that the White House is deeply interested in exploring problems relating to our environment and our growing population. The OST has recently added five staff members to assist the members of the newly-formed Environmental Quality Council.

According to Dr. King, our population growth has only recently been recognized as an official problem, and therefore, the research data available is inadequate.

Dr. DuBridge claimed that OST, in its workings of the past 2 years, has encountered little or no resistance to family planning programs in this country.

An ad hoc task force has evaluated all the research activities within the federal government and will complete their report to Dr. DuBridge shortly.

Dr. DuBridge explained that the ocean does provide some new areas of food production, but warned that the ocean must not be viewed as the single solution to our food shortage problems. Fish protein concentrate is as nutritious as other protein fortified foods but more expensive to produce than either fortified peanuts or soy beans. Dr. DuBridge did point out however, that extracting minerals from the sea is both feasible and profitable. By improving our mining technology, we should be able to tap the wealth from the ocean's bottom.

In order to bring about better coordination in NASA's Earth Resource Satellite Program Dr. DuBridge explained that the President has established a space task group since the Departments of Agriculture and Interior are extremely interested in using ERS data.

Dr. DuBridge explained some of the conflicting environmental viewpoints on types of power centers. Air pollution is reduced by the smokeless atomic energy plants, but public fear of radioactive contamination is high. Both fossil fuel plants and atomic plants necessarily discharge "waste heat," but at the present scale, fossil fuel plants have proven to be more efficient in terms of a power-waste heat ratio.

STUDENT VIEWS AS WRITTEN BY STUDENTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some observations about the campus world of today as they are expressed by three college students who were recognized as youth leaders when they were students at Goodrich Senior High School in Fond du Lac, Wis.

Each of the writers is a former national winner of the Elks Youth Leadership award. Mark G. Petri was awarded first place in the national Elks contest in 1965. David J. Kuter placed second in the same contest 2 years later, and Diane Hull won third place nationally just a year ago.

Their letters are written in reply to Attorney Thomas L. Massey, who serves as chairman of the very successful youth activities committee of the Elks in Fond du Lac. I believe that the letters are perceptive and very instructive about the feelings of many students today. With appreciation for their work, and for Mr. Massey's encouragement, I am pleased to insert these letters in the RECORD at this point:

HARVARD COLLEGE,
Cambridge, Mass., May 1, 1969.

Mr. THOMAS L. MASSEY,
Chairman, Youth Activities Committee, Fond du Lac, Wis.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: Thank you for writing me about the 1969 Elks Youth Activities Banquet. I am most happy to relate some of my activities since I received the Elks Award four years ago and to make some more general comments as well.

I am now completing my senior year at Harvard College, where I have majored in Social Studies, an honors field of concentration including work in Economics, History, Government, and Social Relations. In addition to normal school work, I have been active as a cabinet member and executive committee member of the Phillips Brooks House Association, Harvard's largest undergraduate organization. P.B.H.A., as it is commonly known, has about 1000 volunteers in 15 different programs doing social service work in the Boston area, in Africa, and on American Indian Reservations.

Over the past two summers I have worked as a part of Senator William Proxmire's Washington Senate staff and as Harvard Professor Edward C. Banfield's research assistant for a new (and still unpublished) book on urban problems. Both experiences were rewarding and exciting, allowing me to confront important issues and meet interesting people.

This summer I will begin three years as a Navy Supply Officer, after which I hope to reapply to Harvard Law School (I was admitted for next year, but will have to reapply later because of my Navy obligation). After completing my education I hope to return to Fond du Lac to live, as it compares favorably with the bigness and hurry of the East Coast.

As for advice and encouragement for this year's Elks winners, I suspect they need little of it. Colleges and their futures in general are all exciting enough, rewarding enough, and busy enough to be their own sales pitches for continued activity; and the former activities of the winners suggest that they are likely to take full advantage of such opportunities.

If there is any "trick" in creating a better future through our activities, I feel it is probably combining change and progressive action with a respect for what we have already achieved. Throughout the political agenda of the moment—whether the issue is the war in Vietnam or the recent student unrests that so personally and painfully disrupted my Harvard life—there seems to be a growing awareness of what is *not* wanted without much awarness of what *is* wanted or of what we already have and can too easily risk.

The example of this tendency now on my mind is the occupation of Harvard's main administration building three weeks ago. Not only was this action a frontal assault on the integrity of this university—that would have been serious enough—but it was also an assault without positive goals: there was much talk of tearing aspects of the university apart and all too little of building it into a better place. When constructive talk did finally begin, it was *not* led (or at any rate not meaningfully led) by the original disrupters. In the immediate disorder and confusion slogans were abundant, but real thought about real problems was rare indeed. In the process the virtues and wisdom of a laboriously constructed, but always fragile freedom so vital to a free university—and to a free society—almost became lost.

Writing from that context of disorder, I congratulate the current winners of the Elks Awards because I sense that they have learned the "trick" of working toward positive reform and meaningful action without resorting to obstructionism or disorder. It is a talent all too rare and therefore all the more valuable.

Sincerely,

MARK G. PETRI.

HARVARD COLLEGE,
Cambridge, Mass., May 3, 1969.

Mr. THOMAS L. MASSEY,
Chairman, Youth Activities Committee, Elks Lodge No. 57, Fond du Lac, Wis.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: I most sincerely regret that I could not personally be with you this evening but let me use this letter as an opportunity to convey some of my thoughts and sentiments to you.

I should first like to congratulate all the students the Elks are honoring tonight and especially Julia Becker on her selection for first place in the Youth Leadership Contest. The dedication and effort that these awards represent is indeed outstanding.

It has been almost two years since I left Fond du Lac to attend Harvard and in that time I have encountered many new ideas, people, and experiences. I have uncovered in myself a distinct pleasure in learning and thus my studies, which are mostly biochemistry and history, have taken a great deal of my time. I still intend to go to medical school.

Aside from the always present school work, I had the opportunity last year to help teach second grade in a school for deprived children from the poor sections of Boston. This was indeed a most trying, if not at times shocking experience.

This year my major activity has been to operate a chemistry laboratory for the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston along with several other students from Harvard and M.I.T. Aside from that, I have been preparing for what I hope to be a most fruitful summer. I have been given a summer research grant by the National Institutes of Health to do some original research on several topics that I have long contemplated at the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research at the University of Wisconsin.

As you can well see, my activities have been basically academic these past few years but it has afforded me with a great opportunity to learn and reflect upon subjects both scientific and political. It has been a time of reevaluation and discovery; something which I feel is essential for anyone concerned with the problems of our society.

I feel virtually compelled to consider and relate some of my thoughts on something which has indeed troubled me as well, I imagine, as it has concerned you. The student demonstrations and strikes of this spring have again focused attention on the role of students, of youth in general, in our social structure. Personally I can neither condemn nor praise our actions; I can merely attempt to reflect on the motives for such actions.

The youth of today is in a unique situation, unlike that at any other time in history. We are encouraged to learn and study society most of our young lives—to think on our own and formulate ideals. I think that in many ways this has led to a very moralistic outlook on life; that is also the impression I have gotten from talking to people during our strike here at Harvard. The issues are old ones such as housing and race relations both of which have bothered our society for generations. But today's youth approach these issues from the purest moral sense and when it comes to action, then, it is moralism that dictates action. This is laudable in one sense but yet dangerous in another; for effective social change cannot be had with only a moral dream; dreams too often fade or are distorted.

I feel that the youth of today should by all means act upon their moral convictions but act not from an astigmatic moralism of self-right; rather from a more far-ranged awareness which stems from a personal compassion and understanding of our social problems as well as a true comprehension of the practical problems any reform entails.

It is for the Elks Youth award winners as well as all other youth to search for a direction in society, to dream and to study, and then to act in concert to renovate old institutions as well as build new ones.

It is on this rather optimistic note that I shall close this letter and again send my congratulations to this year's Elks youth winners.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. KUTER.

MAY 5, 1969.

DEAR MR. MASSEY: Thank you for your letter. It was a pleasure to hear from you. As you know, I am a second quarter political science major at UCLA and finding it quite an experience. Apart from the fact that studying is suddenly a predominate activity in my life, I have had so many rewarding experiences in the past eight months that I consider myself an extremely lucky girl. I've always tried to take advantage of every opportunity afforded me and in an attempt to carry out this desire, I've found life, thus far, a series of challenges and adventures. My hope is that the eagerness I've felt has, in some way, influenced those I've come in contact with.

Last year, I had an inkling of the characteristics that might describe today's generation—once at UCLA, many of those inklings turned into realities. I've found here a conscientious group of young adults concerned with the problems and shortcomings of our society. Not only concerned, but anxious to change existing shortcomings. Although there is a minority on campuses throughout the country that insist on change outside of existing procedures and rely on violence to achieve their aims, it is my experience, thus far, that the majority of young people see change possible only within the limits of reason and order. However, when goals remain stagnant through this method, many, along with myself, feel stronger measures are necessary. This isn't saying that we condone riots and violence for violence sake, but it does mean that we prefer purposeful activity to apathy.

May I congratulate all those young people present at the Youth Activities Banquet. Each has a right to be proud of his achievements, for hopefully, these young adults represent the core of leadership to come in America. I've always felt that these types of honors also carry with them a responsibility—a responsibility to remain conscientious and active as adults—to remain informed concerning the vital issues facing our community and nation, so that they may continue to "lead" and make intelligent decisions as citizens. I have great confidence in this generation, and it is indeed a tribute to the Elks that they encourage and recognize active young participants and leaders in our communities.

Yours truly,

DIANNE HULL.

REPORT ISSUED ON MARINE MAMMALS ON SAN MIGUEL ISLAND

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the tragic Santa Barbara oil spill, there has been considerable exaggeration and misrepresentation of the detrimental effects of this spillage on the animal life of the channel area. The following reports from the Department of the Interior and the Navy put the damage to wildlife into clearer perspective, and I would like to take this opportunity to share this material with my House colleagues:

REPORT ISSUED ON MARINE MAMMALS ON SAN MIGUEL ISLAND

A report covering the status of marine mammals on San Miguel Island, California, relating to the oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel, was released by the Department of the Interior today.

The report concluded there was no evidence that deaths of seals or sea lions on the Island could be attributed to oil pollution.

Laboratory tests and autopsies conducted this spring showed that there was no petroleum residue in the tissues of either living or dead animals.

"Analyses of distressed elephant seals and sea lions were conducted by government and independent scientists," the report said. "Aborted sea lion fetuses, typical of those seen during the period, were analyzed and no petroleum residue was found in the fetuses. Dead elephant seals and sea lions were autopsied and the results indicated that oil had not been responsible for the deaths. Blood samples from live elephant seals showed no evidence of petroleum."

The report pointed out that "there is each year a natural die-off in the rookery areas. Natural deaths during this period occur principally from abortions, physical injuries and other causes.

"There were no more aborted sea lion fetuses on the island this year than in previous years when there was no evidence of oil."

Field reports incorporating scientific testing and surveys were begun by the Department when the first information was received last March that oil had washed ashore on a portion of San Miguel, a marine wildlife refuge.

"No new oil has appeared since the March 19 date on any beaches on San Miguel," the report said.

Full text of the report is attached.

SAN MIGUEL ISLAND: MARINE MAMMALS AS RELATED TO OIL SPILL IN SANTA BARBARA CHANNEL

Considerable interest has been expressed in the marine mammals of San Miguel Island, California, as related to the oil spill in Santa Barbara Channel. This paper has been prepared to present factual information on the subject.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The original and only oil to appear on the island this Spring washed ashore on or about March 19, 1969. Four stretches of beach, totalling approximately one-sixth of a mile, or ½ of one percent of the total shoreline, were affected by the oil. All of these areas were located on the extreme western tip of the island. The largest area affected was inhabited by only about 200 elephant seals during March and April; and by about 200 sea lions and elephant seals during May and June. There were, by comparison, thousands of sea lions and elephant seals on beaches on the south side of San Miguel Island during these same times—beaches that were completely unaffected by any oil. No new oil has appeared since the March 19 date on any beaches on San Miguel.

HERD LOCATIONS

Nearly all of the marine mammals are on the south side and west end of the island near Point Bennett. Here the island has low sandy beaches with some rocky points on the south side and steep boulder beaches on the west and north. California sea lions use all of the western end of the island. Steller sea lions are on rocky beaches or offshore rocks. Northern fur seals are on the sand beach of Adams Cove. Elephant seals also use all of the western end of the island. Harbor seals are few and scattered. The southern fur seal is only an occasional visitor.

Population estimates	Adult	Pups
California sea lions	15,000 to 20,000	2,000 to 3,000 (approximate).
Steller sea lions	100 or less	Not known to breed here.
Elephant seals (northern).	5,000	2,200 to 2,300 (1969).
Southern fur seal	Few	
Northern fur seal	100	40 (1968).
Harbor seal	100 or less	

Pupping and nursing periods	Pupping	Nursing
California sea lions	June	Up to 1 year.
Steller sea lions	May–June	Do.
Elephant seals (northern)	January	1 month.
Northern fur seals	June–July	5 months.
Harbor seals	April–May	1 month.

EFFECTS OF OIL ON MARINE MAMMALS

Adults

In the case of those mammals such as harbor seals, elephant seals, and sea lions, which rely on their heavy layer of blubber for insulation, the presence of oil in the hair would be less serious than in the case of the fur seals, which rely primarily on a heavy underfur for insulation. In the latter case, substantial amounts of oil presumably would result in the loss of the insulating ability of the underfur.

In the case of all these species, there is a likelihood that a heavy coating of oil could cause irritation to external surfaces of the mammals. Oil ingested through the animals' efforts to clean their bodies would also probably be detrimental.

Pups

The pups undoubtedly are more susceptible to damage from oil than are the adult animals because initially they have neither the protection of heavy layers of blubber nor heavy underfur. It is also possible that ingestion of oil could result from nursing.

It has been suggested that since close-range identification of pups by females is dependent on odor, the presence of oil on the pups would prevent the mothers from identifying the young or perhaps would cause the mothers to shun the young. We have no evidence that this is so.

Mortality

There is each year a natural die-off in the rookery areas. Natural deaths occur from abortions, physical injuries, and other causes.

Among the California sea lions there has been observed a substantial mortality from premature births, on the order of several hundred per year. In considering mortalities in 1969, it is necessary to take into account this factor in attempting to judge the effect of the oil. There were no more aborted sea lion fetuses on the Island this year than in previous years when there was no evidence of oil. Analyses of distressed elephant seals and sea lions were conducted by government and independent scientists. Aborted sea lion fetuses, typical of those seen during the period, were analyzed and no petroleum residue was found in the fetuses. Dead elephant seals and sea lions were autopsied and the results indicated that oil had not been responsible for the deaths. Blood samples from live elephant seals showed no evidence of petroleum.

POTENTIAL FOR CLEANUP AND CONTROL

Marine mammals

Assuming it was necessary, it would be unrealistic to attempt to clean the relatively few mammals observed with oil on them or transfer them to other areas. In either instance, the disturbance to the rookeries and mammals would likely be more damaging than the oil. Human activity near the rookeries on the island causes adults to stampede, and pups are crushed. Cleaning compounds also could be more of an irritant than the oil. The rookeries are located in an isolated area, with difficult access, which would compound the problem of avoiding damage to the mammals and the rookery structure.

It has been suggested that pups could be transported to other areas and reared artificially. We know of no reason to move them. Moreover, little success has been achieved in rearing these species artificially. We are unaware of any efforts of this kind with elephant seals; only limited success has been achieved after rather extensive efforts to develop artificial methods for feeding Steller sea lion and fur seal pups. To our knowledge, no California sea lion pups have been reared artificially.

On the basis of evidence obtained thus far, it appears that the oil has not depressed the food supply available to the marine mammals of this area.

CONTINUING OBSERVATION

The Department is maintaining a daily monitoring on the condition of marine mammals on San Miguel Island.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Point Mugu, Calif., June 13, 1969.

EDITOR,
Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: Your article "Iridescent Gift of Death" in the June 13 issue of Life Magazine is completely contrary to the expert opinion of qualified scientists, including a group which visited San Miguel Island at the request of Senator Alan Cranston and whose findings were published in the April 25, 1969 issue of the Congressional Record.

A team headed by Dr. James L. Naviaux, Director of the National Wildlife Health Foundation, and including Mr. Mel Morse, president of the Humane Society of the U.S., Dr. John Simpson, a veterinarian specializing in marine animals, and Vern Appling, Chief Ranger for the Channel Islands National Monument, visited the island on Wednesday, April 16.

"I was delighted with his finding that the marine mammals he inspected on San Miguel showed no signs of injury from oil pollution," Senator Cranston states in the Record.

The Congressional Record report by Dr. Naviaux goes on to state that the party found only one elephant seal which appeared clinically sick, and that he had many small bite wounds and an injured cornea. He was treated and released.

None of the elephant seals which had oil on their bodies showed any signs of distress, the experts attested. "No sick or dying animals were found except the one noted . . ."

The report also noted that none of the fifteen or so adult dead elephant seals were fresh carcasses. A large number (75–100) of aborted fetuses were verified by Mr. Appling as having occurred also in earlier years.

In the conclusion of the report Dr. Naviaux states that "there is no evidence that any of the wildlife on San Miguel Island are showing harmful effects from the crude oil at this time."

The conclusions of this investigating party are concurred in by Dr. Simpson, who has visited San Miguel repeatedly over the past two and a half months for the express purpose of removing suffering elephant seals, if any, and treating them. He has found none requiring treatment. In addition, Dr. Simpson has conducted autopsies and ordered biopsies on all fresh carcasses found on the island. In no case have petroleum products been found in the systems of these dead elephant seals.

It is also important to note that only 150 yards of San Miguel's 34-mile coastline are affected by the oil slick.

The National Park Service has also sent marine biologists to the island who have confirmed the findings mentioned above. The Pacific Missile Range, which administers the island of San Miguel for the Navy, has cooperated fully with the National Park Service in the protection, treatment and study of marine mammals there. The Range has also cooperated in flying to the island in the company of experts all news media desiring to cover the story.

Had your reporter visited San Miguel under authorized procedures and in the company of Park Service and Navy marine biologists and veterinarians you would have had the benefit of their opinion and scientific knowledge in the preparation of your story.

I hope that you will make the information contained in this letter available to your readers so that they may consider the merits of this rebuttal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. RUSSELL,
Head, Public Information Division.

CLINTON M. HESTER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an article about a distinguished American and a friend of my family since my boyhood. Mr. Clinton M. Hester, an outstanding member of the bar for over 50 years, has had a long and outstanding career in public service, culminating in his position as chairman of the executive committee of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The article from the Phillips Exeter Academy Bulletin follows:

CLINTON M. HESTER

When Clinton M. Hester arrived at Exeter from Missoula, Mont., in September 1915 with $25.00 in his pocket, he was carrying a letter from Assistant Principal Robinson, stating that inasmuch as Clint's parents were deceased, and seemingly no extra monies were available, it would be impossible for him to work his way through Exeter. The Assistant Principal was so amazed and startled at Clint's determination, as well as the distance he had traveled from home, that he allowed him to enter the Academy. Once at Exeter Clint never lacked for sufficient employment to enable him to stay there.

The impetus of his Exeter education, together with Army service overseas in 1917, prompted him to go to night school, obtaining an A.B., from George Washington Univ. and an L.L.B. from Georgetown, paying for his tuition and living expenses by working as a structural iron worker during the day. After a few years in private practice, he worked for sixteen years in various departments of the Federal Government. President Roosevelt appointed him as administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, now the F.A.A., and he became a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, now renamed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. While Administrator of the C.A.A., Clint made the pioneering survey flights for passenger service across the South Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans in the original Boeing Clippers, and he was responsible for the supervision and the building of the Washington National Airport. Clint believes that his appointment from President Roosevelt was the result of his assignment to draft the original bill for the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

On the basis of his administrative experience and his fine liaison with congressional members, President Eisenhower appointed him chairman of the executive committee of the James Madison Memorial Commission. After four years of persuasion and lobbying, Congress enacted the resolution in 1967 authorizing $75,000,000 for the Madison Memorial Library.

Clint's dedicated services to the government and to our nation have been particularly effective and we congratulate him on behalf of our Class for a splendid career and for his accomplishments. He has now settled down to a private law practice, one of his clients being the National Football League. When he can get away from Washington, he goes to his extensive farm in Hot Springs, Va., where he has re-created a bit of Western living, hunting deer and bear, and trout fishing in delightful mountain streams.

DR. SHELLEY MARK OF HAWAII: URBAN-RURAL BALANCE ESSENTIAL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the prevalence of so much anxiety and frustration amidst our unprecedented affluence has called into question our basic concerns for the essential dignity and destiny of man. Our present social crisis, as well as our increasing awareness of the squandering of our vital natural resources, has certainly helped us to face up to our past failure to plan for change. It is significant to note, however, that the increasing awareness of the need for better planning has tended to focus on "urban planning" and to obscure what former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has termed the "rural-urban balance." This broader aspect of planning formed the subject matter of a penetrating address delivered at the farewell banquet held recently in Honolulu for the National Association of Farm Broadcasters. The speaker was Dr. Shelley M. Mark, the very able and distinguished director of the Department of Planning and Economic Development of the State of Hawaii.

In addressing himself to the possible consequences of a disruption of the "rural-urban balance," Dr. Mark asserted:

> Once the green dollar replaces the green field, then we can look only to a dismal future indeed.

He explained that in the process of finding a rational basis for orderly urban growth we have frequently failed to preserve our prime agricultural lands. Our failure to do so in the past has contributed heavily to our present, and ever-developing, "national crisis of environment."

In sustaining our faith in good long-range planning Dr. Mark said:

Trends are not destinies, for the essence of planning is the changing of bad trends to good trends.

If we indeed have hope of achieving a better tomorrow, and not the awesome specter of George Orwell's "big brother" society, immediate efforts must be made to head off our rising "rural-urban" crisis.

In the belief that my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find Dr. Mark's address thought-provoking, I am pleased to submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

MAINTAINING THE RURAL-URBAN BALANCE

(Address by Shelley M. Mark)

There are some important concerns facing our Islands and our nation today which call for the most serious attention and study. These are indicated as a new national administration seeks to establish new directions and new priorities amidst a set of age-old problems. We have seen its persistent attempts to extricate this nation from the Vietnam conflict in the face of military, political, and diplomatic realities. We are witnessing attempts to head off inflation in the face of a brewing taxpayers' revolt, interest rates at an all-time high, and the danger of recession in the offing. We have seen attempts to face up to our urban crisis falter in the face of determined political opposition to some who possess the wherewithal for coping with it. And we are witnessing the continued rise of consumer prices with a continued decline in the farmer's share.

It is not my purpose this evening to dwell on all these concerns. We can only wish the President and his advisors well in their valiant efforts. In fact, it may be presumptuous, in these beautiful surroundings before such a joyous occasion, to speak of problems that may seem thousands of miles and eons of time away.

But from our island community, the newest of the 50 states, located in the midst of the Pacific Ocean, with the inter-action of many races and cultures, seeking to attain common goals and solve common problems—I think there is much to be learned, much that is applicable to our broader national concerns. Then too, because we are new, small, and relatively isolated, we in Hawaii are dependent on the nation's strength, prosperity, and well being. With your kind indulgence this evening, I would propose to initiate some dialogue on a matter of some common concern—the problem of maintaining what Secretary Freeman and others have called the rural-urban balance.

I'm sure you have seen, during your brief visit and on your various field trips, much of our agriculture. As you know, it is primarily sugar and pineapple production. These have been our basic agricultural crops for many years. They represent two of the most scientifically produced and processed crops in the nation. In recent years, sugar and pineapple production records have been set, and profits have been high. At the same time, Hawaii's agricultural workers are the highest paid in the United States. We have, through years of experience, found that when an enlightened agribusiness management provides to its unionized employees, through honest and realistic collective bargaining, fair wages, excellent fringe benefits, good working hours and conditions and a variety of incentives, the entire industry and the State's economy prosper. Hawaii—like California—has had her farm labor troubles, and we learned the hard way—through violence and death in the early years of agricultural and unionization—that unless employees have decent working conditions and some hope of sharing in the affluence of others around them, there can be no peace in the fields. We hope this lesson is not lost on those in California and other States where farm unionization is a relatively new problem.

And yet our agricultural situation is not without paradox. Here in Hawaii we have two of the most vibrant and progressive agricultural industries anywhere today. Our sugar accounts for 12 per cent of the U.S. market, and our pineapple still takes 40 per cent of the world market. We lead in research and development and productivity increase, our workers are the highest paid, and our technology is sought after and emulated everywhere. Yet the most many hope for in sugar and pineapple is the status quo! And the worst that some expect is that their days are numbered.

Here in Hawaii we have year-around crop-raising potentials, fertile soils, generations of agricultural skills, advanced research and methods.

Last year the value of marketings of our diversified crops was more than $13 million, and of our livestock products, more than $37 million. We sold more than $6 million worth of vegetables and melons, more than $1.5 million in coffee parchment, about $3 million in fruits, and half a million dollars worth of taro, which is the root from which poi is made.

We have witnessed some breakthrough in such specialty areas as papaya, macadamia nuts, and floral products. But we are nowhere near the massive breakthrough in diversified agriculture that will establish us as world leaders in specialty crop production or enable us to meet a larger percentage of our domestic consumption requirements. Instead our farmers are beset with problems familiar to all of you of uncertain land tenure, limited credit availability, increasing competition for workers, and most importantly perhaps—lack of clear guidelines for future goals, objectives, plans and programs.

Here in Hawaii we have the spectre of large land-owners marking time—waiting for agricultural leases to expire so that the lands can be put to what they consider their "highest and best use". We have corporate management torn between traditional experience with productive agriculture enterprise and the new gold that glitters from potential resort development and suburban subdivisions. We have labor unions, whose strength has been derived from organizing plantation workers, now jockeying to organize expected hordes of hotel and resort workers. I daresay these are not uncommon occurrences throughout the rural communities of our nation. Yet paradoxically, all over the world, there seems to be a resurgence and the new message of our times is the same: Agriculture and aqua-culture can feed the world, and the essential dignity of man, hidden under the grime and dust of poverty, can shine forth as agricultural science is developed and expanded and improved in all parts of the globe.

Recently a study of future land use in Hawaii was prepared for a group of local land owners and developers. The press reports told everyone that in land-hungry Hawaii, some 35,000 additional acres will be needed for urban expansion, and that these acres must come from existing prime agricultural land, since agriculture is on its way out anyway.

If, indeed, agriculture is on its way out, it is only because we have shoved it out the door by bowing to the "inexorable laws of economics" and the relentless pressures to grab agricultural land from productive farmers. By yielding to the prophets of gloom and doom, we may be contributing to maximum economic returns, but at the same time upsetting irretrievably the delicate urban-rural balance necessary for our total well-being in the long-term.

Once the urban-rural balance is upset—once our green farms, long rows of crops, orchards, pastures, and forests are given over to the men who want fast profit now, when there are other lands available for urbanization—once the green dollar replaces the green field, then we can look only to a dismal future indeed.

Indeed, common sense tells us that once our environment of beauty—of agricultural activities properly balanced with commercial and industrial enterprises—is destroyed, then our tourism industry will be destroyed, and the whole economic structure will decay and collapse. We cannot live just for today.

Certainly you members of the Farm Broadcasters Association of America keenly understand this principle of urban-rural balance. You know it is a vast problem; it is a problem which defies rational solution, yet upon its solution may depend the very life of our land in the next generation or two.

You have seen that for many decades, Americans by the millions have been moving from rural regions to urban and metropolitan areas, causing, on the one hand, a great waste of valuable natural and human resources, and on the other hand, a steadily increasing pressure of congestion, unemployment, and poverty in the cities.

Former Secretary Orville Freeman has described the problem in rather dramatic fashion (and I quote): "In the short period since World War II, our population has grown by 55 million—37 per cent. The value of goods and services we produce each year has increased from $280 billion to more than $800 billion. Three million farms have disappeared in a technological revolution that is still sweeping through agriculture. More than 20 million persons have abandoned the farms and small towns for the city. One-third of the population has left the city for the suburbs."

Our nation has consistently measured "progress" in gross national product and by the indices of economics. It has not yet developed an annual "social report" which measures the heartaches resulting from—or at least coinciding with—material affluence. Mr. Freeman reminds us that "many Americans fear we may have lost our way. The fact that 20 million Americans live in poverty stares us in the face . . . modern communications media drum it into our senses . . . The crisis of our environment also burdens our conscience . . . Our pangs of conscience as a nation bite deep because we know it need not have happened this way . . ."

Thus, we seem to have a crisis of human frustrations—our productive efficiency and technological progress permit us to have all the material affluence we desire; our social conscience persistently asked: why and for what purpose?

I suggest there is still another, related type of balance which is upset when cities grow to giant proportions and our agricultural and rural areas become deserted. It is the balance between man and his environment, the so-called ecological balance . . . the mysterious and often hidden balance which keeps life-forces operating in a relationship which the Creator established and which Nature governs. The eminent microbiologist Rene Dubos says that "Human beings can become adapted to almost anything—polluted air, treeless avenues, the rat-race of over-competitive societies. But in one way or another, we have to pay later for the adjustments we make to undesirable conditions."

It is becoming more and more obvious that the food, energy, resources, and technology which are required for the nourishment of our bodies and the operation of our industries, are not all that matters. Just as important is an *environment* in which it is possible to satisfy the longing for quiet, privacy, initiative and open space. In Dubos' words: "These are not frills or luxuries, but constitute real biological necessities."

It follows, therefore, that there can be no basis for orderly growth in human society without a fundamental knowledge of man and his environment. This knowledge must be profound if we are to progress. We must understand the principles of heredity and biology as well as economics and engineering. You must remember—like it or not—that the Cro-Magnon man, who lived more than 25,000 years ago, was essentially the same as modern man, mentally as well as biologically. In theory, we could take a Cro-Magnon baby and with a modern fostermother, a diaper, a crib, an elementary school and a college of general studies, fit the Cro-Magnon man into this gathering today as a farm broadcaster and no one would be the wiser.

Certainly we can expect that as we transform green fields and hillsides into concrete highways and subdivisions, as we convert open areas into high-rise apartments, and as we infest the atmosphere with man-made pollutants, the carefully nurtured natural balance between man and his environment will be upset. And with this growing imbalance, his ability to deal effectively in all aspects of his worldly relationships will deteriorate.

Ecological balance, like urban-rural balance, is essential to man. It answers his spiritual needs as well as serving his biological and sociological well-being. And to understand it, we need to study the nature of man.

My purpose and certainly my competence is not to try to solve these intricate problems of balance this evening, but mainly to point up their significance and suggest how we in Hawaii have regarded them. From our vantage point, it is heartening and refreshing to observe that the spirit of the nation always seems to improve once a nagging, serious problem is defined and clarified, and its dimensions made known. "Time to go to work," we then say. And I believe our nation is now at a point where it begins to see the dimensions of the rural-urban imbalance problem clearly, and is ready to go to work to solve it.

Again I exhort you to carry this message nation-wide. Perhaps your Silver Anniversary Convention visit to Hawaii will give you the special *"Handle"* or "angle" you need to spark additional discussions and conferences on this problem. Tell the folks at home that we in Hawaii are joined in spirit and action with all who love the rural life, the green and fresh environment, the environment of beauty and cleanliness which refreshes body and spirit.

Hawaii is a new State. We have had the privilege of studying the histories of our older Sisters in the East and our not-so-old Sisters in the West, and learning much from them. We have had for many years a much smaller, yet parallel, rural-urban problem, and we have been able to do something about it through law and through administrative methods which we believe are both advanced and feasible.

You have seen Waikiki. You may have been a bit disappointed that it is so crowded with high-rise buildings. But have you seen our Neighbor Islands? They are relatively unspoiled.

For many years, our Neighbor Islands lost population because agriculture became more mechanized, the technological and social revolutions following World War II enticed our young people away from the rural areas, and there was little on the Neighbor Islands on which a young family could plan for a decent and dependable future. Today, due to this migration and to a great influx from the Mainland, our capital city of Honolulu is suffering from too-fast growing pains.

With a keen appreciation of the over-all problem, our State Legislatures and the State administration have, in the first Decade of our Statehood, put into effect a unique State Land Use Law. One of its chief purposes is the preservation of rural, conservation and agricultural lands against the pressures of uncontrolled urban growth. We saw long ago that if Hawaii permitted its towns and cities and suburban housing areas to grow willy-nilly into rural and agricultural areas, the best farm lands and agricultural districts would soon disappear. The beautiful Hawaii we knew would have been ruined. We therefore passed the State Land Use Law—the only such State zoning law in the nation—to prevent this imbalance from occurring. This year we are reviewing the first five years of that law, seeking to profit from our past mistakes and strengthen our capabilities for planning into the future. We have not preserved all of our prime agricultural lands in the process, but have provided a rational bases for orderly urban growth.

By another means—the judicious use of the State's Capital Improvements Program, we attempted to halt this trend—which had continued for many past decades—of population movement from the Neighbor Islands to Honolulu. We have encouraged the development of well-planned tourism and other facilities on the Neighbor Islands, and have backed up private enterprise with Government-financed roads, sewers, water systems, airports, harbors, and other basic facilities.

I believe the key to our future urban-rural balance must be good long-range planning. It is worthwhile here to note again Secretary Freeman's comments in the Minnesota Law Review. He wrote: "We have failed to plan for change—to develop public and private institutions and attitudes that would shape and control the technological revolution to serve the needs of society. The result has been a national crisis of environment . . ."

Hawaii saw its own problems in this light and has tried, through its planning processes, to do precisely what Mr. Freeman says the nation has failed to do. We have sought to encourage citizen participation in our planning process. We have had citizen groups on every Island, from every community, meeting regularly to develop and refine the State's planning goals. These have now been published as part of our official planning documents.

And it is noteworthy that our citizens regard the preservation and enhancement of a beautiful environment as one of the fundamentals on which our orderly growth and prosperous development depend. Our citizens have also clearly stated that they want Hawaii's natural resources preserved; they want a stronger agricultural economy; and they want agricultural lands preserved from urban encroachment.

Trends are not destinies. The essence of planning is the changing of bad trends to good trends. If the trend toward chipping away at and chopping up our agricultural lands is clearly evident, then it deserves to be changed. And through our State planning efforts, we try to do just that.

In scores of ways—by legislation, by a very close cooperation of government and private sector, by State Administration action, by the remarkably sophisticated efforts of a great number of private agencies and institutions—Hawaii is seeking to head off its own urban-rural crisis now. We hope to joyously celebrate our Silver Jubilee of Statehood in 1984, rather than gloomily exist in George Orwell's "Big Brother" society. We hope to have a State with agriculture and other industries well balanced on all Islands, a State with clean air, pure waters and a lot less noise, a State where cultural pursuits are found closely related to family farm and small business activities; a State which is a model of racial and economic harmony, visited by millions from East and West; a State where the Aloha Spirit remains as the guide for our relationships with these visitors; a State where poverty is outlawed; where crime is diminished by the environment of good will and prosperity, and where a cheerful, happy citizenry find delight in fruitful work on farms, at home, in clean industrial plants and on scientific campuses from seashore to the snow-covered peak of Mauna Kea.

May I suggest that you plan your next summer convention here in George Orwell's 1984—if not sooner. We can then sit down in comfortable chairs and see how our younger generation is doing with the foundation blocks we prepared for them.

I thank you.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Masonic Grand Lodge of the State of New York conducts an annual essay contest. Mr. Donald Freund, an outstanding civic and community leader, is a member of the Grand Lodge Youth Committee.

At his request I would like to set forth for the RECORD the five winning essays. I think my colleagues will enjoy reading them as I did.

The texts of the winning essays follow:

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By Jo-Ann H. Nelson)

Many teenagers today have lost the feelings of love and understanding between their parents and themselves; therefore, they cannot bear to wait for the time of departure. But my life has changed from the above feelings to ones I am about to describe, over a period of two years.

Being very unfortunate in my younger childhood years, I was confronted with problems of having a motherless home, whereas I accepted and assumed responsibilities to make disciplinary decisions that affected me the rest of my life. Within two years I lost my grandfather and my father. These were most unforgettable experiences that I have had which has made a more promising and realizing person out of myself.

The most unregrettable decision of my life was made in July 1966, when I was accepted and recognized into the home where my brother had been staying.

My first year in my new home was most promising and hardest to readjust my trends and thoughts of life.

My foster parents taught me to realize the value of life—how to face facts, to be realistic by representing myself as a true individual of monetary value and to bear everyday burdens of life. I also was able to tell the truth and firmly stand behind anything said without someone's doubt. Through telling the truth, my trend of thinking was changed and I was restored to what was right and what was wrong to do in life.

These, of course, are just a few examples of how my home has influenced me. Now, I feel that if there was just a little more construction of feelings for caring and understanding in the home, there wouldn't be flower children or hippies, who turn to love or drugs for an answer to finding a feeling of happiness. But, if these individuals had happiness restored to them as I did in October 1968, coming legally adopted, this world would have a much brighter possibility of happiness.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By Bonnie E. McGuire)

The other day I rode through a neighboring town when the school day was just ending. As the students were coming from the building, I watched certain cliques form and others disband. Without much trouble, I could choose which group composed itself of athletes, hot rod owners, studious girls, non-conformists, best-dressed and proud-of-it members, boy-crazy girls, and girl-crazy boys.

From my own experiences I realized that neither money nor brains had been the predominant basis for these classifications, but rather, each student's interests and attitudes had attracted him toward one group or another.

Since each conclusion stimulates more thoughtful questions, I asked myself, "How does a person decide which attitudes toward life he will adopt, and how does one know which interests he should pursue?"

The overwhelming influence of the home on the lives of its youths is what causes certain attitudes to develop and which fosters certain interests to grow. In the course of each youth's preparation for adulthood, these two factors are reflected in every decision and in every action. When a child chooses a drawing set in preference to a dump truck, he does so because his family has favored similar interests. The family's concept of enjoyment determines the child's reaction to the different types of indoor and outdoor recreation. If the family encourages the child in school, this interest reflects the degree of the family's respect for education. When a child observes his parents' continued effort to improve their standard of living, he will take pride in exploring the opportunities available to him.

Finally, the most important influence which the home can exercise over the lives of its youths involves the transmission of civic responsibility from one generation to the next. When a child is taught the value of his family's loyal participation in the various affairs of the community, he has learned the essence of being a good citizen.

Each home is a master die. Cast there are the patterns of our future society.

THE INFLUENCE OF HOME LIFE ON YOUTH

(By Sarah Jordan Rood)

The home life of a young person is perhaps the largest factor in shaping that person as an individual. At home a young person learns, as soon as he is able, to take on responsibility. He is taught manners, and he develops a sense of morals. In short, home life develops the personality of a young person.

Undoubtedly, home is the first place where a young person develops a sense of responsibility. He is taught as a child to pick up his toys and to put them away. As he grows older he is given his share of the household duties, perhaps washing the dishes or making beds or cutting grass. As he gets older he learns to take care of his own needs as well. A well-developed sense of responsibility is essential in a young person if he is to succeed at all. He must not only know how to take care of himself, but he must also be willing and able to take on responsibility—in a job or in college or in whatever he decides to do.

Young people also learn manners at home. Depending on his home life, a young person will be a dependable, courteous individual—or he will be lacking in these traits. He learns how to act in the company of others, how to do what is expected of him. This quality is also essential in a person who wishes to be successful in any way. He learns how to get along with others without offending them, and he will be able to hold his own in almost any situation.

Perhaps most important of all, home life helps a young person develop a sense of morals. From the moment a child is aware of what goes on around him he begins developing a sense of values; most of this development takes place in the home. A young person gleans from the behavior of those around him what he thinks is acceptable and important. Children imitate their elders and will follow the example set in the home by parents or other members of the family. For a young person to develop a good sense of morals is essential. His sense of what is right or wrong will stay with him always, and it will set his pattern of behavior when he ventures into society. His behavior and attitude in school, with his friends, and eventually in a job, will be determined by his sense of values or morals.

Home life has a tremendous influence on a young person and will have a large effect on what he does with his life. Whether or not he develops a sense of responsibility, good manners, and a good sense of values or morals will determine his behavior as a citizen of the United States.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By Richard Allan Harris)

In order for any institution to survive, it must be flexible. As times and man's knowledge change, so must a particular institution, for if it stagnates, it doesn't keep up with man's wants and needs. Therefore, man will abandon it for another institution that does. However, if it remodels its make-up, its influence can remain strong. This is exemplified by many well known institutions, among them the United States Constitution. This document is as much an integral part of American life in 1969 as it was in 1869. The reason for this is, when the founding fathers composed the Constitution, they made sure that it was flexible enough to weather the tempest of history. They assured this through the amendment process and the elastic clause.

But, the Constitution is a rather lofty example. Perhaps an example more pertinent to everyday existence is the home. Home is an especially good example because this particular institution is in the throes of revolution. The flexibility of the home is being tested by the youth of America. These young iconoclasts feel that the home has lost pace with world progress, so they are looking to other institutions to fulfill their needs. They feel that homes are hypocritical in that their homes preach peace, yet condone war. Therefore, they created their own institution: hippie society. However, I think that they have a misconception in that they think home is the epitome of perfection. It is not. Homes are composed of humans, and humans have flaws—thus homes do. This leads me to conclude that the hypocrisy the hippies detest so heartily will be found in any institution. Furthermore, I feel that homes are flexible to a certain extent for a similar reason. They are composed of people, and since people change with the times so do homes. The hippies are dissatisfied with home, yet the vast majority of my contemporaries that I have come in contact with are influenced for the better by that "hackneyed institution". I believe that the political and social views of the home have changed over the years. Therefore the influence of the home is not the same as ever, yet it is as great as ever. In 1909, the home impressed certain mores and values upon the youth. In 1969, it impresses more modern mores and values upon the youth. Yet its influence has not diminished. In fact, even the hippies are influenced by the home. Even though it is a negative influence, it is nonetheless an influence. Fortunately, most of the influence of the home is good. True enough, it is sometimes hypocritical, yet what institution isn't? That is the nature of man.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOME ON YOUTH

(By James Howard Kaye)

A child is born into the world. Will he find his way? . . . Will all of his God-given talents find fulfillment in the years ahead? The answer rests, in large measure, with the home into which he is born.

In today's world, the process of becoming a responsible adult is a complicated one. Great academic and social pressures characterize our society and the young person is constantly faced with the questions, Who am I? . . . What do I stand for? . . . Where am I going? . . . The child's concepts of himself, his feelings of satisfaction and adequacy, his developing notions of decency in human behavior are all related directly to the lessons he has learned as a family member.

Personal values are literally shaped at home. Ideals of manliness and proper masculine behavior are exemplified through the behavior of the father; a child views all women as he observes his mother. Parents are truly the child's first and most important teachers.

The newborn are innocent, unknowing. Yet, why does our world so often speak of hatred and injustice? Why the upsurge in juvenile anti-social acts? A child is not disposed toward delinquent conduct at birth; bigotry is an unknown element in the behavior of the infant. Since early associations are limited mainly to the home, the opportunities are plentiful for the adults within this first small world of the young to open the door to prejudice and distrust. Before long, the willing, searching little student learns the lesson.

Those of us who have matured as members of united, loving families have, indeed, received a priceless gift. The rules and regulations of human conduct which structured our early years . . . and against which we often rebelled . . . now, suddenly, assume new meaning. We find that, when we are now faced with stresses and temptations, the road to follow is clearly marked, for we have been shown the route to proper behavior. It has been a guidepost during those formative years within the family fold; it has been a way of life.

The Bible recognizes the role of home and family as supportive influences in the lives of the young. The inspiring words in the Book of Deuteronomy, Chapter VI, verses 6–9, proclaim:

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart."

"And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up."

"And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes."

"And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

With these words as a source of strength, parents can assume the divine responsibility of forging the way to a better tomorrow . . . through the hearts and minds of their children.

THIEU AND DZU

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have called to my colleagues' attention the failure of the South Vietnamese Government to protect the rights of free speech and fair trial in the case of Truong Dinh Dzu.

Mr. Dzu, who ran second to President Thieu in the 1967 elections, remains imprisoned although he was never accorded an open, civilian trial. The entire Dzu incident raises serious questions about the willingness of the South Vietnamese Government to adhere to the basic principles of a free society; the very principles, I might add, that we are supposed to be protecting in Vietnam.

Yesterday Newsday, a respected daily newspaper, carried a relevant editorial on the Dzu affair and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THIEU AND DZU

In March of this year, Newsday columnist Clayton Fritchey wrote: "Which is the real Thieu—the one who now swears he wants to negotiate with the enemy, or the one who some months ago arrested his non-Communist political rival, Truong Dinh Dzu, and had a military court send him to prison for five years at hard labor on charges of advocating peace talks with the Viet Cong?"

Last week Thieu said the Viet Cong can participate in the future elections in the country and promised "there will be no reprisals or discrimination after the elections . . ."

He might be a bit more convincing if Dzu were released.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States.

This legislation will enable the Tlingit and Haida Indians to receive that money which they have been awarded by the U.S. Government following the litigation and a current determination in their favor.

In 1968 the Tlingit and Haida Indians recovered a judgment against the United States in the gross amount of $7,546,053.80. The case was prosecuted in the court of claims under the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, and funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by the act of July 9, 1968 (82 Stat. 307). After payment of attorney fees and after reserve for expert witness fees and other expenses of the litigation, the net amount available to the Tlingit and Haida was approximately $6.7 million.

At the present time, the Tlingit and Haida have funds, in an amount in excess of $6,500,000 invested in various U.S. Government securities and other obligations unconditionally guaranteed by the United States. There are also balances of Tlingit and Haida funds on deposit in accounts in the U.S. Treasury. The estimate currently is taking account of accrued interest earnings; the Tlingit and Haida funds currently exceed $7 million.

The funds are presently subject to section 8 of the act of June 19, 1935, supra, as amended by the act of August 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 543).

In part, section 8 provides:

The amount of the appropriation made to pay any judgment in favor of said Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska, and such funds shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum. Such funds including the interest thereon shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, organizational, operating and administrative expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which such funds shall be used. The Council is authorized to prepare plans for the use of said funds, and to exercise such further powers with respect to the advance, expenditure, and distribution of said funds as may be authorized by Congress.

The Program Planning Committee of the Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians proposed plans for the use of the judgment funds in November 1968, which plans were approved by the executive committee. The program committee reviewed and supplemented the plans during the meeting of the central council held at Sitka in April of this year. As revised the plans were approved by the central council—Resolution No. 68–69 C.C.–1.

STOP THE MIRV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, newspapers last week carried reports of yet another in the series of tests being conducted by this country of multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles. In view of the hearings currently underway before the Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the announcement that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will begin similar hearings this week, the Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD may find the following advertisement, which appeared in a number of leading newspapers across the country, timely and interesting.

The Institute for Human Values is an organization composed of a small number of rather ordinary citizens who are devoting a considerable portion of their personal earnings to furthering world peace. The proposal contained in this statement was formulated by Dr. Richard Rodgers, president of the Institute for Human Values, in consultation with the Division of Peace of the United Methodist Boards of Christian Social Concerns.

The advertisement follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 8, 1969]

STOP THE MIRV

Mr. President please use the "hot line" to Moscow to stop the MIRV.

Say to Mr. Kosygin, "The U.S. is today suspending the testing of MIRV. The suspension will remain in effect for six months. During that time, let's work out an agreement to end MIRV testing permanently."

Tell Mr. Kosygin he must of course realize that the continued U.S. suspension of MIRV testing will be possible only if Russia also refrains from testing missiles able to strike multiple targets.

Would the U.S. lose anything at all if you should do this? No. The U.S. is already so far ahead of Russia in the development of MIRV that Russia could not possibly catch up in six months' time.

What would the U.S. gain? Much, very much.

1. The gratitude of a humanity spared the new escalation of terror that MIRV would bring as it multiplies the number of poised nuclear warheads, a number great enough now to destroy both nations several times over.

2. The preserving of the present opportunity to reach an arms agreement with inspection acceptable to both sides.

3. The ultimate saving of perhaps as much as twenty billion dollars in arms spending. Billions to help rebuild our inner cities. Billions to improve the quality of American life.

Mr. President, our plea is echoed by some of the most responsible voices in American journalism, such as the Wall Street Journal (June 18), the Milwaukee Journal (June 12), the Boston Globe (June 9), the Minneapolis Star (June 13), the Washington Post (June 12) and the New York Times (June 20).

The New York Times writes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. President, in the name of humanity, please act! now . . . before the opportunity is irretrievably lost.

This same message has appeared in major papers in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Norfolk (Va.), Nashville, Charlotte, Albuquerque, New Orleans, Seattle, Boise, Miami, Tampa, Jacksonville, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Orlando, Tallahassee, Gainesville and St. Petersburg.

Institute for Human Values, Dr. Richard Rodgers, President, 3014 Estrella, Tampa, Florida 33609.

PROGRESS OF LUNAR ROVER DEVELOPMENT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from NASA:

PROGRESS OF LUNAR ROVER DEVELOPMENT

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., has been authorized to release a request for proposal for the development of a small, manned lunar roving vehicle. The RFP to be released to industry today will include the design, development, test and delivery of four flight models.

The new lunar rover is to be ready for flight to the Moon in 1971. It is to be delivered to the lunar surface by a manned Apollo lunar module.

The lunar rover vehicle—much smaller than an automobile—will have four wheels and will weigh about 400 pounds. It will provide lunar surface transportation for two astronauts and their hand tools, collected lunar samples and other equipment and experiments.

The 1971 delivery date is compatible with planned improvements to the Apollo lunar module, command module and astronaut life support equipment. The vehicle will increase the scope of lunar exploration by conserving time of the astronauts, thus providing a greater scientific return for each mission.

MSFC has been conducting research and planning toward a lunar roving vehicle since 1964.

MRS. POST WOWS AID

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, a colleague recently stated that if you really want to know what is going on in Washington, read the women's pages of the Washington newspapers. I did not take him too seriously until I read Betty Beale's column in the July 2 Washington Star, discussing a cookie recipe of Mrs. Marjorie Post, the General Foods heiress, in which one of the ingredients is fish protein concentrate—FPC.

Our Government has been working for some time to develop a suitable flour product from processing fish which would provide as much protein as fresh fish but would require none of the refrigeration. This would enable countries like India, where 250,000 tons of sardines dried up on the beaches last year, to process these fish into an equally nutritious but more stable food product.

As chairman of the Republican task force on earth resources and population, I have been concerned about various methods of feeding the growing number of hungry throughout the world. FPC is one of those promising possibilities, but gaining industry interest and achieving public acceptance has been one of the problems associated with its use.

If a social leader like Mrs. Post is willing to promote the utilization of FPC, it is possible that this important drawback can be overcome. According to Miss Beale:

> The War on Hunger Office was beside itself with joy. Not only did the inclusion of FPC in "delicious cookies" prove that it has no fish taste or smell, but its enjoyment by one of the country's richest women certainly removed the stigma it has had as a poverty food.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Miss Beale's column on FPC in the RECORD:

MRS. POST WOWS AID

(By Betty Beale)

AID is ecstatic—and for good reason.

The Agency for International Development has—out of the blue—won the backing for a lowly regarded product from one of the most famous and richest hostesses in America.

Marjorie Post, General Foods heiress, read an article about fish protein concentrate (FPC) in the magazine Sea Frontiers and was fascinated by it. She promptly communicated with the editor to find out where she could acquire some FPC, and the editor referred her to AID, which had submitted the story.

Enchanted with her action, the AID sent a cup of the FPC out to MP by taxi. In no time at all, Mrs. Post wrote a letter to Jerry Rosenthal of the Office of War on Hunger telling him that she had promptly had the concentrate included in a recipe for cookies, that she had been eating them for two days, and they were "perfectly delicious."

The War on Hunger Office was beside itself with joy. Not only did the inclusion of FPC in "delicious cookies" prove that it has no fish taste or smell, but its enjoyment by one of the country's richest women certainly removed the stigma it has had as a poverty food. It instantly requested her recipie for the FPC cookies. Here it is:

Cream ½ cup margarine and ¼ cup sugar. Blend 1 egg into the mixture. In another bowl mix together 1 teaspoon of baking powder and 1 cup of flour from which a tablespoon of flour has been substituted by a tablespoon of the fish powder.

Add dry ingredients to creamed ingredients to form a batter. Drop ½ tablespoon of batter at a time onto a cookie sheet. Bake at 350 degrees for 8 to 10 minutes.

There you have the most modern cookies in the country. If you have any doubts as to their beneficial value you should know that ⅓ of an ounce of FPC per day added to an infant's diet provides normal mental as well as physical growth.

Hoping it's not too late, this columnist is going to start eating them right way.

330TH BASE POST OFFICE UNIT RECEIVES COMMENDATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the 330th Base Post Office unit (Ty B) (SRF II) of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been commended by the senior officer of the Military Mail Terminal, San Francisco, for its exemplary work in carrying out postal assignments.

The postal service is often the only link that our servicemen have with their families and friends. Thus few things are more important to the GI than prompt delivery of his mail.

It is therefore heartening to know that a military group from my congressional district has been cited for excellence in this task.

At this point, I would like to introduce the remarks of the facility commander, Lt. Comdr. Ferguson to the men of the 330th Base Post Office unit:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY MILITARY MAIL TERMINAL,
San Francisco, Calif., July 2, 1968.

Subject: Letter of Appreciation.

COMMANDING OFFICER,
330th Base Post Office (Ty B) (SRF II), U.S. Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1. The 330th Base Post Office (Ty B) (SRF II), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, performed ANACDUTRA at the US Army Military Mail Terminal, San Francisco, California, 23 June through 6 July 1968.

2. Projects assigned to the unit were performed and completed in a superior manner. The leadership displayed by the unit's officers

and the morale and esprit de corps with which this leadership was received by unit personnel was very exemplary. The unit displayed a high degree of efficiency and initiative in accomplishing not only their postal duties but also their military assignments. It was extremely rewarding to coordinate the various postal activities with a unit with the integrity and aggressiveness possessed by the 330th Base Post Office. The US Army Reserve is indeed fortunate to have this unit in its organization and should be justifiably proud.

3. I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the officers and personnel of the 330th Base Post Office for a superior performance.

R. J. FERGUSON.

GUIDELINE BLITZKRIEG

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, because most Americans have lived their lives in freedom, such expressions as "escape," or "forced to comply by every device we have," or "bondage," would seem to be referring to life in Russia, or Red China, or elsewhere under tyranny.

It comes as a great shock to citizens of these United States to hear high-ranking Federal appointees, supposedly the servants and not the masters of the people, complain of the "escape" of white students to Catholic schools in the State of Connecticut. Why should a schoolchild in this country wish to "escape" from his bureaucratically balanced classroom?

Free Americans receive another jolt when they hear their Attorney General callously dispose of parents who are trying desperately to preserve their public schools from the certain destruction of his unlawful edicts by the authoritarian pronouncement:

They are going to be forced to comply by every device we have.

Such a barefaced threat from Mr. Mitchell places him openly in the company of his infamous predecessors—Brownell, Rogers, Kennedy, Katzenbach, and Clark—all of whom perverted the law and abused the power of the Department of Justice for their own political advantage.

Doubting Thomases who cannot see the assault on freedom until their own freedom is lost might well consider carefully all of the implications of the threat of unlimited force to accomplish an unlawful end. Remember that the law of the land, enacted by this Congress, specifically declares that desegregation does not mean racial balance. Remember also that only a few short years ago the "force" used by this same Department of Justice included Federal troops deployed against Americans in their own homes.

Or consider the statement attributed to HEW Secretary Finch, another unelected lord of our lives, that in denying freedom of choice and enforcing an arbitrary bureaucratic fiat:

We are moving in a more constructive direction.

Such sick reasoning leads to his interesting conclusion that the President who appointed him is not in "bondage" or otherwise responsible to the people who elected him.

Those who are realistic enough to recognize tyranny when they see it stalking the land cannot understand why this is taking place in America. The answer is simply that those in power are determined to remain in power "by every device we have," and to block the "escape" of any American foolish enough to believe that his Government is his servant, not his master. Again, the loyal, hardworking, taxpaying American suffers—and his children with him.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 9, 1969]

EIGHTH LEGAL ACTION IN WEEK ON DESEGREGATION READIED

(By Lyle Denniston)

The Nixon administration today readied another legal action—the eighth this week—to challenge racial segregation in schools.

For the third straight day, the Justice Department was planning to resort to direct legal challenge to end compulsory separation of Negro and white students.

It is understood that the action today will be a warning letter—a necessary prelude to a formal lawsuit—to school officials in a Northern state.

In the past, it was not customary for the department to make public the fact that it had sent warning letters. The switch appears to be part of the new administration's effort to demonstrate that it is not relaxing on school integration.

The abolition last week of any fixed deadline for total school desegregation had drawn sharp criticism from civil rights forces who complained that the administration was blunting the integration effort.

TOUGH ATTITUDE

In most of its actions this week, the Justice Department has asked for desegregation progress only by "the earliest practicable date." However, the volume of its activity seems designed to show a tough attitude toward holdout districts.

Yesterday's spurt of activity brought out a novel approach: An attempt to stop white students from making an "escape" from non-white public schools by entering all-white Roman Catholic private schools that get some forms of public aid.

This was contained in the department's warning to public school officials in Waterbury, Conn., that they may be sued if they do not act to integrate classrooms.

Indirectly, this could lead to some integration even of the Catholic schools, even though public authorities have no direct control over those schools' racial admission policies. The officials might be forced to stop giving aid to the private institutions as long as they remained almost completely segregated.

FREE TRANSPORTATION

In Waterbury, department officials here said, students from the Catholic schools are given free bus transportation by the public school system, and they make use of gymnasiums, manual training shops and home economics equipment in the public schools.

Assistant Atty. Gen. Jerris Leonard complained in his warning letter to the Waterbury school board that this arrangement, plus the "escape" of white students to the Catholic schools, means that the non-white students and their parents are helping bear the expense of segregated Catholic schools.

Leonard, asked officials to advise him what they were doing to integrate schools, said the Waterbury system has district lines, bus routes and transfer policies worked out to insure that Negroes and Puerto Ricans go to schools separate from whites. He also said the non-white schools are "in the worst condition."

Besides challenging Waterbury's school officials, the Justice Department filed four lawsuits yesterday—all against Southern school districts:

ABBEVILLE COMPLAINT

It complained that the pupils and faculty in Abbeville District 60 in Abbeville County, S.C., are mostly segregated even though a "freedom of choice" desegregation plan has been in effect since 1965. Only 215 out of 2,307 Negro students attend formerly all-white schools, and none of the 2,831 white students attend all-Negro schools, the lawsuit said.

It sued officials of Red River Parish (county), La., contending that it has four schools entirely for white students and four entirely for Negroes, and operates completely segregated school bus routes.

It challenged officials in Tensas Parish, La., on the ground that they maintain three schools only for whites and three only for Negroes, and operate a segregated school bus system.

And, it went to court to challenge a "freedom of choice" plan in Hardeman County, Tenn., contending that the plan has put no whites into Negro schools and only 437 out of a total of 2,439 Negroes into formerly all-white schools. The school bus system remains segregated, too, the suit complained.

NO SET DEADLINE

In none of the four lawsuits did the department ask the federal court to order integration steps by any specific deadline. It asked only that steps be ordered taken at "the earliest practical date."

Among the four school systems sued yesterday, three—the two in Louisiana and the one in South Carolina—had their federal funds cut off earlier because of their refusal to integrate.

The Louisiana parishes have not been eligible for federal financial assistance since 1966. The South Carolina district's federal funds were cut off last Jan. 29.

Since the administration began its new spurt of activity on Monday, it has taken legal steps against five Southern school systems and two Northern systems. It also has cut off federal funds to three Southern school systems.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

MITCHELL

On the administration's new desegregation policies, which have drawn heavy criticism, Mitchell said in cases where the government determines that it is possible for school districts to desegregate by September, "they are going to be forced to comply by every device we have."

For those that simply cannot desegregate now, he said, "We will make a determination as to the earliest that it can comply."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

CIVIL RIGHTS AIR CLEARED BY NIXON, FINCH SAYS

The Nixon administration's recent civil rights decisions have helped to clear the air and open communications with blacks and other minority groups, Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch says.

He also said yesterday President Nixon took office more free of commitments to supporters, including Southern white conservatives, "than any of his predecessors."

Finch, in a CBS television interview, said the administration's recent action in school desegregation cases will demonstrate "that we intend to enforce the (Civil Rights) Act of 1964 and the subsequent court decisions.

REALITIES OF SITUATION

"We are trying to take into account the realities of the situation and not be hypocritical, and I think we've had a candor in this administration, generally speaking, that has cleared the air and helped our communications with minorities," Finch said.

Finch was asked whether Nixon was in "bondage" to Southern supporters.

"I think President Nixon came in freer of any commitments probably than any of his predecessors," he replied, "and I believe that firmly or I wouldn't be here."

RIGHT KIND OF STEPS

As to whether the administration was moving in a liberal or conservative direction Finch said neither was the case:

"We're moving in a more constructive direction. I think speculation about moving left or right or these evaluations of the first 100 days or the first six months are artificial ones, and I think we're making the right kind of steps forward."

Finch also said his department's reform proposal for the public welfare system, which is reported to contain a provision for a type of guaranteed annual income, might be sent to Congress this week.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 9, 1969]

UNITED STATES MAY SUE GEORGIA TO FORCE DESEGREGATION

(By Peter Milius)

The Nixon Administration is preparing to take the state of Georgia into Federal court to bring about desegregation of all 195 school districts there.

Officials said yesterday that the Justice Department will send the Georgia Board of Education a notice later this week, warning that it faces a suit unless it orders statewide desegregation on its own.

FUSILLADE OF ORDERS

Meanwhile, the Justice Department kept up the fusillade of desegration suits and notices that began on Monday, following the Administration's heavily criticized desegregation policy statement of last week.

In rapid order, Justice:

Filed suit against three more Southern school districts that had had their Federal funds cut off and still refused to desegregate. The three are Tensas Parish and Red River Parish in northern Louisiana and Abbeyville County School District No. 60 in South Carolina.

Filed suit against Hardeman County in western Tennessee. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare had been ready to cite Hardeman County, the first step in the process that can lead to a cutoff.

Justice also sent a notice yesterday to the Waterbury, Conn., school board, warning that it will file suit unless the board takes steps to correct "serious deficiencies."

Justice said in its letter that "district lines, bus routes and transfer policies have been drawn so as to insure that predominantly white schools remain 'white' and predominantly nonwhite schools remain 'nonwhite,'" and that "the schools to which nonwhite students are assigned are in the worst condition and have fewer special services."

The Department also said "an arrangement has been made with the Catholic school system of Waterbury that allows white students to escape the predominantly nonwhite school districts in which they reside and to attend the practically all-white parochial school system at the expense of nonwhite students and parents."

In all four suits filed yesterday, as in the two filed Monday, the Department asked for desegregation "at the earliest practical date."

USING NEW POLICY

In its policy statement last week, the Administration said it would no longer hold the South to the old "arbitrary" 1969 and 1970 school desegregation deadlines, adding, however, that it would only grant delays to districts with "bona fide educational and administrative problems."

The Administration also said it would make more use of court orders and less of fund cutoffs to achieve desegregation, and would move against desegregation in the North as well as South.

Critics fastened on the first part of the statement, declaring that any relaxation of the deadlines would only encourage Southern recalcitrants to hold out for more time. This week's flurry of Justice Department press releases is in part an effort to blunt that criticism.

Administration spokesmen said last week that a statewide desegregation suit was in the works, but would not identify the state.

The Georgia suit would be the second of its kind; Justice was a party to a similar suit in Alabama three years ago, and all 118 school districts there are now under court order. Last January, only 7.4 per cent of Alabama's Negro pupils were in desegregated schools, the second-lowest figure in the South. The average in the South was 20.3 per cent.

The figure for Georgia was 14.2 per cent. According to HEW, 36 of Georgia's districts have already desegregated, another 42 have promised to by this or next September, 36 have had their funds cut off, 33 are in the cutoff process, 20 are already in court and the rest are still under review.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUTLEY SUN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nutley Sun of Newark, N.J., celebrated its 75th anniversary. This fine newspaper is the oldest paper in Essex County and at this time I want to congratulate Mr. Frank Orechio, the publisher, and his hard-working staff for continuing the traditions of the past and for making the Nutley Sun an even better newspaper.

An article from the Nutley Sun follows:

ESSEX COUNTY'S PIONEER NEWSPAPER NOW A YEAR OLDER

Today marks the 75th anniversary of The Nutley Sun, oldest weekly newspaper in Essex County, and a special color commemorative has been published for this issue to mark the birthday.

The 64-pages of the commemorative section cover a wide variety of Nutley's past, present and future. Featured are complete sections on town history, local government, famed personalities who live here, cultural activities, businessmen, industries, community clubs and finally—the future.

Additionally, today's anniversary has prompted congratulatory messages from political and civic leaders, including one from Governor Richard J. Hughes which has been reproduced on this page. A sampling of the messages received is published in the Speak-Up column on page 4.

Finally, the Sun's birthday was made more memorable when the New Jersey Senate—meeting yesterday in Trenton—adopted a resolution congratulating and commending Nutley's town newspaper.

The issue today marks several firsts—including the use of full-process (four-color) photography. The regular 15 cent per copy price of The Sun has been raised to 25 cents for this issue only. Regular subscribers, however, receive today's commemorative edition at no additional cost.

SENATE CONGRATULATES SUN

TRENTON.—The N.J. Senate yesterday adopted a resolution congratulating The Nutley Sun upon its 75th anniversary and commending the North Jersey newspaper for its "distinguished record of service to the public."

The resolution, reprinted below, was adopted unanimously after being introduced by Senator Alexander J. Matturri, Gerardo L. DelTufo, David W. Doud, Michael A. Giuliano, Milton A. Waldor and James Wallwork.

The special resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, the Nutley Sun, oldest weekly newspaper in Essex County, was established in 1894 and has completed its 75th year of informing, entertaining and serving the people of the Town of Nutley and its environs; and,

Whereas, April, 1969, marked the 10th anniversary of the paper's direction by its present editor and publisher, Frank Orechio, who has ably forwarded the traditions established by its founders and maintained high standards of journalistic excellence and service to the community; and,

Whereas, the Nutley Sun has achieved numerous journalistic awards, including the New Jersey Press Association's award for public service reporting and, on several occasions, the same Association's annual award for general excellence among the weekly newspapers of this State; and,

Whereas, on July 3, 1969, The Nutley Sun will publish its 75th Anniversary Edition; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

That this House hereby congratulates the Nutley Sun upon its 75th anniversary and commends its long and distinguished record of service to the public of the Nutley areas; and

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the journal and a duly authenticated copy, signed by the President and attested by the Secretary, be transmitted to Mr. Frank Orechio, editor and publisher of The Nutley Sun.

MESSAGE FROM GOVERNOR HUGHES

It is with great pride and pleasure that I join with all the good people of the Nutley area in congratulating you and all associated with the Nutley Sun on the 75th anniversary of this fine newspaper. During my eight years as Governor, my respect and admiration for the news media in our State has grown continually and I share your justifiable pride in the achievements of the SUN, which, over the years, has contributed so much to the lives of its readers. Therefore, my thoughts are with you on the occasion of this Diamond Jubilee and you have my best wishes for a memorable celebration and every continued success in the future.

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

NAS TABLES RESOLUTION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the June-July 1969 issue of National Academy of Sciences News Report tells the story of how a 2½-year effort by a Nobel prize winner to encourage a purely scientific investigation has been turned down by the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. William Shockley, Nobel laureate in physics from Stanford University and a man who was largely responsible for inventing the transistor, has long believed that an investigation of heredity and its relation to welfare could produce information which might be helpful in the solution of some of our racial and other social problems.

I express no personal view regarding the validity of Dr. Shockley's proposal, but I am shocked that men who call themselves scientists are afraid to seek the truth. I sometimes wonder if political and social science is not overpowering the quest for truth in the physical sciences. I ask the question: Is not the logical first step in solving any problem that of learning the truth about that problem?

The article from the National Academy of Sciences News Report follows:

NAS TABLES HEREDITY-INTELLIGENCE RESOLUTION

The National Academy of Sciences has voted to turn aside a proposal that it encourage the undertaking of a scientific study of "hereditary aspects of our national human quality problems."

Academy members meeting in the business session during the 1969 annual meeting tabled the proposal by an overwhelming show-of-hands vote.

The resolution was the latest effort in the two-and-a-half year campaign of NAS member William Shockley, the Nobel laureate in physics from Stanford University, to convince the Academy and the scientific community in general of the need to determine the relative importance of environment and heredity as causes of social problems and as causes of racial differences in behavioral traits.

Dr. Shockley has made clear his interest in seeking answers to such questions as: To what extent are urban slums the result of poor heredity? Is the genetic quality of the human population being eroded by differential birth rates in various social, economic and educational groups? Are genetic factors responsible for a significant part of racial differences in educational and economic achievements?

To this end he has presented papers on the subject at most of the Academy's spring and fall meetings since the fall of 1966, carried out extensive correspondence with Academy officers and other persons throughout the country, and given many talks.

As a response to the issues he raised, the Council of the Academy, with the help of several eminent geneticists, in 1967 prepared a 1,600-word statement on Human Genetics and Urban Slums and presented it at the fall meeting that year. It was published in full in the November 1967 *News Report* and later in the November 17, 1967, issue of *Science*.

The statement emphasized the near impossibility of sorting out environmental and genetic factors in human performance.

"There is no scientific basis for a statement that there are or that there are not substantial hereditary differences in intelligence between Negro and white populations," the statement said in part. "In the absence of some now-unforeseen way of equalizing all aspects of the environment, answers to this question can hardly be more than reasonable guesses . . ."

"[There] is the conviction that none of the current methods can produce unambiguous results. To shy away from seeking the truth is one thing; to refrain from collecting still more data that would be of uncertain meaning but would invite misuse is another . . ."

"We question the social urgency of a crash program to measure genetic differences in intellectual and emotional traits between racial groups. In the first place, if the traits are at all complex, the results of such research are almost certain to be inconclusive. In the second place, it is not clear that major social decisions depend on such information; we would hope that persons would be considered as individuals and not as members of groups."

Dr. Shockley has described the full statement as a "disgrace" and has characterized the Academy's record of performance on the issue as "Lysenko-like."

After this year's business meeting, however, NAS President Frederick Seitz said the 1967 statement was still a valid and accurate presentation of the Academy's view. "The strong feeling among the great majority of members," Dr. Seitz told newsmen, "is that it is essentially impossible to do good research in this field as long as there are such great social inequities. And such research is also so easily misunderstood in these times."

GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters from constituents who are hoping to send sons and daughters off to college in just a few weeks.

They express frustration over inability to get a bank loan under the provisions of the guaranteed loan program to finance their youngsters' education.

High interest rates in the present tight money market have dealt a discouraging blow to many deserving youngsters who were counting on these loans to cover at least some of the costs of college.

But that is not the only program in difficulty. Other student assistance programs such as national defense student loans, educational opportunity grants and the college work-study program have also fallen upon hard times.

Recently, I received a letter from the Michigan Student Financial Aid Association, the professional organization of student financial aid officers in Michigan, which sets forth a persuasive argument for full funding of student assistance programs. I take this opportunity to place this letter in the RECORD, calling special attention to the final sentence:

Only if funding levels are dramatically increased, can we fulfill the promise of equality of opportunity in higher education.

Then, lest anyone believe that these funds are a waste, I also want to place in the RECORD a letter I received just recently from a young woman who lives in my congressional district.

Miss Mary Konopnick, a 22-year-old cum laude graduate from Western Michigan University wrote me:

Have you ever wondered just exactly what happens with money that you and other Congressmen earmark for aid to education? Let me offer myself as an example or "proof of productivity" from these educational bills you endorse.

I recommend her letter to you.

Recent demonstrations—some violent, by a relatively few students at a relatively few colleges—a recent Senate investigations subcommittee study found that more than 90 percent of the Nation's colleges have escaped student strife—have raised some questions about students receiving Federal aid.

Most of them, like Miss Konopnick, are very decent youngsters who are assets to the Nation. Good educations are essential if they are to reach their full potential.

We must make certain that students like Miss Konopnick are not denied the assistance they need.

To accept a pinchpenny policy in student aid would be an indefensible waste of our greatest natural resources—our youth.

The letters follow:

MICHIGAN STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ASSOCIATION,
July 2, 1969.

Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: We of the Michigan Student Financial Aid Association, the professional organization of financial aid officers in Michigan, are deeply concerned about inadequate 1969–70 funding for federal student financial aid programs. The proposed $155,000,000 federal appropriation (compared to national needs of $270,000,000) for the 1969–70 National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program will have an adverse effect on efforts to make financial aid available to qualified and needy students. Unless the NDSL appropriation is raised, Michigan schools will receive only 56.6% of the necessary federal funds to support 1969–70 National Defense Student Loans. Financial aid officers from 41 Michigan schools estimate that some 10,675 needy and qualified students will be denied National Defense Student Loans and other federal financial aids at their schools because of insufficient funding.

Breach of promise is a harsh phrase, but we find it difficult to characterize otherwise the inadequate 1969–70 funding proposals for NDSL, Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG), and College Work-Study (CWS) programs. An integral part of the expanded financial aids made available by the Higher Education Act of 1965 was a commitment by schools accepting these funds to make vigorous efforts to encourage promising and needy students *who would not otherwise have attended college* to complete high school satisfactorily and to attend college. Michigan schools have accepted these recruiting commitments willingly and have devoted much time and effort to them. Many low-income students, particularly from minority groups which have traditionally had low percentages of college attendance, have been encouraged to plan for college with the promise that financial aid would be available.

Already this year many qualified high school seniors have been denied financial aid for college because of funding cutbacks. Several schools in Michigan have barely enough NDSL money for 1969–70 to continue loans to returning students, and can make no loans to entering students. Many low-income students are not receiving EOG funds because of lack of available money and because of lack of NDSL funds to make the necessary matching financial aid available to them. The EOG situation is somewhat better than predicted last fall, but funding is still inadequate. A problem, however, is that a crucial part of our effective use of financial aid funds is the timing of firm commitments on money available to us. Because we were uncertain about EOG allocations until early spring, many low-income students were discouraged from making serious college plans. I am sure you will agree that the nation can ill afford to encourage students to pursue advanced education and then refuse to provide the funds and facilities necessary to accommodate them.

The assumption has been made that funding reductions in NDSL can be absorbed by expansion of the Guaranteed Student Loan program. While this may be true in other states, it is decidedly not true in Michigan. Many lending institutions do not participate. For example, only three Detroit and two Lansing banks participate in the program. The participating banks often restrict loans to customers, to students with B-averages, and to upperclassmen and graduate students. We are aware of the serious problems facing lending institutions in a high-interest tight money market. We are also appreciative of the significant increases in lending activity in this program. But we would hope that some legislative action could be taken to improve the attractiveness of these loans to lenders. Possibilities include a federal subsidy to lenders or a further increase in the maximum interest rate because of the continued rise in the prime interest rate.

Because of the lack of available bank funds the guaranteed loan program has not reached its full potential. Until it does, the neediest students just entering college will rarely be able to obtain guaranteed loans. The guaranteed loan program was designed to assist middle-income families. In Michigan it is not doing that adequately, and it is not helping those low-income students who most need substantial financial aid if they are to pursue post-secondary education.

Our hope is that you and other members of Congress will consider carefully the implications of inadequate student financial aid funding for 1969–70 and the years ahead. NDSL funding should be maintained at the $190,000,000 level at the minimum. Preferably all three programs (NDSL, EOG, CWS) will be funded at authorized levels for Fiscal 1970 and future years. Only if funding levels are dramatically increased can we fulfill the promise of equality of opportunity in higher education.

Sincerely,

LEE C. FAWCETT,
Chairman.

MT. CLEMENS, MICH.,
June 3, 1969.

JAMES G. O'HARA,
Congressman, 12th District,
Mt. Clemens, Mich.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: Have you ever wondered just exactly what happens with money that you and other Congressmen earmark for aid to education? Let me offer myself as an example of "proof of productivity" from these educational bills that you endorse.

My name is Mary Konopnick. I'm 22 years old, a resident of Mt. Clemens, Michigan and a recent graduate of Western Michigan University. I attended my four years at Western almost entirely on federal and state funds. If these funds were not made available to me in the form of loans (National Defense), scholarships (Michigan Higher Assistance Authority Tuition Scholarship and University Scholarships), and Grants (Educational Opportunity Grant including the now defunct Government Incentive Award), I would most likely never have attended school or still be in the process of struggling through trying not to become too discouraged.

Instead, today I hold a B.A. Degree and a Secondary Provisional Teaching Certificate. My immediate plans (if I can manage financially) are to attend Medill Graduate School of Journalism at Northwestern University in June.

During the past four years, I feel that I have put government funds to good use by being on the Dean's List for six semesters, by being admitted to a Freshman Woman's Honorary Society, by being inducted into a national Educational Honorary Society (Kappa Delta Pi), by working at the Job Corps in Battle Creek (scholarship funds made it possible for me to hold down only a part-time job giving me more free time to participate in worthwhile programs) and by graduating cum laude.

I recognize the necessity of education in our society today and am most appreciative that I was able to secure a good start on one with your and the government's aid. You may be sure that I totally support any educational bills or programs which allocate funds to universities to be used to provide students with financial aid to complete their education. I hope that you, also, will give your support to continue such programs and to inaugurate new ones. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY KONOPNICK.

CHILTON COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE RESCUE SQUAD

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, Chilton County is one of the counties in Alabama that I am privileged to represent in Congress. The Chilton County Civil Defense Rescue Squad, which has recently celebrated its 13th anniversary, is a dedicated group of volunteers originally established to search for drowning victims in the Coosa River. A few years later, it accepted a partnership with the civil defense network, and now the squad is a countywide emergency unit, equipped to go anywhere, anytime, and for whatever need arises. In addition to being one of the oldest teams of its kind in the State, it is also one of the best equipped and has one of the most loyal memberships of any rescue-emergency operation in the entire region.

The squad is often called on to locate lost children, hunters, and fishermen. One of the sad but necessary parts of their job is to drag a pond, lake, or river for a drowning victim. The men of the rescue squad have spent hundreds of hours on just such work; and, though not boastful about it in the least—they have become expert at it. These operations have continued for days at a time; but the squad is noted for sticking it out, until the job is done. Also, their skill, developed over the years, has allowed them to make several recoveries in a matter of minutes.

Every member of the Chilton County Civil Defense Rescue Squad is a volunteer. They serve without pay and, moreover, each member is required to pay dues and furnish his own uniform. We are fortunate to have dedicated citizens like this in Chilton County, Ala. As a tribute to the men of this squad, I include a list of their names in the RECORD, as follows:

Lally Bates, President; Chuck Avery, Bob Abernathy, Gene Baker, Clyde Blalock, Paul Bavar, Richard Bush, Lamar Blalock, Carl Baker, Jr., Cecil Carter, C. F. Comer, Tom Cox, Dalton Champion, Gordon Conway, John E. Dansby, Alvin Ellison, Jimmy Ellison, Charles Foshee, Don Finlayson, Don Fullen, Jimmy Foshee, Alton Gentry, Bobby Godwin.

Douglas Glass, Donald Giles, Paul Headley, Hollis Hilyer, Richard Headley, Bill Hahn, Willie Johnson, James E. Johnson, Lavonne Jones, Clyde L. Jones, Ronnie Johnson, Emmett Kendrick, Honrie Little, Thomas Liveoak, W. A. "Bing" LeCroy, Raymond Lolley, Jimmy Martin, Bobby Martin, Donald Martin, Calvin Martin, Carl Martin, Dalton Mims, Luther Mims.

Curtis Meank, George Minor, Henry McKey, John McAfee, Ottis Moore, Burton Mullins, Freddie Mayfield, Chester Miller, Gene Mims, Paul Parrish, Ben Popwell, Tommy Powell, Bill Popwell, Jimmy Smith, Alton Sanders, Bill Scott, G. W. Trammel, Don Verner, Earl Wilson, Charles Watts, Jimmy Willis, Charles Wayne Wright, Randel Wright.

DR. EDUARDO MONDLANE: MOZAMBIQUE PATRIOT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, all too often in recent years the world has been shocked by the assassinations of great leaders in the struggle for human freedom. It is tragic for all mankind that those most compassionately involved in the struggle for human rights have been the victims of the most complete denial of a man's humanity, the act of murder. Eduardo Mondlane as a freedom fighter in Mozambique, Africa, stirred the yearnings of men for liberty, yet now is but another name on the list of martyrs along with Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, and only recently, Tom Mboya. All were men of compassion in an age of apathy.

Eduardo Mondlane was the unique combination of an internationally known educator, a man deeply committed to Christian ideals, and the leader of a nationalist revolution in Africa. He was born in Mozambique in 1920 and received most of his early education in Africa. At age 31, after a short stay in Portugal, he came to the United States, where he earned a B.A. at Oberlin College and a Ph. D. at Northwestern. Staying in the United States, he worked for several years in the Secretariat's Office of the United Nations and was later to give up a professorship at Syracuse in order to return to Mozambique and join his countrymen in their struggle for independence.

Emerging as the leader of the Mozambique struggle, Eduardo Mondlane taught compassion where many men learn hatred. He showed understanding where many men are tempted toward intolerance. He viewed the long-range goal where many men come to see only the immediate. In the midst of revolution, he founded a school. In the midst of dissension, he managed reconciliation.

In a world beset by inequality he practiced tolerance.

To those in his own Mozambique he will be remembered as a nationalist leader. Yet, for all men his life is an example of unremitting dedication to the struggle for human liberty. Thus, I insert the following eulogy for Eduardo Mondlane from the Christian Century in the RECORD:

MONDLANE: GUERRILLA CHRISTIAN

Revolution is a word which gushes with sentimentality these days. It is only a folk memory for many of us to recall that our ancestors were revolutionary conspirators engaged in overthrowing the tyranny of colonialism. We are beset, moreover, with some latter-day enthusiasts of revolution who don't seem to have any very clear notion of what a revolution is all about.

Eduardo Mondlane was an authentic Christian revolutionary engaged in the overthrow of colonialist tyranny and endowed with an extraordinary combination of political realism and moral integrity. As president of Frelimo, the Mozambique Liberation Front, he provided an incomparable case study in guerrilla leadership on the part of a steadfast Presbyterian layman. Like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Mondlane left the security of an academic career in the United States to share in the struggle and passion of his people and to take into his own most sensitive soul the dilemmas of violence as a weapon of last resort in the service of justice.

The willingness of Eduardo Mondlane to employ violence should not obscure the parallels between his leadership and that of another modern martyr, Martin Luther King, Jr. Both were brilliant, patient, unassuming, gentle men who surrendered their preferred vocations to respond to the summons of the freedom revolution. The parallels have been thoughtfully noted by Eugene L. Smith of the U.S. conference of the W.C.C.:

"The loss of Dr. Eduardo Mondlane to Africa and the world is akin to the loss of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the United States and to the world. Here were two Christians deeply committed to freedom and to justice with a profound sense of human values. Living in danger, they were unafraid. Suffering injustice, they were above bitterness. Living in racial hostilities, they were too great to be hostile. Living amidst confusion, they had a vision which offered light and hope."

And, we must add, both were murdered at a moment when their lives were most precious to the unfulfilled movements they led.

There are deep cleavages within Frelimo. Mondlane worked miracles of reconciliation to hold contending factions together. His radical critics were impatient with his long-range perspectives on liberation. They felt cheated by his insistence that it was Portuguese colonial policy, not Portuguese culture or the Portuguese people, that Frelimo must fight. They sought to discredit Mondlane's standing as an African nationalist by portraying him as captive to American influences: a bachelor's degree from Oberlin College (via a Methodist Crusade scholarship), a doctorate in sociology from Northwestern University, a white American wife, and a professorial stint at Syracuse University.

As a speaker at the Geneva Conference on Church and Society in 1966, Mondlane said: "As we talk to each other as Christians I think that we should begin to turn from saying to the white man, 'Please continue to help us after independence.' No! Let's begin to build from within." The W.C.C. and other church bodies have aided the Mozambique Institute in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, the city in which a time bomb killed Mondlane on February 3. The institute, directed by Mrs. Janet Mondlane, is an upper primary school for Mozambican refugees.

Frelimo's leadership struggle is likely to be fierce—as the Portuguese government doubtless hopes. At the time of Mondlane's assassination, Frelimo's 8,000 guerrillas were tying down at least 40,000 Portuguese troops in northern Mozambique. Portuguese colonialism remains an anachronistic scourge upon a continent which is otherwise more or less free from the European empires of the past four centuries. On the very eve of Mondlane's death, the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ took a very forthright position by endorsing the U.N.'s repeated censure of Portuguese policies and their implication in the racism of Rhodesia and South Africa, calling for an arms embargo of Portugal, recommending termination of U.S. use of Portuguese bases and expressing support for "the legitimate claims of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau."

We don't know who was directly responsible for the time bomb that destroyed the body of Eduardo Mondlane. However, insofar as any of us is apathetic about or apologetic for U.S. acquiescence in Portuguese policy in Africa, we share in the guilt for his murder. "I may be killed any day," Mondlane said recently, "but there will be victory."

YOU CAN REMAKE THIS SOCIETY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose every Congressman is asked upon occasion by a concerned citizen who wants to participate in the affairs of his Nation, "What can I do?" "How can I participate?" or "Is there a place for me?"

In these days when Government is massive, unaware and unmindful of the individual at times, these are not easy questions to answer meaningfully.

I recently came across an excellent response to these questions written by John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and now chairman of the Urban Coalition.

This response, relevant and wise, appeared in the July 15 issue of Look magazine, and it merits the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The article follows:

MESSAGE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY GENERATION: YOU CAN REMAKE THIS SOCIETY

(By John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

This spring, I received a letter signed by three undergraduates at a major university. They said, "We don't like the fanaticism, the coercive tactics and the ego games of the extremist leaders. But we think things have to change in this society. What can we do?"

I have had the same inquiry—"What can we do?"—from many young people. The quick answer is "Plenty!"

But first, you are right to say there are things that must be changed. Our nation is in deep trouble. There are intolerable injustices to be corrected, outworn institutions to be overhauled, new solutions to be found—and you can't live placidly as though you hadn't noticed.

If we are to root out the evils, deal with the swift pace of change, meet new conceptions of human need and preserve the vitality of this society, our institutions must undergo quick, far-reaching adaptation.

As young people, you are well fitted to renew human institutions. You have the necessary freshness of vision. You have the necessary impatience. And you are not yet entrapped in custom.

But if you are to benefit from those assets, you are going to have to think hard about the realities of social change. The extremist student leaders have devised some theatrical and destructive games that provide the thrill of conflict (and great ego inflation for the leaders themselves) but accomplish virtually nothing in the way of real social change. The extremists are dependent for their success on the permissive atmosphere of academic life. For all their talk of changing the world, they are playpen revolutionaries, imprisoned by their own tactics in the only world that will tolerate them.

The weaknesses of most political action by youth, here and throughout the world, have been inexperienced and futile assaults on the wrong targets, aimless and destructive bursts of anger and violence, and the willingness of many to be exploited by irrational, narcissistic and cynically manipulative leaders. Over and over, we have seen that violence and coercion do not lead forward to constructive change but backward to repressive countermeasures.

What are the alternatives for you? To my mind, they are many and exciting. The best proof that they exist may be found in last year's political campaigns.

Those of you who served as campaign workers committed yourselves to disciplined endeavor to cope with the world on its own terms. In doing so, you left an indelible mark on the year 1968. You may have started something that will change everything.

What I propose is that you now bring your enthusiasm and commitment to a very specific set of tasks that *must* be carried through if this nation is to measure up to the challenge ahead: *1) reform of the major parties; 2) reform of the electoral process; 3) reform of state and local government.*

What you have seen in the past year must have whetted your interest in the machinery of party politics and the workings of the electoral process. Some of you have been so repelled or discouraged that you have given up both on the parties and the process. But others, perhaps most of you, are not discouraged because you sense that you have really set some changes in motion. Few professional politicians would have predicted that the Democratic convention of 1968 would outlaw the unit rule not only at the national convention but down to the state and local levels. Few would have believed the convention would require that delegates be chosen under procedures open to the public. Yet those revolutionary steps were taken—and you played a major role.

At the local level, thanks in part to your efforts, new candidates with fresh views appeared in many places. Incumbents were forced to reassess their positions on important issues, including the war. Local party chairmen were in some instances replaced. School boards have been forced to reexamine their policies.

That is only a taste of what can come. You know how badly a fresh breeze is needed. You know that we need to shake up the means by which the parties manage their affairs, choose their delegates, run their conventions. You know what peril for democracy lies in the skyrocketing expenses of political campaigns. You understand how archaic are the processes of the electoral college.

Similarly, you have gotten at least a glimpse of the critical need for reforming state and local government. You care about the idea of participation, and you know that most participation must necessarily be at the grass roots, a level dominated today by antiquated and creaky political machinery. State and local governments are ripe for major changes. You can have a major hand in bringing about those changes.

Here are some of the activities young people could engage in (and I would include many age levels and many kinds of people: ghetto youth with natural leadership capacities but not much education, college undergraduates, graduate students, young professionals, teachers and businessmen):

Sign up for work in your own party; write Sen. Fred Harris or Rep. Rogers Morton, chairmen, respectively, of the Democratic and Republican national committees, and ask what plans they have for involving young people in party work. (They have such plans.)

Run for elective office, or do volunteer staff work for some one running for office.

Enter government service at state or local levels.

Help design and participate in publicly or privately financed internship programs that will enable young people to get a taste of public life before entering it as a career.

Form a local group to study in depth the social problems that confront your community, and present your findings to appropriate legislators and administrators.

Insist on participation by youth in civic organizations concerned with social problems. Say to civic leaders, "You don't like it when we take unconventional action; then give us a piece of the conventional action."

Do volunteer work for organizations dedicated to good government, and recruit others of your age group to do likewise; if you find no organization that suits your purposes, form your own.

Form a local youth organization to study the processes of state and local government, to discover practical means of improving it and to take action.

These suggestions stress state and local politics, but I'm not suggesting you forsake the national arena. Every member of Congress has roots "back home," has ties with local party machinery and worries about what his constitutents say. You can reach him.

College and university professors of government can help you explore the realities of the world you hope to change, through courses for credit, field projects and extracurricular action. Law school professors can advise you on model-state legislation, conflict of interest, new instrumentalities for citizen action and so on.

Mayors, governors, state legislators and members of Congress can give you counsel on the workings of government. (I know that only a few such public figures will have the adventurousness—or is it shrewdness?—to do so, but a few may be enough!)

All civic organizations should make a point of bringing young people into the heart of their activities. Foundations should provide funds for action-oriented research and programs.

I propose that you form local organizations to pursue these matters. I do not wish to suggest the form the organizations should take, because your purposes will vary. Some of you will wish to work through the Young Democratic or Young Republican organizations. Others will be inclined to form new organizations.

Just the fact of your participation in local politics and government will in itself have a powerful and beneficial effect. It will be good for the community and good for you. But mere participation is *not* the goal. You could enter the system, adjust to it perfectly, end up at the top—and leave us exactly where we are now. The purpose is not just to enter the system. The purpose is to change it for the better. Your elders have shamefully neglected the task of improving state and local government. You can correct that.

The object is the redesign of institutions, the renewal of society. It will take all the intelligence and energy and shrewdness you can bring to bear. But the stakes are high.

The object is to win—not to make yourselves feel noble, not to indulge your anger, not to pad your vanity but to renew the society.

Human institutions can be changed, if you care enough to work at it, if you care enough to study the machinery you want to change and find the points of leverage.

At this critical point in our history, we can less and less afford to limit ourselves to routine repair of breakdowns in our social processes. More and more, we must undertake the imaginative redesign of those processes. We see in all clarity that many of our institutions are ill-fitted for the tasks the modern world presses on them; yet they stubbornly resist change, even in the face of savage attacks by those who would destroy them.

Unless we are willing to see a final confrontation between institutions that refuse to change and critics bent on destruction, we had better get on with the business of redesigning our society.

You can renew this society. But not in a fit of impatience and not without effort. You must be discriminating critics of your society, seeking to identify, coolly and precisely, those things about it that thwart or limit human potentialities, and therefore need modification. And so must you be discriminating protectors of your society, preserving those features that strengthen the individual and make him more free. To fit yourselves for such tasks, you must be sufficiently serious to study your institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them.

The time is ripe for constructive and far-reaching improvement in our institutions. No one person, obviously, can do it alone. But young people all over the country, working together, might produce just the leaven, just the stimulus, just the lift of spirit that this nation needs to move on to the next stage of development.

JOE MONDRES: COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to note that Joe Mondres of Miami Beach, a friend and dedicated community leader today reaches the Biblical threescore and ten of an active and productive life.

Mr. Mondres, immediate past president of Maccabee Lodge of B'nai B'rith of Miami Beach, has just been named the district's outstanding lodge president for 1968–69. The honor was announced at the B'nai B'rith District Grand Lodge No. 5 convention recently held in Miami Beach.

Joe Mondres is a fine example of the many thousands of informed and responsible senior citizens who reside in my district and throughout our Nation. A few years ago, having reached the age of retirement he embarked instead upon a new career of civic responsibility and of helping others. A man of limited means, he could offer nothing but his time and effort. This he did with zest and soon he rose to positions of leadership in several organizations whose charitable and worthwhile projects did much good for the less fortunate in the community.

Mr. Mondres' activities in behalf of the Jewish community are particularly notable. He is a member of the campaign cabinet of the Combined Jewish Appeal-Israel Emergency Fund. He is also vice president of the Hillel advisory board, and vice president of the South Florida council of B'nai B'rith lodges.

He is 70 today and still going strong. He is living proof of the valuable services being performed by senior Americans. May he have many active and productive years ahead to serve his religion, community, and Nation.

BOOST PROTEINS OR WORLD STARVES, EXPERTS DECLARE

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Denver Post reported a frank and realistic discussion of world hunger by Robert C. Liebenow, the president of Corn Refiners Association, Inc., and David M. Updegraff, head of the microbiology section of the Denver Research Institute.

The experts emphasized the need for increased protein consumption to prevent malnutrition and starvation, and discussed new scientific methods of producing protein.

At a time when the Congress and the American people as a whole are becoming increasingly concerned about the shocking evidence of hunger both here at home and throughout the world, these comments are particularly relevant and useful. I commend them to the House and include them at this point in the RECORD:

MICROBIAL SOURCE ADVOCATED—BOOST PROTEINS OR WORLD STARVES, EXPERTS DECLARE

(By Monk Tyson)

Proteins, the source of strength, health and life itself, must be drastically increased in food if humanity is to stave off starvation by the end of this century.

This warning was sounded by Robert C. Liebenow, president of Corn Refiners Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., and David M. Updegraff, head of the microbiology section of the Denver Research Institute.

They spoke at a joint meeting of the American Astronautical Society and Operations Research Society, which ended Friday at the Brown Palace and Cosmopolitan Hotels.

Liebenow and Updegraff warned that two-thirds of the world's 3 billion people "either do not get enough to eat, or do not receive food of proper nutritional quality."

SOLUTION PREDICTED

But both held to the hope that the situation could be solved—through more nutrition in foods. Updegraff bases much of his hopes on development of microbial or single-cell protein.

"The microbes concerned are bacteria and fungi," Updegraff said. "They are capable of growing and synthesizing protein hundreds or thousands of times as rapidly as beef cattle.

"Furthermore, they can use such cheap and abundant materials as kerosene, wood pulp and ammonium sulfate fertilizer as raw materials.

"A great deal of research is needed to develop foods from such materials. For the foreseeable future, social and economic obstacles to the use of such foodstuffs may prove more difficult than the technical problems involved."

MYTHS CAUSE CONCERN

"The magnitude of the task is staggering, despite revolutionary breakthroughs in science and in techniques of production," Liebenow said. His chief concern involves what he calls myths that are often presented as solutions to the problem of world hunger. He presented these figures:

"Although it took all of human history up to about the year 1850 for the world population to reach 1 billion, it reached 2 billion only 75 years later and reached three billion just 35 years after that.

"Now, we are confronted with the prospect that population will increase by another 3 billion people in 30 years—to a globe-shrinking 6 billion by the year 2000. We wonder, with good reason, can they be fed well, or adequately, or even at all?"

Expert opinions have swung periodically like a pendulum from pessimism to optimism and back again, Liebonow said. These attitudes followed bumper crops under a good growing season and poor crops under adverse growing conditions, he added.

FREE FOOD NOT ANSWER

"Needy nations don't want all the free food they can get," Liebenow said. This can have the adverse effect of smothering their own food production, he said.

Exporting this nation's technology and putting it to use in underdeveloped countries isn't as easily done as said, Liebenow explained. Our advanced technology often "fails miserably in a primitive or semiprimitive environment. There is a gulf, not a gap, between the man who plows four or six or more rows at one time and the man who plows one row at a time—with a wooden plow."

"Poor people do not make good customers," Liebenow observed. ". . . Today, our best commercial export markets for agricultural products are countries with highly developed agriculture—Canada, Western Europe and Japan."

Help for poor countries must come from the outside, but this would require political cooperation of those countries, Liebenow said. He cited government restrictions on private ownership of companies in India as an example.

REQUIREMENTS ESTIMATED

"The present world consumption of protein is about 75 million tons," Liebenow said. "It is estimated that 115 million tons are required presently for a balanced world diet. . . .

"In the next three decades, the output of protein must be tripled just to reach a level considered adequate. . . . Incredible as that demand may seem, I believe it will be met."

An important need, he continued, is the "genetic improvement of cereal grains, fortification with essential missing amino acids and development of non-conventional sources of protein from cereal grains and other products."

He cited high lysine corn as an "excellent example." In this type of corn, now being developed, a kernel contains twice as much lysine and trytophan as the conventional type, and other amino acids are improved.

POPULATION CONTROL

Updegraff advocates not only a vast increase in the food supply but said that population control is absolutely necessary.

Speaking on "Microbes as a New Source of Food for the Expanding World Population," Updegraff said cereal grains, the most abundant of foodstuffs, contain inadequate amounts of protein.

Micro-organisms used in single-cell production are algae, fungi and bacteria, Updegraff said. His listings on protein production from these sources, especially bacteria, contain fantastic figures—and sound like bad news for cattle unless protein content of beef can be drastically increased in the future.

For instance, his figures show, a 1,000-pound steer produces one pound of protein a day. The same amount of bacteria will produce 100 trillion pounds of protein in the same period according to Updegraff's figures.

YEAST, SOYBEANS CITED

A thousand pounds of yeast would produce 100,000 pounds of protein a day, and a like amount of soybeans would yield 100 pounds a day, Updegraff's calculations show.

"This enormous growth rate of bacteria provides no very great advantage over yeast," Updegraff said. "Other considerations, such as transfer rates of insoluble hydrocarbon and of oxygen to the bacteria and heat transfer will limit bacterial growth rates in large systems."

Much remains to be done before single-cell production can be put on large scale, Updegraff said.

"For animal-feed supplements," he continued, "single cell protein should be available in the form of algae from sewage and yeast from hydrocarbons within two or three years."

Because large amounts of hydrocarbons are available at low cost from petroleum refining, several countries are setting up protein producing plants.

"Gulf Oil has purchased a small fermentation plant in California and is also planning to produce food yeast from petroleum distillates," Updegraff said. "Esso has carried out extensive pilot plant studies, using bacteria as well as yeast."

Such protein sources as leaves, oil seed, the oceans and improved cereal grains can provide a bigger supply, but Updegraff doesn't believe it's enough. Supplies of edible fish—by modern taste standards—are decreasing, he said.

Updegraff quoted scientists S. R. Tannenbaum and R. I. Mateles, who sized up the arrival of large scale single-cell protein production like this:

"The torch will have been passed to the social scientists, the marketing and distribution people and the statesmen."

SEEKS COMMISSION TO EXPLORE POSSIBILITIES OF FEDERATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently, along with many of my colleagues, I introduced a resolution to establish a commission of distinguished Americans to explore, with other Atlantic nations, the long-range possibilities of federation. The concept has had the support, over the years, of such men as Richard Nixon, Hubert Humphrey, EUGENE MCCARTHY, and many, many others.

This concept—of a Federal union as the basis of international action and peacekeeping—has been actively and persistently advocated by a distinguished former foreign correspondent for the New York Times, Clarence Streit, for some 30 years, while our colleague, Mr. FINDLEY, has been the principal congressional proponent over the past several years.

Recently, Erwin D. Canham wrote an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, calling the Atlantic Union, in the words of Victor Hugo, "an idea whose time had come." Mr. Canham correctly cites Clarence Streit as the man primarily responsible for bringing this idea to its time.

I recommend his comments to my colleagues and insert Mr. Canham's article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 8, 1969]

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

(By Erwin D. Canham)

"An idea whose time has come" is the powerful thought, paraphrased from Victor Hugo, often used by politicians (mostly recently, Sen. Everett Dirksen) to justify supporting something that has long lain dormant.

There is some evidence to believe that the idea of federal union of the Atlantic nations may be now approaching its time.

That is to say, nobody expects that federal union is an early likelihood. But what is more seriously considered than ever before is the resolution supported by a bipartisan group of 70 members of the United States House of Representatives to appoint a commission to explore with other Atlantic nations the long-range possibilities of federation.

ELOQUENT SUPPORT

The idea of federal union as an ultimate basis of international action and peacekeeping has been actively promoted for the last 30 years by one of the most dedicated crusaders alive, Clarence Streit. He published the book "Union Now" in 1939, after almost two decades as a distinguished foreign correspondent for the New York Times.

Ever since, sometimes seeming to be a voice crying in the wilderness, Clarence Streit has talked and written for federal union. He has been supported by some of the most eminent public figures in the Western world. The resolution now pending in Congress was endorsed eloquently in 1966 by Richard Nixon. His 1968 opponent, Hubert Humphrey, and Sen. Eugene McCarthy were long supporters of the idea.

The present chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees are advocates of the exploration of Atlantic union. So was Robert F. Kennedy. So was President Eisenhower. So were Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller. So have been many outstanding European leaders, notably including Maurice Schumann, now French Foreign Minister.

ENTRENCHED DOUBTS

With these and many other advocates, you would think the resolution calling for a citizens' delegation and then an international convention to examine the possibilities of federation would go through Congress swimmingly. It may. But entrenched doubts are great. American public opinion, at least, would need to know what elements of national sovereignty would be in any way affected by the ultimate plans.

Actually, all that is proposed is to examine carefully whether the present allies of the Atlantic could cooperate any more closely to work out terms of economic and political peace. The proposed federation would correlate with the European Common Market, but not replace it.

Richard Nixon in 1966 had this to say: "It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations. Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and numerous scientific and technological advances of the past 20 years point the way in this direction."

COMMITMENT

Whether burdened by the responsibilities of the presidency and advised by the State Department, Mr. Nixon feels the same way remains to be seen. But the resolution itself commits the nation only to explore. As its sponsors point out, during the years since World War II, the U.S. Government has spent nearly a trillion dollars seeking national military solutions to problems which are scarcely military. Little time and energy has been spent in projecting other roads to peace.

The Atlantic union resolution is no derogation from the United Nations, or any other existing organization. The United States is the greatest proof in the world of the values of federation. Why should not its great constitutional idea be considered in application with other likeminded nations?

When will responsible governments lift their gaze from armaments and static conceptions and consider new-old paths to peace?

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE OPPOSES THE ABM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I noted with admiration today the resolution on the ABM adopted by the American Veterans Committee at its annual convention in June. Congress has frequently been indebted in the past to the American Veterans Committee for its clear and dispassionate appraisal of our country's military posture. This resolution should serve to reinforce this esteem.

AVC recognizes that the ABM can lead to the escalation of the present arms race. Far from encouraging our foes to meet us at the disarmament table, the development of this new weapon, they feel, will engender increased suspicions and mistrust and work to destabilize the present world situation. The committee realizes that, embroiled as we are in a military conflict, our country can ill afford these additional expenditures. Finally, the resolution properly points out that the Defense Department has failed to demonstrate that the proposed system will even function as designed.

I should like to reiterate my agreement with these views. Our cities and our poor beg us for attention. We cannot now divert funds, made scarce by the Vietnam war, from these pressing domestic concerns. Constructing the ABM would accelerate our arms expenditures. Already many speak of the necessity of another weapons system, the MIRV. All of these military efforts will elicit a like response from the Soviet Union and encourage us to even more ambitious and expensive projects. This country's concern should be disarmament, not the sophistication of our existing defense capabilities.

A question even arises as to the capacity of an ABM system to bolster our weapons arsenal. Quite apart from the military advantage of such a system, which evidence suggests may be offset by a very modest increase in the size of the Soviet ICBM stockpile, the ABM appears technically infeasible. The information now available reveals that the vast complex of radar and missile installations required may well prove incapable of coordination.

The American Veterans Committee has shown itself again to be a responsible guardian of the public interest. Its motto "Citizens First" is amply borne out in this considered, timely resolution on this matter of urgent national concern. The text of the resolution follows:

AVC RESOLUTION ON ABM

The American Veterans Committee opposes the Anti-Ballistic Program for the following reasons:

1. The Anti-Ballistic Program tends to make armaments limitation agreement more difficult. It contributes to escalation of the nuclear armaments race and thereby heightens the balance of terror and increases the possibility of nuclear war.

2. As a matter of priorities the funds expended for the ABM Program and the additional funds that would be required by the escalation of the arms race are desperately needed for our domestic needs.

3. The Defense Department has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed ABM System will work. Our present deterrent without the ABM System is such that no country would consider that it could now launch a nuclear attack on us without suffering utter devastation and retaliation.

TWO SIDES TO THE CORPORATE MERGER STORY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's activities in the realm of antitrust law enforcement, particularly with regard to corporate mergers, is the source of a most enlightening editorial in the July 1969 issue of Fortune magazine. The currently popular concept that bigness is inherently evil has given rise to what many consider a "horse with blinders" approach to the whole merger concept.

Blanket rules which are both arbitrary and repressive ought not to become the standard measure by which all proposed merger actions are automatically prejudged. Certainly our antitrust laws are a vital and necessary deterrent to oppressive monopolies, but, as with other laws, their enforcement must be thoughtfully and equitably carried out. A superzealous overextension of antitrust law provisions could constrict the economic well-being of many and would serve the best interests of few. The Attorney General would do well to take a more reasoned approach to the situation; perhaps a bit less protection for corporations facing acquisition and a bit more protection for minority schoolchildren in the South is in order.

For a thoughtful presentation of the merger issue, I respectfully submit the following article for my colleagues' attention:

PITCHFORK BEN, MEET WHEELBARROW JOHN

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon."—Joshua 10:12

The Attorney General of the United States, John N. Mitchell, has thrown the weight of his office on the side of an extreme and simplistic interpretation of how antitrust law should be applied in merger cases. In so doing, he has used arguments that disclose, more unmistakably than any previous pronouncement of any federal official, the reactionary bias that underlies the trend of the Nixon Administration's antimerger policy.

The Department of Justice, Mitchell says, "may well oppose any merger among the top 200 manufacturing firms or firms of comparable size in other industries." Moreover, it "will probably" oppose a merger between any of the top 200 with "any leading producer in any concentrated industry." These candid new formulations contradict all those passionate denials by previous antitrust enforcers who said that they were not opposed to bigness as such. Under Mitchell's policy, antitrust enforcers will no longer feel it necessary to engage in those tortuous analyses that purported to show how a given merger, because of "verticle" relations or "horizontal" overlap of markets, would diminish competition. Henceforth the Antitrust Division, never noted for acute or diligent research, will be obliged to prove only size—which it can do by buying a copy of Fortune or asking a man who owns one.

The Attorney General's reasoning is even more alarming than the conclusions that emerge from it. After reciting that the top 200 manufacturing companies now "control" 58 percent of U.S. manufacturing assets (up from 48 percent twenty years ago), Mitchell says this fact "leaves us with the unacceptable probability that the nation's manufacturing and financial assets will continue to be concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people."

This is unacceptable in a way that Mitchell doesn't mean. In the first place, nobody knows whether the recent trend he notes will continue or be reversed; some observers of business, for instance, believe that "deconglomeration" will be the trend of the 1970's. More significantly, an arithmetic concentration of assets by number of firms does not by any means imply concentration in the hands of "fewer people." Most of these 200 companies, especially the conglomerates at whom his aim is directed, are highly decentralized operations; thousands of individual managers and experts participate in their decisions.

The 200 top manufacturing companies have millions of stockholders, with newly reinforced influence derived from mutual funds, take-over bids, and the general liveliness of the capital markets. Nearly all of these companies sell in increasingly competitive markets where technological improvement and consumer discretion sharply reduce the security of any product line; moreover, competition from foreign firms in the U.S. market is becoming more vigorous.

A POPULIST ECHO

Consumers, whose protection (as Mitchell notes) is the ultimate aim of the antitrust laws, are in a stronger position than ever before, because prosperity and the widening range of choice enables them to postpone purchases or to shift purchases from one industry category to another. A nation-wide market, subject to world competition, has long since broken the concentrated power that many *local* monopolists, some of them small if measured on a national scale, formerly exercised over the necessities of life.

In the same speech (to the Georgia Bar Association) Mitchell disclosed that one of the objectives of his antitrust policy is to preserve the small town and city from what he regards as a growing concentration of power in metropolitan centers. "Most of you," he said in a direct appeal to the prejudice of his audience, "represent economic interests—distant from the centers of financial and managerial power—which may be injured by the current merger trends."

Just in case any members of the Georgia bar were too obtuse to get the point, Mitchell added that lawyers outside metropolitan areas "should have the opportunity to act as counsel." He continued: "We do not want our middle-sized and smaller cities to be merely 'branch store' communities; nor do we want our average consumers to be 'second class' economic citizens."

This sentiment, of course, is not novel. Playing upon the fear of large corporations and of metropolitan centers was the stock in trade of such Populist orators as William Jennings Bryan, Pitchfork Ben Tillman, Sockless Jerry Simpson, Huey Long, and Alfalfa Bill Murray. When they denounced overconcentration, in many cases using "Wall Street" as its symbol, they had the excuse of not being able to foresee that the rise of large-scale business would in fact become a great liberating movement, dispersing power, generating competition, and giving consumers more and more influence over the allocation of the economy's resources.

But in 1969 an Attorney General of the United States, himself not a crossroads demagogue but a Wall Street lawyer, has no excuse for failure to take cognizance of American business as it actually is. If Mitchell keeps on making these countryboy speeches, somebody is going to call him Wheelbarrow John.

A CHOICE OF HAUNCHES

The anti-bigness, anti-metropolitan bias in American politics has Thomas Jefferson's revered name attached to its origin. For a long time this bias was the chief asset and the chief liability of the Democratic party, whose grip upon the South loosened only when that region began to catch up, thanks to the belated presence there of corporations of national scale. Georgia, where Mitchell spoke, today exemplifies two societies: one of the most backward rural and small-town areas of the U.S. surrounds Atlanta, one of the most progressive metropolitan areas in the U.S. Where are the "second class" economic citizens of Georgia to be found? Are they around Atlanta, which teems with educated, independent decision makers (whether working for "branches" or for local entrepreneurs who wouldn't be there except for the "branches")? Or are "second class" economic citizens to be found in those red-clay counties where most of the people have very little choice about anything except which haunch to scratch?

At the very beginning of his Georgia speech Mitchell revealed a defective premise that may account for his policy. Noting a twelvefold increase in the U.S. national income (in current dollars) since 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, he went on to say that this economic growth "strongly supports our belief that the antitrust laws have served us well." It's true that the antitrust laws, enforced during most of those eighty years with respect for the free and legitimate evolution of business, have served the nation well. But to speak as if these laws were the main cause of the growth of the nation's prosperity is surely a ludicrous example of the logical fallacy known as *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. (A caused B to happen because B happened later than A.)

A CHOICE OF JEFFERSON'S

If the ex-officio prophets of antitrust think that antitrust created the present U.S. economy, then naturally they will assume that they can now bid the economy, as Joshua bade the sun and moon, to stand still. Mitchell prefers the sun to pause over Gibeon; he likes the look of the moon as it shines upon the valley of Ajalon.

But John Mitchell isn't Joshua. If government is to determine the proper size and shape of economic and social units, then the American people would probably prefer to have such decisions made by the likes of Pitchfork Ben rather than the likes of Wheelbarrow John. Any effort to freeze the 200 leading American corporations into their present shape, any effort to freeze the community structure of the U.S., can only result in a most un-Jeffersonian society where the police power of the central government becomes the concentrated site of economic and social decision making. We have here a conflict between two Jeffersons, the one who believed in a free society not shaped by government and the squire of Monticello who believed in small-scale economic units and who hated cities. Mitchell is backing the wrong Jefferson.—M. W.

THE 2-PERCENT ALLOWABLE HEW ACTION SHOULD BE RESCINDED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution directing the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to rescind the action which he recently took to eliminate the 2-percent allowance in lieu of specific recognition of other costs under the program of Federal health insurance for the aged. The resolution also directs the Secretary to rescind any steps which have been taken to implement his action and further states that he should take no further action to alter or modify such allowance until he has consulted fully with the members or representatives of the hospital industry and other interested persons and reviewed with them the program's reimbursement formula so that any action which might be taken on the matter will afford reimbursement to providers under the program which reasonably reflects the amount of costs it is intended to cover.

During the past 45 days, I have received at least 50 letters from hospital administrations in and around the city of Philadelphia and throughout the State of Pennsylvania protesting the action of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in eliminating this reimbursement allowance as an economy move. When the medicare program was to become effective the principal area of dispute between the prospective hospital participants and the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was over the method of apportioning cost to medicare program beneficiaries. Hospital representatives advocated average per diem—allowance costs divided by total patient-days—as the basis for determining medicare patient costs. The Social Security Administration, on the other hand, argued that the elderly were not like other patients because of a much longer length of stay for the elderly which resulted in a much lower usage of ancillary facilities. The SSA argued for the ratio of costs to charges as applied to costs as the method for determining medicare program costs.

In its discussions with the hospital industry representatives, the Social Security Administration was able to demonstrate that average charges per day decreased as the length of stay of the patient increased. Hospital representatives, on the other hand, were able to cite several local studies which indicated that the cost of routine care is much higher for the elderly. The effect of the two factors of lower use of ancillary facilities versus higher costs of routine care were compromised through the acceptance of the SSA's apportionment formula coupled with a 2-percent allowance for nonprofit hospitals—1½ percent for profit hospitals—particularly as a recognition of the higher nursing costs for the elderly. The legality of this compromise has been evaluated by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

An agreement was reached between then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner and representatives of the hospital industry that they would be consulted and brought actively into any discussions which were conducted about plans to change the reimbursement formula with respect to the 2-percent allowance. I believe that the incoming administration should have honored this pledge and not acted in the precipitous manner it did in discontinuing the 2-percent reimbursement allowance. The apparent rationale for this action was solely for economy reasons. There was no consideration of the effect of such a reduction in the reimbursement on the provision of institutional health care and it was announced without any evaluation or discussions by either the hospitals involved or others connected with the action.

I believe that the Federal Government was clearly committed to discussions with representatives of the hospital industry with regard to any changes which might be considered in the reimbursement allowance. I believe that many hospitals will drop the medicare program because of this lack of candor on the part of the administration. Certainly any hospitals which are not now in the program will think twice about participating in a program in which one day they are receiving a reimbursement and the next are not without any prior notice. One thing is quite apparent and that is that the 2-percent factor was a major consideration in hospitals entering into contracts to participate in the medicare program. Even though the dollar amount that is involved in discontinuance of the reimbursement is relatively small in terms of Government finance, it is most important that the administration realize that the 2-percent factor represents a very substantial amount of the resources essential to hospital operations.

I do not believe that the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could possibly have had sufficient data available to determine the cost of caring for elderly hospital patients. One hospital administrator made the following comment to me in a letter on the matter:

> Secretary Finch has indicated that after 3 years of experience, they should know the cost of caring for medicare patients. This is not possible since the hospitals still do not

know or have audited data on the final settlements for the first 6 months of the medicare program.

Under the circumstances, I believe that this decision should not have been made until the hospitals had been given the privilege of submitting additional data on their costs.

Mr. Speaker, what I object to most is the manner in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced their decision. They announced it without consulting with the most affected persons, the hospitals of the Nation. This is a flagrant disregard of an agreement which the hospital industry had with the previous administration. I believe in open covenants openly arrived at. I believe that the Federal Government cannot act in a vacuum. Its decisions affect people and when these decisions affect the health of the Nation and the ability of the Nation's hospitals to provide that care then I think it is in the national interest that decisions be reached through deliberation and consultation with all affected parties before the fact not after it. The text of the resolution I have introduced today is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 302

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent elimination of the 2 per centum allowance in lieu of certain provider costs under the medicare program

Resolved by the House of Representative (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should rescind the recent action taken by the Commissioner of Social Security (and approved by the Secretary) in amending subpart D of Social Security Administration Regulations No. 5 (20 CFR 405.428) to eliminate the 2 per centum allowance in lieu of specific recognition of other costs under the program of Federal Health Insurance for the Aged as well as any steps which may have been taken to implement such action, effective July 1, 1969, and should take no further action to alter or modify such allowance until he has consulted fully with members or representatives of the hospital industry and other interested persons and reviewed with them the reimbursement formula under such program in order to insure that any action taken in connection with such allowance will afford reimbursement to providers under such program reasonably reflecting the amount of the costs it is intended to cover.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join those who today, in the Halls of this national legislative Chamber, pause in commemoration of Captive Nations Week, 10 years after the passage of the resolution by Congress in 1959, and the subsequent signing of the bill into law by President Eisenhower. This observance, designated under the provisions of the act as the third week in July, serves as a solemn reminder of the more than 100 million people in over 25 countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who are daily being denied their basic freedoms.

Captive Nations Week was designed to show those oppressed peoples the continuing support of the citizens of the United States for any effort to regain independence from Communist-dominated and dictatorial rule. It also acts as a reminder to the Communist aggressors of our intention to combat any encroachments upon the free world.

The "captive nations" are the Achilles heel of the Red empire. They comprise an insecure bloc to the Communists, one which, in time of crisis, could throw the balance against totalitarianism. Realizing this, the Communist leaders have traditionally made alarmed responses to any advance news of the annual Captive Nations Week. It is this response which gives final proof of the worth of this commemoration as a reminder of our responsibility as representatives of this great Nation in extending hope to freedom loving people everywhere.

I urge that Americans take time this week to remember those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who have lost their freedoms, and to pledge support and action in the continuing struggle to regain peace and freedom in the world.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES PROTECTION OF COYOTE, LYNX, BOBCAT AND OTHER PREDATORY MAMMALS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have read about an incident in Florida where ranchers tried to trap coyote parents by driving coyote pups into a burrow, and caging them for over 24 hours in 90-degree heat without food or water.

This senseless torture did not trap the parents. I know that it is often necessary to kill these predatory animals to protect livestock. I have no quarrel with this. But I advocate responsible, selective, and humane methods, not barbaric torture.

Unwarranted killing of predators is leading to the extinction of some species. In some cases, valuable animals, such as the mountain lion, are being hunted professionally for bounty where they cause no threat to livestock. Unnecessary elimination of predators often causes serious rodent problems, and in some cases the deer population gets out of control, and widespread starvation occurs in winter.

I have introduced a bill to encourage positive conservation policies toward these animals. I am advocating the disuse of poisons, and the lifting of bounties in various States for predatory mammals.

This bill would establish that the wolf, coyotte, mountain lion, lynx, bobcat, and several species of bear and other large, wild carnivores are among the wildlife resources of the United States and of special value.

My bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to control predatory mammals when it is necessary to preserve livestock. It establishes a predatory mammal control agency to instruct farmers and ranchers in preventing plundering by predatory mammals, but it forbids the agency to use, demonstrate or advocate poisons as a control agent.

I feel this legislation is necessary to preserve our natural resources of wildlife and I urge full support from my colleagues.

GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, regardless of one's particular political bent, each one of us is aware, I think, of the crisis in values which has been growing throughout the decade. The Government has exerted efforts to bridge some of the gaps, ameliorate some of the existing tensions and provide for essential expansions and changes which are always necessary after an ideological flux. Yet, in many instances the Government has been unsuccessful in its efforts.

Urbanologist Daniel P. Moynihan, speaking at the University of Notre Dame commencement, offered a sensitive summation of the situation. Since he presented a side of the problem which we tend to overlook, I include excerpts of his speech in the RECORD:

GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

I would offer * * * the thought that the principal issues of the moment are not political. *They are seen as such:* that is the essential clue to their nature. But the crisis of the time is not political, it is in essence religious. It is a religious crisis of large numbers of intensely moral, even Godly, people who no longer hope for God. Hence, the quest for divinity assumes a secular form, but with an intensity of conviction that is genuinely new to our politics * * *

Having through all my adult life worked to make the American national government larger, stronger, more active, I nonetheless plead that there are limits to what it may be asked to do. In the last weeks of his life, President Kennedy journeyed to Amherst to dedicate a library to Robert Frost and to speak to this point. "The powers of the Presidency," he remarked, "are often described. Its limitations should occasionally be remembered."

The matter comes to this. The stability of a democracy depends very much on the people making a careful distinction between what government can do and what it cannot do. To demand what can be done is altogether in order: some may wish such things accomplished, some may not, and the majority may decide. But to seek that which cannot be provided, especially to do so with the passionate but misinformed conviction that it *can* be, is to create the conditions of frustration and ruin.

What is it government cannot provide? It cannot provide values to persons who have none, or who have lost those they had. It cannot provide a meaning to life. It cannot provide inner peace. It can provide outlets for moral energies, but it cannot create those energies. In particular, government cannot cope with the crisis in values which is sweeping the western world. It cannot respond to the fact that so many of our young people do not believe what those before them have believed, do not accept the authority of institutions and customs whose authority has heretofore been accepted, do not embrace or even very much like the culture that they inherit.

The 20th Century is strewn with the wreckage of societies that did not understand or accept this fact of the human condition. Ours is not the first culture to encounter such a crisis in values. Others have done so, have given in to the seeming sensible solution of politicizing the crisis, have created the total state, and have destroyed themselves in the process.

I surely do not argue for a quietistic government acquiescing in whatever the tides of fortune or increments of miscalculation bring about; and in our time they have brought about hideous things. I do not prescribe for social scientists or government officials a future of contented apoplexy as they observe the mounting disaffection of the young. I certainly do not argue for iron resistance, as other societies have successfully resisted somewhat similar movements in the past.

I simply plead for the religious and ethical sensibility in the culture to see more clearly what is at issue, and to do its work.

Sympathy is not enough. *Tout pardonner, c'est tout comprendre* is not a maxim that would pass muster * * * with any who have helped us through the recent or distant past. If politics in America is not to become the art of the impossible, the limits of politics must be perceived, and the province of moral philosophy greatly expanded.

DR. ANASTAPLO ON GREECE

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, most of us are familiar with the current military government in Greece. Yet, it has been more than 2 years since this Government came to power, and it is easy to forget the anomaly of such a situation in a country that was the birthplace of the democratic concept.

Dr. George Anastaplo, a lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago and chairman of the political science department at Rosary College in River Forest, Ill., has commented extensively on the political situation in Greece. Among his statements were three televised interviews on contemporary Greek affairs.

Because of the interest of my colleagues in the Greek situation, under unanimous consent I submit these interviews for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an introduction by Dr. Anastaplo.

The material follows:

GREECE AND AMERICA: TOWARD THE PRECIPICE TOGETHER?

(By George Anastaplo)

My concern is that Greek affairs not be permitted to drift beyond our ability as Americans to predict and to some extent influence them. The longer the present regime continues in Greece, the more radical and even desperate will become the dedicated men and women who dare oppose the government established in Athens on April 21, 1967 by a handful of junior Army officers exploiting American training and equipment.

The greatest but not yet likely danger for Greece is that of civil war, which (if it should begin and somehow continue more than a few months) could even see one camp being supplied by a reluctant America, the other camp having the massive aid it would require smuggled to it across one of the many frontiers of Greece. *If* civil war should be permitted to settle down on Greece, the Twentieth century would not see that country return again to that threshhold to modernity at which (after great effort and considerable American aid) she finally found herself in the early 1960's. It will. in any event, take many years to repair the damage already done their country by the present governors of Greece—the damage done by the colonels' regime to respect for law, to the national economy and even to military efficiency.

The United States has had to be deeply involved in the affairs of Greece ever since the Second World War. It will continue to be deeply involved for several more decades. Even so, Greek experts in the State Department are, it seems to me, hopelessly divided about the best course for us to encourage the Greeks to follow at this time. Indeed, the State Department is now so divided on this subject that it cannot be said to have a policy at all—and so opportunities are being ignored which cannot be depended upon to return. Thus, the official American attitude reinforces the temperamental reluctance of Greek politicians to subordinate themselves to a common cause.

I do not believe it either moral or expedient for the United States to continue to treat the current Greek military dictatorship as an honorable ally. Rather, our considerable influence in Greece should be directed to helping the Greeks secure the immediate return of King Constantine to Athens and the replacement of the colonels by a coalition government under the leadership of the conservative former prime minister, Constantine Karamanlis.

The United States will not be able to escape either the responsibility for or the consequences of whatever happens in Greece. It is prudent, then, to do what we can to help Greece return to a truly stable government before the costs for us as well as for them becomes higher and the risks larger than they already are. What we do in the next few months may be decisive for determining what life will be like in that country for some years to come.

* * * * *

The foregoing paragraphs, which continue (unfortunately) to be relevant, are taken from two statements on current Greek affairs published by me towards the end of 1968. We have now begun to hear in this country ominous reports of the first outbreak of serious fighting in Greece since the colonels' usurpation of April 1967. I do hope that these reports are not true. I also hope that the Greeks will not be driven, by the oppression of their government and by the paralysis of ours, to violent measures in their gallant effort to restore their country to her rightful place among the civilized nations of the world.

A few weeks ago, Greece's Noble Laureate, the poet George Seferis, issued to foreign correspondents in Athens a statement which included sentiments it is our duty as old friends of Greece both to notice and to do something about:

"It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last World War. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded, with toil and effort, in keeping alive are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. I can well imagine that for some people these losses do not matter. Unfortunately this is not the only danger that threatens.

"We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end, inescapably. It is this tragic ending that consciously or unconsciously torments us, as in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus.

"The longer the abnormal situation lasts, the greater the evil.

"I am a man completely without political ties and I speak without fear and without passion. I see before us the precipice towards which the oppression that covers the land is leading us.

"This abnormality must come to an end. It is the nation's command."

The three televised interviews that follow are offered as an aid to Americans interested in advising our government as to what it should now do about "the abnormal situation" in Greece.

AN INTERVIEW BROADCAST BY WCIU-TV, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 17, 1968

Q. Dr. George Anastaplo is a Lecturer in the Liberal Arts at the University of Chicago and a Professor of Political Science and of Philosophy at Rosary College, in River Forest, Illinois (where he is also chairman of the Political Science Department). Dr. Anastaplo has received both his Doctor of Jurisprudence and his Doctor of Philosophy degrees from the University of Chicago. He has travelled to Greece every summer since the year 1962 and has made an intensive study of that country's affairs. Last year, Dr. Anastaplo travelled as a foreign correspondent to Greece and had the opportunity to engage in conversations there with many people in different walks of life, including some officials of the present Greek government. He is preparing a book on Greece for publication.

Doctor, it is nice to have you with us on "Grecian Panorama." I know from your many visits to Greece that you have many things of interest you could tell us. But because we don't have much time, I suggest we should concentrate on just a few things tonight. I think that the most important subject currently may be the draft of the proposed constitution that is to be voted on by the Greek people next month. I think our viewers would find it interesting if you would review the events leading up to this draft of the proposed Constitution.

A. The most important event leading up to this draft constitution is, of course, the revolution executed by a group of Army officers in April of 1967, the revolution which came after two years of very excited political controversy in Greece and which was thought by some to be necessary to resolve that controversy. Now, anything anyone says about Greece is going to be controversial and anything anyone says in a short time is going to be superficial. But we must take a chance on this occasion.

The first thing that must be said in thinking about Greece, in thinking about the constitution that is to be voted on next month, is the fact that this is a unique situation as far as American foreign policy is concerned. That is to say, I believe this is the only place in the world where an unpopular and repressive government, which is somewhat dependent upon our support, has as its most likely popular alternative a government of the right. This, I think, cannot be found anywhere else in the world and makes somewhat strange the American position in Greece, a position which is not necessarily that of strong support but certainly of acquiescence in and sometimes mild support of the government.

I have said that it appears that the most likely present alternative to the current government is a government of the right. I am referring, of course, to a government that would be led by Constantine Karamanlis, who was for eight years the Prime Minister of Greece and probably the most important Prime Minister in Greece since Venezelos. Mr. Karamanlis is a known conservative, a man of the right, a man of proven effectiveness, and a man for whom everyone of the right and of the left would settle if he could be put back into power.

Now, what does this mean as far as American policy is concerned? The risk is, of course, that something could happen to Mr. Karamanlis. If something should happen to him—he is, after all, a man in his sixties—if something should happen to him, the most plausible peaceful alternative to rule by the present military governors of Greece would disappear, the man who could have brought the country together. The other thing that could happen, of course, is that as time goes by, as people begin to despair of a political settlement, such as Mr. Karamanlis would be, there is greater likelihood of a settlement by arms.

Last Monday afternoon I gave a talk at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, in which I indicated that time was running short—that the opportunity for a political settlement was disappearing—and that the time had come when one could expect to hear more and more of violent reactions to the regime. The following day—by chance, of course—we heard of an attempted assassination of the Prime Minister of Greece. What really happened in Athens on that occasion, I do not yet know; but certainly, if this was not really an attempt at assassination, it cannot be long before serious attempts will be made. Such are the things that can happen if the plausible alternative represented by Mr. Karamanlis is not encouraged and supported by the United States.

Q. You mentioned that you feel that Mr. Karamanlis could unite the nation. Is this opinion of yours shared by the Greek people, by the Greek politicians? On what do you base your statement?

A. My impression is, from my visit last summer—and I have heard nothing since then that would challenge this—that the people on the right are certainly comfortable with Mr. Karamanlis; even the people on the left, last summer, were anxious for his return: they looked back to his Administration—although at the time they had opposed him—they looked back upon that as a much better alternative, and they realized his return to power was a plausible alternative, especially since the colonels who now run the government could themselves recognize in Karamanlis a man whom they could trust to some extent. This is a political settlement I am talking about. This is a settlement that would permit all factions in the country to be sure that a civilized decent regime would follow and that there would be no bloodletting, no unnecessary punishment, no unpredictable repercussions from a return to political government.

Yet someone might say to the Greeks, "You don't need such a political settlement now; you are about to get a constitution, a constitution which is scheduled to be voted on the 29th of September." But there are some curious things about that situation. It is, first of all, a curiously written constitution in the sense that there was first a draft written by a group of jurists and then, thereafter, there was a draft proposed by the colonels, presumably upon considering the reactions, the responses, the opinions expressed about the jurists' draft. There are other difficulties with this constitution, one of which is the fact that it is being proposed by people who came to power unconstitutionally. That, of course, brings it in under a cloud.

An even more serious difficulty is that I do not see that it is going to make much difference to the political situation in Greece. That is to say, the people who are politically minded do not regard this constitution as something they have to take seriously. Practically every prominent Greek politician I know of—practically every one: there are only two or three exceptions—has come out against it, including Mr. Karamanlis in Paris.

It is very hard to think of the referendum as something that people will really believe to be a legitimate expression of the public will. What I think it will be, rather than a referendum on a constitution, is, in effect, an attempt, by something approaching a plebiscite, to have the colonels' regime legitimated. That is going to be the effect of the voting. It seems to me very unlikely that such a vote and such a constitution would mean much more than such votes and such constitutions did in Stalin's Russia or than they do in, say, Franco's Spain. It is not too difficult, when you control all the means of communication, when you control all major weapons and virtually all means of coercion and when you have available the resources of government—it does not seem to me at all unlikely that you can in such circumstances secure the kind of vote you want.

Q. Then you don't feel that the present regime is about to relinquish its power?

A. No, Miss Vasils, I don't think it is about to. I think that once the Constitution is ratified—as I think it is likely to be in the circumstances: I will be surprised if it is not—, the present government will then decide under what conditions it will implement what parts of it. There is no announced schedule as to how this constitution is to be implemented.

Q. What provisions do you think are significant?

A. There are good and bad features in the proposed constitution. One of the distressing things about it is that there are a number of good features in it which, because of the fact that they will be hereafter associated with this regime—because they have been put forward and endorsed by this regime—will come to be regarded in the future as suspect. That is to say, somebody who, for bad reasons, should want to oppose one of these features in a future constitution, will (instead of having to rely on bad or selfish reasons) simply say, "This is the colonels' idea; you don't want that."

Q. That will be the natural reaction?

A. Yes, that would be a natural reaction with an unfortunate effect. Now, there are several good features in the proposed constitution. Let me just mention two of them. One of them is, of course, the proposed reduction in the size of the Parliament and the provision for a certain regularity in the way it is elected. I think that is probably an improvement. The reduction of the powers of the Parliament, however, I believe has gone too far.

In addition, I think most observers would say that the proposed reduction of the powers of the King is good not only for the country but also for the King himself. That is to say, the King's great powers and, even more important, the King's hitherto undefined powers have put him in a vulnerable situation. It is very difficult for a king—who may be a young man, or who may be old: it depends upon circumstances—to be able to contend successfully with men who have gotten to where they are because they are very good politicians. If he has to put his judgment and prestige on the line against such men, he is likely to be hurt. It is a favor to him, then, in a way—and certainly good for political stability—if his powers are somewhat reduced and defined. I think, however, that these, too, have been cut too severely, that his powers, as I read the Constitution, are even more restricted than those of the British monarchy. And that, I think, is going a little too far.

The provisions I have been talking about are good, except perhaps where they have gone too far. There are, on the other hand, several questionable provisions in the proposed constitution. One is the creation of what is called the Constitutional Court, which would have—which could have—the effect not only of limiting the expression of political opinion but, even more important, of severely restricting the number and kind of political parties that are established in the country. This court will supervise such political activity. Even if the court does not act against any party, it will be known by anyone who brings forward a party for certification that parties can be acted against. When political parties realize that such a court can suppress them, they will conduct themselves accordingly: they will restrain themselves much more than they should and thereby reduce even more the likelihood that they will speak freely on public issues and advance policies opposed to those of the government.

Q. Doctor, I am going to have to interrupt you, because our time is running out. Would you like to summarize or say something briefly, as a concluding remark?

A. The question I think we should keep in mind is, What should be the role of the United States with respect to Greece? I think that, unless something different emerges during our Presidential campaign, we do know one thing: we do know, thus far, that Mr. Nixon's policy has been, so far as I understand it, friendly toward this Greek regime or, at least, acquiescent to it, while, so far as I understand it, Mr. McCarthy's policy, just as Mr. Kennedy's was and as I believe Mr. Humphrey's to be, is unfriendly toward this regime. This juxtaposition [of the Nixon policy and the McCarthy-Humphrey-Kennedy policy] is something that Americans can well take into account as they consider what their government should do.

Q. Thank you for your remarks, Dr. Anastaplo. You prefaced an article on Greece you wrote for the *Massachusetts Review* with words of Abraham Lincoln which I would like to quote for our viewers: "I am very little inclined on any occasion to say anything unless I hope to produce some good by it."

We thank you for your remarks and hope you will soon be back with us on "Grecian Panorama."

AN INTERVIEW BROADCAST BY WCIU-TV, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 9, 1968

Q. Professor George Anastaplo has recently returned from a three-week tour of Greece which he conducted for the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Doctor, it is very nice to welcome you back for your second visit with us on "Grecian Panorama."

A. Thank you, Miss Vasils. It is good to be back.

Q. We heard today that the Greek government has announced that the constitution which was voted on September 29 [1968] is going to become effective next Friday, November 15. I think you will agree that the 92 per cent vote in favor of the Constitution has given the impression to many that the Greek people are in favor of their military government, that they believe it has saved the country from a threat of Communism and from a breakdown of law and order.

I know that our viewers would be interested in your opinion on these matters. I'd like to ask you about the implementation of the constitution as well as about the 92 per cent vote. Do you believe that this really indicates that now all is well in Greece?

A. No. I do believe it does indicate that all is under control in Greece, which is not the same as saying that all is well, although many Greeks who like to think of their country as one that is prone to disorder may believe it is better to have strict control than to run the risks that freedom brings.

No, I don't think all is well in Greece today, but all is predictable.

Q. I know you were in Delphi the day of the referendum and you did observe the voting there from dawn to dusk. Would you begin with an account of what happened that day and continue with your views on the situation.

A. The voting was in a school house there in Delphi, in a school room, where some 700 people voted. It was one of the places in Greece where the men and women both voted in the same place. In many other polling places, men and women voted separately, as is traditional. The voting I saw was very orderly, very quiet, and in some ways quite relaxed. Of the 684 ballots cast that day in Delphi, only seven were cast against the proposed constitution.

Q. Now, would you tell us the procedure.

A. The voter would come in. He would walk over to the table where the election officials were sitting. He would have his name marked off the voting list and his identity card punched to show he had voted (since voting has long been compulsory in Greece). Then he would take off the table an envelope (which was not transparent), take the ballot or ballots—the YES and NO ballots—take them, if he wanted to, into a curtained-off polling booth and there put the ballot he wanted into the envelope, discard the other ballot or put it in his pocket, come back to the ballot box, place his sealed envelope into the ballot box and leave. That was the procedure. Or, rather, that is the procedure one could go through if one wanted to.

On this occasion, however, out of the 684 voters that day in Delphi, less than twenty of them (as I tallied them that day) took both ballots. That is to say, all but twenty—and I don't think there were even twenty—took only the YES ballot, took it from the piles of ballots in front of the election judge and his assistants and, in most cases, put it in the envelope right there on the spot for depositing in the ballot box.

Q. The voter picked up both ballots? They were not handed to him?

A. The voter picked up what he "wanted" to pick up. That is to say, he was "free" to pick up either ballot. On this occasion, most of the voters took one of the Yes ballots and put that, right on the spot, into the envelope and cast it. Very few voters in Delphi that day took both ballots. Very few of them went behind the curtain—there is not much point going behind the curtain if one takes only one ballot—with the result that only seven voted No. Some of those who took both ballots and voted yes were people who knew one is "supposed" to take both ballots. This is the way one votes if one is an educated man, if one is a man of some prestige. (This is the way people voted in Athens that day, I have been told.) Such people might still vote yes, but at least they would take both ballots and then vote yes.

It was so obvious shortly after the polls opened in Delphi that almost everyone was voting yes that I was soon able to send out a report on the voting to a foreign correspondent friend in Athens who relayed it to London. This report, I am told, permitted the B.B.C. to announce, long before the votes were tabulated that night, that the balloting in Greece that day would be at least 90 per cent in favor of the proposed constitution.

Now, the interesting question is. Why did the people of Delphi vote this way?

Q. Yes, I was about to ask that.

A. One reason they voted that way is that they were told they should vote that way. This was the impression they had gathered from government officials, from government propaganda, and from authorities in the town. Everyone was saying, "You should vote yes, and furthermore, you should do it openly." This was again and again said to people—or, at least, people told me they had been told this.

Q. You mentioned government propaganda. What would this consist of?

A. Government propaganda about the voting was found all over. It was found in newspapers, of course, in signs, in big placards, on walls, in signs painted on buildings of all kinds. You no doubt heard of the very large sign on Mount Lycabettus in Athens the large neon sign which overlooked the city and could be seen from the most populated sections of the city all night—I am not sure all night. I don't know how long they kept it on—but it was visible every night. Then, there were the radio, the speeches, the campaigning.

It was a very intensive campaign on behalf of the proposed constitution. There was no one campaigning against the constitution, to speak of—a few stray voices here and there—but no organized campaign, no signs, no politicians permitted to go around the country speaking against the proposed constitution. Politicians were pretty much told to stay at home, which they did. It was a situation in which virtually all the public efforts being made were made to induce the people to vote and to vote YES.

It should also be noticed that this constitution was voted on under martial law. It was voted on, that is, where there was no effective freedom. I personally know people in Delphi who voted YES and openly—who walked in very calmly, took the YES ballot, voted it without even going into the booth, cheerfully, quite content evidently with the whole business—people who I knew from conversations on other occasions simply detest the regime. Something made them act the way the regime wanted them to act. It is not very hard to figure out why this happened, if one knows anything about how such votes are managed in Russia, how they were managed in Germany during the times of the Nazis. It does not take much imagination to recognize the forces that conspire to get the vote a government wants: propaganda, intimidation, bribery and hope, hope that "if we get a constitution, things may change."

Q. Do you feel, now that the Greek government has announced that the constitution will be implemented next week, that many people will say that the government is showing good faith and that they should cooperate?

A. People don't have much choice about cooperating. I think very few people will run the risk of opposing this government in any serious way. There are still thousands of people who are in island exile: a number of them are labeled Communists, and they may well be, for all I know; a number of them are non-Communists. Some of the island exiles are even senior Army officers, loyal to the King, who have thus been put out of the way. There is still tight control by the government of all means of publicity and of all systems of communications.

The Greeks don't know how much of the new constitution is going to be effective immediately. They have been told that some of the articles will not be immediately effective, such as the article assuring freedom of the press. They were told that before they voted. In other words, there are a number of articles that were suspended even before the constitution came into being. A number of other things would have to be known before one can decide what the implementation of the constitution will mean in practice. Is, for instance, martial law going to be continued?

Thus, the Greeks don't know what kind of a constitution they have gotten, and what is even more important, they don't know—they can't know—how various articles in it will be interpreted and how they will be implemented.

Q. It would seem from the 92 percent vote that the constitution was accepted passively. Yet some days later there was quite an expression of sentiment at the Papandreou funeral. What do you make of that?

A. In special circumstances, when there is a certain kind of anonymity or when passions are very high because of a funeral or for some other reason, one can get an idea of what's happening, of what people really think in Greece. That is to say, one does learn that there are a substantial number of people—we need not say how many there are—who are very much against this regime, and from whom nothing is heard ordinarily.

There have been two incidents, really, that have been very revealing. One of them is the incident of last December 13th [1967], in Kavalla. Kavalla is traditionally a left-wing, anti-royalist center. That was the occasion when the King made his effort to overthrow this regime. He landed in Kavalla; he was there suddenly, spontaneously. He was greeted in a way that he has never been greeted in any other place in Greece. He was carried through the streets. This was not organized; this was not a staged production. There was jubilation at the prospect that finally the colonels' regime was all over.

The second such manifestation was at the Papandreou funeral. When the old man, George Papandreou, died two weeks ago, there was obviously great emotion on the part of many who had been his followers over the years. So there was on November 3rd [1968], in Athens, a massive demonstration. I've seen estimates in American newspapers that speak in terms of hundreds of thousands of participants in that funeral demonstration. I just don't know and I am reluctant to say how many there were until I have had a chance to check with people I consider reliable. But what is certainly clear is that it was a very large demonstration. I would not be surprised to learn that the numbers involved in it were far more than the numbers in that area who voted NO in the constitutional referendum five weeks before. Now the problem is, Where were these people on referendum day? Why didn't they vote against the proposed constitution?

The thing that comes through, as one makes an effort to try to understand what is going on now in Greece, is that it is very difficult too learn what is going on because of the massive effort on the part of the government to present its position, and to present it in a way that has no regard for the truth. The Greek government will use any means, and say anything, in order to advance its position. That means that anyone studying this matter has great difficulty finding out from normal sources—the kind of sources one would use for an investigation in any other country in Europe this side of the Iron Curtain—very great difficulty finding out just what is happening.

One thing that *is* certain is that things are quite different in Greece from what the government says they are. I think it important for Americans interested in Greek affairs to keep that in mind. If we Americans are relying on the assumption that the present Greek government really has the support of its people, it is an assumption that is going to bring us to grief insofar as we are allies of the Greeks and want to remain allies of the Greeks in the years ahead.

Q. There are many people who say it is really none of our business as Americans to comment on what is happening in Greece.

A. That is sometimes said. But when Americans, and especially Greek-Americans, comment favorably on the regime, the Greek government plays it up, without restraint, no matter where they are, no matter who they are, no matter whom they are speaking to. Any comment that is favorable to the present regime will be played up in the Greek newspapers, which means that they think favorable comments are relevant. I should think, by parity of reasoning, that unfavorable comments are also relevant, especially when they are made by people who take the trouble to find out what is really happening in Greece today.

AN INTERVIEW BROADCAST BY WCIU-TV, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 23, 1968

Q. Professor Anastaplo, it is nice to have you back on "Grecian Panorama" tonight.

A. Thank you, Miss Vasils.

Q. It is well known, Dr. Anastaplo, that you are an advocate of the return to power in Greece of the former premier, Constantine Karamanlis, as the best solution to the Greek problem today. Some other opponents of the current Greek regime seem to think, however, that this would, in reality, be imposing another form of dictatorship on the Greek people. What are your comments on this?

A. I have heard the same kind of objection raised to the Karamanlis solution—whch is not really my suggestion alone, but the suggestion of many people in Greece as well. I think it is an objection which does not properly take into account what the situation really is in Greece today.

Now, the very fact that we are discussing this sort of thing here, on the air in Chicago, shows that something special is happening in Greece. As you indicated in your instruction of me, I have been to Greece a number of times, including times when Mr. Karamanlis was in power and other times when Mr. Papandreou was in power—that is to say, when there was in power a government right of center as well as a government left of center. Those situations did not compel Americans to discuss Greek affairs as we have been doing in this country the past eighteen months.

Even so, my own position has not been one of trying to suggest what the Greeks should do. It is rather an attempt to suggest what we Americans should do, and particularly what our State Department and our government should do in a situation in which the United States either has some responsibility or at least will have some duties because of its special relation with Greece as an ally. It is from this perspective that I am speaking.

Q. How would you answer those Americans who feel that the United States should not get further involved with any other problems in the world? How much further can we extend ourselves? Some say we are so involved now in Viet Nam that we should not get involved in the Greek situation.

A. That is a perfectly sensible caution, that we should recognize the limits of American power. The "limits of American power" means that we should recognize beyond what mark American power does not extend. But it also means that we should appreciate, if we are to be realistic about what "limits" means, within what limits American power can be effective.

The fact is that Greece is an American ally. It has been an ally of ours for twenty years. It is very much dependent upon the United States for several things—for arms, for example. The United States, on the other hand, wants certain things from Greece. There has long been a connection between the two countries, partly because of the large number of Greeks in this country. There is a traditional friendship between the countries. There has been over the years an affinity of institutions. There have been a number of things that have brought us together. That is to say, this isn't an artificial, a temporary, alliance.

Besides, whatever damage is done in Greece by any government is damage the United States will have to help repair someday. It isn't as if we can walk away from Greece and forget about it. There are a number of factors that require us to be interested in Greece, aside from the question which some people would insist upon, the question of our responsibility for what has happened there. We need not say that the United States *is* responsible for what has happened in Greece in recent years in order to be able to say that the United States should be concerned about what is going to happen or about what is happening in that country.

I am not concerned simply to settle a historical question about who *is* responsible for what has happened in Greece. The principal problem for me today is, what is the best way of correcting the situation right now, a situation which is so burdensome for our friends there, so burdensome for the people of our forebears. Even if one is living in the United States, even if one has been born here (as have I), one cannot help but feel a concern for that people. One cannot, as an American, simply abandon one's friends and those to whom one is close in that country.

Q. Now, you are speaking of the interest we should have, the concern we should have, because of what has happened there since April 1967. You would not have this concern if Greece had an elected, a duly-elected, government. Is that correct?

A. If there was in Athens a government that had been installed by the Greek people, if it was a government which clearly had the support of the Greek people, which was not a dictatorship, as this one clearly is, and if it was not doing various things that this government is clearly doing, such as torture, such as intimidation (even of Greek-Americans), it would be a quite different matter. You can talk to Greek-Americans in this country who will tell you that they have been approached and threatened, through their relatives back in Greece, for criticizing the regime in Greece. After all, even so courageous a Greek as Helen Vlachou has had to close down her journal [*Hellenic Review*] in London. Why did she have to close down so useful and so successful a publication? Press reports published here speak of pressure put on her by threats to her family in Athens. This is not what she said, of course, but this is what press reports have said. When there is this kind of government in Greece, it is a serious question whether or not we Americans should sit by and accept it *as an ally;* it is a serious question whether we can sit by and, even if only passively or by acquiescence, help it do what it does. I am not concerned, primarily, to tell Greeks what they should do. I am concerned to say what the United States should and should not do. This I am obliged and entitled to do.

Now, let us consider the question of Constantine Karamanlis. Those who say that the best thing for Greece would be immediate free elections which would let the Greeks return whom they would return to power, have something to be said for them. There is, for instance, something to be said for Andreas Papandreou as an alternative to Mr. Karamanlis. Mr. Papandreou is a man who is well-intentioned. I have not yet met him. I have never talked to him, nor even corresponded with him. I know only what everybody knows about him. But from what I do know of him, I am prepared to believe that he means the best for Greece. He has considerable talent and, given the proper opportunity, he might some day do things for Greece. I have no doubt about that.

I have no doubt that there are many other Greeks as well as who can make important contributions to their country. But my concern is, What is the best way the United States can help Greece out of the present circumstances, which are in some ways very, very dangerous? Anything can happen when a people is compelled, as are the Greeks today, to do something it does not want to do. What may happen no one can predict. It is the unpredictable, in a way, that is threatening Greece and that is threatening the United State's role in Greece.

Mr. Karamanlis seems to me the best way out because it is a way that does appeal to people of the left, right and center in Greece. I know this from my own interviews in Greece. This solution appeals to people in the American government. It appeals even to people who are supporting the colonels in Greece: they find Mr. Karamanlis least threatening of all the alternatives to their own rule.

Q. Least threatening in what way?

A. If Mr. Karamanlis should come to power, I believe he would be reasonable about what he would do in the way of calling the colonels to account.

Q. What do you think he should do if he came in?

A. I am in favor of amnesty, as much as possible. I am in favor of closing accounts, rather than settling them. I am not in favor of fighting old battles over and over again. Greece has had too much of that. I am not in favor of shedding blood to settle something. I hope Mr. Karamanlis would take much the same position.

What would Mr. Karamanlis do if he returned to power? Would it be a dictatorship? There is no reason why it should be a dictatorship. I don't know what he would do; no one *knows* what he would do. But there is no reason why he should impose upon himself the extra burden of maintaining a dictatorship. A dictatorship is really a very inefficient form of government to maintain. It is very inefficient in many ways. For instance, information is very hard to get. Reliable information that people need to run their affairs intelligently is often hard to get in a dictatorship of this kind, whether it is in Russia or in Germany of the old days or in the Greece of the colonels today. There is no need for Mr. Karamanlis to impose such burdens upon himself. There is no reason for him to incur the enmity of people left of center. He already has the support of well over half of the Greeks. When a leader has such support, he does not have to impose upon his people the kind of restrictions the colonels are imposing. They impose the restrictions they are imposing, and thus run the risk of provoking a ruinous civil war, because they have no other way of maintaining themselves in power.

The Karamanlis solution is, I believe, the only prudent, political solution that can be depended upon. There are other solutions that might work. But this one is the most reliable for getting Greece past the colonels without a catastrophe. It would put in power a man who has some respect for the ordinary political processes of his country. One thing we should remember is that Mr. Karamanlis was actually voted out of office in the elections of 1963–1964. The colonels will never be voted out of office. That is to say, they will never be voted out of office in a situation where they are actually putting up candidates that they are supporting. They might some day use an election, if they feel themselves going, as a way of making a safe transition—but they will not be surprised by the result of any elections they conduct.

Mr. Karamanlis, authoritarian as he sometimes was, strong-minded as he sometimes was, was nevertheless enough of a constitutionalist, enough of a democrat, to allow himself to be defeated, to be defeated in an election which no doubt had all kinds of irregularities and even fraud on both sides. He was enough of a politician conforming to the rule of law and to normal democratic processes to be willing to submit himself to the electoral process and to be deprived of power after having served eight rather successful years in the highest office.

Q. Do you feel that something could be worked out whereby the colonels themselves could serve their country together with other leaders?

A. I think there are things the colonels could be given to do that would take care of them.

If I were a leader of the Left of Center—in Greek politics, I am nothing: I have no position in Greek politics—but if I were someone left of center, if I were a member of the Center Union, I would be inclined to work out a coalition with Mr. Karamanlis, in which some of our people—if I were left of center—would take certain cabinet posts. If, however, the Center Union should insist on free elections, and if they could somehow get them, they would have nothing. It would be (in my opinion) a landslide for Mr. Karamanlis and his supporters, while the Center Union would be left with nothing at all. I think it is in the interest of the Center Union leaders, if they want to retain some control over the immediate political life of Greece, to join now some kind of coalition under Mr. Karamanlis's leadership.

It is in Mr. Karamanlis's interest, on the other hand, to bring into his government several leaders of the Center Union. After all, everyone knows that if the elections of 1967 had been carried out, the Center Union Party would probably have had a majority. The Center Union has been deprived of what it had, in a way, earned, and consequently, there is a danger of bitterness, a danger of recrimination, that comes from this kind of deprivation. It would surely be prudent for Mr. Karamanlis to head off such a development by recognizing what the Center Union can contribute to Greece.

A *political* decision is needed in Greece today, a recourse to what is possible in present circumstances. The objection that the return of Mr. Karamanlis to power is likely to lead to a dictatorship is not something one hears as much in Greece as out. In Greece, people do feel the present regime as a real dictatorship, and they realize that whatever they remember about Mr. Karamanlis's administration, whatever complaints they had about it, his administration was nothing like this, and they appreciate that.

I think that the most interesting thing about the objections one hears against imposing a dictatorship through Mr. Karamanlis is that they reveal something about the sometimes unrealistic character of Greek political opinion. That is to say, it seems to an outsider, such as I am, extremely unrealistic for Greeks abroad to object, "We don't want Mr. Karamanlis, we want free elections, et cetera", as if free elections would solve everything, as if they are likely to get free elections as an alternative to the colonels. One must, in political matters, consider the practical alternatives and make a judgment. The kind of objection we have been discussing tonight, which can stand in the way of forming an effective coalition in opposition to the colonels, should give Americans who are not familiar with Greek politics an idea of the idealistic shortsightedness that has sometimes characterized Greek politics and that has contributed to the present troubles in Greece.

Certain obvious compromises during the 1965–1967 crisis—certain compromises of a political character, certain prudential solutions—would have prevented the troubles the Greeks have now. I refer to the kind of compromise that an ordinary American politician would have easily been able to make. This the Greeks were unable to do—and this is partly why they have what they have. They certainly don't deserve what they have, but there is a reason why they have it.

ROCKEFELLER'S TRIPS A BLUNDER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, while no one can blame Gov. Nelson Rockefeller for the violent anti-American demonstrations that marred his visits to Latin America, the Governor can and must be held responsible for the planning of the trip with such a large entourage, for continuation after it became clear that the enterprise was ill-timed, and especially for his willingness to be photographed in an exuberant pose with Dictator Duvalier of Haiti.

I commend to readers of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Adirondack Daily Enterprise for July 8, 1969, written by the paper's publisher, James Loeb, former Ambassador to Peru:

THE GOVERNOR'S TRIPS HAVE ENDED—FINALLY

Editorial space is supposed to be used for the editor's honest expression of opinion, judiciously articulated but nonetheless straightforward. Within this context, we are constrained to say that Governor Rockefeller's several trips to Latin America have constituted, at least in the short run, a disaster for the United States and even for the Governor himself.

Despite our divergent political affiliation, we have always considered the Governor a fine public servant, a voice of generally constructive moderation, and, with some exceptions, a good governor. We still do.

But everyone makes mistakes, and we believe that Nelson Rockefeller is honest enough with himself to recognize now, after the fact, that these trips have been unhelpful, to put it mildly. We will continue to believe this, despite any public statements the Governor may make to the contrary, simply because he is too intelligent to delude himself.

We recognize that the disturbances do not represent the majority of the citizens of those Latin American countries he was permitted to visit. On the contrary, we suspect that much (but not all) of the opposition expressed was inspired and even maneuvered by forces that would never be friendly to the United States, no matter what our policies are or might be.

We readily concede that, on the basis of his trips, the Governor could make recommendations to the President which would, if accepted and implemented, be of great benefit to the United States and to the Latin American countries. This could be a plus fatcor, but we find it hard to believe that the Governor learned enough to warrant the cost or enough that could not have been learned through less flamboyant investigations.

We would even be prepared to admit, as the Governor has charged, that the press, radio and television exaggerated the negative aspects of his trips without giving sufficient attention to the positive aspects.

But for us the culminating shame was the picture of our smiling Governor with President Duvalier of Haiti waving to the crowds of people whom the most corrupt and ruthless dictator of the hemisphere had brought out to greet him. Added to the deaths that resulted from the various visits, this picture cannot soon be obliterated from history.

There were other dictators visited by the President's envoy . . . in Brazil and Paraguay and Argentina, dictators who had suppressed and/or jailed citizens whose friendship for the United States had been fully demonstrated and documented. But the friendly visit to "Papa Doc" Duvalier's Haiti was the culmination of the disaster.

What kind of impression does this give the Latin American people? If the Peruvian government (also a military dictatorship) nationalizes without adequate compensation one American oil company which, whatever its present legitimate rights, has made many fortunes out of Peruvian oil, we threaten to cut off all our aid. But apparently the ruthlessness and corruption of the Duvaliers of the hemisphere do not bother us at all. What kind of values do we espouse?

We are not suggesting that it is the responsibility of the United States government to intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries, even to bring justice or to implement democratic practices. On the contrary. But we surely should not go out of our way to lend respectability to governments which are a disgrace, not only to their own people, but to the continent.

What is amazing about the Governor's series of trips is that the idea was first suggested to President Nixon by Galo Plaza, secretary general of the Organization of American States, and then accepted by Mr. Rockefeller. Both Galo Plaza and Rockefeller are thoroughly knowledgeable in Latin American affairs; both are democrats with a small d. And President Nixon might have learned something from his horrible experience in Latin America in 1958.

Maybe the one gain from the recent Rockefeller experience, despite the cost, is the knowledge acquired of the great gap between what experts knew of the feelings of Latin Americans a generation ago and what their feelings are today.

The late Mayor LaGuardia once said of himself, "When I make a mistake it's a beaut!" Governor Rockefeller can echo the remarks of "the Little Flower."

IF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTEREST RATE BILL MERELY RATIFIES CURRENT PRACTICE, WHAT, THEN, IS THE NEED FOR THIS FAR-REACHING BILL?

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared yesterday to take the floor in opposition to H.R. 255, the bill scheduled for consideration yesterday dealing with interest rates on installment loans in the District of Columbia, when the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), announced that action on that bill would be postponed for 2 weeks. I am glad the gentleman from South Carolina decided not to call up the bill yesterday because, frankly, none of us had had sufficient time to give it the study it deserves. The committee report on the bill did not become available to us until yesterday morning.

In view of the discussion yesterday afternoon between the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the statement by the gentleman from South Carolina that the bill merely ratified a practice which has been in existence on the part of the banks here for 61 years, I feel it might be useful to the Members to read the remarks I had prepared for the debate yesterday. I was seeking to put the issue into perspective in relation to the Truth in Lending Act which took effect July 1 of this year.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DEBATE ON H.R. 255

Had the bill been called up yesterday, and I had been recognized to discuss it, I was prepared to say that this bill is not necessary in order to accomplish what it purports to do, but it does a lot of things it pretends not to do. It is a bad bill. It should either be recommitted to committee for further study—and public hearings on this amended version—or it should be defeated out of hand.

I am amazed that a committee of the House would bring in a bill to extend blanket amnesty to anyone who ever violated a District law which has been on the books for 61 years. Yet that is what this bill does.

Please read section 4 of the bill as amended in committee:

> The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to any loan described in section 28-3307(a) of the District of Columbia Code (added by section 3 of this Act) final repayment of which is due after July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, do you know of any other bill which goes back 1 full year or more to forgive any violation which might have occurred under existing law?

This bill does. I understand that the statute of limitations for the District of Columbia protects any transaction which was completed more than a year ago. So this bill fills in the intervening 12 months, and provides amnesty for that entire period.

Now what does it provide amnesty from? This is the part which is so mysterious. It purports to permit District of Columbia banks and savings and loans to continue offering the same kind of installment loans that they have regularly been providing, and presumably at the same effective rates of interest. But who or what says they cannot continue to offer such loans without the passage of this bill?

NO REFERENCE IN REPORT TO TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

There is no explanation in the committee report for this point. We are led to believe from the committee report that unless this bill becomes law, District of Columbia banks no longer will be able to offer what they call 8-percent discount loans, which are actually at the effective annual rate of 15.75 percent.

Nowhere in the report is there any reference made to the Federal Truth in Lending Act which took effect July 1, yet the implication has been given that the truth in lending law apparently, or presumably, or possibly, or ostensibly, makes the practices of the District of Columbia banks in extending 8-percent discount loans illegal under the District's 8-percent usury ceiling.

That is simply not true. And I assume that, since it is not true, the Committee on the District of Columbia has therefore carefully refrained from using this argument in its report.

All the Truth in Lending Act requires in connection with these 8-percent discount loans is that the bank reveal that the annual percentage rate of the finance charge is actually 15.75, not 8 percent. In order to avoid any confusion, or to avoid the possibility of nuisance suits under the various State usury laws setting maximum rates on interest, the Federal Truth in Lending Act carefully spells out the fact that the finance charge on which the annual percentage rate is based is not regarded as interest under any State usury law.

But because the truth-in-lending law requires the District of Columbia banks, and all other lenders everywhere in the country, to reveal the actual rates of their finance charges—which are far above what the people have generally thought they were paying in terms of an annual rate—the District of Columbia banks now say they fear that some consumers will file nuisance suits against them alleging that they have been violating District of Columbia's 8-percent usury law ceiling.

ARE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKS VIOLATING EXISTING LAW?

In the very brief testimony before the subcommittee which considered the original H.R. 255, the witnesses from the banking industry made it clear that they did not think they have been violating the District's usury ceiling with their 8-percent discount loans, and felt they could easily prove this in court.

I think they should be given the opportunity to do so.

The handling of this bill has been mysterious and amazing. The amended bill was approved in committee several weeks ago. Yet the amended bill was not available to us until a few hours before its scheduled consideration by the House. The committee report was not filed until sometime before midnight last Friday. Yet we are being asked to take up this far-reaching measure with no real opportunity to study it carefully.

The committee acknowledges hastiness in its draftsmanship by saying that it does not intend the bill to legalize 16 or 14 or 12 percent interest on home mortgages, and I understand the committee plans to offer an amendment to its amended bill to make that point clear. But the fact that the bill came out of committee with provisions which could apply such high ceilings to mortgages makes us all wonder what else might be permitted or allowed in this bill that the committee does not know about or has not looked into.

The worst thing of all is the amnesty clause. I will move to strike that out of the bill. What right have we to forgive past violations of law, if they have occurred?

IS 16 PERCENT TOO HIGH, TOO LOW, OR JUST RIGHT? WHY?

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that although the committee report implies that all of the testimony received on H.R. 255 when the brief hearings were conducted on it in this Congress was favorable, the record should show that I objected to the bill in its original form, for reasons which I spelled out in detail, in a statement provided to each member of the subcommittee on the morning of the hearing, and later inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 at page 11665. No mention is made of my opposition in the report. But in conformance with the recommendations I made in my written testimony, the committee junked the original approach of H.R. 255 and has now come out with an amended bill which straightforwardly raises the legal rates of interest in the District on installment loans. Undoubtedly, the present 8-percent usury ceiling is too low. But what is the right figure? Should it be 16 percent, as this bill proposes, or 12 percent, as is the case in nearby Maryland? No study seems to have been made on that point. So we do not know, from the committee's work on this bill, whether 16 percent is too high, too low, or just right.

All we do know is that the committee has taken the highest rates currently charged by district banks for installment loans and said, in effect, this is a dandy rate, just right, so let us legalize it.

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY NEEDED BEFORE LAW IS PASSED

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be recommitted for further study—and for comprehensive study, not just a whitewash of what has been done. If the Suburban Trust Co., of nearby Maryland can advertise—as it has been doing under truth in lending—that its rate on the kind of installment loans covered in this bill is 12 percent, why do the District banks need 16 percent? Maybe they do. But why?

If we pass this bill, and it becomes law, how soon would it be before the Maryland banks go to their legislature and say that since the District banks can get 16 percent, Maryland banks should not be held to 12 percent. This bill could therefore have tremendous ramifications on all types of consumer loans—on the rates charged.

If the District Committee does not want to undertake the research necessary to come forward with a comprehensive bill on consumer credit rates and charges, then it should let the Washington, D.C., City Council do it. But, in the meantime, I can assure the Members of this House that if 15.75 percent has always been a legal rate in Washington for a so-called 8-percent discount loan, then the Truth in Lending Act does not make it suddenly illegal, so this bill is unnecessary from that standpoint. All truth in lending has done in that respect has been to smoke out the true rate—and that is what truth in lending is supposed to do.

H.R. 255 is a bad bill.

CURB INFLATION HONESTLY—CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a hysteria hovers over our land to sell an extension of the surtax as if it were some desperate final effort to curb the continuing inflation. The cry is that the taxpayers' spending causes inflation—their money must be taken out of circulation. The tax pushers seem convinced that by repetition of the cliche, "the surtax is necessary to curb inflation," they can hypnotize the taxpayers and voters to blindly accept the hoodwink as being true.

As the surtax extension awaits further action, the Ford Foundation announces grants of better than $3 million in the District of Columbia alone.

Are the U.S. taxpayers to be told that foundation grants do not contribute to inflation—perhaps because they are tax free?

Even the United Nations organization indicated concern over our inflation crisis—not on behalf of our taxpayers—but over our marketplace for foreign imports.

Our constituents are not being taken in. They are writing back, "We're worried about inflation, too. Curb Government spending."

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 13, 1969]

NINE NEGROES IN AREA GET FORD GRANTS

Nine faculty members in the Washington area are among 104 Negro college and university teachers who have received grants from the Ford Foundation for advanced graduate study this fall.

The grants, totaling nearly $1 million, were made nationally to 70 universities and colleges. They include allowances for tuition, fees, books and travel, plus a salary stipend.

"The purpose of the awards is to increase the number of blacks who are qualified to participate fully in American higher education by assisting them in obtaining the key credential—a doctoral degree," said James W. Armsey, a Ford Foundation spokesman.

Area recipients and their awards are:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Catholic University—Verna L. Cook, $8,150; D.C. Teachers College—Theodore R. Hudson, $14,015; Howard University—Kermit K. Keith, $10,000; Ezra A. Naughton; $7,416, Edna N. Sims, $7,545, and Michael R. Winston, $10,165.

MARYLAND

Bowie State College—Julia C. Elam, $9,616; University of Maryland at College Park—John W. Blassingame, $8,875.

VIRGINIA

Northern Virginia Community College—Joseph B. Myers, $9,067.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 10, 1969]

URBAN GROUP GETS $2 MILLION GRANT

The National Urban Coalition today received an unrestricted grant of $2.25 million from the Ford Foundation.

The money will be used to help meet expenses of the coalition during the next two years, according to its chairman, John W. Gardner.

It was the third Ford grant to the coalition, which was formed in the wake of riots in Detroit and Newark in 1967 and has tried to marshal business, labor, religious and government groups behind solving the problems of the urban poor.

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1969]

U.N. FINDS U.S. INFLATION "DISTURBING"

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

UNITED NATIONS.—Continued inflation in the United States during the first quarter of 1969 despite restraining influence was "particularly disturbing," according to a U.N. world economic survey.

Noting that the expansion of demand occured notwithstanding the income tax surcharge, higher Social Security deductions and strict monetary policies, the economic and social council study said further U.S. price increases are "more certain than ever" in view of wage awards.

"The task of slowing down the rate of increase in prices with minimum loss of employment and production is the challenge that faces not only the United States but also France and the United Kingdom," the study asserted.

Nevertheless, the 5 per cent increase in American demand, after an industrial slide in 1966, was "by far the most important single factor" in the impact on other countries, the study pointed out.

American imports jumped 24 per cent to $33 billion in 1968. Some 60 per cent of these came from Canada, Japan and West Germany.

Libya, where an oil boom is in process attained the highest 1968 growth in real domestic product—40 per cent—against a 21 per cent 1960–67 average. Other countries with large 1968 rates of expansion included Israel, 14 per cent; the Republic of Korea, 13, and Japan and Iraq, 12. The Soviet Union registered a 7.2 per cent gain.

Countries with the largest gross products are likely to show the smallest percentages of gain because of their higher base.

Despite the outlook for expanded growth, the report warned that if developed countries resort to defensive measures to restore trade balances or ward off imports, developing countries could suffer. If the flow of capital were checked, the 1960s could end with an aid crisis, the survey added.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 10, 1969]

GRANTS MADE TO SPUR MINORITY BUSINESSES

(By Philip Shandler)

The Nixon administration has announced the first efforts of its new Office of Minority Business Enterprise—grants to stimulate new private credit and technical aid.

The one-year grants, announced yesterday by Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, include $200,000 to Howard University for establishment of a National Institute for Minority Business Education.

Another $200,000 in what Stans called "administrative money" is being given to the National Bankers Association, a Negro group, for creation of a locally supported "credit pool."

And the Rev. Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia is getting $650,000—disclosed a few days ago—to help establish in 13 cities Negro-owned shopping centers like his successful Progress Plaza.

The grants were requested by the OMBE, Stans said. They are being made, respectively, by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and two Commerce Department agencies, the Small Business enterprise, Stans said. Announcement of the funding constitutes a first progress report for the four-month-old OMBE, he said.

The OMBE was set up by President Nixon to coordinate the efforts of various departments to promote so-called black capitalism.

Stans also announced that:

1. The Chrysler Corp. has committed itself to granting 25 car dealerships to minority-group members, and other manufacturers are being pressed to follow suit, for a total of 100 new franchises.

2. Gasoline suppliers, retail franchisers, and accountancy associations are being urged to help start new minority businesses.

3. The creation of more small-business investment corporations is being explored to stimulate new capital, and other money is being sought from big corporations and foundations.

The institute at Howard will "identify successful business and management techniques and make them available to minority businessmen," Stans said. This already is being done on a smaller scale by Howard's Small Business Guidance and Development Center.

PROTESTS INCREASED FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have for a long time been protesting the trend toward increased Federal spending and involvement that is promoted by liberals and Washington bureaucrats. Under the guise of "public welfare," the spending power is taken away from the individual and local government and given to the Federal Government to be doled out according to the determinations of individuals with GSA ratings. As a result, all political power comes to Washington and the local and State initiative to undertake constructive programs is destroyed.

My good friend, State Senator James D. Swan, of Elkhorn, Wis., has pointed out another deleterious effect of Federal programs and spending. He points out, correctly, that in recent years the Federal Government often has encouraged State participation in Federal programs by putting up a set proportion of the cost to begin with. Then, with disturbing frequency, Uncle Sam's support has been curtailed or stopped. Meanwhile, the States have geared up to participate with staff and equipment and their citizens grown dependent upon the programs.

When this happens, the States are under pressure to continue, even though they have to foot most or all of the bill. The States have been conned and left holding the bag.

In order to defend the State of Wisconsin against Federal capriciousness, Senator Swan introduced, and pushed through to unanimous adoption by the senate, an amendment to the State budget commonly referred to as the "Swanee Hooker." This amendment provides that in any program financed cooperatively by Federal funds, with State or Federal participation, whenever the Federal share is reduced, the State's share must be cut back by the same percentage. The measure allows local units to follow the same policy.

This amendment was adopted by the Wisconsin Senate as a keystone in the protection of the people against changing programs under changing administrations, and the loathing by local bureaucrats of relinquishing an old program and its payroll, no matter how obsolete the program may have grown.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in placing the "Swanee Hooker" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend its study as a necessary part of the political education of all Members of the House of Representatives. It is my wish that this measure will eventually work its way into the budgets of all State legislatures, thereby making the Federal Government more responsible in its involvement in the affairs of State and local governments. Its adoption would also protect the individual citizen whose finances are being raided with increasing frequency by taxes, from having to pay for both the Federal and State involvement.

The amendment follows:

All appropriations made in this chapter are subject to the specific provision that when and if the Federal Government funding of any proportion of a program is reduced or terminated, State participation in the program shall be reduced in the same proportion as such Federal reduction, such State reduction to be implemented by the responsible State agency within 60 days. The State agency may appeal to the joint committee on finance for mitigation or temporary relief from this order. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the statutes, local units of government are hereby authorized to make similar proportionate reductions in their support of such programs.

YOUTH'S CONSTRUCTIVE GOALS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day I had the pleasure of addressing the people of the village of Garden City, N.Y., at their annual Memorial Day ceremonies sponsored by the American Legion.

During the course of the ceremonies, the student council president, Chuck Jacob, addressed the people of the village.

He was the representative of the young, speaking to the parents and taxpayers of the village of Garden City.

His speech struck me as one which made sense, and had a constructive purpose and a rational goal. The contents of it follow:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH, MAY 30, 1969

(By Student Council President Chuck Jacob)

America's young people are a source of great concern to many today who feel that youth is heading in a direction opposite to that of the rest of the nation. While it is true that there are those who are misguided and seeking answers in disorder, destruction, and distrust, I think it is safe to say that the majority of the young today possess a sincere concern for America, and act in efforts to improve their country. Many times what is regarded as dissent against America is really constructive criticism intended to bring about improvements in the nation that will, after all, be inherited in not too long a time by the younger generation. Thus, while for many this current dissension portends a bleak future for America, I feel that it is an encouraging sign of return to deep concern in America and her problems, an emotion that may well have been lacking in previous times. This concern is now expressed in methods unsatisfactory to many Americans; but this is due to the limitations of our age, and when, in fact this generation is absorbed into the basic structure of American society such concern will be expressed in the forms of legislation, reform, and justice. Americans should not let the impulsiveness and emotion of youth camouflage the basic desire to improve and maintain this country which, after all, achieved greatness in an effort to improve society.

What many do not appreciate is the price America has paid, and is currently paying, in her efforts to keep men free to improve. Disagreements with American policy must not be stifled, for the right to disagree is what thousands have fought and died for. Conversely, those not in accord with America's actions should consider the dear price paid for freedom, and not take the privilege of dissent lightly.

The very fact that Americans have such great freedom stands as a monument to American servicemen of all eras. These men and women who have given of themselves so unselfishly are the ones to be thanked for the freedom in America and over much of the globe. Unfortunately, many of those to whom we owe the greatest thanks are not here to receive them; and that is the purpose of Memorial Day—to serve as a reminder to all Americans that many have shed their blood to establish America as a bastion of democracy for the entire world.

Our nation is a great nation, but one with problems—problems which must be overcome if America is to continue in her destiny in the future.

I think if every American, old and young, let the sacrifices of those we honor stand as an example for him and then gave more of himself to concern and pride in our nation, then many of today's problems would be on the road to solution and it will be a strong, vital America that the youth of America inherits.

BAY'S AIR POLLUTION UNABATED

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, like many places in the United States, the beautiful bay area of California has its problem with air pollution.

The Oakland Tribune has published a series of articles on this subject which are well written and will be of interest to all those who are concerned with this grave problem.

I include the first three articles with these remarks and commend them for your reading:

[From the Oakland (Calif) Tribune, June 29, 1969]

BAY'S AIR POLLUTION UNABATED—SMOG STAYS DESPITE REGULATIONS

(By Ernie Cox)

When President Nixon on May 29 announced creation of a cabinet-level council on environmental quality, he said: "We have become victims of our technological genius."

The President's move, with air pollution as one of its primary targets, is only the latest in a series of governmental actions at various levels to do something about the air we breathe.

For the past two decades the State of California has had what it euphemistically calls "a program for air resources management." In the battle against smog, Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area are far ahead of most of the nation. It was—and is—a matter of survival.

To the average eye-smarting Californian it is small comfort to know that the problem existed as far back as the year 1215. In that year of the Magna Carta King John of England decreed a ban against foul smelling wood-burning carts that local food vendors pushed through London's murky streets. It was the world's first known air pollution control regulation.

The word smog was coined by a London physician in 1905 to describe a combination of smoke and fog.

To the Los Angeles area went the dubious honor of introducing to the world a new type pollutant—called photochemical smog. The major source: the gasoline-burning motor vehicle.

This brownish haze is the result of nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons reacting with sunlight to form new compounds which reduce visibility; irritate the eyes, nose and throat; damage plants, crack rubber products, peel paint from buildings, aggravate asthma and possibly is linked with cancer.

In virtually all California cities of 50,000 population or more, an air pollution problem exists. More than half the state's 58 counties have experienced plant damage.

The U.S. Public Health Service says Americans pour 142 million tons of waste into the air every year—more than 1,400 pounds for every man, woman and child.

In the Bay Area a total of 9,473 tons of pollutants per day were emitted into the air last year, according to local air pollution officials, who claim their "tonnage" figures are 85 per cent accurate.

Last year's pollutant figure represents a decrease of 2.7 per cent in total pollution in the Bay Area over 1967 despite a big increase in the number of automobiles.

The Bay Area Air Pollution Control District has been in operation 13 years and has put into force a series of stiff regulations, with more to come.

Despite these efforts, the district's own figures show that stationary sources such as factories and backyard burning still account for 29 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution. Stationary sources are under jurisdiction of the local district.

The six county Bay Area's 2.3 million automobiles account for 71 per cent of the total pollution problem. Automobile pollution is controlled by the state, not by the local district.

Local air pollution officials state unequivocally that if the Bay Area had 4.4 million automobiles and 8 million people—as in Los Angeles—we would have as serious a smog problem as Los Angeles.

The local district has regulations controlling open industrial or agricultural burning, industrial smoke such as that from factories and ships, and the organic gases given off by inks and paints and by gasoline in uses other than car fuel.

A brand new regulation which goes into effect next January 1 will regulate backyard burning in one and two-family dwellings, considered one of the major sources of smoke and haze.

District officials are satisfied with the regulations as far as they go, but they also know population growth will call for more stringent controls. These are under constant study.

By the year 2000, according to Milton Feldstein, director of technical services for the Bay Area district, this part of California from Sacramento to Santa Cruz will be one vast megalopolis with additional millions of population and at least two cars in every garage.

The state has new control standards on evaporative losses for 1970 model cars; control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 cars are produced. Both controls will be limited to new cars.

Many experts agree that current regulations, state and local, are only buying a little more time—time for something dramatic to happen in the auto industry, probably an alternative to the internal combustion engine; time for the public to become truly concerned; for the planting of more green belts to help purify the air; to develop mass transit facilities, better planning and zoning.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 30, 1969]

A STRATEGY UNFOLDS TO CUT SMOG LEVEL IN BAY REGION

(By Ernie Cox)

On a clear day you can see—not forever—but at least 50 beautiful miles around the Bay Area.

On other days—and they are coming more often—the haze is so heavy you can barely make out the Eastbay end of the Bay Bridge from downtown Oakland.

The average man in the street, if he bothers to look up at all, shrugs and tells himself it's just another one of those gray days. Wedded to the unfettered use of his private automobile, he figures air pollution is somebody else's problem.

Overcoming that attitude is one of the biggest problems of air pollution officialdom. Lending a hand in a public awareness effort is a newly formed group of concerned scientists and laymen calling themselves the Northern California Committee for Environmental Information.

This Berkeley-based group formed just six months ago, has just completed a draft of its first report. It has not been released, but The Tribune obtained an advanced copy of the 20-page document for this series.

The group is an affiliate of the Scientists Institute for Public Information in New York. Its report was prepared by a subcommittee on air pollution headed by Jim Huntziker, a research physicist at the University of California, Berkeley. Others on the subcommittee include Cruz Venstrom of Berkeley, a retired agricultural economist; and Laurence Caretto, assistant professor of mechanical engineering, U.C. Berkeley.

Some of the major points made in the report include the following:

1. Electrical, steam or gas turbine powered automobiles are possible alternatives to the internal combustion engine.

2. Inspection of private autos is needed in order to insure that pollution devices, once installed, remain effective.

3. Coordination of both planning and funds for highways and rapid transit would help reduce congestion and pollution.

4. Fast, train transportation for short runs—with airplane competition prohibited on such—would help reduce auto usage.

5. Progressively higher registration fees, based on pollution emissions, could be used to phase out uncontrolled cars.

6. Two lanes on the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges could be assigned to buses only to encourage more public use.

7. Differential bridge tolls at peak traffic hours and higher tolls for singly occupied cars would encourage mass transit.

8. Maximum piggybacking of trucks by railroads would reduce air pollution, traffic congestion, and highway construction and maintenance costs.

9. As the population in the "poorly ventilated" Central Valley increases, a forward-looking rapid rail transit system could encourage both land and air conservation. Such plans should be begun soon.

"Effective citizen action to help clean our air involves a personal action in two ways," says the report. These are:

Less frequent and more efficient use of personal cars.

Encouragement of effective legislation and controls.

"The population of the United States is still increasing," states the committee, "but even when it stabilizes there would still be the probability of continued migration to the Bay Area—a highly desirable place in which to live. More people imply more cars and consequently more sources of pollution."

The report points out that present laws applying to automobile emissions will have their maximum effect about 1985 but it adds, "there is also room for further reductions in industrial emissions in the Bay District."

The committee cites figures issued in 1968 by the California Air Resources Board predicting impressive reductions in emissions for the Bay Area up to 1985, and adds this comment:

"This would be better air than we now see and breathe. But there are some big 'ifs' which are recognized in the report. One is that the research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards.

"A bigger question is that the initial effectiveness of control devices decreases with age and there is currently no check on the operation of a control device once the car is sold."

What happens when the cool off-shore breeze comes in through the Golden Gate on a typical summer day? The air splits against the Berkeley hills, with one portion flowing east over Carquinez Strait to the Central Valley. The other portion is deflected southeastward to Dublin, Livermore and the San Jose area.

Pollutants from the Richmond area normally move east through Contra Costa County with some southward drift into the Livermore area. However, in the course of a season there will be all kinds of variations from the typical pattern.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 1, 1969]

MASSIVE STATE SMOG STUDY

(By Ernie Cox)

There's a rabbit in a cage out in Berkeley undergoing tests that would take your breath away.

They're pumping smog into his cage to test its effects on his tissues and organs.

Doctors already know a great deal about the poisonous effects of smog on the senses and the human lungs. But the rabbit is part of the State Health Department's continuous search for more knowledge about this public enemy of our environment.

Says Dr. Louis F. Saylor, director of the State Health Department, "Health is no longer narrowly defined as only the absence of disease. Our goal in public health is to provide the means to robust good living."

Dr. Saylor adds that this ideal is modified by the quality of our environment.

The department's Bureau of Air Sanitation was established in 1955 to bring the resources of state government to bear on the growing problems of air pollution. Under contract with the State Air Resources Board, the department is conducting a massive inventory of pollutant emission sources in each of California's 11 air basins.

Dr. John R. Goldsmith, head of the department's Environmental Epidemiology Unit, says four separate annual surveys in California showed that 3 out of 4 persons are bothered by air pollution and 90 per cent of these had eye irritation. One out of 16 in Los Angeles and Orange counties reported air pollution affected his breathing. Dr. Goldsmith also said many local physicians have reported that asthma is aggravated by smog.

The department's own surveys, according to Dr. Goldsmith, found that next to eye irritations, asthma was the most frequently reported chronic condition made worse by air pollution. He added, "The evidence for lung cancer so far is negative."

However, Dr. John Rosen, an Oakland physician, recently told a news conference in Sacramento he considers smog as dangerous to health as cigarette smoking. Rosen was in Sacramento to support a bill by Sen. Nicholas C. Petris, D-Oakland, to phase out gasoline-powered autos in California.

"There is a definite correlation," said Rosen, "between smog and lung cancer . . . a very high correlation."

Dr. Peter K. Mueller, chief of the Air and Industrial Hygiene Laboratory, State Health Department, is convinced smog causes impairment of pulmonary functions in humans and increases susceptibility to respiratory infection.

In a paper presented at the 62nd annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association in New York City last week, Mueller notes that laboratory experiments with animals causes him to suspect the aging process may be accelerated by repeated exposure to smog. He also says long-term exposure to smog irritants can produce emphysema-type conditions in the lungs of rats and mice.

"Both ozone and oxides of nitrogen (smog ingredients) are deep lung irritants," says Mueller. "They exert an inflammatory reaction mainly in the lower region of the respiratory tract."

He added that number of experimental studies in animals have demonstrated "the capacity of photochemical pollution to produce changes in lung tissue and lung function at oxidant concentrations compatible with those found in Los Angeles."

At a conference on "Man and His Environment" held May 28–29 at San Jose State College, Dr. H. V. Thomas, a research specialist under Dr. Mueller, noted a national increase of 400 per cent in chronic respiratory disease over the last decade.

"The trends for deaths from chronic respiratory diseases observed during the past two decades," he said, "constitute a chronic disease epidemic."

While there is still no concrete evidence to prove the point, Dr. Thomas said "one can only wonder" whether the upward trend in respiratory disease is caused by a weakening of the lung's defense mechanism from breathing smog.

Might it not be prudent," he asked, "to try to live in harmony with our environment than to adopt an attitude of hostility towards it?"

Independent studies made in recent years in Great Britain, Nashville, Tenn., and Buffalo, N.Y. showed a strong association between the rate of deaths from stomach cancer and the existence of air pollution. The Buffalo study found the death rate among white men and women, 50 to 69 years of age, was almost twice as high in areas of high pollution as in those of low smog levels.

Another study, looking for the prevalence of emphysema, compared heavily industrialized St. Louis, Mo., and Winnipeg, Canada, a prairie-agricultural city, in neither city were causes of severe emphysema observed in non-smokers. But the incidence of severe emphysema in comparable groups of cigarette smokers was four times higher in smoggy St. Louis than in Winnipeg.

The never-ending research goes on at a relentless pace—not only in California, but throughout the nation—indeed, throughout the world.

At least the scientists and doctors—if not the general public and most politicians—know man must find a way soon to avoid befouling the only planet we have.

COL. EDWIN "BUZZ" ALDRIN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud that one of our three great astronauts who will be taking off for the moon tomorrow is a New Jerseyite from Montclair. Col. Edwin (Buzz) Aldrin is already my most famous constituent, and I know that his hometown of Montclair will be leading the rest of the world in cheering him on. And I know that the prayers of all of us will be with Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins as they embark on this historic trip to the moon—"in peace for all mankind."

Three articles follow:

[From Life magazine]

BUZZ ALDRIN HAS "THE BEST SCIENTIFIC MIND WE HAVE SENT INTO SPACE"

(By Gene Farmer)

Buzz Aldrin is a perfectionist and NASA workmen who have to do his bidding at the Manned Spacecraft Center find him a demanding taskmaster. A good many people inside the astronaut community think, with somewhat less justice, that Aldrin is a square as well. "If Buzz has his way," said one of the wives, "the code names for the spacecraft on Apollo 11 would be Alfa and Bravo."

He has practically no hair and, on the testimony of his wife, is a strange mix—"humility and magnificent confidence bordering on conceit." He is without much tolerance for inconsequential talk, but is happy to wrap his fist around a glass of bourbon and branch and talk until the small hours about the subject that interests him, which is his trade. It is then that he chews at the left side of his lower lip as he rambles on about rendezvous and docking in space, his eyes gleaming with the intensity of small volcanoes as he addresses himself to the problems of "ecliptic orbit"—as if everyone understood as much about that as he does.

One eminent geologist flatly calls Aldrin "the best scientific mind we have sent into space." Says Ted Guillory, a flight plan writer at the Houston Manned Spacecraft Center, "Boy, he's really something. He carried a slide rule for his Gemini flight on the rendezvous and I sometimes think he could correct a computer. I can remember hearing him say things like, 'If the computer says I'm 20 feet out of plane I'll believe 10 of that, but not all 20.' He's one of the few people who can figure out all these rendezvous things in his head."

"If Buzz were a trash man and collected trash," Joan Aldrin says, "he would be the best trash collector in the United States." Buzz was the first man to join the astronauts with a doctorate (M.I.T., 1963), having written a thesis which, NASA's Chris Kraft has acknowledged, contributed a great deal to the success of the space dockings achieved in the Gemini program. When he tested his theories successfully in the last Gemini flight in November 1966 (simultaneously becoming the first astronaut to beat the fatigue problem in a space walk—by learning to pace himself properly), he had the satisfaction of knowing that he personally had added significantly to the space program.

"Challenge" is a word Buzz Aldrin uses frequently. "What is challenge?" he asked once. "What determines excellence? In grade school it's the marks that you get, what you do on the athletic field. At West Point the name of the game is, 'Do what people tell you to do, keep your nose clean and work out your academic progress.' I fitted into that pretty well. I'm a sort of mechanical man—or I was."

This is a judgment with which most of his fellow astronauts would agree. He is an easy man to appreciate, but not an easy man to know. To one of his colleagues he "has enormous ability, enormous talent—but he is very much a loner."

Buzz was born in Montclair, N.J., Jan. 20, 1930, about five months after his father, who left the Army Air Corps in 1928 to work for Standard Oil of New Jersey, had bought a comfortably large house there. The elder Aldrin was a distinguished aviator in the 1920s and 1930s (he still holds a pilot's license at the age of 73) and at one time was a close associate of Orville Wright. He was also a student and friend of the American rocket pioneer Robert Goddard; he introduced Charles A. Lindbergh to Goddard in 1929 and is one of the few men who still refer to General Lindbergh by his old nickname "Slim."

Buzz's father was away a lot, flying all over the U.S. and Europe to promote commercial aviation (only the oil companies had money for that in those days), but the income was good and steady; none of the Aldrins remembers the Depression as a time of privation. There was enough money for a nurse and a cook, who indulged Buzz in certain *outré* tastes he had developed in food—sandwiches of peanut butter, sliced banana and a topping of powdered chocolate; whole cans of tuna eaten straight out of the can; packages of Jell-O consumed dry. "I don't know how he got his mouth apart," says his sister, Mrs. Fay Ann Potter of Cincinnati.

His other sister, Madeline, now Mrs. Charles P. W. Crowell Jr. of Tulsa, Okla., remembers that all through grade school Buzz was more inclined to buckle down to neighborhood football games than to his homework—his report cards were mostly C's and D's.

All that changed just before he was due to enter high school. Not surprisingly, considering his father's example, Buzz decided that he wanted to be an aviator, which meant trying for an appointment to West Point or Annapolis. At a conference with his parents and the school counselors it was made frighteningly clear to him that unless his grades improved he would never see the inside of either academy except as a custodian or a tourist. Buzz got the message, and after that it was all A's and B's—mostly A's. He made it look almost too easy. Fay Ann was a year ahead of him in high school but, she says, "If I had a math problem or a science problem I'd go in and work it out with him even though he hadn't taken the subject yet. He seemed to be able to explain it to me. I marvel today at how well he can explain the intricacies of what he is doing and make you understand and not feel stupid."

He still found football a challenge, and played center on the Montclair High School team that won the New Jersey state championship in 1946, compensating for his small size with what French generals call *cran* and football coaches call "desire." He had learned how to make friends, but even then was beginning to draw apart; he chose to walk to and from school (a mile and a half each way) with Fay Ann. This, Fay Ann thinks, was "so that he didn't have to get invloved with finding other people to walk with. We didn't talk an awful lot."

At the end of his plebe year at West Point, Buzz was No. 1 in his class. In 1951 he was graduated as No. 3. He was also a 13-foot 9-inch pole vaulter—with a bamboo pole, before fiber-glass poles started whiplashing 13-foot vaulters to suborbital heights.

For a West Point graduate in 1951, a diploma was a ticket to Korea—in Buzz's case, by way of Bryan, Texas, where he spent a year getting his Air Force wings. Just before going to Korea, at a dinner party in New Jersey, he met Joan Archer, a striking blonde who owned a master's degree in theater arts and was otherwise unattached. But, says Joan, "Nothing happened, no spark." At the time, Buzz was writing to another girl. When he came back from Korea a year later (66 fighter missions, two MiGs destroyed and one damaged, the D.F.C. and other decorations) he again got in touch with Joan. She was soon wearing Buzz's West Point pin and getting thoroughly bored, since she was now off limits to other dates and Buzz was out in Nevada as an Air Force instructor courting her by mail.

"Buzz wouldn't make the move," says Joan. She persuaded her father to take his vacation in Las Vegas for two weeks, and the night before they were to leave Buzz proposed. "I had just about given up," says Joan. "I sensed that," says Buzz. When they got married it was only the fifth time they had been out together.

Buzz shortly found himself in Germany, flying F-100s, surrounded by pilots who were either as hot as he or claimed to be, and increasingly convinced that what he really needed was more formal education. What he was really doing was looking for a new "challenge." By the time he and Joan were flattened simultaneously by hepatitis for six months in 1959 ("from drinking dirty wine in Italy," according to Joan), Buzz had set his sights on the U.S. space program. He got the Air Force to send him to M.I.T. to get a doctorate, bypassing the master's degree. While there he applied for the 1962 class of astronauts and was turned down. Test pilot experience was then required and Buzz did not have it. "I tried for a waiver," he says. "I knew darned well I wouldn't get it, but I wanted the application in the record." He was disappointed nonetheless and even considered leaving M.I.T. to get test pilot experience. Finally he decided, "Here I am. I might as well get the best out of it." So he stayed in Cambridge. "I had some original ideas," he says without false pride or false modesty, "about piloting problems and rendezvous. That thinking fitted beautifully with what they needed for Gemini."

Buzz has had only one space flight—Gemini 12. Characteristically he was about the only person dissatisfied with the results—he would have liked to have pressed extravehicular activity (the "space walk") to new limits, but in the last Gemini mission nobody wanted an extra risk. Then, in January 1967, came the pad fire in which three men died, one of them Buzz's close friend Ed White, and the Apollo program was set back almost two years. For 21 months nobody flew. Joan Aldrin began to sense that something big was up in January of this year when Buzz began acting more withdrawn than usual. When she finally realized that he had been selected for the moon landing crew, she hardly knew whether to cheer or cry. Waiting for the formal announcement was a time "of walking on eggs, normalcy tinged with hysteria. I wished Buzz were a carpenter, a truck driver, a scientist, anything but what he is. Now I understand how Susan Borman felt—wanting to run and hide. I want him to do what he wants but I don't want him to . . ."

No astronaut's wife ever seems able to complete that sentence satisfactorily. For Joan Aldrin, the Apollo 11 flight will be a time of housecleaning—get the rugs cleaned, wash the windows, paint the walls. It will be a way to keep sane. During the months preceding the flight Buzz had not been home much—any more than his father had been home much when Buzz was the age of his 11-year-old son Andrew. During the Apollo 9 mission in March, Buzz called home every night from Cape Kennedy to check on how Andrew's school science project was going, perhaps remembering something missing in his own boyhood. Last month, Joan Aldrin took the three children (Andrew; Janice, nearly 12; and Michael, 13) to the elder Aldrin's beach house in New Jersey for a quiet vacation while Buzz was at the Cape for his final weeks of training. It was her way of staying out of the way. She was wondering if Buzz would be the same man when he got back from the moon. She had wondered the same thing when Buzz flew Gemini 12. She had felt then that "our marriage wouldn't be the same, that it would be so much more magical and meaningful and magnificent because he'd done this wonderful thing." Then, perhaps six months later, she realized that their marriage was exactly what it had been. "At first I was disappointed," she says, "and then it was comforting to think that it hadn't changed him. I really do believe that after all this is over, and if it is a lunar landing, that he will be the same person. He's not the same person I married, but I don't believe that I am the same person either."

What kind of person was he—or is he? What kind of person is any man who risks a death no man has ever died? Why does he do it? For money? (There isn't that much money.) For glory? For old-fashioned patriotism? There is some of that in all these men. But as Aldrin says, there is something else, a common denominator, perhaps, for all 50 astronauts:

"When you try to answer the question of motivation, you have to ask: 'What type of people are we talking about?' In our business we're talking about airplane pilots, fighter pilots. If you are a fighter pilot, you want to get hold of the hottest thing you can. And having flown that, you ask yourself: 'What else can I fly? What else is available?'

"You come down to the ultimate, the space program. It's *there*. Some people don't think they have a chance and don't bother to try. Others say, 'I'll accept that challenge.' Some make it and some don't. But there's a treadmill going and if you make it, you're on it. You have some control over it by your own performance. Fate determines a lot of where you fit into the puzzle. But why do you do anything? Because you were selected to do it."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1966]

PH. D. IN ASTRONAUTICS

(By Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr.)

HOUSTON, Nov. 13.—When the Gemini spacecraft chased around the earth last Friday night, caught up with and rendezvoused with an orbiting Agena rocket, it was all very familiar to one of the astronauts, Maj. Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., of the Air Force, even though it was his first spaceflight. Major Aldrin had written a dissertation on orbital mechanics and rendezvousing in space for his doctor of science degree at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

On the Gemini 12 rendezvous with the rocket, Major Aldrin and Capt. James A. Lovell Jr. of the Navy were just proving his theory.

Major Aldrin may be the most technically competent of the United States astronauts. He is very serious about his work and his career and is a firm believer in thorough and cautious preparation.

Major Aldrin was able to do more work with less effort while outside the spacecraft for two hours and nine minutes today because he had spent several weeks studying space exhaustion, a problem that has plagued previous United States astronauts during "walks in space."

When Major Aldrin left the spacecraft today he knew exactly what he wanted to do and the best way to do it. It was no accident that he became the first astronaut to overcome the fatigue problem.

This feat followed his performance at an open hatch of the Gemini 12 yesterday when the major set a world record of 2 hours and 28 minutes—the longest time that man has exposed himself to the raw environment outside an orbiting spacecraft.

"POSITIVE ABOUT HIS WORK"

"Buzz is positive about his work," the astronaut's father, E. E. Aldrin, said yesterday in Manasquan, N.J. "When he grabs hold of something, he usually makes it better before he turns it loose."

The major's father also has a Doctor of Science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr., was born Jan. 20, 1930, in Montclair, N.J., where his father was working for the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

He attended public schools in Montclair and despite a somewhat slight build he was center on a high school football team that won a state championship.

Young Aldrin got the nickname Buzz, while still a child. His sister called him "Baby Buzzer" and the family shortened it to Buzz.

He has been accepting responsibility eagerly for at least 25 years. When his father was called into the Army in World War II, he told his son, "You're the man of the family now," and to prove that he was, the boy worked on weekends as a soda jerk.

The young man entered the United States Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., in 1947 and was graduated in 1951. He became an Air Force pilot the next year and flew 66 combat missions in the Korean conflict.

While he was on leave before going to Korea, he attended a cocktail party in New Jersey where he met the mother of Joan Archer, a young actress from Ho Ho Kus, N.J., who invited him to dinner at her home. There, he met Miss Archer, whom he subsequently married.

They now have three children, James, 11, Janice, 9, and Andrew, 8.

After the Korean conflict, the young pilot served a tour in West Germany where he and Lieut. Col. Edward H. White, 2d, also an astronaut now, were good friends.

ALMOST LEFT SCHOOL

When the latter was accepted as an astronaut in September, 1962, Young Aldrin was tempted to end his work at M.I.T. without getting his doctorate and apply to be an astronaut, but, after long discussions with his wife and with his father, he decided to continue in school.

In 1963, he wrote his dissertation on orbital mechanics, dedicating it to "the men in the astronaut program."

"Oh, that I were one of them," he wrote in the dedication.

Later that year he got his wish when he was transferred by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the astronaut program.

The Aldrins now live near the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston in a colony of astronauts and engineers.

On weekends, the whole family water skis or rides boats in Clear Lake.

Major Aldrin almost missed being allowed to fly in space. Several years ago, he injured a knee while jumping on a trampoline, and last year he reinjured the knee while playing squash. However, an operation to remove torn cartilage repaired the damage.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

ALDRIN'S NO ROMANTIC ABOUT LANDING ON MOON

(By Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.)

Like many things in life attempting to set foot on the moon for the first time is burdened with the unexpected and the risks that the unexpected offers. It is overcoming these risks that makes the taste of triumph so much sweeter.

But risk is not the lure nor the obstacle in space flight. I see my part in the first lunar landing less in a romantic and personal way and more as a contribution to increasing knowledge and the understanding of future generations. Such a long-range contribution may be less celebrated than being first to land on the moon, but it may be more significant.

Being selected for Apollo 11 is an opportunity and a challenge that has come my way for various reasons over which I did not have complete control. It might just as well have been any one of a number of other astronauts who are fully capable of accepting the challenge.

The next big steps will be down that ladder and onto the surface of the moon. And these steps will be taken just after 2 a.m. on Monday, July 21, if everything goes according to plan.

REST AFTER LANDING

We actually land the day before at about 5:30 (EDT). But at this point we've put in a long, strenuous day so the flight plan calls for a thorough checkout of the Lunar Module, followed by a meal, a four-hour rest, then another meal. We check out the equipment that will keep us alive on the moon and open the hatch some 10 hours after the landing.

Neil eases out of the hatch first, belly down and feet first. The back pack carrying our life-support system and the spacesuit are both bulkier than we thought, so he will barely fit through the opening. Going out the hatch you start thinking about when you're going to be getting back in. So you'll be pausing there and maybe moving in and out before proceeding down the ladder.

As Neil squirms out of the hatch. I'll take photographs of him. Coming down the ladder, he pulls a lever that opens a storage compartment known as the modular equipment stowage assembly, or MESA. It holds a television camera which should be looking toward the ladder. If the tracking station at Goldstone, Calif., is in view you might see Neil on your television.

The first thing you do upon touching the moon's surface is assure yourself that you can control your movements. You want to make sure there are no unexpected responses when you try to walk or work.

Probably our biggest problem on the moon's surface will be suit mobility. It's not as difficult to maneuver in that suit as it looks, but it takes getting used to. The first time you get into one it's horrible, but then you learn not to fight it. It's easy to strain against it and expend energy with no productivity. The suit has bellows where the arms and shoulders bend. However, if you want to move your arm around, it's sometimes easier to move your whole body.

SAMPLE FOR GRAB BAG

The first thing Neil does on the moon is take a sample of the soil. He has a contingency sample container—we call it a grab bag—in a pocket of his space suit. Neil extends a folded handle on the bag, opens it up, then scoops up what ever he can from the surface. Then he folds up the handle and puts the sample in his pocket.

This sample is taken in the event that some emergency forces us to lift off the moon sooner than planned. If this should happen we will still bring back a bit of the moon for the scientists to study.

All this time Neil will be evaluating how well man can move on the moon. It's extremely important to come back and tell people how well you can operate on the moon in a space suit with a 50-pound life-support pack on your back.

We also want to determine how well we can see in light and dark areas.

We want to know if there is a tendency to weave because you are such a large mass moving in reduced gravity and you need exert only a small force to leave the ground.

TV CAMERA SET UP

When Neil is sure of his movements, he places the television camera on a tripod out in front of the Lunar Module.

About this time, I am ready to come out. If we have good communications with Earth through the spacecraft, I can come out about 20 minutes after Neil. But if communications are bad, Neil will have to set up an erectable antenna on the surface which will be pointed at Earth. If this is necessary, I remain inside the spacecraft to switch to the outside antenna and check how accurately it's pointed by the signal strength. If this has to be done it will be about 40 minutes before I can come out.

Neil gets a rock box out of the MESA and opens it. Inside is a solar wind experiment. It's a piece of plastic film rolled up on a staff and you pull it down like shade. Laid out on the surface it picks up samples of the particles from outer space which constantly bombard the moon and create many of its surface features. While Neil is collecting rock samples, I spread out the collector.

Then the two of us walk around the Lunar Module together to inspect and take pictures of the landing gear, debris underneath, and the descent engine skirt and throat. This extra-vehicular activity is a very subjective effort—very personal—cause it involves an individual and his way of doing things.

"MOVING SHOULD BE EASY"

Moving around on the moon should be fairly easy, but you can't do it automatically like on Earth. You're going to have to think about it because with that big backpack on the center of your weight is not where you are used to it.

The reduced gravity on the moon is probably much closer to conditions on Earth than to floating weightlessly in space. You have something to work against and there is no up and down, so we ought to be able to work much faster than on a spacewalk.

In weightlessness you have to move very slowly, and once you start moving it takes a lot to stop. That's not the situation in the one-sixth gravity on the moon. You can probably get moving quite fast, and if there's a boulder there you could just stick your foot on it and stop, we're not going to be running, though. We're going to be very deliberate, probably taking several steps to stop if we're moving fast.

You have to think when you're putting equipment together, too. If you don't handle it the right way, an easy task becomes difficult. For instance, to fix the legs to the erectable antenna there's a little pin that's supposed to go into a hole. You may think it's in and start working somewhere else, then the leg collapses. That can happen unless you're very deliberate.

CAN'T CORRECT MISTAKES

None of the equipment we're using can be tested first in the surroundings where it will be used. You can't go ahead and make a bunch of mistakes, then make the necessary changes. It has to be designed right in the first place.

As Neil and I come around to the other side of the spacecraft there's a scientific package that we deploy. I put up a seismometer for detecting moonquakes and meteorites crashing into the surface. After we're gone, it will radio evidence of such activity back to Earth. From this information, scientists should be able to determine whether the moon is a cold, dead body, or one with a hot, moving interior and possibly active volcanism.

Neil erects a laser reflector, a complicated array of mirrors and prisms on a frame the size of a large suitcase. The mirrors and prisms catch pulses of laser light sent from Earth and reflect them back. From the time it takes the light to make the round-trip, scientists hope to measure the distance from Earth to moon to within a few inches.

IN COMMUNICATION

All this time we are in communication with each other and, through the Lunar Module, with Earth control and the Command Module when it is overhead.

After the first rock box is filled we go as a team to collect a second documented sample. We will move about a hundred feet away from the Lunar Module, maybe 200 feet, depending on the success in some of the earlier things that were done.

On this final sampling, photographs will be taken from various angles before we pick up a rock. Individual samples are put in separate bags.

These, in turn, go into a larger container. We have scales to weigh the rocks to make sure we don't have too much to carry. With everything else, the Lunar Module can carry about 50 pounds of rocks.

I go back into the spacecraft first, then Neil follows. He will spend a total of about 2½ hours on the moon.

TOSS EXCESS OVERBOARD

Inside the module, we shuffle some equipment around, then start tossing things overboard. We've brought in the rock boxes, the solar wind experiment and the television camera which were stored in the descent stage which will be left on the moon. In the ascent stage our weight margin will be very close, so we get rid of things we no longer need like the two life-support backpacks.

With everything properly stored and the hatch closed, we get ready for the first leg of the trip home. When Mike Collins in the mothership is in the proper position overhead, a computer sequence commands the ascent engine to fire. It must fire to start us home. (If it fails, Armstrong and Aldrin will be stranded on the moon.) There's a high premium in this business for being right the first time.

If everything goes according to plan we'll make a series of burns, then rendezvous with Mike in the Command Module. In the event we cannot dock, or get through the tunnel connecting the vehicles, we will have to spacewalk over to the other craft. For this purpose, we have a chest pack with a 30-minute supply of oxygen.

There is little risk in the moon landing and rendezvous if everything goes according to plan, but nobody can guarantee that it will. We will not know the sweetness of our triumph over risk until it is all behind us.

WILL THE REAL DR. STRANGELOVE PLEASE STAND UP?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the one-sided argument which occupies today's headlines regarding the so-called military-industrial complex there is little said to rebut the antimilitary hysteria of the day.

Recently an interesting article appeared in the Air Force/Space Digest for July 1969 entitled "Will the Real Dr. Strangelove Please Stand Up?" in the interest of seeing that both sides of the controversy are properly presented, I enclose this article herewith and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

WILL THE REAL DR. STRANGELOVE PLEASE STAND UP?

(By William Leavitt)

Will the real Dr. Strangelove please stand up? The question is put in all seriousness. It is asked from the point of view of one who views himself as a liberal. It is asked from the point of view of one who is entirely convinced that unless this country focuses its energies on social needs with the same will that has brought us to a manned landing on the moon, we shall be in the kind of trouble that all the technology in the world will not be able to alleviate.

Why put the question? Because now is the time to search for the truth in the national debate over the role of the so-called military-industrial complex in American society. If the truth is drowned in a vortex of hysterical charges, we will not only cripple our ability to influence events in the international arena, but also, and even more important, we will succumb to a new virus of McCarthyism. Instead of looking for Communists under every bed, we will be witch-hunting every American in or out of uniform who, regardless of his views on domestic problems, believes in the necessity for American strength in a world that continues to be dangerous.

Such a belief in the need for US military strength, it should be pointed out, does not require an accompanying conviction that the Russians or Chinese are ten feet tall and about to attack us—or, to move to another sphere, to believe that sex education in the schools is some kind of Red plot. Put another way, to believe in the need for US military capabilities to match those of potential enemies does not make the believer a "kook" who would like to see the country converted into a garrison state.

The brand of neo-McCarthyism alluded to is already leading to a tragic polarization of US society. Now, more than any other time in recent history, there is an overriding need for balanced analysis of how we arrived at the distorted debate now being inflicted on the country, in which "the military" is being pilloried, along with its industrial suppliers, for allegedly taking over US foreign policy, generally corrupting American society, distorting national priorities, and, worst of all, dragging the country into an endless, costly, and immoral struggle in Southeast Asia.

The so-called military-industrial complex, we are also told, is attempting to thrust on the country an unworkable and unnecessary antimissile system, which, if it is deployed, along with new multiwarhead MIRV ICBMs, will destroy for the foreseeable future any real chance for US-Soviet arms-control agreements and will consequently set off an inevitable arms race that may well lead to superpower confrontation and nuclear war. Dr. Strangelove personified. Or so we are told.

Let us explore some of these allegations and examine how we got to where we are now.

Vietnam first. What are we doing there? How did we get into the quagmire? And, not incidentally, what are the moral questions that need to be honestly examined?

Was it really the men in uniform and their commanders who are fighting this frustrating war who advocated our involvement in the first place? In the large, the answer is no. Vietnam is primarily the ultimate and sour consequence of policies that evolved in the early 1960s out of disenchantment with the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' massive-retaliation policy. Under President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, massive retaliation had become the keystone of US strategic policy designed to deter Soviet attacks on the continental US and on Western Europe.

Many advisers to the new Kennedy Administration questioned, and properly so, whether massive retaliation, as devised by Mr. Dulles, had serious credibility shortcomings. Did our NATO allies, and the Soviet Union itself, really believe that the US would risk its national existence by going to nuclear war with Russia to protect Western Europe? Was there not a way, if America had to go to war to meet its pledges to Europe, to keep a US-Russian confrontation nonnuclear?

These were not idle questions. They needed to be asked. But the new men who ruled and influenced the Kennedy/McNamara Pentagon of the early 1960s developed a fascination with what they called limited war. The focus was on Europe at first. And the idea, which excited great enthusiasm, was to reduce the potential horror of war in Europe from nuclear down to conventional terms. The new aim was to develop so-called balanced forces so that we, in concert with what we hoped would be beefed-up European conventional forces, could respond to aggression at any level.

It all sounded very neat. We would develop a mix of forces able to handle virtually any kind of threat from nuclear fireball to brushfire war. Students of the period will recall a spate of enthusiasm for conventional war in Europe that seemed to look back upon the unpleasantness of 1939–45 as a veritable garden party. We were even told that the conventional forces of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies, in numerical terms, had really been exaggerated and that Western forces were, after all, a good match for the Russians and their satellites, division for division. What happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968 finally shattered that bravado. Or should have.

What began among the Kennedy defense people as a useful critique of massive retaliation and overreliance on strategic nuclear power evolved into a new policy called "flexible response." Its bible was Army General Maxwell Taylor's book *The Uncertain Trumpet*, which brought the General back to prominence in Washington as President Kennedy's military adviser, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and finally as Ambassador to Saigon. But General Taylor was by no means the only advocate of flexible response. And it ought to be pointed out, for the benefit of those who find it convenient to view "the military" as a monolith, that as limited war came to the dogmatic fore, it was not surprisingly, the Army that most strongly supported the concept. Limited war promised to restore the ground service's prenuclear age preeminence.

But the problem, as the future would reveal, was that flexible response was neither particularly flexible nor responsive. To General Taylor's credit, as Mark E. Swenson points out in the article, "The US Involvement in Vietnam—How and Why" (*page 32, June 1969* AIR FORCE/SPACE DIGEST), the old soldier has admitted as much. He is among the few who have had the grace and intellectual honesty to do so.

Worst still, what conceivably might have worked in Europe—if NATO allies had been willing to beef up their conventional forces to ensure the numerical balance between Warsaw Pact and Western forces claimed by the new men in the Pentagon—had little or no relevance to Asia. But, as Mr. Swenson also points out, flexible response was extended to cover the expected requirements of conflict in Asia and the rest of the so-called underdeveloped world. Counterinsurgency capability (COIN) was added to the flexible response stew. Thus armed, it was believed, we could meet the anticipated challenges of Maoist "wars of national liberation" around the world.

The Administration in power sets the policy tone in Washington, and in John Kennedy's Washington it rapidly became the style to talk of ways and means of countering and conquering borders of sneakered peasants, mesmerized with Maoism, who would soon be assaulting governments, one after another, in Southeast Asia. South Vietnam and Laos were already under siege and Mr. Khrushchev was proclaiming Soviet support of wars of national liberation.

Overnight, there developed a new mystique of counterinsurgency. The Army and Marines were generally enthusiastic. The Air Force, pressed to doff its A-bomb image, reluctantly climbed on the bandwagon. We were all treated to replays of the post-World War II British triumph over the Communist guerrillas in Malaya and we were subjected to endless computations on how many counterinsurgents you needed to cope with and prevail over one Red guerrilla.

But, for a time, it was mostly talk. In Vietnam, the cautious President Kennedy was willing to try out some of the techniques advocated by the counterinsurgency enthusiasts (*again, see Mark Swenson's June article for an analysis of the roles of some of the principal Kennedy advisers*). But the conflict was then at a low level and the American involvement small. The President had had his fingers burned at the Bay of Pigs, and the Cuban missile crisis had had to be settled by threatening massive retaliation, no less.

What John Kennedy, had he lived, would have done in Vietnam beyond the technical-adviser stage is an "iffy" question that no one, not even Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—despite his mixed role as adviser and White House note-taker for future memoirs—can really answer. Some argue that, in view of his initial commitment, Kennedy, as disturbed as he was by the repressive Diem regime of the period, would have followed the course his successor in the White House took. Others suggest that for a time, during the worst of the Diem days, there was at least a theoretical possibility that Diem's bankrupt regime and its excesses might be used as an excuse for US withdrawal. The weight of evidence favors the first argument, that Kennedy was in Vietnam to stay, if only Diem could be removed in a US-approved coup, which he was.

Both Presidents Kennedy and Diem were removed from the scene by assassination and Vietnam evolved rapidly into a new kind of dilemma. By mid-1964, the US was faced with an even more aggressive North Vietnam, emboldened by what looked like the inevitable collapse of the South Vietnamese regime. And the decisions were in the hands of Lyndon Johnson, advised by the same people, for the most part, who had sold flexible response and COIN to his predecessor. And by now US forces were being restructured to meet the new orthodoxy of flexible response and COIN.

The new President, convinced by the counterinsurgency advocates and by those who put their faith in what they viewed as the cold logic of strategic persuasion that they believed could be applied successfully against North Vietnam, responded with a series of US escalations, which in sum took the US into a full-scale war. The enemy was no longer just the Viet Cong or even North Vietnam but also Red China by proxy. And the newly avowed purpose of US involvement was to prevent the fall of the rest of Asia to communism in keeping with the well-known domino theory.

To say that President Johnson took the country into a major war under circumstances of questionable legality is to belabor the obvious. To ask whether what he did was right or wrong from the standpoint of national interest, in the long run, is to enter a field of argument where no one can tread with certainty. It may well be that the US effort in Vietnam, whatever the final outcome, has sharply altered, perhaps irrevocably, the timetable of Maoist-style revolutions and spurious wars of national liberation and has given non-Communist Asia breathing space to muster the will and force to protect itself and create some decent future for its peoples. We cannot know the final consequences of Vietnam from the geopolitical point of view.

But there is a set of larger, moral, questions that needs to be asked. Did not President Johnson and the coterie of advisers on whom he leaned, including particularly Secretaries McNamara and Rusk, delude themselves and the people by taking the country into a major war stage by stage, almost by stealth, as it were? Once having done that, did they not compound the deception by pretending that such a war on such a scale could be mounted without seriously affecting the economy? Was it not a cruel hoax on the poor, who had been promised a war on poverty, to tell them and the country that the war in Asia could be prosecuted without effect on the struggle to overcome domestic problems? The hoax was exposed early when civil rights and anti-war campaigns merged.

And, one may ask, did not the Johnson Administration, particularly the ever-quantifying civilian defense hierarchy, also fail the military who were, after all, the people who had to do the fighting and dying in Vietnam, by running the war as if it were some species of war game being played out at a think-tank seminar and with small regard for such variables as public opinion and popular support that so often make the difference?

Looked at in this light, the genesis of the Vietnam War become much clearer. We got into this conflict up to our necks, and, it may be added, isolated from virtually all of our allies, as a consequence of military theorizing by a band of planners who in retrospect were largely dilettantes. The irony is that these Strangeloves, for the most part, are now aboard the bandwagon of critics blaming the whole mess on the "military." If the military is guilty of anything, it is a certain impatience with having been given an escalatory game to play with most of the proscriptive rules applied to our side. It is true, and acknowledged above, that there were enthusiasts of limited war and counterinsurgency in all the services. It is doubtless also true that the military, particularly the Army, believed it could win in Vietnam.

But the overriding and immutable fact that the basic policy decisions to go into Vietnam with a force that built up to half a million men were made by the civilian authority. Here the "monolithic" quality attributed by critics to the military *did* obtain: They followed orders. Under our system, should it have been otherwise?

A further irony, of course, is that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong turned out to be rather better at the game than our own Strangeloves. For it is *they* who have successfully molded world opinion against America as a bully who bombed the innocent and as the Western busybody who bloodily intervened in a "civil" war.

We have paid an enormous price.

The basic lack of candor about Vietnam, masked primarily by the prestigious public image of Mr. McNamara as the world's greatest manager, lies at the root of almost every major problem the U.S. is currently concerned with. Half of the $80 billion defense budget the military-industry complex is blamed for is attributable to Vietnam. The desperate fiscal gamble involved in waging the war on a business-as-usual basis, with no restraints on the economy, has fed the flames of inflation. In turn, inflation has eroded the purchasing power of both the government and the private economy.

Defense programs and social programs cost more and hence are more competitive for the tax dollar, exacerbating a conflict in priorities which need not ever have developed. A taxpayers' revolt is brewing. Relations with our allies, particularly in Western Europe, have been strained nearly to the point of rupture at times. The inequities of the draft, especially to feed the needs of a war so open to just criticism, have swelled the ranks of the peace movement, provided a focus for campus dissent, and further complicated the economic and social unrest in the nation.

It is the tragedy of Mr. McNamara and of the country that the impeccable management expert failed to manage his most important assignment. The trappings of efficiency were mistaken for its substance. It is analogous to a hospital being administered with a high degree of competence, except for the fact that patients were dying needlessly. So put the blame on the doctors.

But as important as Vietnam is, as both a symbol and a reality in the search for the real Strangelove, there are other issues that need exploring—ABM, for example.

The chorus of antimilitary critics now proclaims that the military and a greedy band of profiteering industrialists are forcing on the country an unneeded and unworkable antimissile system. The critics' argument, depending on who they are, is either that the proposed ABM won't work and is therefore a waste of money, or that, even if it does work, it can't do anything but "force" the Soviet Union to press on with complex offensive weapons that could overwhelm any US defense.

What do the critics offer as an alternative? Nothing less than a total US dependence on offensive weapons sufficient to scare the pants off the Russians and the Red Chinese, plus the hope that the Russians will be gentlemen enough to see the wisdom of meaningful arms-control agreements with us.

The question arises: Who are the Strangeloves here? Under the McNamara Pentagon regime this country accelerated the greatest buildup of offensive power in the history of the world, in keeping with the basic theory of deterrence and in support of the delicate balance of terror. But the problem of virtually total reliance on offensive nuclear power is that if deterrence does not work—let the cause be madness on the part of an enemy or merely a miscalculation—then there *can* be a nuclear war. And if there is a nuclear war, no one can really predict the destruction, no matter how much quantification has been done in advance.

Reason would suggest that if there is a chance, however small, the defenses can be mounted, no rational man would oppose their deployment. Oddly, the most "rational" men of all, the disciples of former Secretary McNamara, those who see him as having brought order to the Pentagon, are among the most vociferous opponents of the idea of bringing offensive-defensive balance into US strategic planning. The same people who attacked massive retaliation as devised by John Foster Dulles are now backing that policy, under the label of "assured destruction." Only now the bombs are bigger, and the stakes, if deterrence fails, are even higher than they were in the 1950s.

The ABM issue is thus not so much a question of whether the system the President wants deployed is the best one available—no one can supply the answer to that question barring the test of a nuclear war—but rather whether at long last the United States strategic posture should be allowed to emerge from the Strangelovian shadows of the McNamara era into a new period in which defense can attain some real significance. Despite the claims of those who have written endless numbers of scenarios about assured destruction and all the rest of the jargon of the McNamara era, the world would be *more* hospitable to meaningful arms-control agreements if both the U.S. and Russia developed some measure of strategic defensive capability, by way of having the insurance human beings and governments bank on.

Indeed, rather than calling for U.S. and Soviet pledges *against* deploying defensive systems, serious arms-controllers should be campaigning for an emphasis in arms-control talks on limitations on the *offensive* side. How much more sense it would make in arms talks to *encourage* defensive system development as a preliminary to limiting the deployment of MIRVs and supermegaton bombs!

What the Strangeloves, in their mechanistic approaches to arms control, have not understood, is that arms-control agreements, if they are to have any meaning, must have a base in political reality. And political reality includes the fact that governments, Communist or otherwise, tend to see a duty to afford some measure of defense, if at all technically feasible, for their peoples. Nor do the Strangeloves seems to recognize the quite important arms-control potential in financial terms, of defensive-system development and deployment. For as they themselves suggest, there are limitations to the fiscal resources of even superpowers, as well as continuing resource-allocation problems. Thus, if Russia, the U.S., and other powers began to invest militarily in defensive systems, at least some money otherwise available for offensive developments might not be available.

This possibility never seems to have entered the minds of such people as Robert McNamara, who in the last analysis is probably the greatest Strangelove of them all, in view of his preoccupation as Defense Secretary with assured destruction and other such abstractions, always on the offensive side.

It is a great irony of our times that Mr. McNamara, who presided over the massive U.S. offensive weapon buildup of the 1960s, is viewed as a kind of hero by so many critics who at the same time claim that "the military" has come to dominate U.S. foreign and domestic policy.

What it all comes down to is that many, many Americans, including a sizable collection of civilians who in recent years have played important executive and advisory roles in the design of U.S. military-political policy, are now angry at the way that power has been deployed by the national leadership. Although many of these people helped write the scenarios, worked the abstract computations, glamorized on paper the beauties of limited war, and peddled the nostrums of counterinsurgency, they now are disowning the stunted children of their musings. The nostrums have not worked and now it is time to find a scapegoat. What more convenient scapegoat than the military? It is so easy to characterize those who have borne the brunt of the battle as having brought about the circumstances that led to the battle. And it is so easy to forget that the conceptual framework of our present policies was built by a corps of "experts," largely outside of the military.

And in these divisive times, scapegoating is a foolish tack. It is silly and dishonest to blame the military per se for the basic mistakes of civilian leaders in the recent past. To do so is just as silly and dishonest as it is to blame the poor for being on the welfare rolls. It makes much more sense to search for the causes of the disasters, in both cases, and to honestly admit the errors of the past so that all of us can learn a little something for the future.

Including the real Strangeloves.

JOIN HANDS: FOR THOSE WHO CARE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the formation of a group of action-minded citizens in Los Angeles. Their concern—that racial justice and equality be actively pursued—is admirable. The commitment of the members of "Join Hands" came about as a result of a tragedy, the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This leader, who inspired hope for millions of Americans during his lifetime, may, through groups such as "Join Hands" still inspire the brotherhood he sought.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article carried in the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, January 12, 1969. The official pledge made by members of "Join Hands" follows the article, along with pertinent information:

JOIN HANDS,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 9, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM CLAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLAY: Enclosed are literature and material about Join Hands which we think merit your interest.

This citizens' movement, based on individual commitment to the Join Hands pledge and dedicated to achieving racial justice and equality, has grown rapidly since its birth in Los Angeles the night of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and has attracted national attention.

We know of your concern in this area and would welcome your personal support of the principles embodied in the Join Hands pledge and any help you might give us in promoting the program in your state as well as nationally.

We look forward to your comments and hope to discuss this with you in more detail in the near future.

Sincerely,

JANICE BERNSTEIN,
President.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 12 1969]

JOIN HANDS: FOR THOSE WHO CARE

(By Maggie Savoy)

Bye Bye, '68!

The year of Chicago, Columbia, Sorbonne—and San Fernando Valley State . . .

The year garbage chocked the streets of New York; people choked with hate . . .

Of "Hair" and Kerner and Pueblo and "The Great White Hope" . . .

Of protestors sitting, the poor marching and rich kids on dope.

Miniskirts and maxihates; bussing and fussing; Czechoslovakia, Khesanh, Biafra and Lebanon.

Black panthers and Gene McCarthy running; assassins gunning.

And, at the end, a country decimated by the flu, watching three earthlings jump over the moon.

Nineteen sixty-eight wasn't all bad. As the nation mourned Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Sen. Robert Kennedy, many people of good heart—white, red, yellow, brown and black—stopped wringing their hands and put them to work.

Thousands and thousands in Los Angeles asked themselves, "What can I do?" and set about, in ways small and big, alone or in groups, to do something.

A flip back through the pages of this section shows hundreds of women, men and children who put their hands and hearts to work this year.

One such movement (can't call it a group—it began, and stays, unformed and loosely structured)—is Join Hands.

In the shockwave of the night after Dr. King was gunned down in Memphis, three women, in different parts of the city, watched television and asked themselves—as did countless others—"What can I do?"

"We must turn this, somehow, into something creative," said one. "The enemy is despair."

"I suddenly realized that every night I drive home to a sanctuary," said another. "I wanted a better world for my children. I suddenly realized that if I didn't try my darndest to make it one, my children would have to fight for it. I decided to fight."

"We had better decide what it is we are willing to do," said the third to her husband. "And say what we need to say."

They called each other. And sat down and pencilled a Bill of Particulars. Then they started calling friends and friends' friends, to see how many would sign it with them, and sign a check to pay for a full page ad in the paper.

The "pledge" is not an easy one. It takes a lot of self-looking, and a great deal of commitment, to sign it.

But in a whirlwind, thousands did. In nothing flat Jan Bernstein's West Los Angeles bedroom, dining room and kitchen became a bedlam office. Some 2,500 people backed up their signatures with checks—to pay for the little group's printing, stamps and phone. Some 50,000 copies of the pledge went out through the mails all over California and 20 other states. Others "doing their own thing" (a tenet of the group), formed groups in Orange County, South Bay, Indian Wells Valley, Long Beach (most recently Bakersfield).

And Join Hands was formed.

Its officers are Janice Bernstein (occupation: Housewife); Ethel Haydon (member of League of Women Voters, Pacific Palisades Human Relations Council); Nancy York (director community resources, Marianne Frostig Center of Educational Therapy).

BOARD NAMED

The men on the board are Arnett L. Hartsfield Jr., chief mediator, Community Mediation Center; Dr. Phillip Oderberg, past president Los Angeles County Psychological Assn.; Winthrop Denison Grove, former supervisor South Central Los Angeles Concentrated Employment Project; computer-programmer C. A. Irvine; Ralph Bernstein, systems engineer. Also on the board is Jacqueline Richman, who works for Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency.

To sign the pledge is to take a step. "It was a shock," said one, now a teacher in her college's Educational Opportunities Program. "It made me take a real hard look at myself. I realized I'd been wrapping my prejudices around me like a blanket against a freezing wind."

To take one step is to take another. To some it was a step to the corner grocery, and a word to the manager, "Why don't you employ someone from the minority groups?" To others, withdrawing savings and putting them in a ghetto bank which lends to minority entrepreneurs. To others, volunteering: For a fair housing committee, a neighborhood center, a PTA, a birth control agency, a youth group, a hospital, a human relations council.

To others, talking with the boss. One star salesman talked hard, then resigned and joined a competing company which was training undereducated men to be salesmen. One couple, after several conferences with their minister, handed in their church letter and joined another church nearby, where they are now conducting adult education classes—all white—on black culture.

PERSONAL THING

Many of the pledge signers realized their confusion. "Prejudice is a personal thing," said one. "I realize there are injustices all around me; I realize change is necessary—I believe it. But I'm not sure what is prejudice and what is truth and fact."

Said another, "I feel so powerless. I hear my mother-in-law say things that boil my blood—but I am afraid to say anything to her. I want peace at any price in my own home—but how can we have peace in America if I can't pay that price?"

Overnight, like mushrooms after a rain, people registered for discussion and encountered groups, led by 50 volunteer psychiatrists and psychologists (who first went through their own encounters under the leadership of Dr. Oderberg).

More than 600—all over the Los Angeles map—have gone through them. They're tough. The discussion groups, primarily aimed at taking issues and commitment, take several days or nights, try to analyze and delineate the issues. The encounter groups are rougher: They are 10-hour marathons, where people (mostly white) knock out their prejudices, fears, concerns, ideals and emotions with others.

These are painful, exhausting, annoying and sometimes frustrating hours. I went to one, conducted by Dr. Ernie White. I won't tell you about it (one becomes concerned—no, involved—with the others). Just to say that the price of insight is pain. "Of course," explains Dr. Oderberg. "It is hard to be honest and open with oneself. It is not the way most of us normally function."

WHITE GROUP

Join Hands is a White group. Tackling White problems. "Bigotry is like a tuberculosis bacillus," said one board member. "In a healthy body they can be capsuled off. In a sick body they will take over. America is healthy—we've got to know that. Black, red, yellow, green and purple polka-dotted bigotry is everybody's problem. We have to begin with us."

Join Hands has committees working with business and industry, speakers, fair housing, education.

It will answer the question, "What can I do?" by sending a booklet, "What Can I Do?" free. (More than 10,000 have been mailed.)

Correction of statement: "Join Hands is a white group." The membership of Join Hands comes mainly from all segments of the broad middle class and, therefore, is predominantly but not exclusively White.

JOIN HANDS—SO THAT MARTIN LUTHER KING DID NOT DIE IN VAIN, LET US JOIN HANDS

He had a dream that "one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'we hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal.'"

He had a dream that one day all men "will be able to sit together at the table of brotherhood."

He had a dream that his four children "will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

Now is the time for us to help make that dream come true. For all men "to stand up for freedom together."

Martin Luther King's cause was and is America's cause. I recognize and affirm that cause as my own. I therefore make the following moral commitment:

1. I pledge to confront my own fear and prejudice and strive to eradicate them.

2. I recognize the special rights and privileges that I enjoy, and I pledge to demand the same rights and privileges for each and every man.

3. I pledge to actively support both legislation and taxes to provide more and better jobs, housing, health, recreation, and education for all in our country who are poor, under-employed and ill-housed.

4. I pledge to trade with those business concerns which practice fair employment and provide upgraded job opportunities.

5. I will demand that every effort be made to achieve and maintain quality education in all schools and, in particular, to develop integrated schools of the highest quality. I pledge not to remove my children from such schools.

6. I pledge to welcome neighbors of all races and creeds; to support open housing and to rent or sell my home without restrictions.

7. I pledge not to try to escape the problems of my city, but to work to rebuild it as a place where human dignity flourishes.

8. I pledge to support those political candidates, regardless of party, who demonstrate the clearest understanding that the brotherhood and equality of all Americans is the major issue of our times—the one which must receive first priority both morally and economically.

9. I pledge violence will not cause me to react violently, nor will it cause me to abandon my commitment to this pledge.

10. I pledge this is a commitment to action, not just words.

In signing this pledge I commit myself to involve my friends, neighbors and my co-workers in active support of the aims of this resolution.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION

Sign the pledge and make an individual commitment to its aims. Signed pledges can be sent to your oganizations, local officials, and elected representatives. Return this coupon. Receive additional pledges, emblems, bumper stickers, and notices of discussion groups, special events, and opportunities for joint action. Display the Join Hands emblem as a visible sign of your commitment.

WHAT I CAN DO—JOIN HANDS ACTION BOOKLET

The problem is that in this country there are Americans who do not have adequate food and shelter, who cannot obtain decent employment, who are given an inadequate education, who cannot live where they choose, who do not receive full equality under the law, who do not have equal opportunities for success and who are deprived of their right to self-determination.

The problem is intensified when some Americans build defensive walls, based on fear and prejudice, which dehumanize others and seek to preserve the status quo.

The belief is that still other Americans will take a long, hard look at what is happening around them and determine what their responsibility is.

The belief is that these Americans realize their personal stake in the future and will make a personal commitment to act.

WHAT AM I COMMITTING MYSELF TO?

If you have made the commitment, then you have said that you will not take the easy way out of uncomfortable situations but will state your views when others are opposed. You will let those people with whom you have contact through work, school, friendship or trade know where you stand. You will support those people whose practices are in line with your position and try to influence those whose practices are opposed. You will, at all times, stand by your commitment, especially when it seems most difficult.

WHAT CAN I DO?

One of our most serious problems is that we feel powerless to affect major issues. We fail to realize that, as individuals, we influence other people who, in turn, influence still others. It is only through the cumulative impact of such individual acts that we can effect fundamental change.

Are all your neighbors members of the majority group? If they are, have you ever spoken to them about welcoming members of minority groups to your community? If someone is selling a home, tell him you would welcome a minority family as neighbors. You may find there are others who feel as you do. You can contact realtors in your area and tell them how you feel. Often, they avoid minority group citizens because they are afraid of community reaction.

Look at businesses in your area. Are all the positions, except the most menial, filled by majority group members? Talk to business managers. Tell them you would like to see an effort made to hire and upgrade members of minority groups. If they object to this, tell them you will take your business elsewhere—then do it. No one wants to lose customers.

Have you noticed that all the patients in your doctor's waiting room are white? One reason may be that he discourages minority group patients for fear of losing other patients. Let him know how you feel, and what you think is his professional responsibility. Perhaps you can lessen his fear.

Have you ever stopped to think about the school your child is in? Is he learning American history—or white American history? Let the school know what you want. You may influence a teacher to augment her curriculum. You may get your child a better education.

Do you work in an office or business in which minority group members have a hard time obtaining jobs, or moving up? Talk to your fellow employees about the situation. Let the people who make personnel decisions know your feelings. Volunteer to take on a trainee.

What do you do when you hear others making derogatory remarks or broad generalizations about minorities? Do you answer them? Take a positive stand; put them on the defensive. You may open up a meaningful dialogue. You will make them realize that others don't adhere to or admire their position.

These are some of the ways in which an individual *can* make a difference—ways in which one person can have an effect. Perhaps your greatest influence will be that others who have previously chosen to stay silent and invisible will decide to follow your example and *act*.

If you do not state your position, you and the many who feel as you do will not be represented. Those who disagree with you speak out; it is your responsibility to speak out.

WHAT ABOUT GROUPS?

Personal action involves risk—it means one is willing to rock his own boat. When you're rocking your own boat, it's reassuring to know others are, too. It helps to have people with whom you can share your experiences. Groups provide the support one needs to carry out his personal commitment.

Groups also provide the individual with a source of allies who will join him in tasks too big for one person, and give him the opportunity to join others in the larger, more significant actions.

ACTION LIST

Where you live, you can:

Let your neighbors, landlords, realtors, & minority co-workers know that you welcome neighbors of any race, religion or nationality.

Display fair housing emblem.

Display your join hands window emblem.

If selling—make sure your realtor shows your property to all. Have a nondiscrimination clause in your contract.

In renting—welcome any qualified tenant.

Notify your local fair housing group of any rentals in your neighborhood.

Offer your home as a coffee stop for homeseekers.

Volunteer to go hunting with minority homeseekers.

Join a local fair housing group.

Is your neighborhood all white or all American?

Alert fair housing groups and human relations councils of any problems which arise.

Ask your local realtors for a letter stating their policy on fair housing.

Action: A family living in a semi-rural setting close to the city, in response to an expressed need by Head Start personnel, invited Head Start groups to use their grounds.

Result: Several days a week large numbers of Head Start children, teachers, and parent volunteers use the grounds for a program which includes nature study, fun with farm animals and equipment, and activity in a rustic setting.

In your business or where you work, you can:

Discuss employment practices with co-workers. Press for discussions with management.

Actively recruit minority persons. Use popular publications and those directed toward minority market.

Seek every chance to promote minority employees.

Provide training to upgrade skills.

Volunteer to have a minority student as a trainee.

Hire minority students for part-time and summer jobs.

Work to open up your union or employee organization to minorities. Press for integrated apprenticeships.

Encourage your business contacts to hire minority persons. Refer individuals to them.

Ask your company to state that they are "equal opportunity employers" in their want ads and advertisements.

Place want ads where they will reach the minority market—minority newspapers, magazines such as Ebony.

Deal only with suppliers who are equal opportunity employers. Make this policy public through ads, etc.

Levi Strauss & Co. of S.F. uses the following stamp on all purchase orders:

By accepting this purchase order, seller recognizes that Levi Strauss & Co. requires its suppliers of goods and services to be equal opportunity employers and certifies that it (seller) meets this obligation.

Foster good working relations among all employees.

Clearly state your position to all who work for you.

Seek to have some company funds invested in ghetto-owned and managed financial institutions

Influence your company to establish a subsidiary in the minority community, using local labor and management.

Start a JOIN HANDS group in your company, in your union, in your employee organization.

Display the JOIN HANDS emblem where it can be seen.

Have your company subscribe to the JH business pledge.

Help supply needed transportation for minority employees.

Help find local housing for minority co-workers.

Have your company newsletter announce it will list only apartments and homes available to all. Follow through to make sure it's more than lip service.

In your profession, you can:

Open your practice to serve minority clients.

Work to have your profession render the same quality of service to all persons.

Work within your profession and its societies to eliminate discriminatory practices. Have them take an official stand.

Form a group of colleagues to endorse specific programs or positions on issues. Publicize our stand to public officials, news media and fellow professionals.

Wear your Join Hands button to professional meetings.

Join your colleagues to pressure colleges and universities to recruit and enroll more minority students; to have flexible admission requirements; provide more scholarships, counseling, and tutoring.

Have your colleagues endow scholarships and volunteer as tutors and counselors.

Tell students about your profession and how to prepare for it by forming a group to visit secondary schools in minority communities.

Arrange for after school and summer experiences in your professional area.

Join with colleagues to provide a buddy system beginning with interested 8th and 9th graders, providing tutoring and preparing them for college entrance exams, academic requirements and college life

In your church, social and community organizations, you can:

Encourage membership of minority persons.

Insist upon elimination of any discriminatory practices.

Have your church bulletin organization newsletter publish the Join Hands pledge, endorse its principles.

Plan joint activities and actions with sister churches or groups in minority communities.

Have your church invest funds in integrated housing, minority-owned and managed financial institutions and businesses.

Take a stand and join forces with other churches and groups to fight for constructive change.

Start JH discussion groups, study groups on Kerner Report and related issues.

Establish scholarship/loan funds and camperships for minority students.

Discover needs such as day-care and recreation facilities. Work to fill them.

As an investor, you can:

Make sure businesses you invest in do all they can to increase and upgrade job opportunities.

Invest in financial institutions which serve minority communities and are owned and managed by members of that community.

Buy shares in credit unions which make loans primarily in minority areas.

Make real estate investments only in open housing.

Send a business pledge to every company in which you own stock. Ask for a reply.

Invest a percentage of savings where they are used for integrated housing and minority-run businesses.

Ask your bank's policy.

Action: Someone called a bank which was not making loans in a nearby ghetto area to ask why.

Result: The bank investigated, discovered their appraisers were unwilling to go into the area, and hired someone specially qualified for the job. They further stated they would refuse no qualified applicant.

Help minority persons establish businesses in your neighborhood.

As a citizen, you can:

Support candidates who take a stand and have a history of action; vote accordingly.

Be informed and react to the stands of all officials.

1 Telegram=10 Letters.

Public Opinion Message Telegrams are a bargain. 15 words to any elected official cost 95¢ to state capitols and $1.01 to Washington, D.C.

Hold elected officials responsible for their appointments—be aware of board and commission activities. Present your views to them.

Become aware of discriminatory practices in public departments, agencies, and by public servants such as police and firemen. React to the agency heads and the elected officials responsible.

Send Join Hands pledges to elected and appointed officials. Ask for their endorsement and reaction.

Invite public officials to speak to Join Hands and other groups about their position. State yours.

As a consumer, you can:

Ask businesses about their hiring and promoting practices.

Support those whose position is in line with yours.

Tell the others why you are taking your business elsewhere.

Write letters, verbally support and buy from businesses which:

Practice fair employment.

Invest in ghetto communities.

Conduct training for the unskilled.

Have integrated store displays.

Have integrated advertisements.

Help minority businessmen.

Help solve the housing and transportation problems of minority employees.

Ask all businesses what they do in these areas, and what they plan to do.

To get results: When you contact businesses, contact the person in charge and ask for a written reply.

Let others know what you have found to be the attitude and position of the businesses you contacted.

Have supermarkets post fair housing statements on their bulletin boards so only property open to all may be listed.

Ask stores to display the Join Hands emblem.

Enclose the Join Hands business pledge when you pay your bills. Ask them to let you know what parts of the pledge they are implementing.

Action: One person wrote letters to corporate officers of several large department stores, noting the lack of integrated mannequins and models in the stores' displays and ads.

Result: Responsive replies from store managers, presidents, and even a chairman of the board, stating their concern and citing plans to order new mannequins representing minority figures, and to institute integrated ads.

In education, you can:

Join with informed groups to pressure school boards and administrators.

Attend school board meetings, let your presence counter the vocal opposition.

Look at the curriculum in your schools. Speak out for accurate representation of the part minorities have played in our history.

Action: Some parents in a middle class school asked their principal to work with them to institute a new "honest" American history curriculum, stressing the involvement of all peoples in building this country.

Result: The curriculum was developed and introduced in all grades by the following semester.

Volunteer to provide transportation so minority children can attend your school.

Bring your schools up to date. Insist your district incorporate the newest methods and materials.

Pressure for in-service and sensitivity training for teachers.

Volunteer in your local School Volunteer Program.

Make your voice heard at your P.T.A. Ask them to schedule programs discussing minority culture and history, the Kerner Report and movements such as JOIN HANDS.

Work for better and more relevant job training and vocational education programs.

Check to see if minorities are adequately represented at all levels of school administration. Let the Board know you're looking.

Make sure all schools in your district are providing equal education. Point out inequalities to your Board.

Pressure for compensatory services to close the gap.

Action: Group of L.A. citizens formed HELM Foundation to provide college scholarships to minority students with only average grades but with college potential.

Result: Scholarships provided to several students who are also helped to prepare for college entrance. Money will be raised for many more.

Work for early and continuous contact of children in white and ghetto schools.

To affect the mass media you can:

Write letters, send telegrams, make phone calls. They have impact. Contact top management, commentators, writers.

Praise them when they try to tell the whole story, ask for more of such programs in *prime time*.

Object to unfair or inaccurate presentations.

Request that they portray an integrated society in all stories, layouts, ads, programs and movies. A mass letter writing campaign on this issue to all media, including home and popular magazines, is needed.

Action: A few people wrote Charles Schulz suggesting he add a Black character to his comic strip, *Peanuts*.

Result: He added a Black character.

Ask media to take editorial positions on the problems of race relations, riot reporting, ghetto needs and efforts, problems of poverty, etc.

Ask about the employment practices in all phases of their operation.

The media want to hear from you. In July, John E. Campbell of KABC-TV in L.A. invited letters from viewers on how the station's programming served their needs. Other stations make similar requests. Letters from readers and viewers are read, counted, considered. Make your voice count!

Contact local media to publicize the actions of your group and to expose inequities or discriminatory policies. Find the newsworthy aspect of your story—call reporter or commentator directly. They are accessible and interested.

As an individual, you can:

Let others know where you stand at all times. Speak out whenever you witness an injustice.

Challenge any bigoted remarks.

Wear your Join Hands button, display your bumper sticker and window emblem.

Carry Join Hands pledges wherever you go. Show them at every opportunity.

Keep informed, so that you can inform.

Look around you, become aware of situations that need changing.

Write, Write, Write. Set aside at least one hour a week. Thoughtful letters get results.

Join a Join Hands Discussion Group. Invite some "on-the-fence" friends.

Offer your home as a Join Hands Neighborhood Center.

Volunteer at Join Hands headquarters. Be at the heart of things.

Support the work of groups such as Fair Housing, Human Relations Councils, Urban Coalitions, etc.

Add your strength to their numbers.

Have your local library build a collection on the history and culture of minorities.

Be honest. Be more effective. Confront your own fears and prejudices.

Be true to your commitment at all times.

Moments of choice: You have countless opportunities during any day to act, speak up, write—to effect positive change. Will you use them?

BUT HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN THE GHETTO?

No, we have not forgotten the ghetto. The problems of the ghetto are with us in everything we do. Our purpose is not merely to eliminate the problems of the ghetto, but to attack those aspects of society and its institutions which perpetuate it. These exist in your community, not in the ghetto.

If you have the opportunity to work in the ghetto, you must realize a dual responsibility. You must not only fulfill your commitment there but you must bring back what you have learned to the community in which you live. Our goal only can be accomplished if you match your work in the ghetto with work in your own community.

IF YOU ARE ASKING . . . ?

If, when you ask, "What can I do?," you are asking, "What can I do that is easy, comfortable, and takes very little time?," the answer is, "Not enough to make a difference!."

If, after reading this booklet, you still are asking, "What can I do?," What are you *really* asking?

Action Booklet Committee: Jacquie Richman, Editor; Janice Bernstein; Lois Friedman; Joy Lowe; Michaele Pearce.

All those whose ideas for action are in this book.

Join hands, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

JOIN HANDS

The time is past for studies, commissions, and reports. The time is here for real and rapid change. White Americans must take relevant, concrete action to do away with injustices which have been tacitly condoned through apathy and indifference. This means not only a just and equitable distribution of social and economic power among all groups, but a just and equitable distribution of decision making power as well. It means free movement of all persons within all areas of society.

Each one of us must see himself, his neighbors, his community, and his country in a new light, realizing that the future of all Americans will be determined by the white response to the present crisis. Each person must resolve to engage himself actively in an immediate effort to make that response one which will ensure America's future as a free, open society.

White Americans ready to respond to this challenge have felt isolated or alienated and powerless. Often invisible to each other or defensive about their position, they have worked in small groups in frustration or lapsed into silent despair. Though feeling a concern, they have had no purchase on the challenge.

Join Hands has broken through this isolation and defensiveness to provide a visible unifying force, strong in numbers. Broadly based, through shared goals, it converts readiness to respond into positive, effective action.

How can *you* act to meet the challenge? You can.

1. Involve friends, neighbors, coworkers, employers, and organizations by encouraging them to adhere to the Join Hands pledge to exhibit the emblem in their home windows and on car bumpers, and to send all of these to newspapers, organizations, public officials, and influential leaders of business and industry. Join Hands will send you copies of the pledge, window emblems, bumper stickers, and buttons. Our goal is involvement and commitment through exposure.

2. Organize discussion groups in which you and your friends can examine your attitudes toward the ten points of the pledge, to bring about inward and outward change where necessary and to illuminate your own feelings about the issues involved. Contact Join Hands for trained discussion leaders.

3. Develop groups especially interested in working on specific programs to implement the pledge. Join hands to support existing agencies and organizations already working in these areas—education, housing, employment, etc. We assist and cooperate with these groups, but do not affiliate with them. Join Hands will, with your permission, put such groups in touch with you.

4. Send the Join Hands message across America encouraging others to declare their commitment to its principles and so create a tidal wave of positive public response. Join in forming new chapters of Join Hands. Materials and other assistance are available.

We welcome your support, your ideas, your involvement. Send in the form at the bottom of the Join Hands Pledge with your contribution and marked according to your interests. You will be called by a telephone interviewer for information to help you get into action. If you indicate interest in discussion groups, you will be contacted about them by mail.

JOIN HANDS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Janice Bernstein, Chairman; Nancy York; Ethel Haydon.

Join Hands—Post Office Box 49955, Los Angeles, California. Telephones: 472-8292; 472-6889.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PLEDGE

As one engaged in busines or industry, I recognize and affirm that my company and I have a special responsibility to create a society in which all people may partake equally in the opportunities for economic growth and achievement.

I therefore make the following moral commitment:

1. To seek out and eliminate any subtle and pervasive, as well as any overt, prejudicial practices within my company.

2. To investigate my company's recruitment, evaluation, and hiring practices, and strive to remove any requirements that unduly restrict the employment of the disadvantaged.

3. To acquaint the supervisors under my jurisdiction with the principles of this commitment and encourage their support in its implementation.

4. To establish an active program which will prepare employees within my area of responsibility to meet the challenges of working within an integrated work force and, in particular, of working under minority supervisors.

5. To recognize and understand the special problems of the unskilled and hard-core unemployables. I will attempt to solve these problems as they arise and will not abandon my responsibility.

6. To examine my company's training, job evaluation, and promotion criteria, and to make whatever changes I can to insure equal opportunity for achievement and advancement.

7. To seek out and trade with those companies which provide fair employment and advancement opportunities and, wherever reasonable, trade with companies which are minority owned and operated.

8. To encourage my company to take all positive steps, e.g., by investment of funds, to build and strengthen ghetto owned and managed financial institutions, commerce, and industry.

9. I recognize my moral and social obligation to involve my business associates in this commitment, and to require my social, fraternal, business, and professional organizations to recognize and attack the problems of prejudice in jobs and business.

10. This is my personal commitment to action. To the fullest extent of my authority, I will take all positive steps to promote the aims of this pledge within my company. I realize that the fulfillment of these aims will require the expenditure of time and funds, but I consider it a sound investment in the future of America.

John Hands Business and Industry Committee, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, California. Telephone: 472-6889.

WHAT IS A NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER?

A Join Hands Neighborhood Center is a home.

A home open one morning, afternoon, or evening a week for a gathering . . . to talk about how you and your neighbors can further Join Hands objectives.

A home where people can pick up Join Hands pledges and literature.

A home where people know the problem is critical . . . so critical they will share their time and home with neighbors who also know that . . . Together We Can Make A Difference.

CENTRAL

Bruce Fleming, 2326 Fargo St., Los Angeles, CA 90039, 664-5804, Open Monday, 7-10 p.m.

Mr. & Mrs. Dick Friedman, 509 W. Evergreen St., Apt. 5, Inglewood, CA 90302, 776-1380, Call for time.

Norah Cunningham, 629 S. Hobart, Apt. 2, Los Angeles, CA 90006, 382-6864, Monday 8-10 p.m.

WEST

Cathryn Dixon, 2801 Brighton Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90018, 731-3029, Please call for time.

Mr. & Mrs. Marvin Blum, 1101 N. Kenter Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90049, Open Tuesday, 7-10 p.m.

Anne Lowhar, 912-6th St., Apt. 4, Santa Monica, CA 90403, 393-2186, Open Wednesday, 1-4 p.m.

SOUTH

Betsy Foster, 22609 Iris Ave., Torrance, CA 90505, 326-3863, Open Tuesday & Wednesday, 9 a.m. to noon.

Sylvia Lawlor, 2522 W. 234th St., Torrance, CA 90505, 325-5978, Open any time.

Sandy Sarris, 1140 Shelley St., Manhattan Beach, CA 372-9370, Open Friday, 2-5 p.m.

Rev. Robert Shepard, St. Paul's Methodist Church, 2600 Nelson Ave., Redondo Beach, CA 370-7449 (church), 542-2718 (home), Open Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Rosie Sundeen, 234 28th St., Hermosa Beach, CA 376-1141, Open Tuesday, 4:00-8:30 p.m.

VALLEY

Mrs. Robert Cole, 5752 Ventura Canyon, Van Nuys, CA 91401, 781-6095, Open Monday through Thursday, 3:30-6:30 p.m.

Marjorie Britt, 2025 Lucas St., San Fernando, CA 91340, 365-4839, Call for time.

Mrs. Dixie Langdon, 6000 Wish Ave., Encino, CA 343-4085, Open Tuesday and Wednesday, 7-9 p.m.

Carolyn Rothberg, 4518 Valdez Place, Tarzana, CA 91356, 987-1288, Open Wednesday, 9-11:30 a.m. and Friday, 1-5 p.m.

SAUGUS

Mrs. Ray Schaefer, 20114 Fairweather, Saugus, CA 91350, 805/252-5047, Please call for time.

CHINA LAKE

Mr. and Mrs. William Arnold, 61 A Stroop Ave., China Lake, CA 93555, 714/375-7186, Please call for time. Mailing address: Join Hands, P.O. Box 5401, China Lake, CA 93555.

NORTHEAST

Mrs. J. L. Haight, P.O. Box 403, Verdugo City, CA 91046, 249-1541. Center will be at: Foothill Christian Church (Education Bldg.), 4459 Lowell Ave. (at Foothill), La Crescenta, Open Thursday, 11 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Mrs. Manon Washburn, 10642 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, 353-9577. Open every day, 4-7 p.m.

Mrs. Dollie Smith, 1384 Sunset Ave., Pasadena, CA 91103, 681-9088. Open Friday, 9 a.m.-Noon.

Mrs. James C. Robuck, 415 Oxford Dr., Arcadia, CA 91006, 447-0461, Open Friday, 10 a.m.-Noon.

ORANGE COUNTY

Terri McDonald, 9052 Jennrich, Westminster, CA 714/892-0688. Open Tuesday, noon-2 p.m.

Mrs. David Ewart, 1285 S. Cobblestone Rd., La Habra, CA 90631, 213/943-2884. Open Wednesday, 7 p.m.-10 p.m.

Neighborhood Center Committee Members:

CENTRAL

Carmela Bosko, 606 N. Citrus Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90036, 936-5534. (Does not have a Center.)

WEST

Marge Schnitzer, 1938 Comstock, Los Angeles, CA 277-2234. (Does not have a Center.)

ORANGE COUNTY

Mary Ewart, (see listing).

VALLEY

Carolyn Rothberg, (see listing).

If you, too, want to be a Neighborhood Center Volunteer, or if you have offered and have not yet been contacted, please call Lois Friedman, Neighborhood Center Coordinator, 776-1380.

A NEXT STEP TOWARD JOIN HANDS ACTION—DISCUSSION GROUPS

Why. To review and explain the ten points of the Join Hands pledge. Group interaction to lead to the discovery of shared goals, bring out action ideas and explore how they can be carried out. To find out where each individual is in his personal commitment to action.

What. One two-and-a-half hour meeting a week for three consecutive weeks with a skilled discussion leader furnished by Join Hands. If the group wishes, it then may continue to meet on its own to permit a continued sharing of information, turning up of new action projects and deepening of commitment.

Who. You and ten-to-fifteen other people. Groups should include several persons who have signed the pledge, as well as others who are unwilling or hesitant to sign it but want to talk about it and their feelings about it.

How. Choose one of the following, and check your choice on the form below. (Please acquaint all those whom you invite to a group with the purpose and goals of the discussion.)

1. You join, individually, a group recruited by Join Hands.

2. You invite a few others, including non-signers, to a Join Hands discussion group to which other signers and their guests will be invited by Join Hands.

3. You recruit a complete Join Hands discussion group (including non-signers).

4. And host the meetings of the group.

When. Day or evening. Starting as soon as we can arrange it together.

JOIN HANDS GOAL FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

That signers be strengthened in their commitment to action and the aims of the Join Hands pledge. That non-signers be helped to understand the aims of the pledge and, perhaps, be moved to take steps toward personal commitment to action.

For further information regarding groups, call GR 2-9779.

For Join Hands information, call 472-6889.

RETURN COUPON FOR JOIN HANDS DISCUSSION GROUPS

1. I will join a Join Hands discussion group.

2. I will invite some others, including non-signers, to a Join Hands discussion group.

3. I will recruit a complete Join Hands discussion group.

4. I will be host for a Join Hands discussion group.

Preferred day of week —— Preferred time: Day —— Evening ——.

Name ———— Phone ———.

Address ———— Zipcode ———.

A volunteer will call you after you return this form in order to set time, place and date of the group meeting and to let you know who the discussion leader will be.

JOIN HANDS FIRST ANNIVERSARY ISSUE CALENDAR OF ACTION—HIGHLIGHTS OF A GROWING YEAR

APRIL 1968

Apr 5 Birth of Join Hands.

**Apr 8 So. Calif. Clergymen distribute pledge.

Apr. 12 400 signatures & money for pledge ad in L.A. Times secured.

Apr 12 News conference announcing Join Hands—extensive TV & radio coverage.

Apr 14 Ad in Easter Sunday edition, L.A. Times.

**Apr 20 Convening of experts to initiate JH discussion program.

**Apr 21 First mailing of pledges, bumper stickers, guide to action, etc.

**A continuing activity of Join Hands.

MAY 1968

Formation of JH Board of Directors.

JH incorporated in State of Calif. as non-profit corp. May 28.

**First membership cards issued May 28.

**Formation of Business & Industry Committee.

**First newsletter published.

**Published first bibliography.

**First pilot encounter group.

**JH buttons produced & distributed.

3 hr. interview with Minta Palmer, KLAC, Two Way Radio.

**First of 3 session JH discussion groups.

JUNE 1968

JH Working Conference, "A Time of Urgency," June 8. 200 attended.

**Education Committee formed, June 8.

**Business & Industry pledge written & distributed.

**KNXT first station to carry JH public service spots. Beginning of JH campaign to create climate of opinion geared to action.

**Training session for discussion group leaders.

JH seminar at Inter-Com '68, Palos Verdes.

Feature article by Jack Jones in L. A. Times June 5.

JULY 1968

*Formation of JH Chapters in Orange County, So. Bay Area, China Lake

*TV & radio spots distributed to every station in area

*Orientation for group discussion leaders

AUGUST 1968

3-day JH exhibit at Watts Summer Festival, by invitation

*In Newsletter #2 start campaign to transfer savings to minority owned & managed savings institutions.

Orientation for encounter & discussion leaders, followed by 2-day training sessions. Aug. 5, 17, 18

Speech at Annual Workshop in Human Relations, SF Valley State College

SEPTEMBER 1968

*First printing of Action Booklet—10,000 copies

JH & UCLA co-sponsor Conference, "Profit Motive & Social Responsibility" at UCLA. Over 60 companies participate. Covered by KNXT news.

*First Neighborhood Centers established.

*Formation of Action Committee

Operation Awareness Conference, Arcadia—Sept. 28, JH Seminars

OCTOBER 1968

*KFWB records JH individual action spots, with intensive use thru Feb. '69.

*2 Day Discussion Leader Training Workshop

Oct. 30—3 hr. interview KGEE, radio Bakersfield "Private Line"

Heavily attended So. Bay Chapter organizing & fund raising party

*UCLA Research Library requested copies of all JH publications for student & public reference

Oct. 26—Successful emergency fund appeal—"Non-Dinner" night

Participation in Everywoman's Village Community Involvement Conference

JH student group forms in Mira Costa High School.

NOVEMBER 1968

*First JH Open House (Nov. 8)

*Business & Industry Committee forms sub-committees to help establish minority group small businesses; for referral & job placement & to organize "in-plant" JH groups. (Nov. 14)

*JH joins Community Relations Conference of So. Calif.

JH panelists participate with Bishop Pike & others in Bearings for Re-establishment Conference, "Communication Between Communities".

AAUW Conference, "Crisis in our Cities," uses JH material & discussion leaders.

JH presentation to Jewish Fed. Council, S.F. Valley Area Council.

DECEMBER 1968

*Newsletter #3 inaugurates "Letter to your Elected Officials" action project for JH members.

JH guests on TEMPO, KHJ-TV; From The Inside Out, KTTV, and Reach Out, L.A. City Schools program on Ch. 28, KCET.

*Formation of Bakersfield Chapter

*Start of B/1 Committee project "Write a Letter to a Corporation"

*In Newsletter #3, Action Committee encourages support of East L.A. Education needs.

JANUARY 1969

*Beginning of JH Education Workshop Series—6 meetings—co-sponsored by Education Commission, Westwood United Methodist Church. Over 650 people involved in series.

Feature Article by Maggie Savoy in L.A. Times (Jan. 12)

*All day orientation for Neighborhood Center Volunteers.

Interview on BOUTIQUE, KNXT

Interview on KLAC radio, with Len Hilburn re Education Series

*Westdale-Mar Vista JH Community Section formed.

FEBRUARY 1969

Mailed 1000 JH Kits in response to requests in Jan. & Feb.

"Crisis in Education" series co-sponsored by American Assoc. of Univ. Women, S.F. Valley Branch, Valley Interfaith Commission & JH in Feb. and March.

*Formation of JH Seattle, Wash., Chapter.

*First monthly meeting of JH "Committee of the Whole"

KNXT-TV news coverage of Education Series

JH, B/1 Committee presentation to L.A. Chapter, Assoc. for Computing Machinery

MARCH 1969

*Public Relations Society of America, L.A. Chapter, offers support for JH for 1969 & will promote JH concepts & philosophies throughout So. Calif.

*JH helps stimulate formation of city-wide Education Coalition

JH designated as tax-exempt organization by Internal Revenue Service

*Formation of "JH for Youth Action", student resource & organizing group.

*Franz Wambaugh designs & donates JH Awards of Merit. Rod Serling accepts Award's Chairmanship.

JH Action Booklet used by school district superintendents & board members at L.A. County Schools seminar.

Every student & teacher at a high school in Syracuse, New York, is wearing the JH button.

*Kick-off meeting, Pleasure Faire fund raising event (3/31)

JH "Strategies for Action" workshop led by Dr. Eva Schindler-Rainman

*JH Education Sub-Committee on Excellence formed.

APRIL 1969

**7,000 people have joined JOIN HANDS.

**65,000 pledges circulated on request (no mailing lists used).

**13,000 Action Booklets distributed on request. Requests for many thousands more not filled due to inadequate funds for printing.

**1,000 people have taken part in discussion & encounter group series.

**10,000 Bumper Stickers distributed.

**20,000 Newsletters circulated.

**35 Neighborhood Centers opened.

25 plus states, in addition to Calif., distributing JH material.

**JH Pledge reprinted as ad in regional newspapers & included in hundreds of publications nationwide.

2 Day Discussion Leader Training Workshop.

JH material distributed at annual Social Action Conference of Jewish Religious Concern, in L.A.

Janice Bernstein speaks at School for Community Action Workshop, Seattle, Wash.

MAY 1969

Jobs to start—or finish

May 11—Renaissance Pleasure Faire fund raising.

**Button Month—wide distribution & wearing of JH buttons.

**Renewal of Memberships—Each JH member is asked to remind himself to renew his year's membership when due.

Telephone Tree—So JH members can be alerted to issues.

Expansion of Education Committees into sub-committees on excellence, community power, etc.

Expansion to other States & Cities.

Becoming adequately funded.

JH Awards of Merit ceremony.

(NOTE.—The most important activity of Join Hands, not listed in this Calendar, is the every day action by the thousands of individuals who singly or in groups of their choice live out their commitment to the Join Hands pledge.)

Join Hands, P.O. Box 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

JOIN HANDS NEWSLETTER

THE JOIN HANDS FOCUS

The Join Hands focus is on action which members of the majority group can take in their own community to bring about racial justice & equality.

The Join Hands pledge is both a minimal standard of commitment & a tool. When a person looks at the ten points & decides, honestly, which ones he can support & which ones he can't—yet—he finds where he is & has a point from which he can start to act. Join Hands publications such as the business pledge, the newsletter & the action booklet, "What I Can Do," give him concrete pathways to action.

Join Hands committees act as support & catalysts for individual action & provide possibilities for group action where appropriate.

WE'RE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Join Hands is designated as a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service. This allows donors to deduct all contributions made to Join Hands from April, 1968, on their Federal & State income tax returns. Also deductible are all out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a JH volunteer. You may take 1968 contributions on your 1969 return if you have already filed your 1968 return without taking them.

All friends of Join Hands who contribute through A.I.D. (Associated In-Group Donors) where they work may now specify Join Hands as a recipient of their A.I.D. gift.

Join Hands, as a non-political, non-profit citizens group, receives no government funds, & is supported entirely by individual contributions.

MEMBERSHIP

Join Hands membership categories are:
Basic member, $5 to $10.
Supporting member, $10 to $25.
Donor, $25 to $50.
Sponsor, $50 to $100.
Patron, $100 & up.
Membership dues are renewable yearly.

JOIN HANDS BELIEVES

No one should feel his support of the rights of minorities is an act of charity. It is in his self-interest to work for massive improvements in such areas as jobs, housing, & education. This action must take place where one lives & works, because that's where his power to insure fundamental change in the basic political, social, & economic institutions lies.

The alternative is repression. If we take that course, we shall end by repressing ourselves.

One nation, indivisible, with liberty & justice for all is not merely an ideal goal, it is a format for the preservation of our free society.

JOIN HANDS OPEN HOUSE

Set aside the second Friday night of each month for the Join Hands Open House. Standard fare: a brief orientation, spirited discussion, coffee, cake, new friends.

Call—472-6889—For Time & Place.

BLACK POWER, BROWN POWER ARE YOU AFRAID OF IT?

We in Join Hands welcome the emergence of Black & Brown Power in the minority communities.

We see it as the social, economic, & political power to bring about self-determination.

Only with the creation of united communities based upon self-respect, pride & control of community affairs can a true, lateral cooperation occur between all groups in our society.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Join Hands is incorporated in the State of California as a non-profit, educational & charitable corporation. Present members of its Board of Directors are: Janice Bernstein, President; Nancy York, Treasurer; Ethel Haydon, Secretary; Arnett Hartsfield, Jr., Dr. Philip Oderberg, Jacquie Richman, Ralph Bernstein & Winthrop D. Grove.

You may want to know: Telephone Numbers.

Here are numbers of some other broadly-based community organizations in the L.A. area:

California State service centers multiagency for assistance

To offer meaningful jobs to minority persons call & ask for employment section:

South Central, 567-1151.

East L.A., 264-5100.

Venice, 392-4811.

Community Relations Conference of So. Calif.

Promotes better human relations thru intergroup cooperation. 295-2607.

Fair Housing Groups.

Housing Opportunities Center, 296-6840.

Metropolitan Fair Housing, 296-6840.

San Fernando Valley Fair Housing, 981-6940.

Westside Fair Housing, 473-0940.

Los Angeles City Commission on Human Relations, 624-5211, Ext. 1287.

Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, 677-1168, Ext. 63521.

National Alliance of Businessmen Providing Jobs for Poor & Underemployed, 749-2474.

Urban League, Greater Los Angeles, 731-8851.

Greater L.A. Urban Coalition, 749-3088.

Community organization dealing with urban problems.

Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 2824 S. Western Ave. L.A. 90018, 732-7143.

School volunteers

Become directly involved with children in the schools—and go on from there. Call Sarah Davis, Supervisor of the L.A. City Schools Volunteer Program, 628-2284, Ext. 20.

Roster of public officials

To find names & addresses of your local, state & federal officials send for the "Roster of Public Officials" published by the L.A. Chamber of Commerce at $.50 per copy. Send request to Government Relations Department, L.A. Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 3696, Terminal Annex, L.A.

Samples of the handy information contained therein: 1) Address all mail to U.S. Senators to Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; 2) All mail to U.S. Congressmen to House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; 3) During sessions, address all mail to California State Legislature to State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

Information source

The League of Women Voters can give you the answer to such questions as, "Who's my Assemblyman?" or "When does the term of the current Board of Education expire?" Also has excellent research available on many issues.

For L.A. City, 938-3251

For L.A. County, 481-2582

Phone numbers for information

L.A. Rumor Control & Information Center Call 29NAACP.

Dial An Issue—DU 6-6766 Mon.-Fri.

Join Hands Phone Numbers

Headquarters—472-6889, Open 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays.

Discussion groups—To join a group or host one, call Dolly Carr, 472-9779.

Business & industry committee—372-6889 Letters to corporations, George Elbaum, 474-5609

Education committee—472-6889, Sub-Committee on School Excellence, call Judy Gertler, 467-9301, or Susann Bauman, 279-2135, Sub-Committee on School-Community Advisory group, call Pearl Brickman, 475-3084

Neighborhood centers—to form one, call Lois Friedman, Neighborhood Center Coordinator, 776-1380.

Join hands for youth action (student organizing & resource group)—Call Carol Doose, 393-8838, Marilyn Hornberg 657-1378 or 472-6889.

Fund raising—to plan projects & to help carry out projects now under way, call Harold Boswell, 625-3611, Ext. 65723 (days) or 935-6808 (eves.)

Action committee—Chairman, Jacquie Richman, 823-3047 or 472-6889.

Referral & resource service—Ongoing linkage of individuals & groups with community & media resources as well as with others having similar interests & goals—472-6889.

Speakers bureau—Call Lois Friedman, 776-1380.

Want to put your savings to work?

Write Join Hands for a nationwide list of minority owned & managed banks & savings associations. Join Hands, P.O. Box. 49955, Los Angeles, Calif.

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND "PAIN AND SUFFERING"

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during his vacation with the bankers in Copenhagen, Denmark, William McChesney Martin had much to say about the "pain and suffering" that the Nation would have to go through to control inflation.

In his speech, Mr. Martin made it plain that he was talking about the little people and not the big boys, the bankers, when he mentioned "pain and suffering."

Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine, for July 7, 1969, carries an excellent roundup which plainly establishes that it is the little guy—the small businessman, the farmer, the student, and the housewife—who must bear the brunt of William McChesney Martin's "pain and suffering" because of the current high level of interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this article:

PAIN AND SUFFERING

A Houston tortilla manufacturer can't buy desperately needed new equipment. A Chicago college junior may not be going back to school this fall. A Novato, Calif., contractor has fewer homes to sell. The owner of an Atlanta computer firm will probably have to take in partners. Four Bridgeport, Conn., merchants may be evicted from their stores.

These were just a handful of the many thousands of Americans whose lives were being altered last week by the credit squeeze that was begun in December by the nation's central bank, the Federal Reserve. The squeeze, which aims at slowing economic growth and inflation by restricting the amount of money available for spending, affected state and municipal bonds first. Many localities can pay no more than 4½ or 5 per cent interest, and other rates have soared so high that lenders have refused to buy the municipals. Next the squeeze hit housing, as many banks, preferring the higher interest yields available on consumer and business loans, stopped issuing new mortgages. Finally, in the last month, money has grown so tight that banks are rationing credit to just about everyone.

IT HURTS

As always, the squeeze is hitting the least credit-worthy small businesses and individuals hardest. Big corporations and wealthy individuals who are willing to pay current interest rates, which start at 8½ per cent and mount skyward, can still get credit for most reasonable projects. "We're being selective and making better loans," said one Los Angeles banker. "But if a man has good credit and good earning potential, we have the money to help him." From there, the pinch shades into men like Novato, Calif., builder Richard Elam, who normally has about fifteen new homes for sale at any given time but is cutting this inventory in half to ease the pressure of his carrying charges. Lawrence Gwin, president of Psychological Computer Analysis in Atlanta, is a step down on the credit ladder. Gwin had expected to get a bank loan to launch his brand-new company's first sales drive but will now have to seek private partners and give them part of his company.

Also left out in the cold are Dennis Goode, who planned to start his junior year at Northern Illinois University this fall, and Gilbert Moreno, owner of La Monita Tortilla factory in Houston. Goode has been turned down for a $1,500 student loan by the bank that supplied him with previous credit. "I just don't know what I'll do," says Goode. Moreno could triple his $6,000- to $7,000-a-month sales volume if he could borrow $20,000 for new equipment, but a loan—if he could get it—would cost him about 10½ per cent. He can't afford it. "The business is there . . ." says Moreno with a helpless shrug.

Some of the effects of the squeeze are bizarre. A Chicago banker tells of a businessman who balked at paying 10 per cent for a loan to meet his income-tax payments. The man told the loan officer that the Internal Revenue Service only charges 6 per cent on overdue taxes and "I'll take that for a while rather than pay you 10." But for other businessmen caught in the crunch, the problems are far less casual.

SEEING RED

There are scattered reports of bankruptcies among businessmen whose credit has dried up. But the case of four small-business men in Bridgeport, Conn., who between them operate a liquor store, a record store and a supermarket, is more typical. Their building is for sale at a bargain $200,000 and on the strength of a verbal commitment from a bank loan officer, who offered a $130,000 mortgage, they committed $20,000 in earnest money guaranteeing to close the deal by July 15. Now the bank is balking at giving the mortgage. What's more, a rich speculator is likely to buy the property and, since their leases expire soon, they face eviction or the payment of exorbitant new rents to the new buyer. "My God," says one of the shaken merchants, "what's the world coming to?"

And so the squeeze goes on, drawing increasing cries of anguish from those affected. There promises to be little relief in the period immediately ahead. Last week, the Fed tightened the credit crunch on U.S. banks by proposing restrictions on their ability to borrow dollars on deposit in Europe. As Federal Reserve chairman William McChesney Martin has said, the nation faces continued "pain and suffering" before money eases up.

HISTORY OF AMVETS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1969 is a year of great significance for one of the Nation's leading veterans organizations, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam). This year the organization, famous for its Silver Helmet Service awards, celebrates its silver anniversary as an organization whose goals, first established 25 years ago, have the same relevancy today; namely, to promote world peace, to preserve the American way of life, and to help veterans in the transition from military to civilian life.

This year, which also marks the 25th anniversary of D-Day finds AMVETS redoubling their efforts to assist the returning Vietnam veterans with their problems just as they helped one another following World War II and later Korean veterans since this organization, by congressional charter, includes both Korean and Vietnam veterans in its membership.

In addition, AMVETS work unceasingly toward the cause of world peace and the preservation of the American way of life, with particular stress on the necessity for the involvement of youth in these programs because, as an organization created from the chaos of war and the disintegration of some of the nations involved in that war, AMVETS is particularly aware of the need for every American to work toward these goals to keep our Nation strong.

I joined AMVETS in 1947 and am proud to be a life member of Post No. 2, Culver City, Calif.

A history of AMVETS follows:

HISTORY OF AMVETS

Truly AMVETS was born in the midst of war, for it was in August 1943, with victory still two years away, that a new organization, later to be known as American Veterans of World War II, had its beginning. Overseas the tide of battle was turning. Allies had swept through North Africa and Sicily. In the Pacific fighting raged in New Guinea. Thousands of Americans had made the supreme sacrifice. Hundreds of others were being mustered out of uniform with battle wounds and medical discharges. These men who fought in history's greatest war found it natural to seek each other's company. They were united by similar experiences . . . in jungles, in the Arctic, in deserts, in mountains, at sea, and in the skies. Thus, out of such comradeship, AMVETS came to be.

Two independent veterans clubs in Washington, D.C.—one formed on the campus of George Washington University, the other among veterans employed by the government—joined together to sponsor a servicemen's party. By September 1944 other such veterans clubs organized throughout America—in California, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Texas. On November 11, 1944, Veterans Day, an article entitled "12,000,000 in Search of a Leader" appeared in *Collier's Magazine*. This story, written by Walter Davenport, introduced the clubs and outlined their mutual aims—1. To promote world peace, 2. To preserve the American Way of Life, and 3. To help the veteran help himself. In December, 18 leaders, representing these nine groups, met in Kansas City, Missouri. There a national organization was formed, and it was on Decembetr 9, 1944 the name "American Veterans of World War II" was chosen. The word AMVETS, coined by a newspaper reporter, soon became the official name. The "White Clover," a flower which thrives in freedom throughout the world, is symbolic of the struggle during World War II and is the adopted flower of AMVETS.

In October 1945, two months after the end of World War II, the first national convention was called in Chicago. In 1946 AMVETS petitioned Congress for a federal charter. AMVETS, having displayed dignity and sound approach to National problems, won the deep respect of Congress, and on July 23, 1947, President Harry S. Truman signed AMVETS Charter. The words of the Senate Judiciary Committee echoed throughout the land: "the veterans of World War II are entitled to their own organization" and AMVETS being "organized along sound lines and for worthy purposes . . . having demonstrated its strength and stability, is entitled to the standing and dignity which a national charter will afford." President Truman also commented, "Were I a veteran of this war, I would prefer to have a veteran of World War II looking after my affairs than a veteran of some other war." To this day no other World War II veterans groups has been so honored.

When war broke out in Korea in 1950 and again during the Viet Nam crisis in 1966, AMVETS requested Congress to amend the charter so that those serving in the Armed Forces would be eligible for membership. On September 14, 1966 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the bill redefining the eligibility dates for AMVET membership—"Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940 and on or before the date of cessation of hostilities as determined by the government of the United States is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation."

The first National Headquarters for AMVETS was rented quarters at 724—Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Then on April 18, 1952 President Truman dedicated the first AMVETS-owned National Headquarters. This building, a five-story townhouse, was located at 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. For fifteen years this building served Headquarters and the National Service Foundation. In 1965 AMVETS moved to a temporary location, and the historic townhouse was torn down. On the same site appeared a modern three-story structure of marble and glass. On the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Congressional Charter, July 23, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson dedicated the new building. During the program a beautiful life-like bronze bust of the President was unveiled by Mrs. Johnson. All AMVETS take pride in the Headquarters for the executive offices and conference rooms are most attractive and functional. The Service, Legislative, Accounting, and Public Relations Departments as well as Mailing, Printing and Production rooms are housed in the new building. Its construction and dedication mark a major milestone for AMVETS.

Hourly from Headquarters a Carillon, donated by Schulmerich Carillons, Inc., chimes and then at specific times musical classics resound through the area. These bells are significant of the other AMVET Carillons throughout the United States. The Memorial Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery to honor the memory of those who died in the service of their country was the first installation. This console is in the Arlington amphitheatre overlooking the Tombs of the Unknowns. It was on December 21, 1949 that AMVETS presented the Carillon to the nation with the message: "While these bells ring, safely rest, freedom lives." AMVET Carillons also are now located aboard the USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, at the Garden of Patriots at Cape Coral, Florida, Truman Library in Missouri, Jefferson Barracks in Missouri, State Capitol in Salt Lake City, Utah, the Golden Gate National Cemetery in California.

The "Green Hats" of AMVETS have served the hospitalized veteran, the retarded child, the shoeless orphan, and the lonely serviceman. However, the granting of scholarships has been a major endeavor of AMVETS. Each year many scholarships are awarded deserving students. This program, originated in 1952 and has awarded $250,000 in study grants. Positive Americanism, Youth Programs, Veterans Services, as well as participation in the World Veterans Federation, United Nations, All-American Conference to Combat Communism, and Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge all mean that AMVETS take a realistic approach to the problems of the day.

In 1954 the first AMVET Silver Helmet Award—a replica of the G.I. helmets of World War II—was presented to General George Marshall for his "enormous contributions to the United States in war and in peace." Subsequently Silver Helmets have been presented to other great Americans. Recipients include Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Kennedy, Vice President Nixon, Comedian Bob Hope, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Dr. Ralph Bunche.

A network of trained National Service Officers across the country provide free expert advice to veterans and veterans' dependents. Annually these officers handle thousands of claims and obtain various benefits for the deserving veterans. These involve hospitalization, disability compensation, and educational benefits.

AMVETS keep a watchful eye and take an active part in the legislation on "The Hill". Action on pending Congressional bills is based on the assumption that "the veteran will ultimately benefit from any measure that benefits the nation and, conversely, any program not good for the country as a whole cannot be good for the veteran." AMVETS are especially proud of their roles in the enactment of the "Korean G.I. Bill of Rights" and the "Cold War Bill of Rights." Domestic issues, national defense, and foreign relations are issues of importance and grave concern to AMVETS.

AMVETS offers to its members many personal services. Life insurance, hospital coverage, discount drugs, and travel tours are such programs; however, the associations and friendships of fellow-AMVETS is without doubt the most valued benefit of AMVET membership. In addition, participation in the many service programs, whether it be Americanism, Civil Defense, Traffic Safety, or Rehabilitation, will provide a reward of real personal satisfaction. AMVETS is truly a family organization. Wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of AMVETS are eligible for membership in AMVETS Auxiliary, while sons and daughters between 7 and 17 years of age may join Jr. AMVETS. The Fun and Honor Group of AMVETS is known as the Sad Sacks, while its counterpart in the Auxiliary is the Sacketts. Each subsidiary organization, including the National Service Foundation, is governed by its own Constitution and elects its own officers; however, all activities are geared to further the aims and purposes of the parent organization, AMVETS.

Time marches on, and AMVETS continue to work to attain world peace so that every man can live fearlessly under free skies, to make the United States an ever-better land of "freedom for all", and to help the veteran, his widow and orphan live happily as contributing members of society.

Today AMVETS boasts a membership of 200,000, displays a new Headquarters Building in the Nation's Capitol, praises the efforts of dedicated AMVET leaders, and walks side by side with the other veteran groups. However, an organization cannot be measured by size and official recognition alone. The assistance and consideration to one's fellowman gains the greatest respect and admiration. Thus, "a common sense philosophy" has guided AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, to take the proper action—always keeping faith with the veterans but never losing the respect of the American people.

"We Fought Together—Let's Build Together".

SEX MORALITY GAINS MOMENTUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the sex pushers are now obviously on the defensive and they cannot sell the public their sordid product.

The moral indignation of mature and concerned mothers and dads has stemmed from efforts to exploit the sexuality of their young children under a camouflage of education. But, it is compounded by the proven record that every fied of endeavor preempted by bureaucrats and their intellectual corps has wound up taxed, socialized, or destroyed.

The sex revolution—an obvious invasion of every individual's right to privacy and morality—has been sneaked into the classroom by the self-appointed guardians of licentiousness who now challenge society to take corrective action to remove this smut and pornography from the environment of their child.

The sexologists would justify the introduction of a vulgar presentation of sex in schools by saying that the children are exposed to it at the movies, on television, and in magazines—that it is all around our children. Conceding that the pornographic exposure is present it would be simpler and more rational to clean up the entertainment field and control the smut magazines. After all, those who created the problem are not the ones to solve it—especially by enlarging it.

Mr. Speaker, I include varied related news articles:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 4, 1969]

LETTERS POUR IN TO UNITED STATES OPPOSING SEX EDUCATION

(By John Mathews)

Opponents of sex education programs in the schools are sending about 400 letters a week to the White House, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch, the Office of Education and other government agencies.

An Office of Education official who coordinates responses to most of the letters estimates that about three-fourths of the correspondence appears to be inspired by organized groups campaigning against sex education.

In the latest campaign, letter writers say they are part of the "Eye of the Octopus Movement."

Conservative organizations here—and liberal research groups that keep tabs on conservative movements—were unable to identify the latest organized effort.

The "octopus" seems to be a symbol of subversion with its tentacles reaching out to corrupt children, through sex education programs.

The "octopus" letters are largerly answered by a form letter sent out under the signature of Miss Elsa Schneider, comprehensive program manager for health-related activities in the Office of Education.

Like much of the correspondence, "the octopus" letters call for an end to federal funding for any programs that "promote or contribute to family life education, sex education or sensitivity training in any form."

Replying to the letters for Secretary Finch, Miss Schneider stresses that the federal government does not stipulate sex education curriculum and cannot dictate to local school districts what they should or should not teach.

"I think you will agree that one of the most prized principles of government in this country is that of local control of school curriculum," the form letter reads. "Acting within the framework of state law, state and local school authorities make all decisions about what is taught, teaching methods, qualification of teachers and materials used in the classroom."

In many personal responses to letter writers, Miss Schneider said today, she attempts to correct misinformation. The government does not issue any materials or pamphlets on sex education, she tells letter writers. Cooperative research grants are not currently made in the field, and no office personnel sit on the board of the controversial Sex Information and Education Council of the United States.

SEICUS director Dr. Mary Calderone, a favorite target of sex education opponents, did receive a $30,000 grant two years ago from the Office of Education's cooperative research program to produce a guide for professional counselors in sex education and marriage counseling. The office sends letter writers inquiring about its relationship with SIECUS a form letter acknowledging the existence of the grant, but stating also the Office of Education "does not support the program of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States."

The Office of Education has also awarded grants to schools and universities under provisions of two federal laws which stipulate that grants are originated from the local applicants rather the federal office. Prince Georges County, for example, has been funded to train teachers preparing to instruct sex and health education classes.

Many of the letters are inspired by such groups as MOTOREDE (Movement to Restore Decency), associated with the John Birch Society; MOMS (Mothers Organized for Moral Stability), PAUSE (Parents Against Unconstitutional Sex Education), the Christian Crusade, and others.

The correspondents condemn sex education as immoral, sacrilegious, Communistic, unconstitutional. Some letter writers however, object to being "smeared" as right-wingers because of their opposition to sex education.

A letter writer from the state of Washington described a local meeting, saying "As usual, each time anyone in the group discussion spoke against this sex education, we were subjected to the inference of being part of the John Birch Society. We are not at all interested in the John Birch Society and certainly have no connection with that group."

The parent went on to say she objected to untrained teachers dealing in the classroom with the emotionally charged subject matter.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 11, 1969]

THE STORM OVER SEX EDUCATION

(By Clayton Fritchey)

With the public schools closed for the summer, the controversy over sex education has temporarily subsided, but only on the surface. All signs point to a renewed and enlarged fight in the fall, for it is increasingly clear that much of the protest is not spontaneous, but inspired by organized agitation.

There no longer is any doubt that the protest campaign has a right-wing, fundamentalist, anti-Communist flavor, although there are a number of unorganized individuals who are also against the program for other reasons.

But, generally speaking, there is a national pattern and an underlying theme to the resistance movement, which has been pointedly expressed by Robert Welch, founder and leader of the John Birch Society. Sex education, he says, is "a filthy Communist plot."

The Birchites have established MOTOREDE committees (Movement To Restore Decency) to combat sex education. Others carrying the torch are the American Education Lobby, headed by Lee Dobson, formerly associated with the Liberty Lobby; the Rev. Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade, a Texas anti-Communist organization; MOMS (Mothers Organized For Moral Stability) and PAUSE (Parents Against Unconstitutional Sex Education). Washington is now beginning to feel the effects of their letter-writing campaigns.

The chief object of their hostility is the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS), headed by Dr. Mary Calderone, who says, "The right wing is using us to whip up a backlash frenzy. Sex education is the best issue the right wing has discovered in years, and they're exploiting it for all it's worth."

Mrs. Calderone acknowledges that "there are some well-intentioned and responsible critics of sex education programs though we hear almost entirely from the extreme right which is recruiting the timid and conservative."

Actually, sex education, like any pioneer program, has its weaknesses, and some of the gaucheries have upset a lot of parents. The situation is not unlike that with the "pill," which also has had its failures and some undesirable side effects, but which nevertheless serves a broad, useful purpose.

It's less than two months before the reopening of school, and the problem in hundreds of communities will then be how to reach a rational resolution of the issue, which is by no means confined to the "Bible Belt." Some of the most passionate protest has been in sophisticated metropolitan areas, including suburbs of the nation's capital.

A protest rally in a community on the outskirts of Washington was, for instance, not unlike comparable meetings in smaller towns all over the U.S. A Boy Scout opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. The Gospel Four (a women's quartet) led a crowd of 800 in singing "My Country 'Tis of Thee." Later they sang "Have A Little Talk With Jesus" while ushers collected $426 for the cause.

A Baptist preacher urged parents to take their children out of school if sex education persists. Another preacher likened sex education to "the decadence of topless and bottomless girls in bars . . . the miniskirt, the bikini, the see-thru dress, erotic publications, and co-education rooming arrangements in college where noncredit courses are given in fornication, petting, and how to have an abortion without missing a class."

At a similar meeting in a nearby suburb, one speaker warned that the sex program is "a move by the devil himself to bring us down from within."

The feelings of many earnest critics were perhaps best summed up by a woman reader of The Washington Star who wrote, "Without benefit of sex education in our schools we (the sexually inadequate, guilt-ridden, misguided parents, as we are labeled today) have produced a powerful, morally strong, and great nation of great and noble men and women, with only our belief in God Almighty and His Ten Commandments as our guide."

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 29, 1969]

PART OF CONTROVERSY—SEX EDUCATION FILMS CANDID, EXPLICIT

The films used in sex education instruction here and around the nation have helped fire much of the current controversy.

Reaction to the films probably is partly McLuhanesque: The visual and auditory impact—on parents particularly—is much greater than that of books, pamphlets and other materials. The films are also much more explicit and candid than many of the textbooks whose publishers strike a middle-ground, hoping for mass adoption of their books by school systems.

Here are notes on some of the most controversial films:

"How Babies Are Made" (General Learning Corp.)—The film qualifies for the Academy Award of controversy in the sex education field. It was prepared in consultation with the embattled Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) and the noncontroversial Child Study Association of America, (SIECUS' executive director is Dr. Mary S. Calderone, an outspoken exponent of sex education and a favorite target of organized opposition. She stresses continually that SIECUS does not produce sex education materials, but does review materials. Producers of materials are beginning to shy away from SIECUS endorsements as the controversy rages.)

The film, used sparingly in the Washington area, employs paper cutout figures to tell the story of animal and human reproduction. The most controversial scenes depict barnyard animals mating and a father and mother in bed under the covers. The narrative is frank and direct. The producers, who also provide an illustrated workbook, say the film is designed for 3 to 10-year-olds.

"Boy to Man" and "Girl to Woman" (Churchill Films)—Probably the most widely used sex education films in the Washington area. School systems differ as to the appropriate age level for their use, some showing the films in fifth and sixth grades, others waiting until junior high school. Both films use basically the same sequences for explicit descriptions of male and female reproductive organs and the process of human reproduction. The films also deal with teen-age acne and personal health problems. The film for girls has a section on menstruation.

Among the most controversial sequences is a description in both films, using animated drawings, of the male ejaculation. The narrator says, "It is nature's way of passing the male sperm into the female body during sexual intercourse." A sequence in the film for boys, dealing with masturbation and nocturnal emissions, has been criticized for the statement that "neither causes mental disease or physical injury, but both are natural outlets in no way harmful." Critics say the statement appears to condone masturbation.

"Molly Grows Up"—The most widely used sex education film for girls in the District, long discarded elsewhere, is at least 15 years old. Lines like, "Molly, good heavens, you're growing. I've got to put that hem down," draws choruses of laughter from student audiences. Despite its dated quality, the film has a candid discussion of menstruation. The sequence on reproduction describes only the female genital organs, which are sketched on a blackboard by a nurse.

"Parent to Child About Sex" (Rex Fleming Production)—A recent film designed for parents in which two doctors discuss parental attitudes toward sex and sex education. Scenes deal with questions of preschool children about pregnancy, parent reaction to childhood and adolescent masturbation, menstruation, dating and teen-age sexuality. The film is particularly direct in discussing how negative parent reaction to normal development can produce damaging effects in later life.

The first session at Leland Junior High School produced mixed results: Adamant opponents were not converted, supporters were buoyed and uncommitted parents appeared to be somewhat reassured. Lingering doubts, however, centered not on the materials used in the courses but on how qualified teachers are to handle the materials.

Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties are acting to meet this concern. School administrators in both counties say sex education programs will not be introduced until teachers have received special training and are "comfortable" with the subject matter.

Prince Georges County held in-service training sessions last year for 460 teachers before pilot programs were begun in the spring. The county system plans to train 340 more teachers before the programs are expanded next year.

WIDE VARIATION IN AREA

The extent of sex education and the content of the courses vary widely in the Washington area.

Even where the central administration outlines a program of instruction in a school system the local practices in individual schools can differ substantially. Schools operate in a largely autonomous fashion, particularly in the area of sex education where the principal's assessment of community receptivity is decisive.

No area school district has a course that is exclusively devoted to sex education. Only a small fraction of the courses, called health or family living, concentrate on such topics as human reproduction, male-female differences, adolescent problems of dating and relationships between the sexes. Most courses are a mixture of animal and plant biology, simplified individual and group psychology, "character" training, drug and alcohol information and rudimentary sociology.

VIRGINIA SCHOOLS WAIT

In elementary schools, sex education, even as part of another course is far from a universal subject. In Northern Virginia school districts, sex education is much less structured within the curriculum than in Maryland counties or in Washington.

Arlington has no formal elementary school program, although parent-teacher association and school physicians occasionally respond to student or parent demand by organizing after-school sessions, not under school sponsorship, to teach, for example, sixth-grade girls the facts of menstruation.

Fairfax also has not specified an elementary school program. In the last six years or so, however, fifth and sixth-grade classes, segregated by sex, have viewed two of the most widely used sex education films, "Boy to Man" and "Girl to Woman." Parents are invited to preview the films first and can request that their children be excluded from the sessions. Both films give a detailed explanation of human reproduction.

Students in Alexandria are not taught the basic facts of human reproduction in their elementary classes even though they have a family living and health curriculum.

The Alexandria course, part of social studies, deals with such subjects as the neighborhood, community, nation and family. Science classes follow the course outline prescribed by the state, which discusses lower forms of reproduction but steers clear of human reproduction.

PREPARATION IN DISTRICT

In Washington, the school system has had for the last six years comprehensive guides for teaching "personal and family living, not sex education," says Frank P. Bolden, director of health, physical education, athletics and safety.

At the elementary level the guide has units on "Learning to Work and Play Better With Others," or "Exaggeration-Lying-Stealing-Foul Language," which provide heavy doses of moral or character training. A unit entitled "A Study of Responsibility" classifies a child's responsibilities by age group, each beginning with "obedience," and including "worshipping God" for the 5 to 9-year-old group and "practicing religion" for 10 to 14-year-olds.

A unit on plant, animal and human reproduction is included for the "upper elementary level," but in what appears to be a remnant of the now-abolished track system of pupil grouping the unit is recommended by the teacher guide for students of "average or high average capability." Bolden said his department does not have the responsibility of determining to what extent the entire elementary school family living curriculum is used.

In both Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, existing elementary school family life and sex education programs are being revised and formalized as a result of the State Board of Education directive.

PRINCE GEORGES STUDIES

An outline for a kindergarten-through-12th-grade sex education curricula in Prince Georges County is designed for use by teachers who have taken a special in-service training course and in schools that are determined to have the right climate for accepting the courses.

Beginning in kindergarten and first grade the emphasis is on making children aware that "sex can be discussed openly in the classroom" and that sex is "private but not shameful." The outline notes that "the proper names for the genital organs are learned in order to discourage baby or gutter terms."

Through the grades children learn about heredity, growth and body systems, with human reproduction designated for the fifth or sixth grade depending on teacher judgment. In the eighth grade, necking and petting and other topics relating to dating behavior are discussed and, within the context of family living, miscarriage, abortion and illegitimate pregnancy may be brought up.

Problems of premarital sex relations are considered in the ninth grade, and the senior year of high school deals with preparation for marriage and parenthood. The junior and senior high school sex education units in Prince Georges County are not separate courses but part of physical education, biology and even problems in democracy courses.

MONTGOMERY COURSES

Montgomery County's elementary family life and sex education curriculum, part of the science course, was used in 11 pilot schools this past school year. It is now being revised and will be extended to an-as-yet-undetermined number of schools.

The curriculum begins with basic observations of growth in plants, animals and human beings. In grade two, the teacher's guide suggests a rudimentary discussion of reproduction: "Babies come from their mother and father . . . people reproduce from eggs within the body . . . each sex is especially adapted for its functioning the reproduction process (female egg cells, male sperm cells) . . ."

The discussion of growth and development becomes increasingly sophisticated until in fifth grade, after a discussion of the muscular, circulatory, digestive, nervous and excretory systems, the class deals with the human reproductive system.

Teachers have the option of dividing groups by sex to discuss female and male reproductive systems. Films, film strips, books, pamphlets and diagrams are used for the instruction. Girls get a special unit on menstruation.

SOME SUBJECTS TABOO

At the junior and senior high school levels in the Washington area, most school systems have health education units, usually as part of physical education. While instruction has been greatly liberalized in recent years and materials reflecting the new openness are increasingly available, there still are some taboo subjects.

Homosexuality, masturbation, deviant behavior and premarital sex are treated gingerly, if at all. Despite the fact that one of the longstanding arguments for sex education is that it helps combat illegitimate pregnancies, school curricula bar discussion of contraception. In Washington, for example, nearly 10 years ago the school board banned discussion of contraception and sexual intercourse. The need for classroom discussion of contraception is one issue raised by students calling for "modernized sex education" in the District.

Another area in which the health educators and their colleagues have moved cautiously is in the purchase of human torso models. Traditionally, torso models in biology and health education classes are sexual neuters.

Recently, equipment manufacturers have listed in their catalogues torso models with male and female genital organs. Washington appears to be the only school system that has purchased a set of the new models. The models currently are stored in an administrative office with no immediate plans for use in the classroom.

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1969]

SECRECY VOTED ON SEX TALKS

The committee studying Maryland's compulsory sex education program for the schools has voted to conduct its weekly meetings in secret.

The decision was reached Thursday after one committee member, Genevieve Fleury of Towson, began to record the panel's first session on a small, portable tape recorder. Mrs. Fleury has been a critic of the program.

"We had a small go-round there," Mrs. Fleury said yesterday. "I didn't see any reason why it shouldn't be used. It's a common business procedure."

The 24-member committee was appointed July 1 by the State Board of Education to review the 1967 bylaw that requires a comprehensive sex education curriculum in all grades. The panel was formed at the suggestion of Gov. Marvin Mandel after widespread opposition to sex education materialized in various Maryland counties.

Elizabeth L. Scull, chairman of the committee, said the panel would review the books and films used in the program and would hear comments from citizen groups. She was empowered by the committee to issue a press statement after each session. The committee's report is due Aug. 20.

ACTIVITIES ON THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in answer to my letter of June 19, 1969, to Dr. Thomas Paine, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I have received the following excellent letter of June 30, 1969, from Mr. Robert F. Allnutt, the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Washington, D.C.:

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This refers to your inquiry to NASA concerning activities on the moon by the first astronauts to land there. Our plans in this regard are spelled out in the attachment.

We trust that this information will be of assistance to you. If you wish additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. ALLNUTT,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

STATEMENT BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, JULY 1, 1969

Plans for the Apollo 11 mission of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration call for Flight Commander Neil Armstrong to emplant an American flag on the surface of the moon as one of his first duties upon leaving the Lunar Module and stepping onto the surface. The flag will be erected on a two-piece, eight foot mast, which will be carried, along with the flag, in an aluminum tube attached to one of the landing legs of the Lunar Module. The crew will also carry on the flight five-by-eight foot American flags to be presented to the Congress after the flight.

In placing the American flag on the lunar surface, NASA will in no way be claiming the moon for the United States or for any other nation or group of nations. Such a claim would be contrary to the express provisions of the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to which the United States is a signatory.

No other flags will be placed on the lunar surface in this mission. The crew will carry on the mission and return to Earth the following miniature flags: the fifty States and the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories, all nations and the United Nations.

A plaque mounted on the side of the descent stage of the Lunar Module will also be left on the surface. This plaque bears a map of the Earth, the signatures of the President of the United States and the Apollo 11 crew, and the following inscription: "Here men from Planet Earth first set foot upon the moon. We came in peace for all mankind."

THE INCREDIBLE DREAM: A WALK ON THE MOON—PART IX

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in less than a dozen years, the space age has grown from a beeping 184-pound satellite called Sputnik 1 to 100,000 pounds worth of hardware called Apollo 11. In less than a dozen years, man has seen his planet for what it is, a blue and green ball with white streaks framed against the pinpoints of the universe. And now America's astronauts are taking that fateful step—not only from the earth onto the moon, but from the past into the future. They are becoming the first citizens of the solar system, inaugurating a new age of man. New York Daily News Science Editor Mark Bloom, in his revealing series on the history and heartbreak, the sobering and exhilarating scientific and political breakthroughs leading to the moon voyage of Apollo 11, has performed a true service in preparing us for this momentous event. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the record, I include his "Countdown Minus IX" article preparatory to tomorrow's blastoff and man's first footprint on extraterrestrial soil:

COUNTDOWN TO THE MOON

(By Mark Bloom)

"Perform a manned lunar landing and return."

This is the primary objective of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Apollo 11. Every other assignment for the astronauts on the surface of the moon, even the planned walk, is "peripheral," to quote Apollo 11 commander Neil Armstrong.

Touchdown on the moon in the lunar module, scheduled for 4:19 p.m. New York time on Sunday July 20, will be *it*. Aboard: Armstrong, 38, and Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin, 39.

Flying 70 miles overhead in lunar orbit will be Michael Collins, 38, aboard Columbia, the radio call sign for the Apollo 11 command module.

Armstrong and Aldrin will have three major tasks during the two hours and 35 minutes of outside activities:

Collect up to 130 pounds of lunar rocks and soil.

Set out three scientific experiments, two to remain on the moon and the third to be returned to earth.

Show to their home planet via television what they are doing on the surface, including the historic crunch by Armstrong's left boot, size 11½C.

This step into the future will be taken on Monday around 2:20 a.m., a full 10 hours after Eagle perches on the moon.

In the interim, the astronauts will spend two hours checking the lunar module, having two meals, taking the first lunar snooze, and getting set for the walk.

And to the dismay of hundreds of millions around the world, not to mention some weary, talked-out television commentators, there will be no live TV from the surface of the moon all this time.

The greatest show in history of television begins when Armstrong starts down the nine-rung ladder leading from Eagle's hatch to the surface. When he reaches the third rung from the top, the astronuat will reach out with his left arm and pull a D-shaped handle, opening a storage bay and exposing the lens of a black-and-white TV camera.

In 1.3 seconds, the time it takes light to reach the earth, we will see Armstrong's legs carefully moving down the ladder.

A moment later, men on earth will see man walking on the moon.

For the first half hour, Armstrong will test his mobility on the surface, collect a two-pound "grab bag" rock sample, which is a contingency sample in case the walk has to be cut short, and receive equipment and a camera via a conveyor belt from Aldrin.

At this point, Aldrin makes his appearance on the moon.

For the next two hours, the astronauts collect rocks and soil with a scoop on a three-foot-long handle, filling two containers.

Two hours and 40 minutes after Armstrong opens the hatch, both crewmen should be back aboard Eagle.

And at 1:55 p.m.—after a total of 21 hours and 26 minutes on the surface—Eagle will blastoff to rejoin Columbia.

OUR FLAG IN AN AIRLESS VOID

Ever since the Age of Exploration, man has yearned to plant his banners on remote and distant shores. When Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin make it to the lunar surface, the Stars and Stripes will fly on the farthest shore of all.

Plans call for Armstrong and Aldrin to jointly implant a three- by five-foot nylon American flag about an hour after they step onto the moon.

It will be erected on an eight-foot-tall aluminum staff, tubing along the top edge of the flag keeping it unfurled in the airless lunar environment.

Raising of the American flag—and only the American flag—was mandated recently by Congress. Space agency senior officials had favored raising both the American and United Nations standards.

"The planting of the flag is symbolic of the first time man has landed on another celestial body and does not constitute a territorial claim by the United States," the space agency said in a terse statement.

More enthusiastically publicized by Nasa is a plaque which the astronauts will unveil and leave on the moon, bearing images of the earth's two hemispheres, signatures of the three Apollo 11 astronauts and President Nixon, and carrying the inscription:

"Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind."

Also to be left on the moon is a silicon disk about the size of a half dollar bearing messages from more than 100 world leaders. To fit them all on the disk, the messages have been reduced to about 1/200th of their original size.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, July 16, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

O God and Father of us all at this high moment in our national life we bow at the altar of prayer invoking Thy blessing upon us and upon our noble endeavors. Shine Thou upon our Nation as we launch out into a new day. Bless our astronauts as they wend their way to the moon, as they land on its surface, and as they find their way back. Grant them safety all the way and may they return with their mission accomplished and their aims achieved.

We thank Thee with glowing hearts that we live in an hour like this. May we play our part as participants in this crowning hour of our Nation's history.

In the spirit of the Pioneer of Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GODSPEED TO OUR ASTRONAUTS AND SUCCESS TO OUR SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderul day this is for America and for the world. America, in the name of peaceful exploration, has launched into orbit three brave men—Neil Armstrong, "Buz" Aldrin, and Mike Collins, who are to conduct the first landing on the moon.

No matter how many times a launch has been done before, the potentials for danger are so great that the whole community of mankind pauses as Saturn V lights for the takeoff.

Our country has conducted with great credit as well as success its open program of peaceful exploration of space. The National Aeronautics and Space Act was proposed by President Eisenhower, and was forged and perfected in committees of the Congress of which I was the chairman in the House. We then pledged our program to peaceful goals in the interest of all mankind. I think history is supporting the wisdom of those decisions of 1958.

We welcome the sense of sharing which other nations have had in this endeavor. Their flags are being carried to the moon and statements of many of their national leaders will be left as a memorial on the moon to this epic event in the history of our race.

Today, at Cape Kennedy, Ambassadors of most of the nations have been present to see the launch. In one way they are our guests because of the investment the American people have made financially to bring about this mission. In another way, they have a right to be there as participants, not merely guests. Our space program has been built upon a common heritage of knowledge with the cooperation of many nations over many generations. Also, the conduct of this mission has depended upon cooperative tracking stations in many nations, and our flights are conducted under a regime of peaceful acts of space established by international treaty.

Our men go to the moon not to seize it in the name of ownership but as ambassadors for all men of good will. The mission, the men, the hopes of the world, all represent to the highest aspirations of mankind for peace, for progress, and partnership.

The inspiration of our moon flight is that we can join forces to solve the major problems on earth just as well as we continue to do so in space, and to continue space explorations will have its applications and spinoffs which will pay for the progress of our fellow men here on earth.

This mission has only begun, and many difficult tasks are yet to be performed. We have high confidence in the work and in the equipment but if the mission is not completed, these men would not want us to turn our backs on what they have strived for so hard to accomplish.

Nor would America want us to quit. We, of course, hope and expect that within about 8 days this mission can be a part of history, a wonderful success and a tribute to the astronauts, the engineers and the scientists and the workers, the citizens and the Government which made it possible.

We ask God's blessings on this great adventure of the human spirit.

THEY ALSO SERVE WHO STAND AND WAIT

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish my presence today in this Chamber with a corporal's guard of House membership, while our colleagues enjoy this morning's historic spectacle of the lift-off in Cape Kennedy, to connote lack of support for, indeed enthusiasm for, the enormous achievement of man's flight to the moon.

I join my colleagues in proudly paying tribute to our space team. I wish them a safe trip and every success, and while our astronauts are on the moon, I hope they will pick up and bring back some of that surface because, Mr. Speaker, being from Wisconsin, America's dairyland, where our farmers are burdened by foreign dairy imports, I want Wisconsin dairy producers to be reassured that the moon's surface is not made of potentially competitive green cheese.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for the statement he has just made about the spirit and attitude which prevails throughout all of the membership of this body. Those of us who are here today are certainly with our astronauts in spirit and share in the very high hopes of all of us for a successful achievement down there at Cape Kennedy and also share in the great pride at what has already been accomplished.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF MILITARY SPENDING

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)