

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BIBLE SAVES SOLDIER'S LIFE IN VIETNAM

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we often overlook the fact that our servicemen in Vietnam need more than the regular issue of equipment, clothing, food, and ammunition.

There is a spiritual need that cannot be fulfilled with military appropriations measures. This point was made clearly and concisely in a letter from a soldier in Vietnam which was reproduced in the *Donaldsonville, Ga., News*.

The soldier owes his life to his faith in God. In sharing his letter with readers of the *RECORD*, I ask, How can we turn aside his simple but eloquent request: "Please America, please pray for us?"

SOLDIER SAYS BIBLES, PRAYERS NEEDED IN COMBAT

(NOTE.—Let us pray fervently that God in His wisdom, will bring us and the world to find peace and an end to this fearsome strife. O God help us!)

(Letter received by Soldier's sister, Mrs. Pearle Parrish, Rt. 6, Covington, Ga., who has so graciously shared it. (Reprinted at the request of several readers.))

"Dear Sis:"

"I don't know where to start first. So many things have happened since I last wrote you. Well, to begin with I have escaped death at the hands of the enemy in a way so amazing I am still in a daze. You remember I told you I was going over armed with the Bible too. That Bible is the reason I am still here and able to write this letter to all America. Here is the story:

"My buddy and I were sent out on duty with our equipment in the work I told you before was our job. We had just received information—the most important for weeks. But we were discovered by the enemy.

"I gave my buddy the information we had collected, told him to beat it and prepared myself to face the enemy. It was the first time I had been face-to-face with the necessity of pointing my gun at a man to shoot the life from his body. I thought fast, then I said 'Lord, it's Your responsibility now.' As I reached for my carbine a shot from one of them struck me in the breast and blasted me down. But my buddy had not obeyed my order. He had not gone. Thinking I was dead, he turned for me, grabbed my carbine as well as his own, stood astride my body, and blasted away with both guns. He was hit too—his knees with three bullet wounds. But when he finished there were not any of the enemy left.

"He was amazed when I rolled and tried to get up. The force of the bullet had only stunned me. Dazedly I wondered why. I pulled that little Bible out of my pocket and in utter muteness looked at the ugly hole in the cover. It had ripped through Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, through Samuel, Kings and kept going. Where do you think it stopped? In the middle of Psalms 91, pointing like a finger at this verse—"A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." Sis, when I read that verse, it roused me off the ground. I did not know there was such a verse in the Bible. I'd been reading most in the New Testament. In utter humility I said, "Thank you, precious God."

(This soldier goes on to relate in his letter to his sister, that when he got his buddy back to the post, his buddy called him over to say, "This convinces me. I want to get right with God." He wouldn't even let them tend his wounds, saying, "Nothing matters now but this.")

"Falling on his knees with the three wounds he prayed until his body became almost numb. But he wouldn't give up. And when he knew the Lord had heard his cry, and had come into his heart and saved him he ran outside and shouted to the whole camp.

Continues this soldier's letter, "since that time I have talked with the boys, held meetings, and prayed with them.

"Twenty-five of the men have come out for God. God has even reached my general.

"I tell you, Sis, prayer is going to win this war. Not guns alone, fervent agonizing prayer.

"Pray Sis, pray as you have never prayed before. Tell everyone to pray. Tell all Americans to go on their knees.

"Until nations and people have paid in blood and tears for thrusting God out of their hearts, out of their homes, nations and lands this war will not end.

"Tell them to send Bibles and more Bibles. A Bible will give a soldier the confidence that God is with him. Try to get this letter on the air, in the papers in anything that is printed. Make copies of it. Send it from coast to coast. Tell them the Army wants prayer—and Bibles.

"Please America, Please, Pray for us."

THE MASSACHUSETTS AMERICAN LEGION'S ANNUAL CONVENTION

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE and I had the privilege last week of addressing the final session of the Massachusetts American Legion's annual convention in my home city of Springfield, Mass. Celebrating the Legion's 50th anniversary, the convention took as its theme "Fifty Years of 100 Percent Americanism." It is refreshing—indeed, almost startling—to find an organization pledged to its Nation's highest ideals in this era of often heedless dissent and demonstration.

The Legion, wholly devoted to what it considers this country's best interests, has taken political stands that have stirred spirited controversy over the past few decades. This, Mr. Speaker, is a good sign. It means the Legion is actively taking part in the national debate over U.S. goals, stating its position plainly and explicitly instead of timidly evading the issues. The vague and muddled political "stands" that many organizations issue are designed to please the greatest possible number of people—and, as a result, contribute virtually nothing to the dialog on national problems. The Legion's stands do not even approach this category. Frank, honest straightforward, the Legion's positions help stimulate the kind of debate this country needs to unravel the host of knotty problems it faces.

The Massachusetts Department of the American Legion is among the best in the country. Its convention—held in Springfield's giant municipal auditorium—reflected this reputation for excellence. Brisk electioneering for Massachusetts department offices and spirited debate over resolutions showed that Bay State Legionnaires are concerned—genuinely concerned—about their Nation's problems and the Legion's role in helping to resolve them. James H. Denver of Springfield, chairman of the convention, could not have been more accurate in terming the convention a "huge success."

The convention elected William J. Watts, of East Longmeadow, past Hampden County American Legion commander, as its new State commander. I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Watts every success in his new post.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the *RECORD* at this point newspaper articles published by the Springfield Union and the Springfield Republican on the convention:

LEGION ENDS CONCLAVE

"For the true Legionnaire there can be only one ultimate goal—and that is the swift coming of the day when there will be no veterans because there are no wars."

500 DELEGATES

This concluded a major address by U.S. Rep. Silvio O. Conte, R-Pittsfield. He and U.S. Rep. Edwin P. Boland, D-Springfield, were key speakers at the final day Saturday at the 51st anniversary convention of the Massachusetts American Legion at Springfield's Municipal Auditorium.

An estimated 500 delegates were on hand for the morning session to hear the two congressmen.

The afternoon parade down Main Street was postponed, then cancelled because of heavy rains.

Before adjourning, the convention installed William J. Watts, 46, of East Longmeadow, as its commander and Charles L. Muskes of Springfield was sworn in as state historian.

Frank Nietupski of Ludlow was installed as national delegate-at-large.

NEXT IN HYANNIS

Also the convention voted to meet next year from June 11 through 13 in Hyannis.

James H. Denver of Springfield, convention chairman, termed the gathering a "huge success" and said that while the convention officially ended Saturday afternoon, it is expected that many delegates will remain until Sunday before going home.

Miss Mary Barletta of Somerville, president of the state Legion Auxiliary also spoke to the morning meeting, bringing her organization's appreciation for past favors during the year and best wishes to the newly elected officers.

ESTIMATED 500 DELEGATES

Miss Barletta served 14 years with the Army Nurses Corps in World War II and is the first Disabled Veteran to be president of the auxiliary, officials said.

An estimated 500 delegates were on hand to hear Conte and Boland at the morning session.

Conte said: "In 1919 a group of veterans who had just fought what was then known as 'the war to end all wars' got together and determined that this nation should not be allowed to forget the sacrifices made by the American fighting man in behalf of his country."

"Fifty years and three wars later we are here today to attest to the fact that America has not forgotten those men and their sacrifice.

CITES LEGION ROLE

"The country has not forgotten because the American Legion has not let it forget.

"I only wish that the success of the Legion could have been matched by the country itself in its efforts toward peace on earth.

"But as we know, little more than 20 years after the Legion was founded, the United States was again embedded in war... bloodier than America's involvement in World War I, but still a war popularly supported across the land.

"America emerged from World War II as the most powerful nation on earth and five years later was at war again in Korea.

PRaised Fighting Men

"Today as we gather here young American boys are still getting the call to combat and, despite well-publicized cases of those who balk, thousands are doing their duty every day."

Conte praised the fighting men and the 36,000 who were killed in Vietnam, and then said:

"But my friends, in the America of 1969 war has finally been unmasked. Our country, I believe has always hated war. But it has taken the tragedy of Vietnam to bring this hate to the fore.

QUOTES EISENHOWER

"The lesson, unfortunately, is too long taught and too quickly forgotten. But one who did not forget was the late, great soldier and President, Dwight David Eisenhower. He stated the case best when he said:

"I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity."

"As we here gather today to rededicate ourselves to overseeing and protecting the rights of the American veteran, let us not forget that important message from one who was perhaps our greatest soldier.

"But also let us always remember that throughout our long and troubled history there has been one constant factor—the bravery and dedication of the American fighting man."

ONE ULTIMATE GOAL

Conte concluded by saying that for the "true legionnaire" there can only be one ultimate goal and that's the swift coming of the day when there are no veterans because there are no wars.

Boland, speaking on his concern for the arms race between major nations and the U.S., made a two-part proposal:

"The first part is that without waiting for anyone else, we immediately stop all flight tests of our MIRVs (Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles).

"The second part is that we resume MIRV testing anytime the Soviets do so.

SEES NO RISK

"My proposal would entail no risk to our national security—no risk whatsoever—for these reasons:

"We are substantially ahead of the Soviets in MIRV technology.

"We can monitor their flight tests—as they can monitor ours. If they resume tests, we will know.

"We can maintain our readiness to resume testing as we must assume the Soviets would also do. Obviously this is not unilateral disarmament or anything even remotely approaching it.

ASKS ARMS CONTROL

"The only path to national security in the nuclear age lies in arms control, not in arms proliferation.

"The plateau on which the United States and the Soviet Union now stand is one that may be uniquely suited to a mutual halt.

"We have not many months, perhaps not many weeks, before it may be too late. If we wait for a mutual agreement to limit MIRV testing and deployment the chances are we shall be too late.

"Under this proposal, we would seize the initiative. We would do something while there still is time. We would not just dither about doing nothing until the deadline for action has passed.

"We must seize this opportunity to take the initiative. The future of our nation... the future of the world... may hinge on it," Boland said.

CONGRATULATES LEGION

The U.S. Representative noted that this is a milestone year in the history of the American Legion and congratulated them on their golden anniversary theme, "50 years of 100 per cent Americanism."

Boland said it was refreshing and even startling in this era of dissent and demonstration to talk to a group of men pledged to the security of the country...

Actual deployment of MIRVed missiles by Russia and the U.S. which would cost "many additional billions over the next few years" would bring us to a point of no greater security than exists today, Boland said.

"The gravest threat of MIRV, however, is to the concept of deterrence. For such weapons point to the possibility of destroying so many of the other side's offensive missiles before they could be fired that a 'first strike' would no longer be so plainly suicidal," he said.

"IS SO WORRISOME"

Boland added that it is the development of such a first strike capability that is so worrisome to all who have looked closely at the strategic weapons problem.

"In deed, Secretary of Defense Laird has based the administration's case for building the safeguard antiballistic missile system on the contention that the Soviets are: 'going for a first-strike capability' by adding MIRVs to their largest missiles.

"All of this would appear to be beyond the natural control of man were it not for two facts:

"First, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has fully developed MIRVs.

"Second, both nations are preparing to enter bilateral negotiations for a strategic arms limitation treaty."

Boland said that taken together, these facts offer a real if fleeting opportunity to stay the mad momentum of nuclear armaments.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

"I and other members have introduced in the Congress a resolution calling for a moratorium on MIRV testing by the United States.

"I believe that President Nixon should suspend flight tests of MIRVs for so long as the Soviet Union does the same," Boland said.

Because of independent surveillance systems, both the U.S. and Russia can count the other's offensive missiles and estimate with some assurance the damage they might do.

"The only real hope of avoiding the deployment of MIRV warheads by both sides is to ban the testing of MIRVs before they have been fully developed," he said.

LEGIONNAIRES ELECT WATTS STATE HEAD—VICTORY WON BY 37 VOTES

(By Carl Winters)

William J. Watts, 46, of East Longmeadow, past Hampton County commander of the American Legion, Friday night was elected commander of the Massachusetts American Legion following at least three ballot recounts in Municipal Auditorium.

ENG PLACES SECOND

Watts, an employee of the New England Telephone Co. also former head of American Post 293 in East Longmeadow, squeaked to

victory by a 37-vote margin over his nearest opponent.

Watts garnered a total 450 votes to 413 for Robert L. Eng, 44, of Quincy and 154 for George Jeffers, 42, of Granby, former commander of Hampshire-Franklin Legion District 2 and an unsuccessful contender for the top state post at the Legion convention two years ago in Chicopee.

Only two other Greater Springfield residents figured in election proceedings that wrapped up the second day of the Legion's 50th anniversary three day convention in Springfield.

MUSKES IS HISTORIAN

Charles L. Muskes of Springfield, also a past Hampden County commander and past commander of American Legion Post 430 here, was elected without opposition to the post of state historian.

Frank Nietupski of Ludlow, another past Hampden County commander and a member of American Legion Post 286 in Wilbraham, came out sixth in a six-way race for five positions as national delegate-at-large.

Tense electioneering occupied legionnaires from 5 to 9 while balloting was conducted in the auditorium. Throngs of anxious candidates and their supporters crowded auditorium steps and made their pitch as antique fire trucks with wailing sirens and campaign banners zipped by in Court Street.

Convention officials said a total of 1037 ballots were cast out of 2558 eligible convention delegates.

Major afternoon proceedings saw the passage after heated debate of a 35-cent increase in annual per capita dues to the state Legion, boosting the rate from \$3.10 to \$3.45.

Convention delegates also passed a series of resolutions ranging from a call for the retention of the ROTC regardless of militant pacifist actions on college campuses; opposition to any change in Civil Service veterans preference; and the 24-hour display of the American and the state flag on all state and municipal buildings and American Legion posts in Massachusetts, with the flags to be illuminated by lighting from dusk to dawn.

Resolutions to be forwarded to the national Legion conclave opening Aug. 18 in Atlanta, Ga., include a call for greater federal veterans services to meet needs of returning Vietnam veterans; opposition to the planned federal change in observance of Veterans Day on the Monday before Nov. 11 instead of on Nov. 11; establishment of a national veterans cemetery in New England, preferably in Massachusetts; and federal use of funds now in GI insurance programs to lower the rate on GI mortgages.

In his acceptance speech in the auditorium following announcement of voting results, Watts pledged to utilize his state post to insure continuation of programs aimed at benefitting veterans and to back the resolutions passed at the convention. He also said he would press for Legion programs aimed at increasing membership strength.

FAVORS WITHDRAWAL

In earlier statements before balloting, Watts advocated withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam involvement, but on a graduated basis.

"I don't think we'll lose face if we pull out gradually," he said. "I think we have to watch out for the welfare of the fighting men, but I think a gradual pullout as more beneficial than a total withdrawal all at once."

Convention officials estimated that close to the expected 5000 legionnaires were in Springfield Friday night and "the fun will really begin now that the business sessions are over."

FIRETRUCK ARMADA

Fireworks, colorfully costumed young women campaigning for state candidates, campaign posters everywhere and the armada of siren-sounding antique fire apparatus gave Court Square a carnival atmosphere through

the afternoon proceedings and nighttime balloting.

Conventioneers in their resolutions also called for the legalization of beano in Massachusetts and asked enactment of legislation preventing the issuance of special permits for store operations on "Sunday" holidays except in the case of perishable commodities or extreme personal emergency.

The convention delegates also proposed that the American Legion include the words "For God and country" on all its stationery; increase its current schedule of one \$500 college scholarship and four \$100 scholarships awarded annually in the state; and develop a broader range of public relations programs providing awards, citations and incentives to citizens.

INSTALL OFFICERS

Installation of officers is scheduled to begin with proceedings at 9 this morning in the auditorium and the conclave will officially be capped with a parade in Main Street starting at 1.

Featured contingents will include drum and bugle corps, antique autos and fire trucks and marching and drill teams from Legion posts throughout New England. Parade units will form up at Locust Street and march to Liberty Street.

CONSIDER CUMBERLAND'S CONTRIBUTION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Cumberland College is located in Williamsburg, Ky., in my district, and I wish to express commendation for the work done by that institution to enrich the life of the people of Appalachia.

Cumberland's mission, since its founding in 1889, has been to serve the mountain area in which it is located. It enrolls more "strictly Appalachian" students than any other private or denominational college in the Nation. About 1,250 of its 1,700 students originate in these hills within a 100-mile radius of the college. A very high percentage of its graduates return to the hills as teachers with the lateral effect that more than 100,000 Appalachian grade and high school students are taught each school day by Cumberland alumni.

More than 52 percent of the students at Cumberland receive some degree of financial assistance. The average family income in this area is only 30 percent of that of the Nation taken as a whole. Statistics reveal that 50 percent of the college students nationwide come from homes with family incomes in the upper 25-percent income level. By contrast, at least 50 percent of the students at Cumberland come from the socioeconomic environment where family incomes are in the lower 25-percent income level.

At this point in the RECORD, I include an article taken from the current alumni publication:

GRADUATES RETURN TO APPALACHIAN AREA

It will be noted that Cumberland College graduates return in large numbers to the geographical area from which they come, namely the Appalachian sections of Kentucky and East Tennessee.

There is a large concentration in the Greater Cincinnati Area, including Northern Kentucky, since Southern Ohio and Northern Kentucky school superintendents make a strong effort to get Cumberland graduates as teachers.

Recognizing that education affords the best and only permanent solution to the economic and social problems of the area, Cumberland seeks to meet the needs of the section through the provision of higher education.

Located in and serving an area in which the per capita income is 70 per cent less than that of the nation as a whole, the college has as its main objective the helping of the people in the section in which it is situated.

CUMBERLAND'S STUDENT ENROLLMENT

A statistical survey of the fall enrollment at Cumberland College reveals the unique service that Cumberland College renders to the mountain region surrounding the college.

From the tri-county area, composed of Whitley, Laurel, and Knox, statistics show that 467 students from these three counties are enrolled at Cumberland. Whitley County has 295 students at Cumberland; Laurel, 97; and Knox, 75.

Five other mountain counties have a total enrollment of 409 at Cumberland. These are Harlan, Bell, Clay, McCreary, and Leslie. From Harlan County, 109 students are enrolled; from Bell, 107; Clay, 83; McCreary, 65; and from Leslie, 45.

An additional 150 students from the mountain region of Kentucky are attending Cumberland this fall.

Over 200 students from the Appalachian sections of Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia enrolled at Cumberland this fall, making a total of around 1,250 Appalachian students in attendance at the Williamsburg institution of higher learning.

Cumberland College, which was founded in 1889 as Williamsburg Institute, has always had as its primary purpose the serving of the Appalachian student.

According to President J. M. Boswell, the college enrolls more Appalachian students than any other denominational college in the nation with most of these coming from Kentucky.

Richard Brashear, student aid officer at Cumberland, has revealed that the student aid budget at the college for 1968-69 will approximate \$650,000, with around \$575,000 of this amount going to assist mountain students.

Mr. Brashear says 275 mountain students are given total aid and an additional 500 are given varying amounts of financial assistance ranging from complete aid to scholarships as low as \$90 per year.

President Boswell says that as far as he knows, the cost to the student at Cumberland is the lowest of that of any of the denominational senior accredited colleges in the nation.

With a teaching faculty of more than 100, a number of whom are now on leave working on their doctorates, Cumberland has several programs involving college students and staff which are for the improvement of the general educational and economic situation which prevails in the mountains.

CUMBERLAND'S SPECIAL PROGRAMS

In keeping with its main objective, the college has special programs to aid in enriching the spiritual lives of the people of this geographical area.

Under one program Cumberland supplies interim ministers to the many churches in the section from both its student body and its staff. The college makes available gospel teams composed of three to seven students who on invitation go to churches in the area for special religious services of duration from one to two days. Special non-credit courses

in religion and particularly in Bible, are taught off campus by members of the Religion Department of the college.

Cumberland's program in teacher education plays a vital role in the relationship of the college community. Cumberland also sponsors annually both a science fair and mathematics contest for students in the region, and a meeting of guidance counselors for public schools in the area. Cumberland students, under the direction of staff members, conduct special story hours for children of the community. The college students also engage in a home reading program for the benefit of children in the area. This program has an uplifting influence on the parents of the children in whose homes the reading is done.

OUTSTANDING ALUMNI

Among the graduates and former students of Cumberland are two governors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, missionaries and ministers serving at home and abroad, educators of national prominence, physicians, attorneys, dentists, optometrists, pharmacists, engineers, business executives, judges in local, district, state and federal courts, legislators and leaders in several branches of the armed services of our country.

RESERVE MINING COMPANY EMPLOYEES COMPILER REMARKABLE SAFETY RECORD

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it was recently called to my attention that the Babbitt, Minn., local No. 4757, United Steelworkers of America, won its fifth I. W. Abel Presidential Safety Award when employees of the maintenance department in Reserve Mining Co.'s Babbitt Division worked more than a million man-hours without a lost-time accident.

This taconite mine is in my district, and I can assure you that this is a remarkable safety record. The mining and processing of taconite involves the use of massive machinery and vehicles, and employees must be extremely safety conscious to minimize possible hazards.

I wish to join in congratulating local No. 4757 for its efforts in maintaining high safety standards. The union's intense interest in safety is most commendable, and I certainly encourage the membership to continue their exemplary performance in working toward an accident-free record.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news article from the July edition of Steel Labor announcing local No. 4757's award:

BABBITT LOCAL WINS ABEL SAFETY AWARD

BABBITT, MINN.—Local 4757 won its fifth I. W. Abel Presidential Safety Award when employees of the plant maintenance department in the Reserve Mining Company's Babbitt Division completed 1,019,873 man-hours without a lost-time accident.

The accident-free period of time began on Oct. 30, 1967 and continued through Feb. 28, 1969, according to Paul Robichaux, chairman of Local 4757's Safety Committee.

Local 4757 has taken seriously the problem of maintaining safe working conditions and insists upon adherence to safety rules by all concerned. Company officials are under

constant pressure from the union's Safety Committee to operate the open pit iron ore mine and crushing station with the least possible danger to the members of the local.

MONTE CASSINO MARCH

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, I took the occasion to relate the great historic achievement of the stubborn, gallant, and undaunted Polish Second Army Corps in the capture of the abbey at Monte Cassino, which occurred on May 18, 1944.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House an article which appeared in the July 16 issue of the Post Eagle, New Jersey's only American-Polish newspaper, published in Clifton, N.J., by Mr. Chester Grabowski.

The article refers to a New Jersey resident, of Polish extraction, who wrote the "Monte Cassino March" which will be played at the 25th anniversary commemoration of the battle; at the cemetery in Italy.

The article follows:

BLOOMFIELD MUSICIAN'S "MONTE CASSINO MARCH"

BLOOMFIELD.—When the crowds gather at the cemetery in Monte Cassino, Italy to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino, where the Polish 2nd Corp headed by General Anders stormed and captured the Monastery opening the way for Allied troops to Rome, a March of the Polish Soldiers will be played by the Military Band leading off decorations of the Graves of the soldiers.

The composer of this March happens to be a New Jersey resident, Mr. John Niewiadomski of Bloomfield, who is also invited to attend the ceremonies. Mr. Niewiadomski, although a Veteran of the U.S. forces, thought seriously of the bravery and valor of the Polish Soldiers who took what others could not, the Monte Cassino Hill. He felt that these brave soldiers should be recognized and therefore, being a professional musician all of his life and composer of numerous works, he rolled up his sleeves and composed the "March of the Polish Soldiers." This March was submitted and has been accepted as the official March for the coming commemoration services.

Mr. Niewiadomski was born in Lublin Poland and migrated to these shores in 1909. He lived in Paterson, Passaic where Mr. Niewiadomski was educated and settled with his wife, the former Lucille Kislewski in Bloomfield where they have been residing for the past thirty years. Our composer-musician studied music in private conservatories and has played the trumpet in a number of symphony orchestra's including the New Jersey Symphony, from which he has retired over fifteen years ago.

Throughout his musical career he was a member of the Bloomfield Symphony, and a symphonic group in New York, which played the Opera Halka. Although he is retired he still plays his trumpet as well as the violin and presently is dabbling with ideas on composing a symphony of his own.

The Niewiadomski's are the parents of one daughter, Mrs. Viola Porter who resides in Phoenix, Arizona. They spend their winters in Arizona and summers in the East. They

are communicants of St. Valentine's Polish Parish in Bloomfield and members of various Polish organizations—including the P.N.A. and Sons of Poland. They are also active members of the Aria Choir of Passaic and practice with the Paderewski Choir in Phoenix, Arizona, at the Pulaski Club. Mr. Niewiadomski and his wife are leaving for Poland on the 27th of this month, this being his second trip and her third to the place of their birth. While in Poland they will visit Mrs. Niewiadomski's brother Marion Kislewski of Oliva, outside of Warsaw and the Wielgus family. From there they will arrive at Monte Cassino for the ceremonies and then on to Rome before returning to the States.

Mr. Niewiadomski during his musical career has composed a Polonez, Waltzes and Religious Hymns as well as a special composition for his wife. The family including his daughter, who plays the piano, is musically inclined.

E. Z. "EASY" JONES

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of loss that I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Times News of Burlington, N.C., which comments on the life and death of E. Z. "Easy" Jones.

As the editorial points out, "Easy" was one of the pioneers of radio in this country. His personality and human warmth made him a personal friend of every North Carolinian within the sound of his radio station.

There is no way to measure the influence that a man like "Easy" has on a community. He exerted this influence through his campaigns for building a better community, and most of all, through the feeling of friendship and unity which he brought to an entire area. He is one of the last of a great group of radio pioneers. Although he spent most of his career in the relatively small city of Burlington, N.C., he often traveled abroad. He enjoyed the friendship of many of the great people of the world, such as Queen Frederica of Greece. He was a man who walked with kings and never lost the common touch.

The editorial follows:

E. Z. "EASY" JONES

There were countless times through the years when many close friends and acquaintances, knowing of the career of E. Z. (Easy) Jones, could have wished for that earlier day and an opportunity to see him perform in vaudeville, in radio shows, and in other entertainment outlets.

He had some memorable experiences and achievements. He was proud, naturally, that he could introduce Irving Berlin's "Always," or more popularly identified as "I'll Be Loving You Always." He had his time with Jack Benny, Gracie Allen and George Burns, then with Red Barber, the famed sports announcer in a later year. He had the thrill of seeing his Crazy Water Crystals radio show, which he wrote and produced in Atlanta, move to a national audience.

Then, as experience mounted, he turned toward radio ownership and management, working in Greensboro and then organizing a station and holding part ownership in High Point before coming to Burlington in 1941

to become a stockholder and the first general manager of WBBB, which later added a FM affiliate.

It was an eventful and interesting career which he followed, bringing much success and many honors to him as his effectiveness and leadership were registered far beyond the local scene and into the policy-making levels of radio interests in the state and with the Mutual Broadcasting System. He also deserved everything which came his way, for he gave himself that completely to duty and to the interest which his radio voice served the public.

Yet, Easy never really left the showmanship of his earlier days. It was a part of him and something which he handled well. He had presence on any scene, and he probably never forgot a joke which he had ever heard.

Then, too, he had a sense of timing for his radio stations, projecting them into new opportunities and trends, as he also held a big part of the past for the appeal it maintained. Then came the growing role of radio in news coverage, and he took his place on the featured 12:30 p.m. newscast, a time period which, through his direction, became one of the more popular and professional programs of the area. He used his radiotutorials to bite, to suspicion, push and, then, to cuddle and to gently respond with warmth and feeling. Honors came to him through what he said and did as he took a subject—international, national, state or at home—and gave it his treatment. Then, too, his "Snag-Solvers" program became a purely personal time with his audience, and his approach allowed him to be an unseen friend and family-member of countless households.

He served his radio stations well, giving them a showmanship which he loved and a strength which he helped to build for them in other services. He was a devoted friend to his friends, a man who was close to his family and who loved this area and his day on the scene with it. No one can accurately measure the service he gave to building a better city and county—the radio station's call-letters stand for "We're Building Better Burlington"—but he had a vast influence.

His voice, indeed, represented more than words. It projected a movement in progress for us all for which we long since have raised our arm in respectful and sincere salute—and now in tribute to his memory.

TAX BONANZA

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all Americans in saluting the bravery and skill of our astronauts and the technological prowess which made their great space feat possible yesterday. I watched it on TV and it was a splendid sight.

But I could not help but remember, watching the commercials, that Gulf is one of the primary beneficiaries of a huge tax bonanza.

Because of this gift to Gulf by Congress and the American taxpayer, Gulf was able last year to make more than a half billion dollars in profits, yet paid less than 1 percent—eighty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent, to be exact—in Federal income tax.

This is 42 percent less than the average American industrial corporation had to pay in such taxes.

It is nice for Gulf Oil to sponsor this television show but it would be even nicer for them to pay their fair share of taxes.

As I sat there and watched those three brave men soar into space and listened to that commercial, I wanted to add to their commercial that this big and thriving oil company paid exceedingly little of those billions it took to send them aloft.

I have opposed the 27½-percent oil depletion bonanza which Gulf and other oil companies have long enjoyed at the expense of the ordinary taxpayer and I will continue to oppose it.

In concluding, let me add just one word. I have used some of that good Gulf gasoline in the past but I guess I will have to turn in my credit card in protest.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, centuries ago, John Donne told us "For Whom the Bell Tolls"—it tolls for thee, and it tolls for me, and for generations now it has been tolling for the captive nations of the world, some of them without national, intellectual, or civil liberties for generations.

This week has been designated by the U.S. Congress as Captive Nations Week—in fact this is the 10th anniversary of this provision in Public Law 86-90, passed by the Congress in 1959.

In the decade that has passed, have we seen any liberation of the minds and bodies of a billion human beings from the subjugation they have endured for so many, many years?

Unfortunately, no. In the past decade, we have had a lot of rhetoric, a lot of pity, a lot of righteous indignation; but if anything, the situation seems to be worsening instead of improving.

The recent debacle in Czechoslovakia is a case in point. Like Czechoslovakia, more and more nations seem to be losing their national identity to naked, brute force. More and more people seem to be losing their native freedoms to dictators who have arisen in their midst.

Let me insure that my position here is not misunderstood. I speak here not against the use of words; heaven forbid that. I speak here of the uselessness of sterile words; of colloquy among ourselves in this body that never reach the very people who should and must learn the meaning of freedom.

The word is the most powerful weapon of modern civilization; yes, Mr. Speaker, more powerful even than those stockpiles of instruments of utter destruction which world powers have accumulated.

This is because words are the weapons which capture men's minds and not those which destroy their hearts. Therefore, I say to you, sir, we are underutilizing the battle of words to teach men that they too were created with "certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We now have whole generations of citizens of captive nations who never even knew what it was to have their own national government, who never even knew what it was to have liberty, who never even knew what it was to have freedom of thought, freedom of action and freedom of emigration.

I regret to say that we are not without fault in this battle that the forces of democracy appear to be losing to the forces of darkness. We lack almost as much knowledge of what goes on in many of these captive nations as they know of what transpires in the free world.

To a great degree, the latter is understandable. These captive nations are devoid of a free press and the residents are fearful, upon pain of imprisonment or even death, to discuss publicly the events of the day. But the United States has a free press—without Government control or censorship. But too often, the laws of economics are the determining factor rather than the desire for thorough news coverage.

I ask you how many newspapers, how many broadcasting stations or networks in even recent years have even sent correspondents to Turkestan, to Tibet, to Lithuania, to Rumania—to so many of these captive nations where entrance is permitted—to bring us the true facts of the lives these people must endure.

And while our opposite number in the battle for man's mind and heart spends billions in broadcasting lies and half truths in hundreds of languages, how much time, effort, and money does the free world utilize to counter these measures; to convince these people of the fact which must seem inconceivable to them—that a free world does indeed exist.

That as long as their minds are free, the imprisonment of their bodies cannot stifle the age-old dream that governments derive their power from the people and exist for the betterment of their citizens.

There is much we can do as Members of Congress to contribute to the fight to free men's minds and bodies. Captive Nations Week would be an appropriate time to begin that struggle.

DENTON J. QUICK

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all diminished when government at any level loses a man who has rendered devoted and superior service. Such a loss has occurred in my district with the untimely death of Denton J. Quick, director of the Sussex County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

Denton Quick epitomized throughout his 34 years of public service everything we respect in a dedicated public servant. He was a man of great compassion who spent much of his lifetime advancing the cause of public health. His record in this regard includes terms as president of the New Jersey Public Health Association,

membership on the State Health Facilities Council, the New Jersey Crippled Children Commission, the New Jersey State Mental Health Advisory Council, and the New Jersey Hospital Association. Just 3 weeks ago here in Washington, as chairman of the education and welfare steering committee of the National Association of Counties, he worked on arrangements for a national welfare conference.

Denton Quick demonstrated early in his public career outstanding courage in helping to safeguard the public interest. As sheriff of Sussex County in the latter portion of the 1930's, he drove out a nest of the German-American Bund who were intimidating the local citizenry.

Not the least of Denton Quick's service to his community was his unselfish and long standing activity on behalf of the youngsters of his home county. For 34 years he led a troupe of youngsters, presenting Christmas entertainment for schools, churches, and civic organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before my colleagues the following editorial from the New Jersey Sunday Herald which expresses far better than I a tribute to Denton J. Quick. The editorial is as follows:

DENTON J. QUICK

The passing of Denton J. Quick, director of the Sussex County Board of Freeholders, comes as a shock to the county. He had been so much a part of the county that his loss will be felt personally by almost everyone.

A native of Newton, Denton Quick knew through first hand knowledge every section of the county. He became a public figure almost from the time he was graduated from college. He started his political career as a young man and became active in the old Sussex County Republican Club, and within a few short years took his first public office in the county as undersheriff. He then went on to become sheriff and, still later, county freeholder, a position he held for 19 years.

Besides his political activity, he played leading roles in many state and county welfare and improvement organizations. He earned the admiration and affection of hundreds of youngsters for his annual portrayal of Santa Claus for almost two generations. His energy and enthusiasm seemed inexhaustible.

Denton Quick's untimely death has saddened the hearts of all who knew and worked with him. Regardless of political affiliation or conflict of views that mark the career of every person in public life, he leaves an indelible record of devotion and service to the community.

AMERICA AS SEEN BY A NEWCOMER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a speech recently made by Rev. Eddy Ie to the Wednesday Morning Prayer Breakfast Group. Reverend Ie is assistant pastor at the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Bethesda, Md. He also conducts a radio broadcast four times weekly to

Southeast Asia. This is in the Indonesian-Malay language.

Reverend Ie was ordained by the Dutch Reformed Church in Indonesia, trained through the Melbourne College of Divinity in Australia. Reverend Ie has traveled widely and has spoken at many student conferences in the Far East and Southeast Asia.

In September 1963, he migrated to the United States. He is married and has a 4-year-old son.

Mr. Ie was invited to speak to the breakfast group by the group's president, Homer McMurray, to tell what he thinks of the United States of America and to share with the members his personal impression and hope for this country, as seen by a newcomer. Members of my staff regularly attend this breakfast meeting.

Mr. Ie's presentation follows:

AMERICA AS SEEN BY A NEWCOMER

Five years ago, when my wife and I arrived in this country, we were absolutely amazed at the affluence of this nation!

Although prior to coming to the States, we saw attractive magazines like the National Geographic, Life and Look magazines, and many others, yet when for the first time I stood on the soil of the United States of America, and observed the magnificent and majestic buildings and freeways, I could hardly believe that they were true! To me, it is like Alice in Wonderland coming into reality.

Thereafter, when I was exposed to the technology and the American Art—I mean real representative art—I became the more excited!

It is a great country.

There was, however, something else, that really captured my mind and imagination for a long time!

It is the unique and noble history of this nation, with some of its abiding heritage.

Before migrating to this country, I read some of the history of the United States, in order that I might be acquainted with the basic principles of this nation.

In my reading, I learned that the founding fathers had deep religious beliefs in God as their Guide and Guardian.

For instance, they believed that "knowledge" and "Godliness" were two inseparable elements. Quoting the words of John Spencer Bassett in his Book, *A Short History of the United States*, he said: "In all these institutions, except the university of Pennsylvania, the chief impulse to found the college came from a church. Higher education in America now so well able to stand on its own feet, was born of religion, and long nourished by it."

Honestly, I was frequently astounded at some of the statements made by the distinguished leaders of this country. To me, it was so inspiring to read the following statement made by one of your greatest presidents:

"Whereas both Houses of Congress have, by their joint committee requested me to recommend to the people of the United States a Day of Public Thanksgiving and Prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God . . . ! Now therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next, to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that Great and Glorious Being, who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is or that will be. . . ."

Indeed, students in Asia are asking the questions: "What Makes America Great?" and "How come the U.S. has grown so strong and steady?" They realize that the citizens of this country work hard. They recognize that this is a rich and fertile continent. They know that America has a great number of

scholars and scientists; men and women who shape their society to a "Technetronic Society."

Yet, there is one thing that they do not know about. That is the *spiritual resources of this nation*. Maybe, if those students and analysts in the Orient would turn to the pages of the history of the United States, they might learn the secret in the National Motto, "In God We Trust."

It is quite possible, that other than the Kingdom of David and Solomon, America is the only nation that God has bestowed so much upon—and that because of the dedication and devotion of her leaders and the people.

But what about the confusing present?

1. The Memphis Incident and the Assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy surely shocked and rocked the whole nation, and even the world.

2. The American political scene at the moment is also puzzling.

a. It seems to be preoccupied with "power"—black power, student power, poor power, flower power, etc.

b. Discussion has been superseded by uproar.

c. Debate by demonstration.

d. Dialogue by confrontation.

e. Civil disobedience by overt resistance.

3. Furthermore, conditions in the nation are changing so swiftly that American traditional props of ancient religious tenets and humanitarian principles are kicked out from under us. We feel at times that we are left to make urgent "moral decisions" virtually on our own. We are informed that major crimes in the U.S. have increased five times faster than the population since 1950.

4. Although the communications revolution has made it possible for a new top-level order or proclamation to be carried immediately by radio and television; yet many Americans today have little faith that any leader could master either of the two major problems we face: RACE and WAR.

Many foreign observers realize that America is in the midst of a transition, a transition that is both unique and confounding. It is even frustrating to the Marxists.

Even though they see the marks of mounting contradictions in the "Internal American turmoil," but . . . that "commotion" does not fit classical categories:

Well-fed alienated youth from well-to-do families.

Middle-class dis-affection.

Racial issues taken into the hands of brilliant and militant religious leaders.

5. Finally, the skyrocketing of scientific discoveries contributes to a mixed feeling among the individuals. An eminent student in National Affairs currently said:

"If the present transition of America to the technetronic age achieves no personal satisfying fruits, the next phase may be one of sullen withdrawal from social and political involvement; a flight from social and political responsibility through inner-emigration."

In his December 2, 1968 U.S. News & World Report editorial, "Why 49 million did not vote," Mr. Lawrence states:

"Indifference may possibly have been a more potent factor than sheer ignorance in keeping 49 million persons away from the polls in a presidential election. This can be overcome only by placing more emphasis on the responsibility of citizenship."

The following statement made by Walter Lippmann can be interpreted as a solemn and serious prediction:

"The art of invention has become a deliberate and organized thing in our times. We cannot predict its outcome, because we cannot predict what will be invented. All we know is that the changes will be great and fast."

But even though these are depressing thoughts, we may take courage as we con-

sider: the wheels of the gods grind slowly, but they are turning! Thus human history is never static.

Secondly, America is not alone in facing these kinds of complex crises. At this moment, numerous countries in the West, as well as in the East, are going through tremendous changes.

Thirdly, this could be America's greatest test. If she can endure the trials, she will enjoy great triumph.

But if she should capitulate, then, like a ship in the midst of a storm, she shall capsize.

Perhaps all this chaos is to remind America of something she should heed. At this moment, I am thinking of the admonition of Benjamin Franklin to the members of the Constitutional Convention when he said:

"In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth—how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illumine our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. And have we now forgotten that Powerful Friend?"

And in addition, Benjamin Franklin might have reminded them and us:

"No king is saved by the great size or power of his army. Neither is a mighty man delivered by his much strength. Behold, the Lord's eye is upon those who revere and worship Him. . . . He will undertake to deliver from death, and to sustain in every crisis of life."

PRAYER

O God of our Fathers, We are grateful that here in this land, after ages of political convulsion, the common man has come into his own.

It is our prayer that all over this land there may be a return to the faith of those men and women who trusted in God, as they faced the exposures and danger of the frontier.

May all of us come to understand that "right living" alone exalts a nation; that only in Your will we can enjoy peace and potential possibilities.

The world surely cannot be changed until the hearts of men are changed. Even our hearts need to be transformed.

Therefore, may our ultimate reliance in America not be placed in mere knowledge or material power, but in the character of the average man, knowing that "Happy is the Nation" whose God is the Lord.

This we pray in the Holy and Precious Name of Christ. Amen.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, while many things have happened since the captive nations' resolution was passed 10 years ago, the situation is quite the same as far as the satellite countries are concerned. One major difference is that the Soviet empire has extended the tentacles of communism into the New World and brought Cuba within its sphere of influence. Its major move during the past year was the invasion of Czechoslovakia, during which it transported tens of thousands of troops into that little satellite.

The Kremlin continually stirs up trouble in numerous other ways. It exacerbates the ancient quarrels between tiny Israel and the Arab world. A Soviet naval force has been established in the Mediterranean. The supply of arms to our enemies in North Vietnam continues. The Soviet empire can, at any moment, cause "all hell to break loose" at almost any point on the globe—in Berlin, in the Mideast, in Africa, and in Latin America.

The one fact that stands out 50 years after the Bolshevik takeover in Russia is that nations do not become Communist voluntarily. The Russian people did not choose communism—it was forced upon them by a little gang of revolutionaries during World War I.

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasias, Ukraine, the Far Eastern Republic, and Turkistan did not choose communism during the years immediately after the First World War—they became part of the Soviet Union without their consent. The Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, became unwilling Soviet "republics" during the early part of World War II when the National Socialists of Germany were allied with the Communists of Russia.

Following the defeat of the Nazis, a number of other countries were forced into the ranks of the captive nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany. The peoples of these lands had no voice in the matter. One day they were independent nations—the next they were swallowed up by the Soviet Union.

Not only did these people lose their right to determine their own destinies when they were absorbed by their ruthless neighbor, they lost other rights as well—the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, the right to speak and write their own thoughts, the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, the right to a fair trial, and numerous other rights that free people take for granted.

Here in the United States of America, where we still retain our own fundamental freedoms, we must continue to support the right to self-determination of the peoples who inhabit the captive nations. We must repudiate the Brezhnev doctrine, which proclaimed the right of Communist Russia to intervene militarily in any Socialist country threatened by a "capitalist order."

Let us hope and pray that the subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain will soon be free and that Captive Nations Week will no longer be necessary.

DEFENDING THE ENGINEERING MENTALITY

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that a popular thing to do these days is to

attack the mentality of those with whom we may disagree.

A case in point is attacks from certain quarters of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in carrying out the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

I was, therefore, pleased to find that some of this hysteria is put into good perspective in an article appearing in the June 26, 1969, issue of the *Engineering News-Record*.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Robert Moses, retired chairman of New York's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority:

DEFENDING THE ENGINEERING MENTALITY

A reporter, Gene Marine, has written a book entitled *America the Raped—The Engineering Mentality and the Devastation of a Continent*. This volume he felicitously dedicated to his mother. The jacket features a tin garbage can topped by mountain scenery in color.

Marine starts off as follows:

"I am a reporter and uncomfortable in the role of sociologist, political theorist or scholar. As a reporter, then—albeit a concerned one—I have decided to stay with my 'story,' to try to be clear at the expense of scholarly apparatus, rather than meticulous at the expense of readability."

"Marine's main target," says the publisher, "is the Engineers (with a capital E) and what he calls the engineering mentality." It takes a really gifted, brash reporter to dispose of the entire record of the U.S. Army Engineer Corps, founded in 1775, in a few nasty epithets. "The Army Engineers," says this bright boy, "get the men who are left over after the good jobs are gone."

I am an engineer only by association with the profession and with no better passport than a few honorary engineering degrees which are supposed to grant privileges, such as speaking out, and immunities, such as defenses against charges of ignorance. The author has grossly libeled the engineering profession. There are, to be sure, dumb engineers just as there are dumb authors, conservationists, sanitarians, mayors, legislators, budget directors and park officials.

Similarly, public servants who work for the Port of New York Authority, U.S. Forest and Park services as well as the Corps are pictured as fanatics who don't work for the people. Says Marine: "They build bridges and dams and highways and causeways and flood-control projects. They manage things. They commit rape with bulldozers."

I could, if there were space, cite a dozen gross misrepresentations of public works and as many crass errors of fact in this book. What, for instance, does the reporter mean by "walling off the rich estuaries of Long Island?" He says that all Long Island's wetlands are threatened. I have been mixed up with Long Island estuaries for a long time. Does Marine refer to the big jetties which keep the South Bays open to tides, fish and boating and prevent erosion of the shore? He says this is "a rape from which America can never, never recover." Another characteristic Marine whopper reads: "Can you imagine filling in the Grand Canyon? That's what they're doing. And they're going to charge us for doing it." Again, as to DDT. Marine fails to comprehend that whatever its limitations DDT has rid us of the mosquitoes which made part of Long Island uninhabitable in summer.

EXAGGERATED

This pretentious, exaggerated, grossly inaccurate and fanatical piece of propaganda was of course written to sell. There is no evidence of research, documentation, or accuracy. Note, for example, the extravagant space given to a proposed Consolidated Edi-

son pumped storage plant on the Hudson Palisades. There is no reference to almost 70 years of persistent, successful effort to preserve some 60,000 acres of suburban Hudson shorefront and Ramapo mountain land. All that interests the author is cursing a small plant proposal involving three or four hundred acres.

Marine refers to "Cosmopolitas," an imaginary, ideally planned city, and says: "It would be as silly—if the ecological point of view is going to be applied to problems other than saving the ebony spleenwort—to build a Cosmopolitas without planning for racial ecology as it would be to overlook problems of water supply or air pollution."

There are numerous other distortions. When was a Jones Beach causeway under water and what is the point of such a charge which is wholly fictitious? What's wrong with Jones Beach, which the author sneers at? This is a book for a few thousand of bigoted and uninformed conservationists. There are no doubt some engineers short on esthetics, some bungling rapists and bulldozers, and despoilers of nature, but not nearly as many as there are phony conservationists.

Marine's quaint notion that all engineers have by birth, disposition, training and practice no patience with landscaping, architecture, esthetics, amenities, etc., etc. is sheer hokum. I can testify as head of the United Nations Construction Committee that far and away the most knowledgeable and useful of the distinguished foreign planners of the World Capitol picked by the several participating nations, was Basov, the Russian, who was an engineer, Gilmore Clarke, one of our ablest planners, is a civil engineer who happens also to be one of our best roadbuilders and landscape consultants, was dean of architecture at Cornell and on the U.S. Art Commission. Has the author ever heard of him?

Marine's wholesale denunciation of pollution of the great commercial waterways is another example of his purple prose. These waters can not be as pristine as mountain brooks, though they can be kept relatively unpolluted by law and policing. Rivers have long been water roadways. Fish swim in the midst of astonishing raw stuff, especially in tidal streams. This is no argument for sewage. It is a word of caution to those who do not comprehend the many often conflicting objectives and uses of mankind and the necessity for sanity as well as sanitation. Even Marine admits that "if we are to live as we want to live, there must be some dams, some 'thermal pollution,' even some sulfur dioxide—and some fish who can't make it home to their spawning grounds."

President Nixon has appointed a Cabinet-level advisory group to battle "deterioration of the environment." It includes the President, the Vice President, six Cabinet secretaries, a scientific adviser, and a 15-member Citizens Advisory Committee. Unfortunately, Lee DuBridge, the presidential scientific adviser, already anticipates drastic action and mentions that electric autos may replace internal-combustion cars, surely a wild, unrealistic beginning of a practical study.

EMOTIONALLY CHARGED

The Christian Science Monitor, quoting Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Nobel Prize laureate, says, "There is a certain hysteria in the country about environmental problems. Environment has become an emotionally charged word today, almost on a par with 'crime in the streets' or 'student revolts.' It is obvious that enough is not being done in controlling and regulating the environments. But much more is being done than the public is aware of and more than ever before." Glenn Seaborg is right. The extreme conservationists contribute little. We are not yet a nation of poisoned, strangulating

hypochondriacs doomed to choke on foul air, swallow our own smoke and gaze vacantly on a devastated countryside. Education, leadership, money and time will see us through.

Here we have the clever reporter suddenly turned scientist who treats the entire subject of man despoiling nature as if it were a sudden dramatic disturbance like a typhoon, earthquake or flood, civil war, riot or a raging fire.

Nobody but a fool will deny that there has been a selfish despoiling of nature, that selfishness has often masqueraded as public service and that industry has in many places injured nature. But oversimplifying the problem by manufactured evidence and misrepresentation will only promote prolonged and bitter argument. Armchair philosophizing and academic chatter will not save us from engineering rape. Our salvation requires realism, sober, steady, reliable courageous day-by-day hard work, balance and serenity.

One must admire the boundless, fathomless indignation of Marine over the rape of the universe. To be sure, the basic remedy is at hand—stop breeding by the two-legged, reduce populations and thus guarantee uninterrupted enjoyment by the survivors.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today one can pick up almost any newspaper and know that somewhere in the world there is turmoil and hostility. From one hemisphere to another people are fighting—fighting for freedom. In the almost 200 years that have passed since we fought for our independence, I think Americans sometimes forget what it was we were after and how precious a commodity it is.

The week of July 13-19 is of special significance to all those countries fighting for freedom. This is Captive Nations Week, and it is a time for special remembrance for our brothers who have not yet won their fight. This year the observance has added meaning in that it represents the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, as it was established by a congressional resolution, signed into Public Law 86-90 by President Eisenhower in July, 1959.

Over the last 10 years there has been much growth in the observance of Captive Nations Week. Today as we pay tribute to those nations still struggling under the yoke of captivity, we are joined by others the whole world over who have succeeded in their efforts to be free.

Many good people in my district have settled in New Jersey after fleeing the tyranny rampant in their homelands. It is in talking with them that I have come to treasure even more the freedom and independence we have here in our own country. These many friends, however, have loved ones that still live in countries abroad dominated by the rule of Communist aggression. It is to them that we must offer the hope of a time when they too can enjoy again the freedom to

think as they please, to worship in their own way, to elect their own officials, to make an honest living by a means of their own choosing.

Let us during this week rededicate ourselves to the struggle to free all men. Furthermore, we cannot make this a goal for only 1 week out of the year. Man must always be on guard to protect his independence. For those people from whom this precious liberty has been taken, we must work every day.

CHARLES CASTLEMAN A MASTER VIOLINIST

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the spiraling career of one of my constituents who has proven himself to be a master violinist. His name is Charles Castleman. Born in Quincy, and later moving to Braintree, Mass., he began taking violin and piano lessons when he was only 4. Just 2 years later, he performed with Arthur Fiedler, and the Boston Pops. In 1951, Harold Schonberg of the New York Times said:

When Charles was only 9, his bow arm was strong and flexible, his rhythm superb. There was plenty of assurance and dash in his performances, and a prevalent musicianship that appeared to stem from his own instincts. Careful training, of course, was responsible for the accuracy of his conceptions but no coaching that ever existed could have supplied the natural flow one heard yesterday afternoon. (New York Times, Oct. 15, 1951.)

Three years later, he soloed at the New York Philharmonic. Between the ages of 13 and 16, he played Carnegie Hall four times and appeared on the Frank Sinatra, Lawrence Welk, Arthur Godfrey, and Jackie Gleason shows. He entered Harvard after receiving a National Scholarship Award even though he was only 15. For this accomplishment, he received a personal letter from John F. Kennedy.

After attending Curtis Institute in Philadelphia, he won two major international contests, the Tchaikowski Competition in Moscow, U.S.S.R. and the Queen Elizabeth Concours in Brussels, thus becoming the only American violinist to successfully represent the United States in two major international contests. Having played tour dates all over Canada and the United States he went on his first full-fledged European tour in the spring of 1968. Here are some of the reviews he received:

"Crisp Rhythm of Young U.S. Violinist. This unassuming young American has great gifts—a firm, crisp rhythm, bright tone and a lively rapid vibrato that imparts vitality to every phrase. Highlights of the concert were his beautiful 'shaping' of the running passages in the finale of Hindemith's Sonata Op. 31, No. 1, the ringing octaves in the Paganini Caprice and the astonishing skill with which he overcame the difficulties of the Ysaye Sonata." (London Daily Telegraph.)

"Charles Castleman is a devil of a violinist, of the romantic caliber of a Paganini and Sarasate. The powerful tone of his instrument filled the auditorium to the last corner, always pure in intonation and clear even in the most complex passages. Castleman masters all the tricks and subtleties of his trade. His contact with the almost hypnotized audience was terrific, and so was the enthusiasm." (Berlin, Die Welt.)

"The fascination of Castleman's violin is among the rare surprises of a season. He choreographs the music down to the last note, and has almost all the techniques one could wish for in an international virtuoso. Technique and virtuosity, however are only the means to an end for him. Rarely does one hear so little superficiality in a violinist. If things go as they ought to, he will have an outstanding career" (Munich Abendzeitung.)

"A Violinist Extraordinary. The audience found all its expectations surpassed, and everyone applauded for three. Castleman offered a program that only a few artists can master; with admiration, we have to report that this young violinist cannot be rated high enough as an interpreter and technical wizard. We shall long remember the rich, clear tone of his Guadagnini violin." (Salzburger Volksblatt.)

The reviews he received in the United States were no less complimentary.

"A clear sense of musical style and purpose . . . a performer of international stature, Castleman has the stuff brilliant careers are made of." (Washington Post.)

"It is hard to believe that the source of this complex tonal edifice was a single violin. Rhythmic intricacies were flawlessly executed; technical problems seemed nonexistent—he sang with humanly expressive power." (Boston Christian Science Monitor.)

"New Violinist Scores Big Triumph Here. The pièce de résistance was Charles Castleman. He attacks with much bravura and continues with a rich tone that is often as smooth as velvet. His style is persuasive, his phrasing beautiful." (Houston Chronicle.)

"Castleman Stylish Violin Soloist. This was a stylish, mature playing by an artist with taste as well as technique. Mr. Castleman's attack's were clean, his phrasing crisp in the outer movements of Mozart's Concerto in D, and there was both warmth and elegance in the Andante. Whether in the intimate context of the Mozart or the all-out bravura playing of Wieniawski's Concerto No. 1, Mr. Castleman was unreservedly involved most effectively to his audience which responded with a storm of applause. (New York Times.)

Few men will ever receive such acclaim much less at such a young age. Far be it for us to try to add to the praise of his peers, nevertheless, the service he has rendered our Nation's image demands our attention. Consequently, I wish you and the rest of the House to applaud this young American and wish him continued success.

I include at this point the letter he received from John F. Kennedy 12 years ago:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1957.
MR. CHARLES CASTLEMAN,
Braintree, Mass.

DEAR CHARLES: I wish to send my sincere congratulations to you on recently receiving a National Scholarship Award from Harvard University.

With every good wish for the future, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE END OF LINE POWER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine article which recently appeared in the Boston Jewish Times. One of the regular features of this newspaper is the "State of Affairs" column, normally written by Mr. Emanuel "Manny" Goldberg, who following experience in journalism, now serves as assistant dean for university planning at Brandeis University. In addition, Mr. Goldberg has taken an active and exemplary interest in both Massachusetts and community politics and civic affairs.

However, he has been upstaged for the moment by his daughter Betsy, who has made a significant contribution to "State of Affairs." Betsy's comments on the generation gap and the "line problem" offer insight to both young and old. To me, one of the most impressive aspects of this article is that such mature and provocative comments are written by one so young. Miss Goldberg is 13 years old, and will be a ninth grader at the Beaver Country Day School in Boston this fall. It seems as though Betsy is more than following in her father's footsteps—she is forging ahead. At this time I should like to offer "State of Affairs," by Miss Betsy Goldberg:

THE END OF LINE POWER

I want to apologize to those of you who were expecting my father this week—but at the end you might realize that the lapse was worthwhile.

The purpose for this column (my first) is to bring a different view into the traditional "State of Affairs" column. I would like to express some of my own opinions about the world, America and society.

When you hear the word "America," what do you think of? Hot fudge sundaes; red, white and blue; peace? Or a run-down city and ghetto with poverty-stricken people? Many of us find that our ideas about this country change as we grow older, experience more, and learn more about the views and problems of others.

Most people with a clear and honest mind are able to think about both the good and bad things in our country. Fortunately, so far, the bad things have never seemed to get us down. Maybe this is because we are optimistic and believe that all problems can work themselves out in America.

Now let me consider the world's problems. Are they really so complicated and threatening? Let me tell you my ideas and how I think some matters can be solved.

Human woes all started when man invented the line; yes, a simple line as long or short as you want to make it. These lines are a part of everyone's life. A simple line separates people. It is a boundary, border or restriction. It segregates black and white; it separates state from state. Eventually, it leads to Country versus Country.

Is there any hope for mankind so long as we "draw the line"? The answer is to try to eliminate boundaries and the wrong kind of discrimination.

Hopefully, a century from now, mankind will have invented something so overpowering that it can destroy "line-power." It will be something precious that everyone can

own, rich or poor. It will be able to transcend all artificial boundaries, even the ones that now separate people. It will rush on without being stopped. Maybe the invention will simply be love and brotherhood.

Getting back to today and the demonstrations, sit-ins, riots, etc. on the leading college campuses, all I can add is "example." Wasn't it great how the matter was handled at Brandeis? Perhaps Brandeis had a special appeal and challenge for the students.

I don't agree completely with the views of every college student who uses non-violent methods to express them. But I admire these methods. Outsiders and unlawful groups rush in to use violence, merely to get publicity for the situation, and this soon gets out of hand. I still haven't figured out why the demonstrations against war, poverty, discrimination, etc. arise mainly on college campuses. They'll be more effective if they are directed to the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

I don't agree with non-negotiable "demands" unless these are things that have already been promised. When students or anyone else "demand" things unlawfully, they must realize that in the end they can be dismissed from school or face other consequences.

Nobody can predict what all these outbursts at the college will eventually lead to. The situation is dangerous but all responsible teenagers hope it results in a change for the better and a good society.

I don't understand why the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) call themselves that because the last thing they are for is a democratic society. Maybe it seems that the contradiction is the best approach for them to get attention. Do you think they are succeeding?

I just hope the voice of the best in young America will continue to be heard. Already youth knows it will not be able to accept important commands without having something to say about them.

With all the things they are doing to be articulate, youth sometimes wonders if it is accomplishing anything besides a joke. But everyone has a unique way of doing things, their own "flair", from the hippies to the brilliant Harvard students.

The joke is really on the adults who won't listen to the kids, who themselves don't realize the harm they can do if they use violence, and on the people, kids and adults alike, who want to destroy things but put nothing in their place.

The kids keep asking the right questions. It is up to the adults to help them find the right answers so that the two, together, can live in a better world.

STEVE DUNFORD

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, a distinguished citizen of Utah, an old friend of mine and thousands of others, died in Salt Lake City. He was Stephen Love Dunford, former chairman of the board and president of Dunford Bakers.

Steve's mother baked bread in her kitchen in the early days of the depression, and her sons sold it door to door. After the death of their mother, the Dunford boys decided to carry on the tradition. There were three of them. Steve who was the oldest, was the busi-

ness developer. His brothers performed the other essential production sales and procurement activities of a new and growing business. They established first retail outlets, then they started selling at wholesale and established foodstore retail bakery outlets.

The Dunford Bread Co. became the largest and best known business of its kind in the Intermountain West. All the brothers, and later their sons, worked hard in their local, family-owned business and made it a giant, by local standards, and all through the growth, Steve was the business developer, a smiling, open-hearted, friendly, compassionate man. He was a great citizen, a loyal husband and father, and a wise and practical counselor. In addition to his widow, the former Mae Christensen, he leaves the following sons and daughters: Larry Stephen, Craig C., Jayne, Mrs. David E. "Kay" Thomas, James Clark, Steven Mark, Christopher Richard, all of Salt Lake City; one grandchild; brothers, L. Clayton, Burns L., both of Salt Lake City.

Steve was a great sportsman and made herculean contributions to the growth of competitive golf in Utah, where many affectionately called him, "Mr. Utah Golf" after he received the award from the Utah Golf Association.

Utah and the West have lost a great and progressive citizen. His family has lost a husband and father who loved them with great devotion.

SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS MUST BE BUILT AND ADEQUATE FINANCING IS NEEDED AS PROVIDED IN MY BILL H.R. 12913

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all the world observes the magnificent accomplishment of our Nation in the exploration of space and the broadening of the world's horizons, there are many Americans who feel we must hide our heads in shame because of the water damage that we are doing here to the good earth the Almighty has given us. At the same time that we are proudly and properly able to send our intrepid astronauts to the moon, we look about us and see the natural resources of our waterways polluted and filthy—almost unusable by human beings in many instances. We are obviously on earth abusing the heritage which has been given to us here on earth.

There are many Americans, Mr. Speaker, myself included, who are fed up with this filth. They are fed up with what must appear as hypocrisy on the part of their Government. This House has in the past frequently and consistently enacted legislation with the view to controlling pollution of our Nation's waters. It has done so in a sincere effort by Members on both sides of the aisle, and, in fact, usually unanimously, to rid

ourselves of a situation that is deplorable and horrifying. And yet when it comes down to the cold hard facts of life—when it comes down to the spending of money, we balk at spending a small amount per citizen to construct and aid in the construction of sewage treatment works.

There is no question that we are not putting enough into our effort to clean up the Nation's waters and there is no question that we cannot continue to mark time while pollution abounds about us.

We must face the facts, Mr. Speaker. There appear to be only two possible alternate solutions. The first is that we appropriate the funds necessary to do the job. The second is that we provide a means of financing for the funds we do not appropriate. Let me make myself perfectly clear. The best means of doing the job is to appropriate the money and see to it that it is spent where it will do the most good. A financing scheme is a second best solution. We all know that.

We are all aware, however, that frequently we must accept the second best solution until we can accomplish the first best. Now, personally, I favor an increase in appropriations for our construction grant program for treatment works. As a practical matter, I realize that at this time, even though we might be able to increase appropriations in this area to some extent and should increase these appropriations, the sad truth appears to be that we will not be able to appropriate the full amount that this Congress has authorized. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill today, H.R. 12913, that is in all substantial regards the same as was suggested by the administration and conveyed to the Speaker with executive communication 967. I think that the text of that communication is most interesting to this body and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring it to the attention of all of the Members now. It says:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate Committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

As indicated during the recent Congressional hearings on the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, this Administration has given considerable attention to the serious problem of financing the construction of needed waste treatment works. Last year, both houses of the Congress passed S. 3206, a bill which would have provided a supplementary method of financing waste treatment works. That legislation was not enacted because of problems regarding other parts of last year's water pollution legislation and the lack of time to resolve them. Enclosed is a proposal which is very similar to that approach.

The problem of cleaning up our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters is critical. This bill would provide a mechanism to provide the necessary Federal financing to help meet water quality standards. The proposal would

provide additional financing alternatives to the States. It would allow significant increases in capital investments within State programs for the construction of new facilities to help meet abatement schedules presently established in accordance with the water quality standards.

The bill would add a new subsection (f) to section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The subsection would provide a new and additional method of financing the construction of waste treatment works. This method would be in addition to the direct grants for such works authorized under section 8(b) of the Act.

Under this new method the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into long-term, not to exceed 30 years, contracts with a State or local governmental unit to pay in installments the Federal share of the costs of constructing such works. The Federal share would be determined in the same manner as the Federal share is determined for grants; that is, 30, 40, 50, or 55 percent as the case may be.

Before entering into any contracts under the bill, the total sum available for contracts will have to be established in appropriation Acts for each of the fiscal years 1970 and 1971. This sum cannot, however, exceed the sum authorized to be appropriated under section 8(d) of the Act in those fiscal years, less the sum appropriated for such grants.

The sum available for contracts would be allotted to the States by the same formula as funds appropriated in excess of the first \$100 million are allotted for grants under section 8(c) of the Act—that is, by population.

These allotted sums will be available to the States for obligation for the fiscal year it was allotted, plus 6 months. In fiscal year 1970, these sums will be available for obligation for 18 months from the date of enactment of this legislation.

The payments made under each contract would be available to cover the cost of items listed in the definition of the term "construction" in section 8(e) of the Act.

The proposal would authorize the use, at the discretion of a State, of up to 25 percent of the sum available to a State from its contract allotments in each of fiscal years 1970 and 1971 to enter into long-term agreements to provide reimbursement payments for eligible treatment works for which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966, without a Federal grant or with only a partial Federal grant. These treatment works are those that are found to be eligible by the Secretary for reimbursement under section 8(c) of the Act.

AUTHORIZATIONS PROPOSED

The Department has given serious attention to the problem of the level and duration of authorizations. We have also closely scrutinized estimates of needs for the waste treatment grant program.

Our analysis of needs to meet water quality standards during the 1970-3 period indicates that a Federal grant level of about \$750 million a year would be adequate. These figures are based on total needs over the four year period of \$4.7 billion for new treatment plants and upgrading; \$2.7 billion for replacement and expansion of existing plants; less \$1.1 billion for investments made in 1968 and 1969; \$.5 billion for new industrial connections to municipal plants; \$.5 billion for phosphate removal facilities for communities in the Great Lakes area and the 20 largest cities; and \$.2 billion for allowances for cost increases.

Although based upon the best available data and assumptions concerning needs, these estimates must still be considered somewhat tentative. For example, cost differentials among various regions of the country may exert a significant influence on costs.

Changes in the rate of industrial connections could add or subtract to the overall municipal needs. Improvements in technology or greater use of regional treatment facilities could reduce costs while higher treatment requirements could increase them. Ongoing review of these and other related issues are expected to provide a significantly more accurate estimate than the current one.

Because of these considerations, the Department is not proposing, at this time, any extension of the waste treatment grant authorizations beyond fiscal year 1971. The refined estimates that will be part of the 1970 "Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact" should be tailored to needs as closely as possible to assure they can be used for planning purposes by State and local governments. The Department expects to come forward with new proposed authorization levels early next year.

FUTURE OF THE WASTE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

One of the most important areas of concern to us is the priority system followed by the States in connection with the treatment works grant program. Section 8(b) of the Act requires that a project for which a Federal grant is sought must, among other things, be in conformity with the State water pollution control plan approved under section 7 and be certified by the States as entitled to a priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial and pollution control needs. The Act provides that the State plan set forth the criteria used by the State in determining the priority of projects. The Department is greatly concerned that heretofore adequate attention has not been given to developing criteria that will achieve the objectives of the Act. In our review of such State plans in the forthcoming fiscal year we will begin to pay more attention to the "criteria" and to the adequacy thereof. We will work with those States where improvements are needed to accomplish this, to the extent that this can be done in FY 1970 without disrupting State planning already underway, and we will where necessary, consider disapproval of State plans that are not adequate despite our efforts to cooperate. In fiscal year 1971 we will expect such considerations to be fully implemented in the State planning process.

As the review of the criteria progresses, we will want to know what consideration, if any, is being given to the extent to which treatment works contribute to the realization of public benefits, including assurance that other sources of pollution will not preclude the realization of such benefits; provisions for training, surveillance, and adequate project planning and design will assure effective management of the treatment works; the project is part of an effective river basin pollution control plan or management program already developed or under development; the area served takes advantage of economies from large-scale treatment works; and the extent to which the community has established a system of charges or other revenue measures to meet current operation costs of the treatment system, amortization costs, and other requirements.

Section 8(a) of the present Act authorizes us to make grants subject to a number of limitations. Section 8(b)(1) requires that a grant cannot be made "unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act" which includes the comprehensive programs developed under sections 3 and 7(f) of the Act. These programs, among other things should consider the possibility of regional collection and treatment systems. Besides taking full advantage of economies of scale which result from such systems, we believe this practice is consistent with section 8(b)(1) of the Act in the making of construction grants. We

should avoid a proliferation of small inefficient systems that increase costs to all levels of government and achieve less than optimum water quality. Similarly, foreseeable growth patterns and needs and plans developed to meet those needs should be considered in the development of plans. We will review applications to determine whether regional treatment systems are feasible, and if they are, we will encourage their becoming a reality.

Another area of concern is the requirement for assuring proper operation and maintenance of treatment works. We believe the State and the applicant should be able to demonstrate at the time of the approval of the grant under section 8(c) of the Act that a sufficient number of operators will be provided and that operator personnel will be adequately trained; that equipment will be adequately maintained; and that laboratory and surveillance facilities are adequate to assure that the treatment plant will perform according to design specifications. We will insist on such assurance.

The Department is looking very closely at the problem of funding of facilities used primarily for industrial treatment. The Congress has indicated support for joint municipal-industrial treatment systems. More consideration and study is needed in this area, however, on proper cost allocation. We are reviewing very closely any project for which the industrial treatment is a significant portion of the total, and will present to the Congress our findings on what we believe to be an appropriate cost-sharing arrangement. We also plan to develop an overall proposal on this problem, after study.

These are just a few areas of concern where we are acting now to improve the program. I have directed that a total review of this program be undertaken immediately to see what its successes, shortcomings, and failures have been and to develop effective administrative and legislative proposals for the purpose of improving the program. Our objective is to propose needed legislative changes early next year in connection with the re-authorization changes that will be needed in fiscal year 1971.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislative proposal is consistent with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am introducing differs by some language, which was developed here with the aid of our committee and legislative counsel, for the purpose of eliminating one or two possible ambiguities in the bill as suggested by the Secretary of Interior and preserve the objectives of the bill as intended by the Secretary of the Interior.

I have been given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that certain Members of the other body are considering raising the appropriation for this purpose, and I say more power to them. The purpose of my bill is to assure that the maximum amount of money will be available for the building of these works. It seems unlikely to me, and I am sure that there are many Members who will agree, that whatever the appropriation is for the forthcoming fiscal year and year following, that it will equal the full authorization under the law. Therefore, this bill will still serve a purpose. It provides that during fiscal year 1970 whatever amount that has been authorized by the unappropriated for construction grants-in-aid are authorized to be made available

for a contract program by the United States will contract to pay the Federal share over a 30-year period. For fiscal year 1971 a formula is devised to encourage increased appropriations for grants and to supplement those grants by a contract authority. In this case, the contract authority can be up to three times the amount of the grants appropriated. The purpose of this formula is to preclude any idea on the part of anyone that we are encouraging a contract program in lieu of a grant program. With this approach, it is clear that the primary intention of Congress is that there be a grant program, if necessary to be supplemented by a contract program.

I feel that we cannot delay this vital program any longer. We must take action to indicate to all that it is the intent of Congress that higher priority be given in the saving of our Nation's waterways. I feel we must do this now. We cannot wait.

Mr. Speaker, we have only a limited amount of water and even more limited clean water. We are not going to be able to bring more into being. We must make do with what we have and if we poison it, there will be no more and what there is will to that extent be defiled. The pinch is already being felt—even in the Washington area—with the water shortage and filth in the Potomac River. How much greater must the crisis become before action is taken?

This legislation is essential.

EXPOSING THE POSTAL CORPORATION MYTH

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure to hear the excellent testimony of Mr. James Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Postal Reform.

Mr. Speaker, our committee and the American public have heard a great deal about a great salvation—the coming of a new idea that would solve all the problems of the Post Office Department—the so-called Postal Corporation. To hear the advocates of the Postal Corporation you would be led to conclude that the adoption of this concept would, within 5 years after its commencement, produce an efficient, economical, business-oriented Post Office Department. And here lies the crux of the issue. Can such a business, removed from the control of the people, achieve its promised goals without raising postal rates and fees, lowering Post Office employees' wages, and decreasing postal services? I think not.

This was the thrust of Mr. Rademacher's testimony—the Post Office Department would no longer be a service for the people, but rather it would be a cold, aloof business run by strangers.

However, make no mistake about it, like myself, Mr. Rademacher recognizes the need for postal reform. What he is really saying is that a Postal Corporation is not necessary to solve the problems of the Post Office Department for, "There are better ways of ridding a dog of fleas than drowning the dog."

I wish that the American people could have the opportunity to read Mr. Rademacher's thoughtful and incisive statement.

I, therefore, submit Mr. Rademacher's statement for inclusion in the RECORD so that my colleagues who do not sit on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will have an opportunity to read it. Mr. Rademacher's statement follows:

POSTAL REFORM STATEMENT OF JAMES H. RADEMACHER, PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

For the purpose of the record, I would like to state that my name is James H. Rademacher, and that I am President of the National Association of Letter Carriers, with offices at 100 Indiana Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. We have approximately 210,000 members in more than 6,500 branches located in every State of the Union and in all our possessions.

Today I am accompanied by J. Stanley Lewis, Vice President; William T. Sullivan, Secretary-Treasurer; J. Joseph Vacca, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; George A. Bang, Director of Life Insurance; Austin B. Carlson, director of Health Insurance; Glenn M. Hodges, Assistant Director of Health Insurance; Dr. Joseph S. Smolen, Director of Training and Union Development; and Gerald Cullinan, noted postal historian and my Administrative Aide.

Needless to say, we are extremely grateful for the opportunity to appear before you and express our views concerning postal reform.

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

I would like to begin this statement with a simple pronouncement of fact:

The National Association of Letter Carriers is solidly in favor of postal reform.

This should not be necessary to state at this time and in this place. We have been on record for many years, urging certain basic reforms in the structure of the postal establishment. We were, indeed, urging such reform long before the proponents of a postal corporation were ever heard from.

Unfortunately, however, there have appeared in many newspapers throughout the country a series of "canned" editorials attacking and insulting the National Association of Letter Carriers, its leaders and its members, by claiming that we are opposed to postal reform of any sort.

I say these editorials are "canned" because certain phrases run through them, repeated time after time, to such an extent that the possibility of coincidence must be excluded.

One such recurrent phrase concerns the "cozy relationship" which we are alleged to have with the Congress and which, it is charged, we are unwilling to lose.

It is true that we have tried to enjoy over the eighty years of our existence, a friendly relationship with Congress. We would be foolish if we did not do so, since time after time, Congress has represented the only source from which we could obtain justice. We are, naturally enough, opposed to having this relationship destroyed through a reorganization program which would leave us literally at the mercy of a group of corporation managers.

But, the word "cozy" is, frankly, irritating and misleading. It smacks of indelicacy. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if our rela-

tionship with the Congress were as intimate as the phrase implies, our members would be far better off than they are today!

These editorials have sought to imply that there is something improper about the letter carriers exercising their constitutional rights by presenting our case to the Congress in as attractive a light as possible.

One would think, after reading such holler-than-thou editorials, that no lobbyist for the newspapers or the magazine ever darkened the corridors of Capitol Hill with his presence, or tried to urge the Congress to keep their rates of postage at an abnormally low level.

The NALC is for reform—total reform—of the postal establishment, but we see no reason why such reform cannot be accomplished under the present structure of the Post Office. We support, in short, your bill, Mr. Chairman—H.R. 4—which, in our opinion, would do just about everything the corporation proposal would do and would still keep the Post Office—the most essential system of communications in the free world—in the hands of the people through their elected representatives in the Congress.

It has been interesting to me, during these hearings, to find that neither the Postmaster General nor Mr. Frederick Kappel, could come up with a decisive answer when asked why reform could not be achieved under the present structure of the Post Office. Their answers, when boiled down, amounted to the unsupported assertion that they thought the corporation concept would be better, but they gave no solid or convincing reasons *why* they thought this way.

Mr. Chairman, it is our basic contention that the Post Office is, and always must be, a service to all the American people. It is not a moneymaking scheme; it is not a public utility.

Time and time again Congress has insisted on this public service concept of the Post Office, particularly in the Acts of 1794, 1844, 1851, 1930, 1958 and 1962. Time and time again the postal managers and other representatives of the Executive Branch (particularly the Bureau of the Budget) have nibbled away at the corners of this Congressional policy. It was significant to us that during the Postmaster General's extensive testimony before this Committee there was very little emphasis placed on the sanctity and importance of the postal service; the major emphasis was always placed on the need for economies; the need for *saving a buck*, rather than the need for *serving a patron*.

I am not maintaining that there is anything beautiful or desirable about the postal deficit. I am sure that the Post Office can be operated more efficiently and economically than it is, and every effort should be made to keep the deficit at a minimum.

But, I also think the postal deficit has been grotesquely magnified in the public mind. Since 1950, the Gross National Product has more than tripled. During that same period, the population of the United States has increased by one-third. But in 1957-1959 dollars—"real" dollars—the postal deficit is actually less per capita today than it was in 1950. In real dollars the deficit in 1950 came to \$4.29 a year. In 1968 it came to \$4.22 a year.

And, while \$4.22 a year is probably too much—I still say it is the greatest investment the average American citizen can possibly make. It returns to him economic advantages amounting to hundreds of times his investment—and it also, of course, returns to him educational, social and political advantages which are beyond computation.

We hear a great deal of adverse criticism of the so-called "subsidies" built into the postal deficit. These subsidies amount to approximately \$700 million a year. There may be some unnecessary subsidies involved in the figure, but by far the majority of them are in the public interest and have been re-

peatedly designated by the Congress as being desirable and necessary for the welfare of our society.

But, it puzzles us why this \$700 million in postal subsidies should be singled out for scorn and attention, when so many other and more formidable subsidies festoon the Federal Budget.

The farm subsidy runs to about five times the postal public service deficit, but it doesn't get nearly the same publicity or criticism. The military budget is interlaced with subsidies of one sort or another which, if examined objectively, would dwarf the public service budget of the Post Office. I am certainly not arguing one way or another about the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance (we have enough troubles of our own without getting into *that* controversy), but I do suggest that this is a subsidy far in excess of that for which the Post Office is so derisively abused.

The public service deficit of the Post Office—six tenths of the total deficit—has been built into the postal policy of the Post Office by the Congress. In my opinion it has returned to the people of the United States more benefits than any other subsidy permitted to any other group in the country. It is a subsidy to *all* the people of the United States and, for the most part, it falls upon all our citizens, great and small, with admirable impartiality.

The postal deficit probably is too large. But it is far less important than the *service* deficit for which the management of the Post Office—at the dictation of the Bureau of the Budget—must bear the principal responsibility and blame.

Our second point, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, is that the postal service is far too important to the people of the United States ever to be permitted to be removed from the control of the people through their elected representatives in Congress.

I shall touch on this subject more thoroughly later on in this statement, but I want to establish our philosophical point-of-view on this very important matter.

The postal service, directly or indirectly, affects every single man, woman and child in the Nation every working day of the year. It must *never* be let out of the hands of the people.

Some say that a corporation would handle the mails more efficiently than the Government can handle them. I seriously doubt the truth of this. But as desirable as efficiency is in any kind of operation, I do not think that, in this case, it is the sole or even most important objective of the postal establishment.

Democracy is not the most efficient form of Government, it is merely the best. Certainly Fascism is more "efficient," and, perhaps, even Communism is more "efficient," if we disregard the human values involved. But the human values are the important ones, and they must take precedence when we consider government—or the system of communications on which our form of government depends for its success, and its very existence.

Those who control the communications of a country as large as ours, control the nation. We must not let that control get out of the grasp of the people. We must not permit Congress to relinquish its prerogative of oversight.

I do not see in the corporation bill—H.R. 11750—nearly enough safeguards, or sufficient checks and balances, to protect the American people from serious incursions upon their freedom and their rights.

The bill gives to the Chief Executive Officer of the Postal Service almost unlimited powers, but does not supply, in our opinion, sufficient protection against the misuse of such powers.

Your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, gives to the Postmaster General far more extensive powers than he has now, but it still retains

in the hands of the people—through their Congressmen—the means of preventing such abuses. We must never relinquish such means.

The Post Office must be reformed, but it must be reformed in a prudent way. There are, in short, better ways of ridding a dog of fleas than drowning the dog.

THE CORPORATION MYTHOLOGY

In recent months, I have been particularly impressed—and rather appalled—by the almost blind and child-like faith that so many Americans have in the efficiency of corporations *per se*. This faith—which seems to be equally shared by a large section of the American press—a large segment of the American people—and a surprisingly large number of Members of Congress—seems to hold that a corporation—by very virtue of its *being* a corporation—can do no wrong, and that Government—by very virtue of its *being* Government—can do no right.

This is part of the American mythology.

I might say that, like all other myths, it is inconsistent.

Something goes wrong with the Post Office Department, and a large number of citizens want to scrap it and turn it into a corporation.

On the other hand, something goes wrong with the privately-owned Washington transit corporation, and a large number of citizens want to scrap it and turn it into a Government agency!

There is a certain element of restlessness apparent, a desire for change for change's sake. I submit that in a matter so important as the structure and ownership of the Post Office, we cannot afford to indulge in such capriciousness.

When Mr. Frederick Kappel—who is certainly one of the most devoted and distinguished citizens in the land—testified before this Committee recently, he exhibited an almost naive faith in the efficacy of paying top executive majestic salaries as a means of curing the Post Office of all its ills.

This seems to me almost a classic case of an overcommitment to *expertise*.

The payment of enormous salaries to top executives is no guarantee of managerial efficiency.

Probably no industry in America today pays more monumental salaries than does the automobile industry—and no industry has been guilty of more monumental boo-boos.

It was not the Government, for example, which produced the Edsel or the Corvair, or which turned out hundreds of thousands of automobiles which had to be recalled because of faulty or unsafe features in basic design.

It was not the Postal Inspection Service which perpetrated that appalling and childish persecution of Ralph Nader; it was private detectives hired by the very top management people in General Motors.

If mistakes of such magnitude were made in Government, heads would roll and, in some instances, criminal proceedings would be imminent.

Every week we read of mergers in the private sector which have been made necessary because of managerial ineptitude in one, if not both, of the amalgamating corporations. And, I remember reading, in a national magazine recently, that at least 30 per cent of those mergers turn out unsuccessfully because of poor managerial planning.

Of course, there are thousands of beautifully-run corporations in America today. But there are a good number of badly-run corporations, too. Just by calling the postal establishment a corporation, we are not assured of its being, automatically, a managerial success.

And what happens if we get a corporation that is *not* a managerial success? What happens if we get a *badly-run* corporation? We would be far worse off than we are now, because the remedies could not be so quickly

applied as they can be today. The hands of the Congress would be comparatively tied and the entire economy and social life of the Nation could suffer serious harm before the situation could be cured.

I remember during these hearings, Postmaster General Blount was asked what would happen if the corporation were tried out, and failed. The Postmaster General laughed and said: "I don't know. Things couldn't possibly be worse than they are now."

With all due respect, I beg to differ. Things could be one hell of a lot worse than they are now. Certainly the operation of the Post Office is in a state of some disrepair today, but its faults and inefficiencies are being greatly exaggerated by the corporation proponents. The Post Office is handling 84 billion pieces of mail a year. The mail is getting through—sometimes a little slower than we would like—but it is getting through.

If the corporation concept were tried—and failed dismally—(a possibility which the most ardent advocates of the proposal will not deny)—we would have instant chaos, instant dissolution, instant financial and economic crisis. If the crisis continued for any length of time, we could even have serious political upheavals.

It is, in my opinion, unpardonably frivolous for the Postmaster General to say that the postal service couldn't be worse than it is today.

It is also, in my opinion, frivolous of the advocates of the corporation concept to admit that they have no idea whether or not the corporation would succeed, but they think it is "worth a try."

It is also not only frivolous,—but wickedly false,—for the advocates of the corporation concept to say—as they have said in correspondence with me—that the postal service is no longer the most essential system of communications available to our citizens.

We are dealing, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, with the most important—the most essential—system of communications in the free world today. There is a very clear line of demarcation which separates bold and thoughtful reformation from reckless and irresponsible experimentation. I submit that those favoring a postal corporation have passed that dividing line without even giving it a wave of recognition.

I cannot resist adding one more point on this subject. We of the National Association of Letter Carriers admit completely that the Post Office Department would benefit by more able and more enlightened leadership. We do not agree, however, that this is the only, or even the major, problem blocking the road to postal excellence.

The quality of the postal service ultimately and basically depends upon the quality of the people who work in the service. All the mechanization and automation in the world cannot compensate for the handicap of a disillusioned and disheartened work force which is turning over every year at an increasingly accelerated rate. All the mechanical improvements known to man cannot overcome the obstacle of perennially decreasing quality among the average applicants for postal jobs. The following chart contains statistics on turnover in the postal service during the past five years. Certainly we need continuity of top management, but what is more important to an efficient postal service is continuity of productive employees.

TURNOVER, SEPARATIONS, AND SEPARATION RATE¹

	Separations	Separation rate
Year:		
1964.....	69,687	11.83
1965.....	89,534	14.86
1966.....	155,703	23.32
1967.....	193,703	27.4
1968.....	166,726	23.2

¹ Source: Post Office Department.

As I have said before, I have tremendous admiration for Mr. Kappel, even though we have some basic disagreements in our respective philosophies. However, I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the solution to most of the present postal problems does not lie with the creation of hundred-thousand-dollar-a-year postal tycoons; it lies with the creation of \$10,000-a-year letter carriers and postal clerks.

"End of commercial."

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSAL

We were especially pleased during the hearings when the question of the constitutionality of the corporation proposal was raised. Indeed, we had hoped that this question would be more extensively explored. It has, in our opinion, and in the opinion of counsel, a considerable degree of validity.

It is true that the General Counsel of the Post Office Department has—upon request—supplied an opinion that the creation of a postal corporation would be permissible under the Constitution of the United States.

If I may say so, we would like a somewhat more objective opinion on the matter. Traditionally, it has been the nature—even the function—of Departmental lawyers to utter opinions supporting positions already taken by their bosses.

(Many of you will remember an incident which occurred eleven years ago when the Judicial Officer of the Post Office Department was fired out of hand because he had issued an opinion—on request—that the Federal courts would not declare *Lady Chatterley's Lover* an obscene book. It turned out he was perfectly right—but he remained fired. Objectivity among Federal lawyers is not usually encouraged and can be fatal.)

Certainly, the constitutionality of this proposal should be tested before any action is taken.

Article One, Section 8 of the Constitution says "the Congress shall have power . . . to establish post offices and post roads." This is the same section, as you know, which gives Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, and so forth.

It would certainly seem to me no more constitutional to turn over the operation of the Post Office—including the creation and abolition of post offices—to a corporation than it would be to turn over the Pentagon to a corporation.

Most important of all, Section 8 of Article One, says that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises." Postage, Mr. Chairman, is just as much a tax as is the income tax. Congress has traditionally considered it so. Certainly, it is also, by definition, an impost.

If there is any significant sentiment for demolishing the Post Office Department and creating some kind of corporation in its place, it would seem to us far more advisable, and considerably more legal, to try to achieve this through amending the Constitution.

Certainly if an attempt is made to achieve this radical change through simple legislation, the legislation will be seriously challenged in the Federal courts. And, if the courts decided the action was indeed unconstitutional, a considerable amount of serious confusion would ensue.

Now, I would like to speak very frankly for a moment—if I may—on another aspect of this business which I find very disturbing.

There has been a tendency—a somewhat unwholesome tendency, in our opinion—among certain elements of the Congress, to delegate unpopular, difficult, or, perhaps, politically embarrassing functions to the Executive Branch. (The recent decision of the other body to get rid of the obligation of confirming Presidentially-appointed postmasters is an example.)

Some intimidations of this were heard during these hearings. It was suggested that Congress admit that it is incapable of managing the postal establishment and that it

should quickly wash its hands of the whole burdensome business.

This seems to me a very defeatist attitude. If Congress really feels it is handling Post Office affairs badly—and I think this charge is exaggerated to the point of untruth—then would it not be more inspiring to the American people if Congress were to determine to improve its performance in this area so essential to the welfare of the people it represents?

Congress must perform many functions which are burdensome, and even distasteful, but which are essential to the safety and even the continued existence of the Nation: The setting of taxes, for one thing; the creation of a military draft; the declaring of war, and so forth and so on.

If Congress decides to rid itself of the burdensome (and Constitutional) duty of running the Post Office, where will it all end? Will the imposing of all other taxes—including the income tax—be handed over to a group of bureaucrats who are not directly responsible to the people? If this trend is carried on to an absurd length, will Congress reduce itself to the performance of purely ceremonial functions, like Great Britain's House of Lords?

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think the American people—especially because of recent events—expect Congress to assume more responsibility, not less. I think the American people believe they have a right to expect Congress to improve its performance and increase its responsibilities, instead of throwing up its hands in despair and getting rid of vital functions which it finds burdensome.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCES

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Letter Carriers, and, obviously, many Members of this Committee, were surprised—and more than a little alarmed—by the bland optimism of the Departmental witnesses when they discussed the problems of financing the proposed postal corporation.

They were so euphoric in their attitudes that we got the impression that they were willing to make almost any affirmative statement—no matter how improbable—just as long as it helped to sell the corporation concept. At times the spokesmen were so free with their claims that I was reminded of the spels of the old-time medicine men who used to sell snake-oil to the yokels.

First of all, there was the absolute assurance that the corporation—without raising rates or reducing service or mistreating postal employees—can save the Post Office a billion dollars a year and, within five years, place it on a self-sustaining basis.

Certainly, new procedures, new facilities, new machinery, *et cetera* can do a great deal toward moving the mails faster and better, and they can, undoubtedly save the Post Office a considerable amount of money, but—a billion dollars a year?

As you know, about 82 cents out of the postal dollar go for wages. About 15 cents more go for transportation costs and for other charges (such as the building or the leasing of facilities) which are controlled by the Department (and would be controlled by the corporation) only to a relatively small degree.

That leaves only 3 cents out of the postal dollar which can be saved. And in that 3 cents is the appropriation for research and development—an area in which every thoughtful student of the Post Office agrees, a great deal more money must be spent, not less.

We were startled to read in the Kappel Commission report one specific instance of how enormous savings could be realized. The Report says that they estimate that 15% of the total cost of city delivery can be saved "partly through mechanization and partly through better methods" in the sorting and bookkeeping that letter carriers must perform.

Anyone who knows anything at all about postal operations realizes that these functions are relatively minor and take up very little of a lettercarrier's time. Anyone who thinks that better procedures and mechanization in this area can save 15% of the total cost of the city delivery system simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

If this is the kind of thinking which has inspired such cheerful optimism about operating the postal establishment on a break-even basis within five years, then we would advise the utmost caution in treating the proposal with any seriousness.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) pointed out earlier in these hearings, the Congress, after 35 years, still finds it necessary to pour \$55 million a year into the Tennessee Valley Authority—which has been extolled as such a paragon among Government corporations.

If this is true of a relatively small operation such as the TVA—when compared to the postal establishment, that is—then Congress can expect to be pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year into the postal corporation for many decades to come!

If the corporation were to last that long, of course.

It is quite possible, of course, that a certain amount of money could be saved by the corporation if it were to contract out some of the functions which are now losing money for the Department—such as rural delivery service, parcel post, the collection of mail from mail boxes, and so on. The contractors could conceivably use non-union casual labor for these operations and undercut the costs which the Post Office Department must now pay.

I suppose this *could* be done, but I firmly believe it would be highly inappropriate—dangerous—irresponsible—and, perhaps, illegal to contract out the handling of the people's mail in this way. These proposals are far different from the highly-controlled Star Route procedures.

It would mean that trillions of dollars each year—not to mention the most personal communications between individuals—would be placed in the hands of strangers who would not be directly responsible to the United States Government. I hope we never live to see that take place in this country.

The mail is far too important to be handled in such a haphazard way. We have been struck, during these hearings and in conversations with the advocates of the corporation proposal, by the comparative lack of understanding among them in this area. There is a tendency among them to consider the mail as simply another commodity—not as the precious, irreplaceable, essential thing that it is.

But, to our way of thinking, the corporation-mongers really went into optimistic orbit when they stoutly assured this Committee that they would be able to sell on the open market \$10 billion worth of postal corporation bonds *without the backing of the United States Treasury*.

I can assure you that the skepticism which many Committee members showed on this point was shared by the National Association of Letter Carriers. It is also shared by the union's financial advisers. And, I was very interested to note, it was shared even by Mr. Kappel, whose Commission had envisaged a five-billion dollar bond issue which would be supported and backed by the Treasury—quite a different matter.

We were also interested to note that the Postmaster General—when asked why he had doubled the size of the proposed bond issue from five billion to ten billion, finally admitted that he and his staff had more or less picked the larger figure out of thin air. This seemed to us significant—symbolic, almost—of the rather cavalier way in which

the entire corporation proposal has been presented.

For example, there seemed to be far too little concern among the proponents as to what would happen if the corporation were to be created—and then went bankrupt! Surely no one believes that such a calamity could not occur.

Well, what *would* happen? Shouldn't the results of such a contingency be worked out well in advance before this proposal receives serious consideration?

Would the entire postal service of America grind to a stop? Would it be taken over by its creditors? What can the people of America expect?

It is customary in bankruptcy proceedings to sell off the liquid assets of the corporation so as to pay the bond holders at least something on the dollar. Would this mean selling the General Post Office in New York or the headquarters building here in Washington to the highest bidder? I think not. But what *would* happen?

What would happen if a single corporate entity—like A.T. & T., let us say—controlled enough of the bonds to become the dominant force in the corporation? Would A.T. & T. then control the policies of the postal service—their principal rival in the communications field? And, if the corporation went bankrupt, would A.T. & T. then take over ownership of the postal service and inherit the entire communications monopoly in the United States?

I know, Mr. Chairman, that these contingencies I have mentioned sound way out. But, when we are discussing the postal service of the United States, we are discussing the way we live—all of us, everyone in America. We cannot afford—and the entire free world cannot afford—any reckless assumptions in a matter as grave as this. There is, in the proposal, an appalling lack of safeguards, of checks and balances, of certitudes and defenses against disaster. The line which separates cheery optimism from irresponsibility seems to have been totally obliterated.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that the corporation advocates have been most optimistic—overly optimistic, in my opinion—about their ability to save a billion dollars a year if they can only get their hands on the Post Office.

I submit that, to break even, they will have to save not one billion dollars a year, but two billion dollars.

If they manage to sell their unsupported bonds in today's unreceptive market, they will have to offer an interest rate sufficiently high to attract great lashings of "risk" money—gambling money. Our financial advisers tell us that the interest rate would have to be at least close to 10 percent. This adds another billion dollars a year which the Post Office would have to "save" through better methods, better systems, better procedures.

Two billion dollars a year!

In my humble opinion, this simply cannot be done.

The only way such a goal could even remotely be approached would be through a combination of three alternatives!

—They would have to raise the rates to astronomical heights.

—They would have to reduce service to a whisper, except perhaps in the highly concentrated urban areas, where delivery is comparably easy.

—They would have to keep the pay of postal employees at an intolerably depressed level.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the National Association of Letter Carriers is totally and unalterably opposed to all three of these alternatives.

And, if they knew the facts, I am sure the American people would be, too.

THE POSTAL CORPORATION—A NIGHTMARE FOR THE PATRONS

Actually, the postal corporation, if it ever came into being, would be a nightmare for almost every segment of our population.

Above all, it would be a nightmare for the patrons of the postal service—the individual user and the large professional mailer would suffer equally under its provisions.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this statement, Mr. Chairman, there was no evidence, during the testimony of the advocates of the corporation concept, of any deep concern for the integrity of the postal service—as a service. The emphasis was placed almost everywhere on cutting costs and effecting economies.

As a matter of fact, H.R. 11750—the bill which would create the corporation—makes it very clear that *service*—as we think of it—would be only a secondary consideration. On page 15, lines 1 and 2, for instance, we read that the Postal Service (which is the current euphemism for the corporation) shall "serve as *nearly as practicable* the entire population of the United States."

The corporation would, of course, determine the meaning of the words "nearly" and "practicable"—and, in regard to "nearly" I predict the managers would prove to be mighty poor judges of distance.

There is no economically "practicable" way to deliver the mail to ranchers in Montana and Texas, for example, or even to the farthest end of the average rural route, without charging extra fees for the service the patrons receive.

The U.S. Census Bureau tells us that at the end of 1968, 69.9% of the American population was living on slightly more than one percent of the Nation's land area. What kind of service would this corporation give to the 30.1 percent who live on the other 99% of the land area?

When one is pledged to "save" two billion dollars a year in operating the mails, would it be deemed "practicable" to give this large segment of the population the same free delivery it has become accustomed to receiving?

Also on page 15 (lines 10, 11, 12) we come upon some very ambiguous language which sets up alarm bells in our minds. It says that facilities will be maintained so that patrons will "consistent with reasonable economies of postal operations have ready access to essential postal service."

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I submit that every American—no matter where he lives—has the absolute right to free and frequent and regular delivery of his mail.

And I also submit that all American citizens—no matter where they live—have the absolute right to have "ready access to essential postal service" whether such access is consistent with reasonable economies of postal operations or not!

Does the language of the bill mean that any service that wasn't consistent with economy of operation would be deemed "non-essential"?

The individual patron—the ordinary citizen—can only expect from the proposed corporation higher and higher postage rates and less and less essential service. He would find it a nightmare.

I have been amazed, Mr. Chairman, with the complacency—and indeed the enthusiasm—with which some publishers have accepted the corporation idea. A careful reading of the bill indicates (at least to us) that the Chief Executive Officer of the corporation would have the power of life and death over every publication in the country that depends upon the mails for its existence. While the language of H.R. 11750 has been considerably tempered, when compared to its predecessor, H.R. 1382, it still gives the Chief Executive Officer more power over the mails than any single individual should have in a

free society. Certainly, as a publisher myself—of our own magazine, *The Postal Record*—the lack of safeguards frightens me, and if I were in the publishing business for profit, I would be very scared indeed of the potentials for autocratic censorship of dissident opinion.

Although it has never been the policy of the National Association of Letter Carriers to involve itself in the rate-making process, we feel that the corporation issue is so vital that we must at least comment on some attitudes prevailing among the users of second-class mail.

It has seemed to us that the major publishers have been overly-encouraged by the enthusiasm of the Postmaster General and the corporation advocates for the institution within the postal establishment of a true Incremental Costing procedure which would replace the Cost Ascertainment System, which we all know is inadequate and inaccurate.

They feel that since the Post Office was established to transmit and deliver—primarily—first-class mail, then the major share of postal costs must be laid at the door of this class of mail. The rates for first class would then be raised sharply while the rates for other classes of mail would remain undisturbed.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps these gentlemen know something I don't know, but I have certainly failed to detect any enthusiasm in the Congress for the acceptance of any proposal that would raise first-class rates sky-high and not raise the rates on second-class and third-class mail. I personally haven't heard any Member of Congress say that he would like to raise the postage on Aunt Minnie's personal letter to 10 cents, while permitting the *Wall Street Journal* or *Reader's Digest* magazine to proceed through the mails at less than three cents apiece.

And, perhaps these publishers are underestimating what a true system of incremental costing could do to them. The principal historian of the Post Office Department has told me that it is at least arguable that the Post Office was established, and its facilities erected and maintained, just as much for the transmission of what we now know as second-class mail, as for first-class mail. The original purpose of the Post Office was not only to transmit personal messages among our citizens, but also to transmit news and editorial opinion so as to keep the people of this country informed.

This being the case, it would be interesting and most informative if an amendment were offered to H.R. 11750, the corporation bill, which would insure that the burden of incremental costing be divided equally between first- and second-class mail. The effect of this amendment on the enthusiasm of the publishers for the corporation concept would be most enlightening.

Or, Mr. Chairman, there could be an alternative resolution which would permit the editorial matter of magazines and newspapers to go through the mails absolutely free of charge—but which would charge the advertising material in such publications exactly the same rates as third-class mail is charged.

Certainly, the acceptance of either of these amendments would be of material benefit in reducing the postal deficit. It would also help determine whether the enthusiasm of certain publishers for the corporation concept is based on purely philosophical grounds, or whether it is based upon somewhat less exalted considerations.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we are getting sick and tired of reading in certain major publications editorials denouncing the efficiency of the Post Office. The public is being brainwashed into believing the service is far worse than it actually is.

I cannot see what the publishers have to

complain about. There is nothing wrong with their service.

Who can remember ever not getting the *Wall Street Journal* on time? In post offices all over the country, when the *Wall Street Journal* arrives late, letter carriers are still made to wait—and all the first-class mail in their satchels is made to wait—until the *Journal* is distributed to them for delivery.

Who can remember failing to get *Time*, or *Life*, *The Reader's Digest*, or *Newsweek* late?

They arrive at our doorsteps as promptly as the sun appears over the eastern horizon. Could they expect such efficient and inexpensive treatment from a corporation-type operation?

They all wring their hands and decry the postal deficit. This is their privilege and, we all know, the postal deficit is too large. But, at least, it would be a great deal more honest if they were to admit their own enormous contribution—through low rates and special considerations—to that deficit.

And, of course, the size of the postal deficit has been widely (and, I think, purposely) distorted and misconstrued by many of the Nation's editorialists.

As the Chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee (Senator McGee) has pointed out, talk of a \$1.2 billion deficit is "grossly misleading." Approximately \$735 million of that deficit is the direct cost of public services, identified by the Congress, and required by law to be paid out of the general fund of the Treasury and not from postage rates. The actual deficit of the postal establishment is less than five hundred million dollars a year.

This is a sizable sum and, undoubtedly, it can and should be reduced. But, if the editorial writers would refer to the true figure of \$500 million instead of the inflated figure of \$1.2 billion, the public would be able to keep the postal problem in proper perspective, and would not be so susceptible to mass hysteria concerning their post office.

Yesterday (July 16) our great country sent men to the moon. This realizes a nine-year ambition during which time the taxpayers have spent over \$24 billion on just the ultimate landing on the moon. During the past 40 years, tax dollars to operate the postal service have totaled only \$14 billion. In comparison, considering beneficial effects, have not both been worth the investment? Should the U.S. Government offer to all the people a subsidized postal service which has little glamour in the same manner it is subsidizing the glamorous trip to the moon?

We have been especially surprised, Mr. Chairman, at the way some of the smaller publications have joined the clamor for the creation of a corporation.

Since the corporation is pledged to operate on a break-even basis—which will mean saving two billion dollars a year—within five years—and since it is inconceivable that Congress will permit the revenues necessary for the performance of such a miracle to be milked out of first-class mail exclusively, then—if the pledge is to be redeemed—second-class mail would have to sustain very substantial rate increases.

The very largest publishing houses could conceivably absorb such a rate increase, but many of the smaller publications would necessarily be forced to the wall. This would give the largest publications a virtual monopoly in their fields, but it would cause a significant shrinkage in the diversity of editorial opinion in this country, which would be an enormous pity in a free society such as ours.

So—for the users of the mails, large and small—we can see in the corporation proposal only greatly increased rates, greatly reduced service, and a greatly diminished spectrum of editorial opinion and interpretation of the news.

In short, we see nightmares all around.

A NIGHTMARE FOR EMPLOYEES AND THEIR UNIONS

A number of newspapers and magazines have attacked the postal employees because they have had the audacity to oppose the creation of a postal corporation.

So, I ask today, Mr. Chairman, why shouldn't we oppose this plan?

In the first place, we shall all be taken out of Civil Service. We are told that we shall be given something just as good, if not better. We have only the word of the corporation proponents for that—and, to be perfectly frank, the history of the past thirty years in the postal service has not exactly persuaded us to accept the promises and assurances of management with blind and unquestioning faith. We have earned the right of skepticism!

Many thousands of letter carriers, and other postal employees, joined the postal service because of the job security and other protections that Civil Service affords. All that would evaporate under the corporation.

We would have to negotiate with management in such areas as pay—health and life insurance—workmen's compensation—sick and annual leave—the works.

That sounds perfectly normal and straightforward . . . until one reads further. We would still be denied the right to strike, and binding arbitration could be achieved only through agreement of the Postal Disputes Panel. (Sec. 808, (f), H.R. 11750)

I want to make it perfectly clear that we—and every other group of postal union leaders that I know—realize the grave implications of a strike in the postal service.

I have gone on record with my membership—and have placed my own political future in our organization on the line in doing so—urging them to "Cool It" and not let their frustrations lead them to unlawful actions.

But no one, surely, can reasonably expect us to accept a proposal which would take away from us every weapon we can legally and reasonably use against cases of managerial aggression.

We would be denied access to the Congress, and Congress would be virtually incapable of coming to our aid.

We would be denied the right to withhold our services.

And, even in the most serious matters of disagreement, we could go to binding arbitration only if management agreed to permit us to seek such relief.

The proponents of the corporate concept, when they speak of operating the establishment on a break-even basis, give us the impression that they have not taken into consideration the possibility of any postal pay raises during the next five years.

I hasten to add that postal employees do not share this point of view.

The advocates of the corporation talk grandly of collective bargaining, but what they offer us is an ugly parody of any known collective-bargaining process. They would, in short, have us precisely where they want us—even more so than they do today—and we would be deprived of the recourses we now have—the appeal to Congress, or even to the Civil Service Commission.

I direct the attention of the Committee to the language of the bill, as it appears in Chapter VIII "Personnel," pages 45-58.

The language is vague, the protections hazy, the safeguards almost nonexistent. The words "mutual agreement" are twice employed on page 52, when discussing the means available for the settlement of disputes. I know the Postmaster General did a great deal of artistic verbal shadow-boxing when he was persistently asked about the implications in these sections of the bill, but, in our opinion, the words can be interpreted only one way: We would be able to get relief only if the corporation managers were good and willing to give us such relief. We would go to the bargaining table

with our hands tied and with all the weapons on the side of management.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there is *no way* that the postal employees could accept a unilateral arrangement such as this.

The labor-management provisions of the bill open the gates to virtual serfdom. They are absolutely unacceptable to us.

So, if the corporation ever were to be created, we, the employees would have a more than ample share of nightmares.

A NIGHTMARE FOR THE CONGRESS

I want to treat delicately, for just a moment, around another aspect of the corporation proposal: The difficulties it would present to Congress itself.

I want to preface these remarks by saying that they are motivated by genuine concern, and not because of any desire, or inclination, to intrude in your business.

Nonetheless, it has struck me very forcibly that the creation of a postal corporation could be so troublesome to Congress that it could very well constitute a political nightmare.

Certainly I know that the barrage of newspaper editorials and comment has stirred up some superficial support for the corporation among the folks back home—people who want a better postal system, and who have been brainwashed into thinking that the simple creation of a corporation will, by itself, perform miracles just through the waving of some magical wands. The average people who now favor the corporation concept, of course, don't know what is in store for them.

But, what is going to happen when the rates go up (as surely they must, if the goals of the corporation are to be met), and the service recedes (as surely it must), and the people go to the Congressmen, indignantly demanding relief?

Will it be enough to tell them you cannot do a thing about the situation because a Big Bad Corporation (which Congress itself has created) has come into being, and Congress is now almost powerless?

Will it be enough to tell them that their rates can be reduced only if Congress passes a Joint Resolution negating the action of the Rate Commission. Particularly since—not ever before in the history of the Republic—has an action of the Executive Branch been rescinded by virtue of a Joint Resolution?

It seems to my naive and untutored mind that all this could add up to a considerable degree of electoral unhappiness.

Particularly, I might add, at a time when the people expect Congress to assume *more* responsibility, not to abrogate it; when the people expect *more* performance from their elected representatives; not less.

The present postal service may make the constituents grumble; the postal service under the corporation will make them mutinous.

And, if this happens—and I think it would—the corporation would become a nightmare for Congress, just as much as it would for every other segment of our population.

The postal service affects, directly or indirectly, every man, woman and child in the country every working day of the year. *Nothing* could be more the business of Congress than this ubiquitous, universal and essential national function. If disaster falls upon it because Congress has washed its hands of it and left its operation up to a band of corporate strangers who are not answerable to the people, then, it seems to me, serious and searching questions will be asked in every Congressional District in the land.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, you may have received the impres-

sion by this time that the National Association of Letter Carriers is opposed to the postal corporation concept.

Certainly, that is the impression I have been seeking to convey.

Then, what are we *for*?

We are for total postal reform as detailed in your bill, Mr. Chairman—H.R. 4.

We have never been able to see—and we cannot see now—why total postal reform cannot be carried out within the present framework of the Department without removing it from the control and the influence of the American people through their elected representatives in Congress.

And, if you will remember, neither the Postmaster General nor Mr. Kappel nor Mr. O'Brien nor former Senator Morton came up with any clear and convincing argument why reform cannot be accomplished without sacking the Post Office Department and replacing it with a huge and unresponsive corporation. Their replies to the questions of the Committee were elusive. It is perhaps oversimplifying the problem but, in essence, they added up simply to a preference for the corporation concept *per se* and a distaste for the Government concept.

In our opinion, this isn't enough. Not nearly enough.

Could it be that there are those who are afraid H.R. 4 will work—and then it would be proved that there is no need for a corporation at all? What is so holy about this corporation concept that its advocates would rather have no reform at all than have reform achieved under present conditions?

We are beginning to wonder, Mr. Chairman: *What is going on?*

What is behind this determined and unswerving and well-financed insistence upon taking the Post Office away from the control of the American people—and away from the control of the Congress?

The assistants in the Post Office Department have been talking vaguely and grandly about the great improvements in employee relations that can be effected once a corporation is created. If the reforms are so wonderful, why cannot they be placed in effect now? Why is a corporation necessary to do these things?

When we look at the recent efforts of the postal administration to reduce and eliminate services while raising rates and fees—and when we look at their sluggishness in trying to alleviate the economic and working conditions of the employees—we wonder if they are not *purposely* trying to run the present postal establishment into the ground in order to make the corporation concept more attractive to the Congress, the employees and the people?

Under your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General will be able to do everything that the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation would be able to do—except that he would still have to be responsive to the needs and desires of the American people. He should, indeed, be able to do *more*—because he will remain in the Cabinet and will still have ready access to the ear of the President.

Under your bill, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department will have the same freedom in using its revenues as the corporation would have. It would be free of the ridiculously antiquated appropriations procedures which now make the efficient operation of the mails almost impossible.

The rate-making process under your bill, Mr. Chairman, seems to us to be even more just—and more constitutional—than does that provided for by H.R. 11750, and Congress would have a far better opportunity of regulating and participating in the procedures, and the patrons and large users of the mails would have a far better protection against sudden and damaging changes in their rates.

(You will remember, Mr. Chairman, we

originally recommended that the Congress set up its own rate commission, independent of the Department, which would make its own recommendations to the Congress directly. We still feel this procedure would be more constitutionally correct, but we certainly have no objection to the system provided for by H.R. 4.)

H.R. 4 provides for mechanization and modernization of the postal plant just as fully as does H.R. 11750.

Although we have some minor differences with the labor-management procedures outlined by H.R. 4, we vastly prefer them to those offered by H.R. 11750. Under your bill we would be assured of the right to compulsory arbitration and would not have to seek the permission of management to achieve it.

Your bill, H.R. 4, Mr. Chairman, will rid the Post Office of undue political interference more effectively than would H.R. 11750. Those who claim otherwise simply have not read your bill. This provision could be further strengthened by incorporating the provisions of H.R. 6959.

There is, in short, nothing that the corporation-mongers promise which cannot be achieved through H.R. 4. Certainly—at the very least—we should try H.R. 4—try to reform the Post Office from within its present Governmental structure.

But, we are totally convinced that, with the help of Congress, the Post Office *can* be totally reformed while still remaining an integral part of the Government. We are also totally convinced that, at this time, the formation and creation of a postal corporation is both unnecessary and highly dangerous.

Last November and December, before his swift and marvelous death-bed conversion to the corporation concept, Postmaster General Watson offered a \$500 million blueprint for the modernization of the Post Office without running the extreme risk of taking the Post Office away from the people. The Report, which went to the White House in November, has been virtually ignored ever since the new Administration came into power. His call for 74 *module* post offices—mail factories—in the 74 largest cities (which account for 52 percent of the mail volume) made a great deal of sense to those who read it. We have not heard it even referred to since last January 20. We think it should be restudied before any irreversible action is taken.

As we have said, over and over again, the postal service is far too essential to the social, economic, industrial, mercantile and political life of the American people ever to permit it to be removed from the ultimate control of the people. We cannot turn it over to a band of corporate strangers.

In closing, I would like to quote a statement by Rep. Tom Steed, Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office in the House. In the *Shawnee, Oklahoma News-Star* of last November 24, he had this to say:

"If Congress were willing to give the suggested powers to a corporation, why wouldn't they give them to a Postmaster General? If he had the powers complained of, most of the things reported by the (Kappel) Commission wouldn't exist.

"The postal service is too important to the people to entrust it to one man, one commission, a group not responsible to the people. Congress is so sensitive to this, it just is not conceivable to me they will ever do this."

I agree with Congressman Steed's sentiments in this regard, and I sincerely hope he is right.

We have attached an exchange of correspondence between the Postmaster General and myself, relative to our position on postal reforms. Also attached is a very important analysis of the reasons for the so-called "crisis" in the Chicago post office in 1966.

We want to thank you for permitting us this opportunity to express our views on the subject that is so close to the hearts of all Americans—the United States Post Office Department.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as free citizens of the United States, we take this opportunity to mark the 10th anniversary of the observance of Captive Nations Week. This is the week during which all Americans from all walks of life will commemorate it in nationwide manifestations, rallies, ceremonies, and other public gatherings.

In 1959, Congress passed Public Law 86-90, commonly known as the captive nations resolution. The third week in July is set aside to remind the world of the plight of our fellow human beings behind the Iron Curtain. Americans must be informed of the fact that communism is not "mellowing" because we may be put to sleep and wake up some morning in another "workers' paradise."

These captive nation observances serve as a powerful moral symbol underscoring the fact that Americans will never forget or abandon the captive nations or accommodate themselves to their permanent enslavement. The captive nations themselves need this peaceful demonstration of our solidarity with them. They must know that they are not forgotten. This will restore their hope that someday they will be free of the alien governments and alien leaders.

As we observe Captive Nations Week we must do everything in our power to help these people in their struggle for national and religious freedom and in their desire for independence.

We can appreciate the fact that in the last 50 years of communism's ascendancy that some 100 million human beings have been murdered through civil wars, manmade famines, purges, genocidal deportations, and executions. The very magnitude of this figure of those who lost their lives under communism escapes us. One must think more of this figure as human beings rather than statistics, for each of these persons was loved by someone. They had relatives, friends, dependents who shared their agony and then had to bear the void in their lives when they were gone. With the demise of these hundreds of millions the hopes and plans of a better tomorrow were shattered in the lives of many more millions.

The captive nations will not be freed from the yoke of Communist tyranny until communism in Russia itself is defeated. This is the center of an ideology that is determined upon taking over the whole world. To battle an ideology that has already brought over a third of the human race under its domination in less than 50 years requires an ideology that is even more dynamic, more powerful. Communism will not be defeated by

power politics, military power, nor economic sanctions—which may impede its growth—for it is basically a spiritual warfare, a war of ideals which touch upon the nature of man and his final end.

The battle is a battle of forces of good and forces of evil which must be carried into the enemy's territory—the captive nations. And, it is upon the grounds of these captive nations that victory over communism can be attained.

Pope Pius XII expressed his concern for the people of the captive nations when he stated, in one of his prayers, the following words:

May our fervent prayer be of help to them. May our fraternal solidarity make them feel that they are not alone. May their example be edifying for the whole Church, especially for us who think of them with so much affection.

"Grant, O Lord, that the days of trial be shortened and that very soon—together with their converted oppressors—they may freely serve and adore You, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit live and reign forever and ever. Amen.

In the spirit of freedom, we cherish the symbolic day of July 4 as our day of liberation. The French regard July 14, Bastille Day, as a significant event in French history, so should Captive Nations Week emphasize even more our commitment to democracy, and the concern which free people must feel for those who do not possess it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week, American, as well as citizens of 17 other nations in the free world, are observing Captive Nations Week.

This observance is notable because it is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which the 86th Congress passed in July 1959, and was signed by the late President Eisenhower.

With the sobering lesson furnished by the Soviet Russian takeover of Czechoslovakia last year, it hardly seems necessary to reiterate to the Red Empire the determination of the 27 nations behind the Iron Curtain never to acquiesce to permanent captivity and ever to seek, by all peaceful means, their eventual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention the following Captive Nations Week Manifesto 1969:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress to the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million

people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsive to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European

peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United State of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 13-19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends
of the Captive Nations.

JOZEF LETTRICH,
Chairman, Assembly of
Captive European Nations.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAMS AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD, JANUARY THROUGH MARCH QUARTER, 1969

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What guard did to assist
Headquarters, 3d Battalion.....		Provided equipment to San Fernando Valley Archer Club, Chatsworth, Calif., Mar. 28-30, 1969.	Furnished 1½-ton water trailer from unit.
76th Aviation Group, California Air National Guard....	124	Helicopter demonstrated medical evacuation procedures for California high school cadets, Brea, Calif., Apr. 2, 1969.	Flew OH-23C helicopter with litter pod and answered questions about aviation program in California Air National Guard.
Headquarters, 144th.....	(1)	Conducted familiarization tours of air defense wing activities for grade students, Scouts and agriculture group, Fresno, Calif., Mar. 31, 1969.	Explanation and demonstration of radar systems and jet engine principles.
HHC, 217th Transportation Battalion.....	3	Participation with Neighborhood Youth Corps of the Equal Opportunities Commission, Fresno, Calif., for quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	In-training program for youth in varied administration positions. Engagement of youth in typing, filing and office procedures to increase proficiency in writing, reading, and earning capabilities.
2d Battalion, 159th Infantry, 49th Infantry Brigade.....		Blood donated to American Red Cross, San Jose, Calif., Mar. 23, 1969.	Guardsmen donated 109 pints of whole blood to Red Cross facility in San Jose.
Company C, separation detachment, 579th Engineer Battalion.....	30	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 81, Napa, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Sponsors troop at local armory during weekly meetings. Assists in instructing scout subjects.
Company C, separation detachment, 579th Engineer Battalion.....	80	Armory provided for California Cadet Corps, Napa, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Provides assembly point for California cadet training.
Company D, 579th Engineer Battalion.....	35	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 61, San Rafael, Calif., quarter ending Mar. 31, 1969.	Sponsors troop at local armory during weekly meeting and helps in merit badge requirements.
2d Signal Platoon, 249th Signal Company.....	50	Civil defense seminar at University of Southern California. Seminar held at San Diego, Calif., Mar. 21, 1969.	Unit supplied 3 guardsmen to operate 33 telephones and 2 switchboards in support of civil defense operations.
Hq, 144th Air Defense Wing.....		Airlifting California Air Patrol members to Edwards AFB, May 18, 1969.	Furnished aircraft for trip.
Do.....		Airlift of Military Affairs Committee to the Twentynine Palms U.S.M.C. base, May 24, 1969.	Furnished aircraft and crew for trip.
Do.....		Rendered plans and made preparations for the Armed Forces luncheon May 16, 1969, and the military ball on May 17, 1969.	Furnished personnel to help in scheduled events.

¹ 132 prekindergarten students; 65 2d grade students; 114 4th grade students; 80 8th grade students; 45 Indian Guide Scouts; 142 Cub Scouts; 32 Boy Scouts; 38 adults, Department of Agriculture group.

YOUTH ACTIVITIES PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What Guard did to assist
Sep. detachment, Company C, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat). Do.....	25 10	Sponsors Boy Scout Troop No. 81, Napa, Calif..... Napa High School gymnastic class, gymnastic training.....	Unit provided meeting place and assisted at meetings. Provided meeting place.
Company D, 579 Engineer Battalion (combat).....	35	Boy Scout Troop No. 61, Marin County.....	Unit acts as sponsor and furnished armory for meetings, technical advice on formations, and merit badge examiners.
112th Engineer Company (dump truck).....	150	Construction of baseball field for Susanville Little League.....	Provided equipment and personnel to construct field; also provided trucks and drivers.
Headquarters and Headquarters Company 40th Armored Brigade.....	80	Boy Scout Explorer Post No. 70 of Los Angeles—pancake breakfast.....	Supplied field ranges and a cook.
49th Aviation Company, 49th Aviation Battalion.....	35	Boy Scouts safety and marksmanship instruction.....	Provided rifles, instruction and armory.
3d Battalion 143d Artillery.....	1,200	Boy Scout jamboree, Foster City.....	Furnished drivers, trucks, and water trailers.
Aircraft maintenance platoon, Company D, 40th Support Battalion.....	35	Boy Scout safety and marksmanship instruction.....	Provided rifles, instruction, and armory.
Headquarters, 146th MAW (Air National Guard).....	16,500	Tour of Van Nuys Base.....	Hosted by guardsmen.
Service Battery (175 mm.) (SP), 143d Artillery.....	800	Contra Costa County Boy Scout field exercise.....	Provided 4 water trailers with 1,600 gallons of water.
Headquarters, 175th Medical Group.....	Unknown	Youth conference, Lake Tahoe.....	Loaned tentage.
HHC(—) 2d Battalion 185th Infantry.....	3,000-4,000	Display (firing of M-60 machinegun) established by unit in a major shopping center in Modesto.....	Set up and manned the display.
Headquarters, 1st Battalion (HERC) 250th Artillery.....	450	Tours and facilities provided sponsors, Boy Scout troop and Cub Scouts.....	Provided instructors and facilities.
Headquarters 76th Aviation Group.....	150-200	Christmas party at Compton Armory, Long Beach, Calif.....	Planned and carried out party.
Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 160th Infantry.....	180-200	Cub Scout family outing in Angeles National Forest.....	Provided trucks, trailers, and licensed drivers to transport food, clothing, and equipment.
Do.....	50	Cub Scout event, Glendale Armory.....	Armory and kitchen facilities provided.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat).....	200	Construction of access road and clearing of area for camp sites for American Sunday School Union.....	Unit provided crew and a dozer.
Company A and B, 579th Engineer Battalion (combat). Headquarters, 146th MAW (ANG).....	35 Unknown	Sponsors for Boy Scout Troop, No. 28, Eureka, Calif..... Base film library loans to Boy Scouts and junior athletic associations.....	Armory used—including rifle range, classroom, and drill floor. Assistance in transporting film to various groups.
Headquarters, 3d Battalion, 185th Armor.....	40	Cub Scout pack, annual tour of armory.....	Assisted by guardsmen.
Do.....	500	Christmas program for underprivileged children.....	Hosted by the Guard.
Headquarters, 129th Special Operations Group (ANG).....	2	On-the-job training program during summer months.....	Motor pool provided training in field of automotive servicing.
Headquarters, 111th Armor Group.....	42	Cub Scout outing, La Jolla.....	Provided equipment, vehicles, and men.

See footnote at end of table.

YOUTH ACTIVITIES PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD—Continued

Unit	Number of youth involved	Nature of activity	What Guard did to assist
Headquarters 2d Battalion, 144th Artillery.....	5,000	Arcadia band days, 40 bands in competition.....	Battalion CO was reviewing officer; color guard, transportation, water trailers, provided by Guard.
Headquarters 163d Fighter Group (ADC) (ANG).....	4	Annual awards to outstanding scholar of 4 high schools.....	Donated the plaques.
Do.....	200	Talks presented to 8th grade students on career in military.....	Provided speaker.
Do.....	Unknown	Films on democracy and foreign countries in Upland School District.....	Procured film for occasions.
Do.....	2,850	Elementary schoolchildren given 30-minute tours of base, Ontario, Calif.....	Arranged for and escorted children on tour of base.
Headquarters, 217th Transportation Battalion.....	2	Neighborhood Youth Corps program—trains young people to become productive members of community.....	Initiated training program furnishing administrative and technical on-the-job training for young people.
1112th Transportation Company.....	8,000	Operation Santa Claus for underprivileged children.....	Provided transportation and personnel to transport and deliver gifts.
263d Transportation Truck Company (It-med).....	Unknown	Support of U.S. Marine Reserve in assistance of pickup for "Toys for Tots".....	National Guard vehicles and men were used.
Do.....	91	Headstart program in San Mateo.....	Day's outing with National Guard members providing transportation, food, tickets to Santa's Village for rides in park, and gift for each child.
Headquarters, 3d Battalion, 144th Artillery.....	Unknown	San Fernando Valley element of Boy Scouts—Re-seeding of 13,000 acres in Angeles National Park with pine trees.....	Furnished 7 trucks, lumber for construction of scout camp building and National Guard drivers.
Headquarters, 40th Infantry Brigade.....	38	Neighborhood Youth Corps program—Training in secretarial, supply, or mechanical fields.....	National Guard personnel used for training.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion.....	3,000	Completion of bridge to allow year-round access to Boy Scout camp.....	Volunteer National Guardsmen built bridges.
Do.....	50	Painted Boy Scout hall and erected fence at Ferndale fairgrounds.....	National Guardsmen involved.
Company B, 579th Engineer Battalion.....	3,000	Repairs to Boy Scout camp and general cleanup of area, and transportation of equipment from one camp to another.....	National Guardsmen worked on this project.
Do.....	250	Handicapped Scouts jamboree at Elk River Boy Scout Camp.....	National Guardsmen cooked meals and a driver was used as ambulance/emergency vehicle driver.
1st Battalion, 184th Infantry.....	7	Boys trained for mechanics positions; girls for clerical.....	Instructed in training.
Do.....	30	High school field trips to airbases.....	Loaned trucks and drivers for transportation.
Company A, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry.....	4	Training in general office work.....	Instructed in training.
Company B, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry.....	2	Do.....	Do.
Company B, 49th Support Battalion, 49th Infantry Brigade.....	30	Thanksgiving dinner and trip to San Francisco Zoo for the children in Hunter's Point area.....	Undertook and participated in complete project.
256th Engineering Company.....	6	Job training program, clerical and mechanical.....	Training and supervising by guardsmen.
Military Department, State of California.....	4,050	California Cadet Corps.....	CCC program is operated by California National Guard.

¹ Including adults.

RICHARD A. JONES ADDRESSES SAN ANTONIO HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much absorbed in my duties as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee.

As you know, housing continues to be one of the critical areas of need in America today. It has been popular in recent years and in fact for quite some time to downgrade and knock public housing. And yet this is very unjust because public housing has rendered a most valuable contribution to the well-being of America.

I recall the beginning of the housing program in San Antonio, Tex., back in the late 1930's. But that is actually recalling another time and another epoch which to me is very difficult to conjure to the minds of modern America and therefore, I will not go further into that subject at this time.

But suffice it to say for the present that having had the great privilege to have worked with and under the great Marie McGuire, when she was the director of public housing of the San Antonio Public Housing Authority and later nationally famous as the Commissioner of Public Housing, I earned a deep and abiding respect and recognition for the contributions and validity of the public housing program.

San Antonio today is very fortunate to have as its executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, Mr. Richard G. Jones.

I have gotten to know Mr. Jones over the years and respect him for his tremendous ability as an administrator and as a compassionate human being who has also been sensitive and responsive to human need. Under his leadership, the San Antonio Housing Authority has contributed tremendously to the well-being of the city. It has cooperated magnificently with all of the ideas, from the war on poverty efforts in San Antonio to the various and sundry social and welfare projects of the city; it has cooperated in every possible way that it has been able to including the use of property for rental purposes and for sites for social and community programs.

I manage to maintain a close and personal contact with every housing project in my district and can personally attest to the success of the program even though it faces serious and crippling obstacles, some statutory, some local, and some partaken of the traditional enmity toward the program by those who have the most prejudice against it. Recently, at the 29th annual conference of the Southwest National Association of Housing and Renewal officials in New Orleans, La., Mr. Jones made some revealing and important remarks which I take the liberty of placing into the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF RICHARD G. JONES INTRODUCTION

Borrowing a technique from the television media, I would like to move into the story before stopping to identify the program and some of its characters....

The scene opens in the office of a local savings and loan institution where a young couple anxiously make application for their first home in Dreamwood Acres. Priced at a bargain \$13,500, this three-bedroom brick beauty is located only minutes from the elementary school, shopping, the expressway to downtown, and not too far from the

grandparents who loved to babysit. In the couple's mind, it represented a complete victory in house-hunting after countless week-ends of searching and those endless newspaper ads which were so filled with promise.

With the easy questions behind them and the uneasy ones about income, credit rating, installment payments and the prospects for continued employment moving along toward that hoped-for approval, our young home buyers were elated when loan officer, George Orwell, made his educated guess that they would probably qualify for a \$13,500 home.

Suddenly, the heady atmosphere of that room changed as Loan Officer Orwell informed our friends that instead of Dreamwood Acres, the particular home for them was being assigned in Dreary Valley, across town, where FHA's Master List revealed the largest number of subdivision vacancies in the metropolitan area. All homes were being assigned to qualified buyers on the principle of "first come, first served" in the most vacant subdivision. The principle was jokingly referred to around the loan office as "the first get the worst" policy.

Sensing the couple's sagging spirits, Loan Officer Orwell tried to make matters better by pointing out that a second offering could be made from the Master List in the "second most vacant subdivision".... after our young couple had given him a "yes" or "no" answer on the three-bedroom brick home in Dreary Acres across town. And it seemed to matter even less in the stifling atmosphere of that office when Orwell valiantly tried to rescue things with even a third offering in the "third most vacant subdivision" revealed by the Master List published daily by the local FHA Office.

It was a puzzled Loan Officer who watched this bewildered young couple retreat from his office with crushed spirits and a helpless comment that "they guessed they'd just wait a while for something else."

Well, as you have already detected, that deadly little scene is being enacted daily in housing authority offices throughout the land where families search for low-rent housing to meet their needs. And this brings us to the subject of our panel discussion

today: "Administering HUD's Tenant Assignment Policy." As my former boss at the Denver Housing Authority, Lee F. Johnson, was fond of saying when the outlook appeared bleak—"this is probably going to be an exercise in futility, but anyway, here goes" . . .

To my knowledge, there has never been a policy in the low-rent public housing program which has so divided the Federal-local partnership envisioned by Congress in the Housing Act of 1937, as the policy contained in that now famous Circular of July 10, 1967, entitled "Revised Requirements for Administration of Low-Rent Housing Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

It seems ridiculous always, but sometimes a little humorous, that for reasons unknown to most of us, tenant assignment is a subject which is not open for discussion at the national or regional level of the Department of HUD. To that stock answer, I would reply: "Since when isn't the survival of a local housing authority open for discussion?" Because survival of this rather frail institutional structure of a local housing authority is now at stake.

Under the circumstances, it's probably some sort of minor miracle that the subject is even on the Southwest NAHRO program today and Earl Bullington, Director, Tenant and Operations Services Division, HAO, HUD, in Fort Worth, and I can even discuss this most sacred of cows in the HUD barnyard—the Method of Administration which we affectionately refer to as "tenant assignment." It goes without saying that there is nothing personal intended if the remarks about this most hated policy get rather heated.

A BRIEF HISTORY

If you will recall, the tenant assignment policy came into being on the first workday following the departure of former Public Housing Commissioner, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire. This was probably no coincidence, and eternal credit is due Mrs. McGuire for protecting this bunch of innocents for I can't guess how many months before July 10, 1967.

In my own case, I read this most enlightening answer to the racial and ethnic problems which haunt our cities while on an airplane headed for Washington. My first reaction was that "the HUDsters must be kidding." The "tone" of the HUD Circular of July 10, 1967 and its attachments struck me as bordering on the ridiculous because of the uncompromising language. Just for fun, I counted no less than thirty-three "shall do's" or "must do's" and the word "may" crept into the circular only three times—obviously naked and afraid in such stern company.

Early attempts to discuss the tenant assignment policy with HUD officials proved fruitless and met with stallout until the policy was safely settled in the Federal Register on October 19, 1967. I'll not try to detail the efforts of the multitude of state housing associations and NAHRO chapters and national officials who tried without success to open up the subject for discussion with the hierarchy of HUD. Such stalwarts as our own Keith Ables, leading the charge for the Texas Housing Association, finally retired from the battlefield with a badly bent lance after jeopardizing the future of the new low-rent program in his community.

And some of you may recall that "yours truly" won the "Chicken of the Year" award at this same gathering last year in Oklahoma City after an ignominious surrender required to preserve San Antonio's new \$30 million expansion program and to receive the first installment of a requested \$42 million modernization program. On the humorous side, the HUD partners reminded me of the wife in a divorce case who told the judge that "she had tried everything to make her marriage work—she had scolded, screamed, nagged,

and threatened her husband." If we are unable to resolve this problem, then I would strongly recommend that the "Chicken of the Year" award be given annually to Southwest NAHRO for the most dramatic surrender. Perhaps our friends in Little Rock, Dallas, Houston, and New Orleans, could be considered for this year's high honor . . .

RELATIONSHIPS

The unilateral decision to amend all Annual Contributions Contracts of local housing authorities and the Police State methods of enforcement certainly constitute the blackest page in the history of low-rent public housing since 1937. This entire episode, which is still not finished, has ruptured and disrupted the spirit of friendship and mutual assistance which must prevail in any partnership, more than any other event in history, and left deep scars on all participants. It accrues to the benefit of not a single person inside or outside of HUD or in the entire housing profession. It is a national disgrace.

On the positive side, we can recall with great admiration the contribution of such Federal partners as Joe Burstein and "Turnkey III," Abe Silverman and Ken Cavanaugh on the R.A.P.E.-T.I.P.S. program; Marie McGuire for the advance of the elderly housing program; Tommy Thompson and Marie McGuire for their encouragement of architectural excellence. Then going back to our beginning, Warren Jay Vinton for devising a financing formula for Iha's which is still superior to all other methods.

On last election night, when our national NAHRO organization held its Housing Workshop in Atlanta, many of us felt that the narrow margin of victory could probably be accounted for by multiplying the number of local housing authorities in the country times the number of executive, directors and concerned Iha employees, plus the number of Iha Commissioners, plus the number of low-income families who might have understood the nature of the deadly game which was being played with them on tenant assignment. Personally, I hoped that the vote heralded an end to the arrogance of Government which we had witnessed over this issue. Apparently that was a rather dreamy wish, or perhaps that has not been time to analyze this complex subject. Or, perhaps like Viet Nam, it's here, and now what do we do about it or with it?

ASSUMPTIONS

In searching for the key to unlock this whole business of tenant assignment, I think that it might be well to look at some of the assumptions on which it was built.

Let me read from Secretary Robert Weaver's letter of November 24, 1967 to Congressman John Dowdy:

"* * * We have prepared a statement of the legal basis for the new tenant assignment provisions, which also covers the underlying reasons for the new policy. A copy of the statement is enclosed. As you will note, the statement also includes an explanation of the choices that may be made available to eligible applicants in deciding where they wish to live, and the choices available to local authorities in adopting a tenant assignment plan. The new provisions were put into effect after it was concluded that the requirements issued in 1965 were not achieving the objectives of the Federal policy in this area."

And attached to the same letter from a "Statement of the Basis for LRHM Section 102.1 Exhibit 2, 'Requirements for Administration of Low-Rent Housing Programs Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964' we read:

"It was the experience of this Department under the requirements as stated in the 8-27-65 Circular that in many instances where Local Authorities had adopted freedom-of-choice types of plans, dwelling units

in projects or portions thereof occupied exclusively by members of one race remained vacant while applicants of another race were waiting to be admitted to housing. Consequently, not only have losses of revenue occurred, but applicants needing housing have not obtained it or were substantially delayed in obtaining it, with resultant added cost to the Federal Government as well as unfulfillment of the purposes of the United States Housing Act.

"Efficiency and economy in the administration of low-rent housing are basic requirements of the United States Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1402(1)), and the Federal assistance contracts with the Local Authorities expressly require them to operate the projects in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy. (Annual contributions contract, section 201.) The provision in revised Exhibit 2 requiring Local Authorities to offer first the locations containing the largest number of vacancies, has as a basic purpose to insure Local Authority compliance with the aforesaid requirements of the United States Housing Act and with the contract obligations thereunder.

"It was also the experience of the Department under the requirements stated in the Circular of 8-27-65 that in many instances so-called freedom-of-choice types of tenant assignment plans did not afford freedom-of-choice in fact. Under these plans, the entire burden for expressing a choice of project or location was upon the individual applicants, who were to make this choice in many communities in which segregated housing patterns have been traditional. In such situations, for various reasons such as the mores of the community, fear of reprisals, types of neighborhoods, inducement by Local Authority staff—whether by subtle suggestion, manipulation, persuasion, or otherwise—or other factors or combinations, such "freedom of choice" plans, in their operation, did not provide applicants with actual freedom of access to, or full availability of, housing in all projects and locations. The existence of a segregated pattern of occupancy was in itself a major obstacle to true freedom of choice, since few applicants have the courage to make a choice by which they would be the first to change the pattern. Even without inducement of Local Authority staff, the plans tended to perpetuate patterns of racial segregation and consequent separate treatment and other forms of discrimination prohibited in section 1.4(b) of the Department regulations.

"Under the foregoing circumstances, it was determined by the Secretary in his discretion that the Department should, therefore, no longer permit Local Authorities to adopt and operate under unrestricted freedom-of-choice types of plans. Accordingly, the requirements were revised to place some limitations of freedom-of-choice, as set forth in the revised Exhibit 2. These are intended to eliminate the discriminatory results of unrestricted freedom-of-choice plans mentioned above, and, thus, to effect full compliance with section 1.4 of the Department regulations and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Perhaps the fallaciousness of the assumptions underlying the tenant assignment policy were best revealed by the HUD official at the NAHRO Conference in Portland, Oregon, in October, 1967. At that time, he disclosed the HUD conclusions that after giving "freedom of choice plans" two years in which to desegregate the low-rent projects, that policy had failed. I wonder if it ever occurred to him and others at HUD that the freedom of choice plans had not failed nor had the local housing authorities trying hard to implement the freedom of choice policy, but rather, that HUD was witnessing a cultural phenomenon . . . one that we witness daily in our cities. That people are not re-

sponding to the way HUD officials think that they should respond. That housing patterns developed over many generations could not possibly change dramatically in HUD's two-year trial period, nor any other agency's trial period.

CONCLUSIONS

In concluding my remarks about tenant assignment, I would only say that we should examine the basic assumptions and purposes of this policy and measure the results of this policy. In San Antonio, for example, it has seriously reduced income at a critical time in our history; it has increased vacant apartments from less than 50 when we implemented the policy to more than 300 apartments now—with no limit in sight; it has hampered the efficiency of our operation and brought serious misunderstandings about between the LHA and its puzzled applicant families and social agencies; it has depleted our supply of applications as families dropped to the bottom of the non-existent "communitywide waiting list;" and that it has not accomplished integration of projects as rapidly as did the "freedom of choice" policy. In short, it has failed miserably on every count.

INCONSISTENCIES

If our Federal partners can be persuaded to look at the tenant assignment policy with us, I think that they will also discover an impressive array of HUD policies which are inconsistent with the goals of tenant assignment. For example, how does the arbitrary assignment of eligible families displaced from an urban renewal area square with the stated goals of that program? How does the roll-of-the-dice tenant assignment plan square with the stated purposes of Model Cities to rebuild the worn-out fabric of the neighborhood for the benefit of the residents within that area? And wouldn't a total waiver of the tenant assignment policy be required to participate in the highly selective home ownership program, Turnkey III, where applicants are selected on the basis of sufficient income and motivation for home ownership and willingness to learn and perform their own maintenance? I predict that it would not be too long until some enterprising young Legal Aid attorney would be challenging the obvious discrimination in the way we apply the tenant assignment policy within the same operation.

And more important than any of the conflicts with HUD's other programs, can anybody tell us what tenant assignment does for the dignity, self-respect, and personal esteem of the individuals caught up in this nightmarish policy? When we administer the heavy-handed tenant assignment policy, aren't we really communicating a message to our applicants that Big Brother Housing Authority knows best where each should live? . . . that they do not have the God-given and acquired intelligence to make up their own minds about the neighborhood in which they want to live and raise a family? Why should local housing authorities be made to insult low-income families who are already burdened with a good many of the inequities and injustices of our society?

Frankly, I think that we can all do better than this. I would like to suggest that we reopen this entire subject with the present HUD administrators. The ego of the former administrators is no longer at stake and alternative courses would now be open. It is not too much to ask that HUD, with its 15,000 employees and \$3 billion dollar annual program, assign a small team of competent social scientists to visit a few local housing authorities and gather the facts surrounding this most hated and ineffective tenant assignment policy. Surely the new administrators in HUD will hear our plea. My thanks for your attention.

DDT THREATENS BREATH ITSELF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1969 issue of the SFI Bulletin, the official publication of the Sport Fishing Institute, carries an article entitled "DDT Threatens Breath Itself." So that my colleagues may be aware of the tremendous dangers posed to mankind by the excessive use of DDT and similar pesticides, I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

DDT THREATENS BREATH ITSELF

An alarming report by Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr. (Department of Biological Sciences, State University of New York), appearing in *SCIENCE* (Vol. 159:1474-5) over a year ago (29 March 1968) has been widely overlooked. It should, however, become widely publicized, and the studies and calculations involved should be repeated by others to secure adequate confirmation or modification of Wurster's findings. For, if what he reported therein becomes verified as correct, the full dimension of the implications of accumulating contamination of the global environment by DDT may represent a far greater threat to life on Earth than a nuclear war between the major powers.

Dr. Wurster's paper simply indicates that DDT significantly reduces photosynthesis by marine phytoplankton!

The main findings, in short, were that concentrations of DDT [1,1,1-trichloro-2, 2-bis (p-chlorophenyl) ethane] as low as a few parts per billion in water reduced photosynthesis in laboratory cultures of four species of coastal and oceanic phytoplankton, representing four major classes of algae, and in a natural phytoplankton community from Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Toxicity to diatoms increased as cell concentration decreased. As he stated in the last sentence of his paper: "Such effects . . . may be ecologically more important than the obvious, direct mortality of larger organisms that is so often reported."

The possibly alarming aspect of this stems from two additional facts, when coupled with Dr. Wurster's findings, that: (1) about 70 per cent of the free atmospheric oxygen we breathe is generated by photosynthesis of algae in the sea, and (2) DDT is sufficiently widespread in the sea that it has been recovered from bodies of penguins that inhabit Antarctica, far removed from any area of pesticide use.

According to advice received by the Sport Fishing Institute from Dr. LaMonte, C. Cole, world renowned ecologist at Cornell University. "The figure of 70 per cent oxygen generated in the sea is based on months of intensive study and analysis which led to the conclusion that average productivity per unit area can be considered equal on land and in the sea. This was far from an arbitrary choice and involved very careful consideration of such divergent estimates as those of Vernadsky and Steeman Nielsen. Three particular factors received special attention.

"1. Seasonal cessation of photosynthesis is less drastic in the sea than on land.

"2. Local nutrient deficiencies are more rapidly repaired by circulation in the sea.

"3. In the rain forest and in the sea, light that escapes the highest producers is still available to forms farther down with different pigments, whereas many terrestrial communities have only a single photosynthesis stratum."

CONNECTICUT PASSPORT CRISIS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that conditions require that I speak out again on the passport application problem in Connecticut. This is a mess which has gotten steadily worse over the last few years and, notwithstanding my constant prompting of the State Department, which has not been given the constructive attention it deserves.

I have now been informed by the State Department that the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts is providing two additional clerks to assist the Federal courts in Connecticut in handling passport applications. Unhappily, this positive move by Federal officials is to be offset by the recent decision of the superior court judges of the State of Connecticut to discontinue as of November 1, 1969, the handling of passport applications by the State courts of Connecticut. Thus the Connecticut passport application problem, even with the additional Federal input, will be worse than before once the State court decision goes into effect.

The very perceptive article by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post of July 17, 1969, explains the multiple and expanding social forces which are responsible for the accelerating demand for passports and the diminished capability of our Government to meet that demand. Once again I urge the State Department to exhibit the ingenuity and the efficiency needed to solve Connecticut's passport application problem. The correspondence between the State Department and myself, and the article by Marquis Childs follow:

PASSPORT UNIT SNOWED UNDER BY BOOM
IN FOREIGN TRAVEL
(By Marquis Childs)

Now it's a travel explosion. As though not a word had ever been spoken about seeing America first, the perils of the dollar balance and the gold outflow, Americans in unprecedented numbers are rushing off to foreign shores.

The fly-now, pay-later plan is said to account for a large part of the travel boom. The low rate on chartered flights is another reason. Clubs, often improvised for the purpose, sign up for a charter at a cost to members far below that of regular airline fares.

Travel bargains are attracting those who never before ventured out of the United States. An example is a 22-day escorted tour of six countries (if it's Tuesday, this is Belgium) for \$495, which includes round-trip fare, meals and hotel. At that rate, the bargain hunter argues, you can hardly afford to stay home.

An unhappy consequence of the travel boom is a virtual breakdown, or at any rate a frustrating slowdown, in the issuance of passports. Long lines of irate citizens at every passport center, and particularly in New York, reflect the clogged passport machinery. The most irate citizen is Director Frances G. Knight of the State Department's Passport's Office. The tart-tongued Miss Knight has run an efficient shop. She was caught in the travel deluge without the essential extra personnel,

through no fault of hers, according to her staff.

What happened is an example of the penny-wise, dollar-foolish economy policies prevailing in other departments as well as State. Miss Knight has asked State's budget makers for funds for the fiscal year just ended to hire an additional 22 persons on a permanent basis. For the current fiscal year she asked for another 24. A total of 64 is considered the minimum to handle the ever-increasing demand.

Nothing quite like the present travel boom had been anticipated. Total applicants for passports in June were 36 per cent above June a year ago. The daily average is close to 12,000, running 30 per cent above 1968. The staff of the Passport Office is on a 10-to-12-hour-a-day schedule which includes Saturdays. Especially galling to Miss Knight is that the passport operation more than pays its way. The operating budget is \$5 million, while the office takes in more than \$15 million in fees.

The travel boom is expected to slacken as the rush of summer trippers subsides. The plight of the passport office is evidence of the urgent need for an overhaul of the system. Aside from the passport offices in 10 cities, reliance has been on Federal or state courts. With clogged court calendars there is increasing reluctance to perform this function. Passport applicants complain of delays of two months or more.

The passport tangle is only one comparatively small example of how the narrow frame of Government has been inadequate to encompass the swiftly expanding economy or the rise in the number of educated people bent on foreign travel. Both high school and college students are on the move as never before.

The expansion has been sparked by a credit explosion. Ever-new credit devices have sent the debt total of private individuals soaring to unprecedented levels. How much fly-now, pay-later has contributed, it is too early to say, since this powerful appeal through every advertising medium is fairly recent.

The total of installment credit as of May 31 for autos, home appliances, television sets and the whole range of buy-now-and-pay-by-the-month goods was an almost incredible \$91.8 billion. This represented a jump of \$9.5 billion in the previous 12 months. An added \$2.3 billion was outstanding in credit-card and check-credit plans. These figures do not include real estate and insurance loans.

The outflow of tourist dollars is an important factor in the balance of payments problems. Various cures were considered under the Johnson Administration, including taxes on airline tickets and a limit imposed on the amount the tourist could spend. The travel industry was powerful enough to fend off these remedies and now the Nixon Administration is faced with the same situation enhanced by the travel boom.

An effort has been made with limited success to offset the outflow by persuading foreign visitors to come to America. For the first five months of this year 557,948 foreigners bent on either business or pleasure came to the United States, an increase of 17 per cent over the same period in 1968. It did not include nearly 11 million visits of more than 72 hours by Canadians and a half million Mexican visitors. Measured against the horde of Americans leaving by every available plane and ship, the offset is small.

A far more serious side of the narrow frame of Government is the airport and airways squeeze. At principal airports the overcrowding is intolerable and the air controllers repeatedly testify to the hazards of hundreds of near misses in the corridors where traffic is heaviest. This is without the jumbo jets to come into service in the fall. The White House has proposed a long-range plan calling for quick expansion and the taxes to pay for

it. Delay will imperil life and limb as well as a major industry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

Mr. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations,
Department of State, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: I have your letter of July 11 in response to my several letters addressed to the Secretary of State and to the Director of the Passport Office concerning the continuing urgency of the passport application problem in Connecticut. I had learned through newspaper accounts that due to the efforts of another Connecticut Congressman the administrative office of U.S. Courts is providing two additional clerks to assist the Federal Courts in Connecticut in handling passport applications. Since I have been working on this problem for several years I should have received this information earlier, but I am grateful to you for including it in your letter.

It is regrettable that you do not have a breakdown, by city, of applications made through State Courts in Connecticut, for the urgency of the problem has now been magnified by the decision of the Superior Court Judges of the State of Connecticut to discontinue as of November 1, 1969 the handling of passport applications by the State Courts of Connecticut.

I have endeavored, apparently without success, to point out to the State Department that Connecticut taxpayers are entitled to proper service in the handling of passport applications. This in truth is a service and not a privilege. I thank you for telling me that the State Department is presently giving consideration to two of my suggestions—1) providing additional temporary assistance to the State and Federal Courts to handle passport applications during the busy seasons and 2) that notaries public be authorized to handle passport applications.

The closing of the passport-handling facilities in the State Court is going to further inconvenience the people of my State and particularly those in my Congressional District. I must seriously recommend to you that you call the Secretary's attention to the urgency of my recommendation that immediate action be taken and that a proper passport facility be established in Waterbury, Connecticut, on a temporary basis, pending the completion of the U.S. District Court facilities currently under construction there.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for many long months now, I and others have been working to secure enactment of a bill to establish a Capitol Guide Service.

Both Chairman FRIEDEL and I have introduced the bills, H.R. 6965 and H.R. 894 respectively. Radio Station WMAL here in Washington, in a recent editorial made a most eloquent plea for enactment of this legislation. I commend the editorial and the bill to all Members.

The editorial follows:

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

Caught in a seemingly endless squeeze are the members of the United States Capitol guide force.

The guides who show visitors around the

Capitol Building are not, technically, employees of the United States Government. They are free lance workers selected by Congressional leadership, who depend on the 25 cents a head collected from each tourist to pay their salary. The guides work co-operatively with the money being pro-rated among them. They have no pension fund, no sick leave, no benefits of any kind—unlike Congressional employees.

For years the guides have tried to get on the Congressional payroll where they would be adequately taken care of. In turn, they have pointed out, the chintzy demand that every American taxpayer pay 25 cents to be shown around his own Capitol could be done away with. But red tape, which is manufactured somewhere in the bowels of the Capitol by shifts of nameless men and women working around the clock, has successfully blocked this.

Since 1956, 13 years ago, this is what has happened to a few guides who had to quit work because of old age and illness. One died in the poor house at Manassas, Virginia; another, (one of the most colorful guides to ever show tourists around the Capitol) had to be taken care of by a daughter until he died, impoverished. Another is in a nursing home but her social security pension is not enough to continue her there, and because she was not a Capitol employee she has no other income.

The Capitol guides are the only representatives of the United States Congress most people meet in their visits to Washington.

The Capitol guides should be treated for what they are, human beings needing consideration and fair treatment. They have a compelling case, if only those who are responsible would pause long enough to listen!

COMMERCE UNION ACTS IN NATIONAL INTEREST IN MIDST OF INTEREST INCREASES

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. William F. Earthman, president of the Commerce Union Bank in Nashville, announced his firm intention not to increase the prime rate of interest, regardless of outside pressures. This was a courageous and statesmanlike stand to make, and an example that concerned bankers around the country might follow. The July 7 issue of the Nashville Tennessean contained an article by staff reporter Frank Ritter on this gratifying development. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMERCE UNION PRESIDENT VOWS NO NEW INTEREST HIKE

(By Frank Ritter)

In the midst of speculation that the nation's banks are preparing for another hike in their prime lending rate, Nashville's Commerce Union Bank announced yesterday it will not go along.

William F. Earthman, president of Commerce Union, said he strongly opposes any increase in the record high 8½% rate and that he hopes no increase will occur.

"But in any event," the bank president added, "Commerce Union pledges to its customers, and to the public, our resolve not to increase our prime rate."

Andrew Benedict Jr., president of First American Bank, said he also is hopeful that the prime rate will not be increased. He declined to say what First American's position will be if other banks across the nation raise their prime rate, but added:

"Politically, this would certainly not be a good time to increase the prime rate, and I don't think it will be increased."

John W. Clay, executive vice president of Third National Bank, said he does not know what position the bank will take if a rate hike occurs. However, he added:

"I would hope we can abstain from any further rate increase. An increase is just not in the interest of the customer, the bank or the country at large. I hope we can maintain our rates at the lowest possible level so customers can take advantage of the funds we do have to loan."

The prime rate—which is the interest that banks charge their biggest and best customers—has been raised several times in recent months. Early last month the rate was raised again, from 7½% to a historic high of 8½%, and the nation's bankers are now considering another hike of 1 to 1½%.

Other bank rates, such as interest rates to small businessmen and farmers are scaled upward from the prime rate.

In response to reports of possible further increases in the prime rate, treasury secretary David M. Kennedy has called a meeting today in Washington of 25 of the nation's biggest banks. Kennedy is expected to caution against any further increase.

Earthman, in his statement yesterday, said: "Higher rates are a traditional method of curbing loan demands, but in my opinion prime rate increases alone will not slow down the economy. In my judgment, a further increase in the prime rate would not be in the public interest."

Instead, Earthman explained, Commerce Union "will further drastically curtail its lending activities, with particular emphasis on curtailing inflationary loans."

A bank spokesman explained that "inflationary loans" would be defined as those which add nothing to the economy—such as loans for speculation in the stock market, or to individuals for purchase or expansion of a business.

One principal reason why a further increase in the prime rate is being contemplated is because most banks in the nation are short of funds to loan—due in large part to action by the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve has made it more expensive and difficult for banks to borrow money by increasing its lending rate to the banks.

However, the corporate sector of the economy has continued a strong demand for money and this has caused pressure for the banks—pressure which some bankers are saying will be alleviated by another prime rate hike.

Benedict, while emphasizing that he hopes the prime rate will not be increased again, said yesterday that banks outside New York, Chicago and the West Coast have little to do with setting the prime rate.

If other banks across the nation do increase their prime rate, the risk which Commerce Union would be taking in refusing to go along would be less than the risk some other Nashville banks would be taking in similar circumstances. This is because Commerce Union does not have as many national customers as some other Nashville banks.

Most banks have some national customers, such as Ford Motor Co., General Electric, Genesco and others, to whom the banks have pledged a certain amount of money throughout the year. The customers may ask the banks to lend them this money at any time.

If the nation's major banks hiked their prime rate—which, in most instances, is the rate charged the national customers—most of the smaller banks would be forced to go along.

The reason for this is that if a bank declined to go along its national customers likely would immediately ask for all the money which that bank had committed to the customer for that year. This is only

natural, since the national customer could be expected to seek money at the cheapest rate possible.

CHICKEN HOT DOGS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News of July 8, 1969, carried a column by the distinguished newsman Will Muller headlined, "Less Fat, More Chicken In Your Hot Dog?" Mr. Muller very properly takes exception to the practice of meat processors these days to load hot dogs and other cooked sausage products with excessive amounts of fat. He also very properly takes exception to the proposal to permit up to 15 percent of a frankfurter to be composed of chicken parts without this fact being noted on a label. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Muller's comments, I submit the text of his column for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LESS FAT, MORE CHICKEN IN YOUR HOT DOG?

(By Will Muller)

Out of Washington recently came a glowing account of how Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, special assistant to President Nixon for consumer affairs, opposed more than 30 percent fat in hot dogs.

The occasion was a U.S. Department of Agriculture hearing on revision of its restriction on what goes into frankfurter.

Mrs. Knauer will win the applause of ladies anxious about the constrictions of the new fat styles and those over-indulgent worried over the prospect of arteriosclerosis. She has done little for the present hot dog eater, who, under some proposals for revising regulations, might clamp down on the sex organs of a chicken just as Al Kaline is rounding third at the Tiger ball park.

As understood here, the average fat content of sausage today is 32 percent. The USDA favors a maximum of 33 percent. The meat industry is for 35 percent.

This numbers game probably is germane to public nourishment. But what the man in the street wants to know is what the fat comes from and what he is eating.

The poultry interests want up to 15 percent of their product admitted to the frankfurter without a warning label.

The department would ban kidneys and sex glands from chickens used in franks. This prohibition is questioned by the poultry industry.

Its argument is made reasonable when viewed with the suggestions advanced for the content of sausage by the meat industry. For instance: From beef, fat, livers, lungs, spleen and tripe. From pork, fat, livers, spleen, and stomach.

In with the chicken would go its gizzard, heart and skin. Into the hot dog of the future would be dumped assorted pork and mutton parts, goat lungs and spleen, all glued together with spice, milk powder, cereal, soy protein concentrate and water.

The proposal to admit the chicken into the casing of a hot dog is only the distraction for the public's eye while the magicians are dumping in various scraps. These would include defatted pork, the residue of lard making.

In this land which enjoys the highest standard of living of any in the world, the frankfurter is the favored food of its children. On many tables it is served as an economy staple.

Suppose every hot dog sold in the city carried with it a description of its contents, a procedure advocated by leading statesmen for cigarettes. The USDA hearings are a part of the country's groping toward "wholesome meat laws." Whatever emerges should be forced to conform to recent legislation requiring honest packaging.

How does the frankfurter addict get and keep his delicacy down? Proposed seasonings deal with that problem this way:

"A condimental amount of salt, natural spices, oleoresins and-or other spice extracts; mustard in an amount not exceeding one percent of all the ingredients, not including water, in the sausage; and-or corn syrup solids, corn syrup; glucose syrup, dextrose, sucrose; natural smoke flavoring and-or artificial smoke flavoring."

With a chaser like that a man could eat a saddle. Or swallow the myth that something good for the consumer is going to come out of all those proposals for revising the hot dog.

What the outcome of those wiener hearings will be is unknown. But this department will eat its next frankfurter when Mrs. Knauer and Mr. Nixon are seen sharing one at Kennedy Stadium.

VATICAN WARNED UNITED STATES ON RED DANGER LONG AGO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New World, the official newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, has from time to time carried articles reviewing the publications of old Vatican memos.

Of special interest in view of the continuing problems inherent in any dealings with the Communists is the recent review of papal documents which show that the Vatican had warned U.S. officials of dangers of communism sometime before the Red threat became evident to our statesmen.

This article, which appeared in the July 4 edition of the New World, follows:

OLD VATICAN MEMOS PUBLISHED: HOLY SEE WARNED THE UNITED STATES ON RED DANGER LONG AGO

VATICAN CITY.—In its newly published fifth volume of a series giving hitherto secret documents of papal diplomatic and humanitarian activities during World War II, the Holy See has detailed an attempt by the late Domenico Cardinal Tardini to warn the United States that Europe under communist domination would be no better off than under Nazi domination.

This is found in a memo of Cardinal Tardini to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's personal representative at the Holy See, Myron C. Taylor.

The memo is one of 500 and more documents published in the new book, which has a historical introduction of 63 pages, plus almost 600 pages of documents.

The new volume is part of a series begun by the Holy See in 1965, apparently in reply to attacks on Pope Plus XII's motives launched by German playwright Rolf Hochhuth in his play "The Deputy."

This volume—and most of its predecessors—was edited by an international team of Jesuit historians: the Revs. Pierre Blet of France, Robert A. Graham of the United States, Angelo Martini of Italy and Burkhardt Schneider of Germany.

Cardinal Tardini, who then held the post of secretary of the Congregation for Extraor-

inary Ecclesiastical Affairs and the rank of monsignor, cautioned Taylor against a naive view of communist Russia during the presidential representative's first visit to the Vatican, in 1941.

Monsignor Tardini's memoranda—written in a style that matched his frank and incisive personality—are a biting critique of Roosevelt thinking about the alliance with the Soviet Union and the religious problem in that country.

In a memo to Taylor, the prelate wrote: "At present, Europe is faced with two great dangers: nazism and communism. Both are opposed to religion, to Christian civilization, to personal liberty, to peace. At the present moment nazism is better organized and boasts greater strength."

"If the war now in progress were to mean the end of both dangers, a period of tranquility would be possible for Europe," he continued. "If even one of these evils—communism, for example—were to remain an active force, Europe would, within a few years, be in a situation identical with that in which it finds itself today."

Communism, "notwithstanding its pacifist claims, pursues a program which is eminently militaristic," Monsignor Tardini asserted.

Myron Taylor was very pleased, and for good reasons, with the results of his two trips. The Pope and the President shared the same general ideas. When Taylor sought the Pope's sympathy for the newly declared Atlantic Charter, this was easily done. It was simple to demonstrate that the Pope had expressed comparable ideas in his own Five Point peace program and in his encyclical of October, 1939.

The Pope, moreover, acceded to Roosevelt's request to remove a political difficulty that was troubling the Administration—the opposition of Catholic isolationists to Lend-Lease for the Soviet Union. If the Pope had been as fanatically anti-communist as he is made out to be sometimes, he could have folded his hands and expressed his surprise that the President of the United States should ask him, the Pope of Rome, to interfere in pending domestic legislation or to intrude upon the right of American citizens to express their political opinions freely.

As it was, in order to convenience the President, the Pope had Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati make the decisive statement that met all Roosevelt's desires and expectations.

The Pope's perhaps surprising permissiveness on U.S. aid to embattled Russia is consistent with his refusal, at the same time, to say a word in favor of the Axis "crusade" against Russia.

Just before Taylor arrived, the Italian ambassador had complained about the Pope's "mutism" on the Russian war. He suggested that at least some Italian cardinal be prompted to say what the Pope couldn't or wouldn't say. The Pope decided that he could not ask an Italian cardinal to make any such statement unless he at the same time mentioned the religious persecution in Germany.

Of course, the Pope himself never made any statements that could be taken as referring approvingly to the war on Russia. The new documents confirm that neither did he support the war in secret conversations—rather the contrary, as his concession to Roosevelt shows.

The memoranda of Monsignor Tardini demonstrate, however, that the Vatican was greatly concerned about the course of Roosevelt policy. Monsignor Tardini's judgment of the President of the United States was not complimentary.

Commenting on the President's optimistic letter on the future of religious freedom in Russia, dated Sept. 3, 1941, he wrote that the phrases are "too vague and studied all too closely." In his judgment, "It is extremely distressing to see how Roosevelt foresees with such imperturbability the continuance of bol-

shevism. That would signify for Europe and the world's future certainly nothing better and even probably worse."

Monsignor Tardini did not accept the distinction Roosevelt made between communism and nazism. "From the ideological aspect," he wrote, "both communism and nazism are equally false and pernicious. Both are materialist, both anti-religious, both destructive of the most elementary rights of the human person, both implacable enemies of the Holy See."

The President's letter, he said, was no compliment to his acumen. He spoke with equal bluntness and logical preciseness to the Axis diplomats.

Rejecting the demand for an open Vatican condemnation of communism, he said that the condemnation of years past still stood. A new statement, he said, would have a political meaning and not a religious character. Besides, said Monsignor Tardini to an Axis diplomat, it was Hitler who made the pact with Stalin, claiming it was a guarantee for peace in the East. Thus it was Hitler who should explain himself.

Monsignor Tardini said that communism is the worst enemy of the Church and he would be glad to see it destroyed, but it was not the only enemy. "The swastika," he told Ambassador Attolico of Italy, "is not exactly the cross of the crusader."

Supreme skepticism about the peaceful intentions of the Soviet leaders dominated Tardini's memoranda and his conversations with Taylor. On Sept. 16, 1942, he asked whether President Roosevelt had thought of the day after the war when Europe was prostrate and communism would be the only force, invading every country.

The United States would find itself in the exact same situation in which it finds itself with regard to Nazi Germany, he told Taylor. Had the President thought of that? Taylor was surprised and when he returned to Washington he carried Monsignor Tardini's memo on this subject for presentation to the President.

The poor estimate that Monsignor Tardini had of President Roosevelt's program had not improved by the time of the second Taylor trip to Rome, a year later, again in September. He noted that the United States had always had a blind spot on the religious problem in Russia.

"It should not be surprising at this time," he wrote in recording his views for the Pope's attention, "that Roosevelt not only minimizes the communist danger but asserts that communism has evolved and that it would be good for the Holy See to make a kind of modus vivendi with Russia."

"This memorandum on Russia," he wrote, referring to a document brought by Taylor, "demonstrates the error and illusion of the Americans who believe it possible that the communist government, once victorious in the war, would enter into the family of nations like a meek lamb. The truth is quite the opposite. If Stalin wins the war, he will be the lion who devours all Europe."

"I said to Taylor that neither Hitler nor Stalin can remain quiet and still in a family of European nations. I am surprised that such evident things are not realized by leaders and high-level political personalities."

"Stalin," wrote Tardini again, "is no peace leader forced into war. He is himself a war-monger, who was beaten to the punch by a criminal more daring than he."

It is small wonder that Monsignor Tardini's own draft reply to the President's letter was rejected by the Pope and a milder one sent in its stead.

The Pope did not entirely share the Tardini point of view, but the Monsignor's doubts about American leadership during and after the war were no doubt very much in his mind.

"The United States," warned Monsignor Tardini, "intend to reorganize Europe as they see fit. And since they know little or nothing

of the European situation their wishes can bring enormous harm to Europe."

Monsignor Tardini lived long enough to see the reversal of American policy in Europe, rearmament and the beginning of NATO in response to the Soviet challenge. Few men in a similar position are better entitled to say, "I told you so."

Other major events covered in the new volume—entitled "The Holy See and the World War, July 1940–October 1942"—are the creation of diplomatic relations with Japan and China, and the British demand for the recall of all Italian missionaries from the Middle East, including Vatican representatives of Italian origin.

Also covered are the efforts of Pope Pius XII to secure guarantees against the bombardment of Rome and the reports of the future Pope John XXIII, Angelo Roncalli, from his post in Turkey.

It was in this period that religious persecution in the German-controlled areas, notably in Poland, was reaching its height. Despite this, the German government demanded the rights to be consulted by Rome on the appointment of Church leaders in the Reich sphere of influence. This was turned down by Pius XII.

In his second visit (September, 1942), Taylor stressed the vast military preparations of the United States and the determination of the American people to pursue the war to ultimate and complete victory, no matter how long this would take.

In particular, Taylor was instructed to warn the Pope against any moves that might be suggested to him by the Axis in view of a negotiated peace, which could only be illusory.

Pope Pius XII replied that he had never been a partisan of peace at any price but only of a peace based on justice and morality.

Dispatches from the Apostolic Delegates in Washington (Archbishop Amleto Cicognani) and London (Archbishop William Godfrey) described the political and religious situation in their respective countries under war conditions.

In 1941, for instance, Archbishop Cicognani gave ample details of the open controversy between Bishop Joseph Hurley of St. Augustine and Archbishop Francis I. Beckman of Dubuque, the former urging support of the Roosevelt policy of intervention and the latter siding with the isolationist opposition.

Writing to the Pope on Sept. 4, 1941, Archbishop Francis Spellman of New York said that the prevailing sentiment of the country at that time was against intervention. He himself, however, had a different view, "I feel that eventually America will finally be an actual participant."

Temper was short at this time in both the Vatican and London over the question of Italian missionaries in Egypt and Palestine. On instructions from his government, the British minister, Sir D'Arcy Osborne, demanded that the Pope recall not only these priests but also the Apostolic Delegate in Alexandria, Archbishop (later cardinal, recently deceased) Gustavo Testa. He was accused of being responsible for pro-Italian sentiment among the local clergy.

The Vatican's reply was to ask for proof of the charges and to stress that the missionaries and above all, Vatican representatives, have standing instructions to remain out of politics.

Vatican aides pointed out to the British minister that short of proof that these instructions had been disobeyed, they could not in fairness recall the missionaries. Besides, the precedent was dangerous for the Church insofar as it could be used equally well by the Italians and the Japanese against missionaries of enemy countries.

The Vatican denied that in pointing out the bad propaganda this would make for the British cause any attempt was being made—

as the diplomat charged—at "extortion." If the British wished to expel the missionaries on their own authority, they would have to reckon with the consequences. In the end Archbishop Testa was recalled to Italy on leave of absence. Soon after, the threat to the Suez Canal—which had enhanced the British security consciousness in the area—was removed by the defeat of Rommel at El Alamein.

A similar crossing of swords took place in the spring of 1942 when both the United States and Great Britain objected strongly to the assumption of Vatican diplomatic relations with Japan. This crisis, however, was softened when the Republic of China also asked and was granted diplomatic relations with the Vatican. President Roosevelt, according to the documents, finally dismissed the matter as of no importance.

Other matters covered in the 800-page fifth volume of the new Vatican publication include the dispute over the reception of Anton Pavelic, head of the puppet Croatian regime. He was received in the Vatican only as a private citizen. To protests from the Royal Yugoslav embassy, the Vatican denied that this constituted recognition of the Ustasha regime.

In the fall of 1942, several Allied diplomats in the Vatican also asked the Pope for an open condemnation of the Nazis. The reply was to state that the Pope had already condemned crimes by whatever side committed but that the Holy See could not descend into particulars without entering into political matters and requiring documentation and proof.

In Latin America, where the United States in the spring of 1942 was trying to mobilize the hemisphere against the Axis, the Holy See was accused of using its influence to block this policy. The documents and correspondence on this controversy show, on the contrary, that no attempt had been made by the Vatican to influence the conference of Rio de Janeiro, called for the purpose of speeding diplomatic rupture with the Axis.

GARDENA VALLEY NEWS CELEBRATES 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to one of California's outstanding newspapers, the Gardena Valley News, as it begins to celebrate its 65th year of distinguished service to the people of Gardena Valley.

Under the able leadership of William J. Hunt, publisher, and George P. Algie, copublisher, and Mrs. Dolly Warfield, managing editor, the 60-member staff of the Gardena Valley News has increased the circulation, prestige, and community influence of local newspapers in southern California.

Recognition of their achievements these past few years is well acknowledged. The Gardena Valley News received the California Newspaper Publishers Association Award for the best front page in 1968, Outstanding Community Service in 1967, best spot news picture in 1965, and best front page in 1963.

The Gardena Valley News was the recipient in 1969 of the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge for the 1968

editorial entitled "Home Ownership, the American Way."

I am proud to commend before my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, the publisher and copublisher and the staff of the Gardena Valley News for their significant contributions to the people of their community, and to extend my congratulations upon the occasion of the paper's 65th year of publication.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 11870

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong opposition to H.R. 11870, which would allow increases in the weight and width of trucks and buses traveling on our Interstate Highway System.

In New York City, vehicular traffic has become a source of increasing annoyance and danger for many residents—especially those living near highways. And I am sure residents of other cities share the same problem.

In my own district in the Bronx, for example, a fine apartment complex known as Co-op City is under construction near a highway. Some families are already occupying the units which have been completed and they have found that the nearby highway has become a disturbing part of their lives.

Vehicles speed by at all hours of the day and night, often interrupting sleep as they generate noise and fumes. In addition, parents are constantly worried about children who might wander too far from home and too close to the highway.

It is largely middle-income families who occupy apartment complexes such as Co-Op City. They are decent, hard-working Americans who are often committed to ownership of the apartment units or long-term leases. They cannot readily afford to dispose of their commitments and move elsewhere.

It is this aspect of it all—the human ingredient—that is a matter of deep concern. Are we to give people or trucks and buses priority? That is the question that we must ask ourselves when we consider this bill. I, for one, will not deviate from the proposition that the welfare, comfort, and security of our people must come above anything else.

We who are privileged to serve in Congress must seize upon opportunities that enable us to make life a little more bearable for the people that we represent. That is truly the greatest reward of public service. When we move away from that purpose, we serve only to tarnish the mantle of public service.

Last year, vehicular accidents became the fourth leading cause of death in the country. Some 53,000 deaths and 1.9 million disabling injuries resulted from 13.7 million accidents. In addition, the economic loss totaled \$10.7 billion. Those are the hard, staggering statistics, but they alone do not tell the whole story.

When we pause to relate those statistics to all the elements of American life, a graphically tragic picture emerges. The grief from the loss of life, the pain from injuries—the anguish, the suffering, the worry and the financial loss. These are basically the things that I am talking about—the elements that represent the human side of this issue.

Remember, too, there is no way of really measuring how many more lives have been thrown into turmoil because of other problems on the highways—the problems of noise, fumes, and general hazards that directly affect so many Americans who live near highways in the co-op cities of America.

Surely our highway problems will become more acute if we permit an increase in the weight and width of trucks and buses. The added weight is bound to make it more difficult to stop within a safe and reasonable distance. The inevitable result would be more accidents, more deaths, more injuries, more property damage, more noise and more fumes.

These problems become no less serious when we consider increasing the width of trucks and buses. Just imagine how they would obstruct the view of passing motorists? I shudder to think of the consequences.

I know of no sound reason for the passage of this bill. In fact, I would be totally bewildered if it was enacted into law because there are so many valid reasons that warrant its rejection.

The conclusion that this would be a worthless, costly, damaging and cruel piece of legislation is inescapable.

JAYCEES REQUEST UNITY BEHIND PRESIDENT'S EFFORT TO EFFECT A LASTING AND POSITIVE WORLD PEACE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the North Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce recently passed a proclamation in support of President Richard M. Nixon's peace proclamation.

I wish to take this opportunity of commending this outstanding group of Jaycees in their timeliness and interest in bringing this proclamation and its contents to my attention. It is heartwarming to see that there are many individuals in our country who still are aware of the fact that we, as a nation, favor world peace; but that we, as a nation, should not, however, compromise our honor and capitulate or accept peace at any price.

Certainly the statements made in the proclamation by the North Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce should give encouragement to our representatives who are presently negotiating on behalf of the United States for a fair and lasting peace on terms fair to all instead of one brought about solely to appease in an effort to extricate our country from the web of

this war which in the long run may well bring disastrous results not only to our country and our own security, but to the security of other peace-loving nations of the world as well.

I am proud, therefore, to call this proclamation to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. The proclamation reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON'S PEACE PROPOSAL

Whereas, the North Miami Jaycees stand in full support of the efforts of President Richard M. Nixon in his quest for an honorable and positive peace in the country of South Vietnam, and,

Whereas, we support the more than one-half million Americans in South Vietnam and proudly salute and pay tribute to those 35,000 men who have gallantly and unselfishly sacrificed their lives in this quest for peace, and

Whereas, we seek nothing for America, but rather a climate for a self-determination of the peoples of South Vietnam, and,

Whereas, we believe that now is the time to indicate to the other side that they should not plan on the resolve of the United States to crumble from within,

Be it therefore resolved that we, the North Miami Jaycees seek the individual support of every organization, every American to provide a positive unity between the President of the United States of America in his efforts to effect a lasting and positive world peace.

BLACKS URGED TO CHANNEL RAGE INTO POSITIVE POLITICAL STRATEGY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, some men distinguish themselves by their ability to reach to the heart of an issue, to dissect it into palatable bits, and by so doing—to communicate understanding. Bayard Rustin has so distinguished himself. We know it is his overwhelming urge to communicate understanding which enables him to forcefully clarify the confusions which stifle many efforts.

Until white and black can approach America's problems together, we are severely inhibited in our ability to overcome them. Mr. Rustin has made very clear the basis and the need for the co-operation we seek. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this article from the AFL-CIO News, June 28, 1969:

TO ESCAPE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE: BLACKS URGED TO CHANNEL RAGE INTO POSITIVE POLITICAL STRATEGY

(By Bayard Rustin)

(NOTE.—The author of the following article, Bayard Rustin, is executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute and a prominent civil rights leader.)

We have reached a point in the political development of America that can legitimately be called an emergency. Our country is in trouble, very severe trouble, and those who are most profoundly threatened by this unhappy situation are black Americans.

Within recent weeks we have seen a conservative appointed a Chief Justice of the United States. We have seen two integrationist candidates for the school board of Denver, Colo., go down to a resounding de-

feat. We have seen an obscure police chief from Minneapolis run away with the mayoralty election on a platform of nothing more than "law and order." In Los Angeles we have witnessed the defeat of a talented and idealistic Negro candidate for mayor and the victory of an incompetent and unprincipled demagogue. And now in New York City we have seen both the Republican and the Democratic Parties nominate right-wing candidates for mayor.

As these developments have come in the wake of a Republican presidential victory and the racist Wallace movement—the size of which was unprecedented—we can understand the gravity of the present situation, and we must recognize the necessity to change the course of our common political destiny.

There are many reasons for this reaction that is victimizing all people concerned with social justice, but the fundamental reason lies in the dynamic of fear.

There exists today a dangerous relationship between the extreme Left and the extreme Right, and between black rage and white fear. The confrontationalist tactics of the one evoke a reactionary response from the other. When the pseudo-revolutionaries of the New Left manhandle professors, occupy buildings, and destroy property, the Right wins new adherents. When sincere but misdirected young black people engage in violence in the name of justice, they are strengthening those very forces which in the past have inflicted violence and injustice upon the Negro Community. Such acts of protest may be cathartic, they may appear to be bold and militant, but let us be very clear—their primary effect is politically reactionary.

These acts have set loose a wave of panic in this country. And there are opportunistic rightwing demagogues who understand the nature of that panic and are building their political futures upon it. These demagogues don't believe in meeting the urgent needs of the black community for income and education. Indeed, social justice would threaten the very base of fear upon which they stand, for it would remove the cause of social unrest. Their program is the billy club and their staunchest ally the police arm of the state. They believe in repression.

The lessons of the past month should be clear. An assault upon our democratic institutions will not reform those institutions but destroy them. Violence will lead to more violence, not to social justice. And the fundamental tragedy is that the absence of justice will provoke more people to engage in violent acts. We must find a way out of this vicious cycle.

The needs of the black community for adequate jobs, housing, and education can be met only by developing a political strategy that will attract a majority of Americans to a program for social change.

There are whites who are unemployed and white workers whose real income is steadily decreasing as the cost of living rises. Both these groups share with blacks the desire for increased and upgraded employment opportunities. Let us build a movement with them. There are whites living in substandard housing and paying exorbitant rents. Their children attend schools that are over-crowded and under-staffed. They share with blacks the desire for massively funded programs in housing and education. Let us build a movement with them, too. And there are those more affluent whites of liberal persuasion who sincerely desire social justice. They too should be our allies.

These are positive points around which a political majority can be built. Such a strategy is the only means by which black people will achieve social and economic equality within the context of contemporary American society.

This strategy demands the repudiation of racial separatism which can only isolate Ne-

groes. It also demands the rejection of extremism and violence which increase fear and heighten animosities between groups that might otherwise be united.

Black people are enraged because there are social injustices which provoke rage. But if that rage is not expressed politically, if it is not devoted towards achieving constructive goals, then it will be self-defeating and ultimately self-destructive. Let us be enraged about injustice, but let us not be destroyed by it. Let us act now with forcefulness but restraint, with militancy but wisdom, in the hope of liberating ourselves from rage and injustice, and our white brothers from the fear which now enslaves them.

A WHOLE NEW LIFE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "when you give a man a book, you do not just give him 12 ounces of paper, ink, and glue, you give him a whole new life."

Unfortunately, with a budget proposal currently before Congress to cut aid to education by 25 percent and to slash library funds 66 percent, there is the strong possibility that many of our children will never experience the tremendous satisfaction of "a whole new life."

In the past, Congress has shown itself to be a champion of education, placing it among the top priorities of national concern. It, therefore, is even more discouraging and objectionable to see the increasing disregard for the importance of adequately financed educational and library organizations. The immediate case in point is the current proposal for a \$500 million reduction in Office of Education programs and a \$90 million reduction in library programs, both of which I strongly feel the Nation can ill afford.

Within recent years, learning has become a much more exciting experience for our young people. A wealth of books and equipment designed to spark curiosity and intellectual excellence, plus teachers and librarians dedicated to imparting a love of knowledge in youth, has enabled us to improve the lives of a major portion of America. Yet, we now stand on the brink of losing this momentum, should we vote a cutback in essential funds.

It is not however only those who have tasted the fruits of learning who will be deprived if funds are removed from these programs. The effect will be felt throughout the Nation. For there are still more than 40,000 schools in need of their own libraries. Moreover, there are urban poor and those who live in rural wilderness who have come to rely on the so-called missionary libraries which are virtually an oasis for many.

We puzzle over the younger generation and lament that their behavior will precipitate the Nation's destruction. But, Mr. Speaker, we are the ones who will be accessories to the fact, should we close our eyes to the needs of education and library systems.

It is undeniable that reductions in Government spending are necessary if we are to set our fiscal house in order. Nevertheless, these cutbacks should occur in those areas which time and again have demonstrated fiscal irresponsibility. Pork barrel legislation, farm subsidies, outmoded and excessive defense projects are just a few considerations in which we could and virtually must economize; not education.

How can we consider such substantial cutbacks in education and libraries when we have pledged our efforts to cure the vast and appalling domestic problems which plague us. Our ghetto problems are based on the roots of prejudice, ignorance, insensitivity, and lack of awareness that has been festering in America for some time. It is through books and education that we can provide our citizens with a better life and pave the way for man's increased understanding of man. For it is through books and education that we can free men from the shackles of ignorance and the iron bonds of prejudice.

I strongly feel that it is time for us to economize in the areas of wanton spending, mismanaged funds, and misused appropriations. But Mr. Speaker, let us not jeopardize our entire educational system for the lack of foresight, responsibility, and a sense of realistic priorities.

A REVIEW OF THE SILVER SITUATION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address before the Commodity Club of San Francisco, Mr. H. F. Magnuson, vice president of the Goldconda Mining Corp., Wallace, Idaho, emphasized the need for the Federal Government to adopt policies that will provide for an orderly transition to a free market in silver. Mr. Magnuson points out that the amount of silver in coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks is nearing exhaustion, after which time the Treasury will no longer be able to supply the needs of industrial silver consumers.

Mr. Magnuson urges the U.S. Government, as the critical supplier of silver to industry, to make plans immediately to provide for an orderly transition to a free silver market to avoid a violent dislocation in the silver market. Encouraging exploration for and development of new silver ore bodies will help to accomplish an orderly transition. Mr. Magnuson suggests that this can be done by having silver producers and users join with the Government in formulating a new policy pertaining to silver.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the full text of Mr. Magnuson's important message in the Record as a part of my remarks:

A REVIEW OF THE SILVER SITUATION

A year ago I told the members of the Commodity Club of San Francisco that the price

of silver would rise once the Treasury was no longer a dominant factor in the silver market.

The latest figures available from the Treasury Department indicate that by mid-July, 1970 the Treasury will have exhausted its supply of silver, if it continues to sell coinage silver at the rate of 2 million ounces a week.

Consequently, it is vital that the administration immediately formulate plans for phasing out the weekly silver sales so that an orderly transition can be made to a free market. Only if the transition is orderly, will a violent dislocation in the price of silver be avoided.

I will go into detail on this in a few minutes.

Since I last spoke to you, the price of silver rose to \$2.565 an ounce in mid-June last year, then began retreating and now it is quoted at around \$1.75 an ounce, 30 per cent below its 1968 high.

The weakness in the price of silver during the past ten months has not been due to any fundamental change in the silver situation, but rather to factors extraneous to the fundamental supply-demand picture that will, in the final analysis, determine the price of silver.

These factors include the liquidation of silver inventories and the smuggling of hoarded silver from India during the period when the price was above \$2 an ounce. It also includes the continued presence of the U.S. Treasury in the silver market, through its sale of 2 million ounces of the metal each week.

Last year about 64 million ounces of silver, an amount equal to 18 per cent of the total amount of silver used by the Free World for industrial purposes, was smuggled out of the Far East and exchanged for gold.

Now that the price of gold has risen to better than \$43 an ounce, this smuggling no longer is profitable, because the people of the Far East are not willing to trade their silver for paper money and the price of silver is too low in relation to the price of gold to make such smuggling activities attractive.

We must also keep in mind, in reviewing the 1968 silver situation, that the U.S. Treasury supplied the world markets with 179 million ounces of silver—105 million ounces through the GSA weekly auction and 74 million ounces through the redemption of silver certificates prior to June 24th, 1968.

But these factors are extraneous to the fundamental silver supply-demand picture, and in order to keep the silver situation in perspective during this period of transition to an entirely free supply-demand market, it is necessary to review some relevant facts.

In the first nine years of this decade industrial consumers of silver in the Free World have used 719 million ounces more of the white metal than has been mined.

In the same nine-year period, the U.S. Treasury has supplied the world market with 859 million ounces of silver.

It must be kept in mind that I am counting only the silver used for industrial purposes during this nine-year period, and not silver that went into coinage.

The deficit between Free World production of silver, and Free World industrial consumption of silver, has risen six fold in the period between 1960 and 1969, from 16.8 million ounces in 1960 to 109.1 million ounces in 1969.

There is no reason to believe that there will be any material change in the immediate future in the gap between silver production and consumption of silver by industry. The problem we face is that of increasing production to meet increasing demands, and this problem, as I will explain later, is one that should concern the administration in Washington.

I cannot emphasize this point too strongly,

for it is basic to the entire silver situation now, and in the years to come.

It means:

That once the Treasury no longer is able to supply the needs of industrial silver consumers, the price of silver will rise.

That the U.S. government, as the critical supplier of silver to industry in this transition period, must make plans immediately to provide for an orderly transition to a free silver market in order to avoid a violent dislocation in the market, and that it should make every effort to stimulate increased production of silver.

Let's take up these two points in order.

First, the ability of the Treasury to supply silver to Free world industry. And keep in mind that I said Free World industry, not domestic industry. I will return to this point later in my discussion.

The ability of the Treasury to continue to supply silver to the Free World depends almost entirely on the amount of silver it will recover from silver coins.

As of March 28, 1969, the Treasury's adjusted inventory of silver in coins amounts to 108.2 million ounces. This is enough silver to enable the Treasury to continue its sale of 2 million ounces a week for 54 weeks, or until mid-April, 1970. To this, must be added the 22.6 million ounces of coinage silver the Treasury had on hand at the end of March. This would prolong the sales until early in July, 1970.

However, it is significant that the Treasury has in the past over-estimated the amount of silver it would recover from coins, and has, since last November, revised downward its estimated inventory by a total of 40 million ounces.

Mr. Thomas W. Wolfe, director of the Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations, Department of the Treasury, in making his estimate of changes in combined silver inventory on April 18, made this comment, which, I believe, deserves emphasis.

"The actual yield of silver from the separation of mixed dimes and quarters since January, 1969, is proving lower than previous samplings indicated. Accordingly, a ten million ounce downward adjustment has been made in the total estimated silver remaining in mixed coin inventories at the Mints and Federal Reserve Banks."

Previously the Bureau of the Mint had reduced its silver coin inventory by 30.2 million ounces with the explanation that silver dimes and quarters containing this amount of silver had to be recirculated last November and December, because of the shortage of clad coins during the Christmas shopping season.

Between July 1, 1968, and March 28, 1969, a period of nine months, the Treasury estimate of its inventory of silver in coins has decreased by 130.6 million ounces, from 238.8 million ounces to 108.2 million ounces. Should this rate of decline continue (14.5 million ounces a month) the supply of silver coins—not necessarily the silver bullion derived from such coins—will be exhausted by mid-November.

Now this situation is in distinct contrast to the statement made by Assistant Secretary of Treasury Robert Wallace on May 4, 1968, when he declared "it still seems to be a pretty safe guess that we ought to be able to continue our GSA sales another three years at least, and depending on our silver coin recoveries, perhaps considerably longer."

In reference to this last remark of Mr. Wallace, concerning future recoveries of silver coins, it is significant that while the Treasury's estimate of its silver in coins has declined 55 per cent in the nine-month period ending last March 28, the amount of fractional coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks, which includes the silver coin inventory, has declined only 36 per cent.

This is, of course, further confirmation of the remark by Mr. Wolfe that actual yield of silver from coins is lower than had been expected.

Now, as to my second point—that the Federal Government should direct its efforts to bring about an orderly transition from a silver market that it dominates to a free market governed only by supply and demand.

Once the government withdraws as a supplier of silver, where it has provided an average of more than 95 million ounces of silver a year to the Free World in the past nine years, and an average of 172.4 million ounces in the past three years, there is certain to be a violent dislocation in the market price.

This is not healthy for either the mining industry, the silver users or the public. We only have to look to the situation in copper, where excessive price increases have resulted in substitution of other metals for copper. The uses of silver, fortunately, do not lend themselves readily to substitution, but an excessive price could result in a fall-off of marginal uses for silver, including that in jewelry.

I believe that silver producers and users alike should address themselves to this problem, and that the Federal Government should take the lead in bringing them together by forming a new silver commission, to replace the old Commission on the Coinage, so that this transition can be planned.

The transition is only a little more than a year away, at most.

After the Treasury is no longer able to supply silver to industrial users, there will be of necessity a greater need for increased production of silver.

But production of silver cannot be increased overnight, or in one season as is the case in raising wheat or corn. New deposits must first be found, then explored and developed, and finally brought into production. It requires six or seven years, at the best, to bring a new mine into production after the ore body has been discovered.

This fact, which we in the mining industry call "lead time", makes it imperative that exploration and development of new silver ore bodies be stimulated, and such stimulation can be provided only by an adequate price for the metal.

Such stimulation is lacking when the price of silver falls while the price structure generally, and the cost of money, spirals upward.

The Secretary of the Treasury in the new administration, Mr. David Kennedy, has been making a review of the silver situation and Treasury silver policy. It is my understanding that he has been obtaining views of all interested parties, including producers, users and Treasury and Mint officials.

The fact that the Commission on the Coinage is scheduled to meet with him next Monday may be significant, in light of this review.

Changes in silver policy in the past, you will recall, have been made at meetings of the Coinage Commission. In view of reports prevailing during the past several weeks that Treasury sales of silver may be curtailed, the meeting next Monday is being awaited with great expectation by those interested in silver.

A few minutes ago I referred to the fact that the Treasury supplies silver to Free World industry, and asked you to keep that remark in mind.

I would like to explain it now.

In the past three years, this nation has been a net exporter of more than 92 million ounces of silver. This is just 19 million ounces short of the United States silver production in those three years. In that three-year period, mines in the United States produced 111 million ounces of silver, while American industry used 440 million ounces, leaving a 329 million ounce deficit. In the same three-year period, the U.S. Treasury made available 517 million ounces of silver.

This has closed the gap between U.S. production and consumption, and has made silver available for export.

Although the Treasury sells coinage silver only to domestic industrial consumers, this nation has continued in the first two months of this year to be a net exporter of silver, to the extent of 5.2 million ounces or at an annual rate of 31 million ounces a year.

In February, our net export of silver amounted to 4.6 million ounces. We exported 9.3 million ounces and imported 4.7 million ounces.

Our exports in that month consisted of 5.2 million ounces in refined bullion and 4.1 million ounces in ore and base bullion.

Let's examine our export of silver in ore and base bullion in more detail.

Previous to 1967, our export of silver in ore and base bullion had been negligible. For example: in the three years 1964-1966, our total export of silver in ore and base bullion amounted to only 1,555,000 ounces, or less than half our export of silver in ore and base bullion in February this year.

In 1966 our exports of silver in ore and base bullion totaled 369,000 ounces. In 1967, that figure jumped to 2,365,000 ounces, and in 1968, to 23,129,000 ounces. If our exports of silver in this form continue at the pace of the first two months of this year, the 1969 exports of silver in ore and base bullion will amount to more than 32 million ounces.

This requires an explanation.

This nation has sufficient smelting capacity to make the export of silver in ore unnecessary, so we can assume it is silver in base bullion that is being exported.

The definition of base bullion, I have learned, includes coinage silver.

I am informed on good authority that the major cause for heavy exports of silver last year was a substantial exportation of coinage silver for refining.

Early in 1968, when the United States non-ferrous metals industry was struck, the U.S. Treasury agreed to the exportation of silver under .999 fineness which it had sold for domestic consumption, on the condition that the exporter arrange for importation into the United States of refined silver as an offset.

However, in 1968 this nation exported 55 million ounces of silver more than it imported.

I am further informed that because of the heavy Treasury sales of coinage silver, some of the purchasers of such metal have found that refining costs outside the U.S. are lower than those charged by domestic refiners.

The bulk of this coinage silver that is being exported goes to Belgium and the United Kingdom. Belgium recently increased the capacity of its silver refinery at Hoboken from about 15 million ounces a year to 40 million ounces, and the United Kingdom has substantially increased its refining capacity.

The domestic refining industry is not protesting such exports, despite the fact coinage silver ostensibly is sold by the Treasury only to domestic industrial consumers.

It will be recalled that the Silver Committee of the American Mining Congress has consistently urged that restrictions on the sale of Treasury silver be removed and all buyers should be eligible to bid, since under such a procedure the taxpayer would be assured of getting a higher price on Treasury silver sales.

It also should be pointed out that silver derived from the illegal melting of coins also probably is being shipped to foreign refiners, and is included in the export figures. While the melting of coins is illegal, the export of the resultant silver bars, which is base bullion, is not illegal.

Be that as it may, the important fact to be considered, I believe is that we are

exporting more silver than we import, even though domestic production of silver runs about 110 million ounces a year under domestic industrial consumption.

Once the Treasury halts the sale of silver, this country will of necessity be a net importer of silver in order to make up this deficit, and silver we are selling cheaply now will have to be purchased back at higher prices.

It can be argued that our net exports of silver now help our balance of payments situation. It can be argued just as successfully that necessary imports of silver in future years will worsen our balance of payments picture.

So far, I have confined my remarks about the silver supply situation to the silver that is being obtained from melting down coins. As you are aware, this is our principal supply of silver, and the only kind of silver the Treasury is selling at its weekly auction.

However, because the Treasury does publish statistics relative to its total supply of silver bullion, any review of the silver situation would be remiss if no reference were made to these statistics.

The March 31 report on silver bullion is the latest one that is available. It shows that Mint holdings of bullion silver amount to 86.3 million ounces.

However, upon examination we learn that the Mint holdings actually total 71.6 million ounces, after deducting 4.3 million ounces of coinage silver sold at GSA sales and not yet paid for; 4 million ounces that have excessive nickel and which are not suitable for sale; and 10.0 million ounces of .999 plus and .999 silver committed and not available.

In addition, nearly 14 million ounces of this bullion silver is .400 fine, reserved for minting the clad half dollars, and 22.5 million ounces are in unrefined silver largely mixed with gold, which will become available over a long period of time.

The remaining 35.5 million ounces held by the Mint includes 22.2 million ounces of coinage silver, 8.6 million ounces of .833 to .995 silver, and 4.7 million ounces of .996 to .998 silver. The coinage silver is the only silver that is being sold.

And it must be kept in mind that there is pending in Congress a bill that would make available to purchasers 8 million ounces of silver that was allegedly contracted for just prior to the time the Treasury discontinued sale of silver at \$1.29 an ounce, and which was not delivered.

Some of you will recall that a year ago I said a considerable quantity of silver reported by the Treasury to be on hand was "paper silver", existing only on paper.

The truth of this remark is borne out, I believe, in the statistics of the past year, which show the downgraded estimate of silver in coins, and the silver actually available for sale in the classification "silver bullion."

There is one other point I think should be made in any silver review.

That point concerns the disposition of the silver remaining in the Treasury, including coinage silver.

The Treasury justifies its sale of 2 million ounces a week on grounds that it is needed to close the gap between domestic production and consumption, yet we have seen that much of this silver is finding its way to overseas markets.

This is an argument for phasing out the sale of Treasury silver, so as to provide for a more orderly transition to a free market.

This silver remaining in the Treasury belongs to the U.S. taxpayer. It is a national asset and thought should be given to its most profitable use.

It now brings the Treasury—and the taxpayer—about \$1.70 an ounce.

It could be sold at \$3.38 per ounce if it were used for the minting of silver Kennedy half-dollars or silver Eisenhower dollars, as has been suggested.

Last year Mexico monetized silver it had purchased from the United States at \$1.29 an ounce, and sold it at \$4 an ounce by minting 30 million 25-peso Olympic commemorative .720-fine coins, each containing one-half ounce of silver.

Surely we could do as well with coins commemorating two great Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In summation, I would like to emphasize these points:

The amount of silver in coins held by the Treasury and Federal Reserve Banks is nearing exhaustion, having been reduced 130.6 million ounces in nine months to 108.2 million ounces at the end of March.

This brings closer a free market in silver. The Federal Government should concern itself with providing for an orderly transition to such a free market and encouraging ex-

ploration for and development of new silver ore bodies. This should be accomplished by having silver producers and users join with the government in formulating new policy pertaining to silver.

The domestic industrial silver consumption will continue to run about 100 million ounces above production and this fact will create a serious situation once the Treasury no longer is a supplier of silver. Silver exported now will return to these shores at a higher price.

Treasury figures indicate that it will be out of the silver market by mid-1970.

The short term price outlook for silver remains obscured as long as the Treasury continues to sell silver and as long as the world monetary uncertainties exist. However, as to the longer term, I am confident that we can look forward to higher silver prices.

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 misjudgment and misrepresentations of the Safeguard decision that are clearly linked to past scandals."

Mr. Nixon and his secretary of defense have been unfairly attacked, by such senators as Fulbright and McGovern, not only as if they were being stubbornly perverse in arguing for the ABM defense but also as if they were solely responsible for our being at war in Viet Nam and for the existence of "the military-industrial complex," whereas these developments arose under previous administrations. The carping senators and opposition press are trying to use apples to make arguments against oranges. They are doing the same thing that McNamara's assistant secretary for public administration admitted he was trying to do—manage the news to their own ends.

FREE WORLD INDUSTRIAL CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION OF SILVER (MILLIONS OF OUNCES)

	Total	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960
Industrial consumption.....	2,659.4	347.3	348.6	355.1	336.6	299.2	260.7	247.8	239.5	224.6
New production.....	1,940.1	238.2	216.8	224.7	218.4	210.7	214.6	205.7	203.2	207.8
Deficit.....	719.3	109.1	131.8	130.4	118.2	88.5	46.1	42.1	36.3	16.8
Treasury silver made available.....	858.8	179.5	195.2	142.5	80.4	151.0	25.2	.9	62.6	21.5

U.S. SILVER PRODUCTION, NET EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

	Total	1968	1967	1966
Production.....	110.8	35.0	32.1	43.7
Consumption.....	440.0	145.0	145.0	150.0
Net exports.....	92.4	55.1	15.2	22.1

U.S. TREASURY ESTIMATE OF CHANGES IN COMBINED OUNCES, SILVER INVENTORY

	Coins	Bullion	Total
Inventory, July 1, 1968.....	1238.8	80.3	319.1
Inventory, Mar. 28, 1969.....	1108.2	86.7	196.9
Change.....	-130.6	+6.4	-124.2

† Estimated range, plus or minus 10,000,000 ounces.

CRITICISM FOR OBLIQUE PURPOSES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the July 6 Chicago Tribune.

Citing an article by Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent for the Cowles publication, in the July bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the editorial joins Mollenhoff in urging that responsible discussion of the management of the Defense Department replace frequently unjust and misplaced criticism. The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 6, 1969]

CRITICISM FOR OBLIQUE PURPOSE

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the Des Moines Register, says that there is plenty to criticize in the operations of the department of defense, but he objects to attempts to misapply the criticism to wholly unrelated subjects.

Writing in the July Bulletin of the Amer-

ican Society of Newspaper Editors, Mollenhoff says that the news media have been tardy in calling public attention to a decade of corruption, mismanagement, and waste in the Pentagon. He is especially critical of broadcast journalism for following the official line and says that many writers gave fawning and noncritical coverage to former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

"Reporters," Mollenhoff says, "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 billions, though no details are spelled out."

"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 Senate, and the bosses of defense industries have conspired to push the United States into the Viet Nam 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. Somehow many of the stories ignore the dominant role of the political bosses at the Pentagon or tend to absolve them from blame for what has gone wrong."

Many reports, Mollenhoff says, give the impression that the Nixon administration or Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has the responsibility for what took place in 1963 or in 1968. Seldom, if ever, is the name of former Secretary McNamara mentioned in a critical manner, even when he was personally involved in a 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," Mollenhoff writes, "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 a direct connection these should not serve as arguments for rejecting a program that the

POLL ON ABM

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a public opinion poll in my district, the Fifth District of North Carolina, the results of which I would like to share with my colleagues.

There were three questions which reflected overwhelming opinions of the people in my district and I would like to single these out today:

Of the more than 10,000 persons who answered the poll, more than 73 percent favored the deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system around our major defense sites. Twenty-two percent voted against the proposal and another 16 percent failed to answer the question. These we could only determine as being undecided on this vital issue.

The results of the poll indicated that the people of the district were also in accord with the way the President is presently handling the war in Vietnam. There were 92.1 percent who said they favored the President's gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops as the South Vietnamese take over the responsibility of the fighting. Only 7.9 percent voted against the gradual withdrawal policy.

Those answering the poll also took issue with the student militants by voting overwhelmingly to take strong measures against those who disrupt campus activities; 94.5 percent voted to expel faculty members as well as students who take part in disruptive campus activities. In answer to still another question on the subject, 90.7 percent agreed that Federal funds should be taken away from the colleges and universities which fail to take disciplinary action against the lawbreaking students. This can only be interpreted, in my opinion, as an indication that the people of America are sick and tired of the rabble rousers and lawbreakers running loose on the campuses of our colleges and universities.

The following is a list of the questions

and the results as computed by my office. I want to make it clear that each and every questionnaire was counted, not

just a sampling of them; so the results are exact and not just projected figures:

Question	Number answering out of 9,924 total		Percent of each question		No opinion
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1. Do you think the best way to settle the war in Vietnam is through negotiation?	5,973	3,276	64.25	35.75	6.8
2. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal of American troops as the South Vietnamese are trained and equipped to do their own fighting?	9,068	777	92.1	7.9	.8
3. Do you approve of legislation which would return to the States to use as they see fit part of revenue now collected in Federal income taxes?	8,214	1,382	85.6	14.4	3.3
4. Do you favor expulsion of faculty members and students who violently disrupt orderly academic procedures in our colleges and universities?	9,350	544	94.5	5.5	.3
Do you favor withdrawal of Federal funds from colleges which take no disciplinary action against faculty members and students who violently disrupt orderly procedures at our colleges and universities?	8,767	899	90.7	9.3	2.6
6. Draft—which do you consider the most fair?					
(a) Extension of the present draft program?	2,729	913	27.5	9.2	
(b) A lottery at age 18?	2,699	784	27.2	7.9	
(c) A volunteer career military service after Vietnam?	4,506	715	45.3	7.2	
7. Do you think Government financial support to farmers under the various programs should be limited to \$25,000 per farmer?	7,607	1,295	85.45	14.55	10.3
8. Do you believe the farmer is receiving a fair price for the crops he produces?	4,774	2,560	65.1	34.9	26.1
9. Do you favor total registration of all guns?	2,741	7,084	27.9	72.1	1.0
10. Do you favor registration for purchasing shotgun and 22-caliber ammunition?	2,841	6,567	30.2	69.8	5.2
11. Electoral college—do you favor:					
(a) Award of electoral vote by congressional district?	992	1,538	10.0	15.5	
(b) Abolish it and elect President by popular vote?	6,629	665	66.8	6.7	
(c) Apportion electoral votes of each State according to votes candidates received?	2,173	1,190	21.9	12.0	
12. Do you believe the voting age should be lowered to 18 for Federal elections?	4,175	5,650	42.5	57.5	1.0
13. Do you favor deployment of the ABM around our major defense sites as President Nixon proposes as insurance to retaliate in case of enemy attack?	6,428	1,898	77.2	22.8	16.1
14. Office of Economic Opportunity—do you favor?					
(a) Transfer to other agencies?	2,203	944	22.2	9.5	
(b) Retaining OEO in its present form?	1,032	1,290	10.4	13.0	
(c) Abolishment?	5,102	854	50.4	8.6	
15. Do you favor increased financial support in the form of bloc grants from the Federal Government to assist State and local law-enforcement agencies?	6,333	1,599	70.9	29.1	10.0
16. Do you favor seating Red China in the U.N.?	3,241	5,889	35.5	64.5	8.0

POLLUTION CONTROL, A HOLDING ACTION

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, I was pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three articles which appeared in the Oakland Tribune dealing with a vexatious problem, that of air pollution.

At this time I submit the concluding four articles and hope that they will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 2, 1969]

POLLUTION CONTROL, A HOLDING ACTION

(By Ernie Cox)

Industrial smokestacks, open burning of garbage dumps, agricultural burning, ships in port and fumes from paints and other solvents—all are controlled in six Bay Area counties.

Starting next Jan. 1, burning of rubbish in backyards of one and two-family dwellings will also be regulated.

It is all the work of the 13-year-old Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

The regulations have made substantial inroads against many types of air pollution but the overall Bay Area effort is a losing battle—or at best a holding action—against automobiles and trucks, over which the local district has no jurisdiction.

The district operates from its new six-story office building at 939 Ellis St., San Francisco. What goes on inside its walls more closely touches the man in the street than do many other better-known agencies of government.

Ninety district employees will be operating in the upcoming fiscal year under a \$1.8 million budget financed mainly from property taxes in the counties of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

The budget provides for the operation of the district's 10 air monitoring stations and another soon to be opened in the smog-plagued Livermore Valley.

The 1955 legislation setting up the district also contemplated the inclusion of Napa, Sonoma and Solano counties but it contained a loophole requiring affirmative action of each board of supervisors before the counties to the north could be included in the district.

After 13 long years the three counties are still holdouts and it is becoming increasingly an irritant to the local district—almost as smarting as smog itself.

D. J. Callaghan, the district's \$27,500-a-year chief administrative officer, says the three north bay counties are producing 1,800 tons of pollutants per day, some of which is carried down into the air of the six counties where residents are taxing themselves to fight smog.

The district is governed by a 12-man board of directors composed of a city councilman and supervisor from each of the six counties. A 20-man advisory council, appointed from a cross section of industry, commerce and business, recommends non-binding decisions to the board.

A three-man hearing board sits as a quasi-judicial body to consider individual cases. On the hearing board are J. Joseph Sullivan, San Francisco attorney; E. Spencer Bodine of Marin County, a retired engineer for Shell Oil Co., and Joseph G. Hunter of San Francisco, a retired chemical engineer.

Severest criticism of the district setup has come from a four-year-old San Jose-based group called Citizens Against Air Pollution,

Inc. It is headed by Peter B. Venuto, assistant professor in the School of Business, San Jose State College. Others on the board of directors are A. Beprestis, a San Jose chemist; attorney Walter V. Hays of San Jose, and John H. Bloomer, a Palo Alto engineer.

Venuto said his main criticism of the district is that Callaghan is an administrator and not a technician in air pollution, and that Callaghan is appointed by a "politically oriented" board of directors rather than being elected by the voters of the district.

"Air pollution is a technical problem," said Venuto, "and our smog chief should be technically qualified. There also are no checks and balances under the present setup. The voters have no say as to which councilman or supervisor is to serve on the pollution district board."

"We do not need a board of directors. The smog chief should be directly elected by the district and given full responsibility and authority."

Venuto said he also feels the advisory council is "loaded in favor of industry" and that certain members have a direct conflict of interest because their employers are some of the major air polluters in the area. The advisory council and hearing board are both appointed by the district directors.

Venuto charged also that district officials have refused to make public the names of major polluters, and won't identify the pollutants coming from individual sources.

"There are so many loopholes in the present law," he said, "that the district is able to grant repeated continuations and variances which actually allow an industry to pollute the air legally."

District officials say what Venuto has asked for is the name and address of the "25 biggest polluters" even though the industries may be meeting all current legal requirements of the district. They say also that pollution would have to be defined in order to pinpoint individual sources, because pollution is made up of numerous ingredients and the ingredients vary widely from one industry to another.

The district also refuses to divulge the component breakdown of emissions from individual industries. This information is supplied by the industries and, said a district spokesman, it is "privileged" information because it might be used by a competitive industry to learn of a plant's processes.

Out in Martinez, 88 residents became so impatient with their own board of supervisors and the pollution district they filed a suit in U.S. District Court in San Francisco seeking an injunction and \$13.2 million from Shell Oil Co. which operates a new \$80 million refinery in the Contra Costa County seat. The suit was filed last August and is still pending.

Thomas Fuller of Martinez, a retired teacher and long time spokesman for the citizens group, said the court action finally came after months of hearings before the Contra Costa County supervisors and the smog district board.

Fuller said as far as he is concerned the Shell refinery in Martinez has still not improved its operation to any great extent.

"My personal feeling," he stated, "is that the smog board has got too many political strings attached to it."

District officials disagree sharply. They say Shell is tearing down its 12 plants within the refinery "brick by brick" to get to the cause of breakdowns which produce smoke and smog.

The refinery still has an "occasional breakdown," said a spokesman, but he contended the Shell operation has improved greatly in the past year. The district advisory council currently is looking into the possibility of strengthening the "breakdown" provisions, of the present regulations, he said.

Another citizens group, called Clean Air Now, was founded by Mrs. Sarah Feldner, a Palo Alto housewife.

She said 120 Bay Area families belong to the group which has lobbied for legislation in Sacramento and frequently compares notes with citizen groups in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Feldner, who regularly attends smog district meetings, said the meetings are poorly attended by the public and added, "It is hard for the directors to get much feedback from the public when the public doesn't attend any of the board meetings."

Air pollution, she said, has been thought of as the "concern of the middle class" but she added, "this must change. Air pollution is everybody's business."

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 3, 1969]

CALIFORNIA PASSED FIRST SMOG LAWS

(By Ernie Cox)

The first laws in this nation requiring smog controls on cars were passed in California.

The old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board, a state agency in operation about two decades, was the first of its kind in the United States.

California's regulations were so far ahead of the rest of the states, the Federal Government adapted many of them in the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967.

The Legislature passed the Mulford-Carrell Air Resources Act of 1967 which revamped the statewide smog control setup. The state's Pure Air Act of 1968 set new and more stringent standards for cars.

Despite all the laws and controls to date, there has been no significant reduction in total air pollution shrouding California cities each day.

As more people move into the state, as they buy and use more cars, the increase in smog is running ahead of the controls.

More stringent controls are planned for the future but many scientists and others are not optimistic that the problem is anywhere near to being solved.

The battle is being carried on statewide by the Air Resources Board, which was created in 1967 to replace the old Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. The new board, headquartered in Sacramento, has been given broad powers over non-vehicular pollution as well as that from cars.

The board is presently considering air quality standards for the entire state, which has been divided into 11 so-called air basins. The standards, if adopted, will be higher in many cases than those now followed by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District under its own six-county regulations.

California's Pure Air Act of 1968 went into effect last November and test procedures were adopted by the Air Resources Board on November 20. The standards spell out a five-year program of increasingly stringent standards for 1970 to 1974 model cars.

The act will prohibit the sale in California of new vehicles which cannot meet the state requirements.

Scientists and public health officials agree the automobile is the main culprit in the smog problem.

They do not all agree with some of the state's own rather optimistic predictions for the future.

In its 1968 annual report the board says regarding new cars, "control of evaporative losses will not begin until 1970 . . . control of oxides of nitrogen will not begin until the 1971 models . . . strictest standards for exhaust hydrocarbons do not go into effect until 1972 . . . those for oxides of nitrogen, not until 1974."

The board says this "timetable . . . will progressively reduce the emissions of all three pollutants to a minimum point by about 1985."

At least one group, the Berkeley-based Northern California Committee for Environmental Information, does not share the optimism of the State Resources Board. The committee, which includes scientists and en-

gineers, says the state board's predictions for 1985 "rest on potentials in law, but not in fact; on administrative problems of inspection and joint jurisdictions, and on a combustion technology not yet available."

In simpler terms, the Berkeley committee says "research has not yet been done to design a production car to meet California 1974 emission standards."

The state board is well aware of that fact. It acknowledges its predictions for Los Angeles and San Francisco cleaner air by 1985 are "based on the projected growth in these areas, together with the assumptions that vehicle emissions will comply with the standards . . ." It adds that "research and development will be required of the automobile industry and others to produce vehicles that will meet these standards."

Chairman of the Air Resources Board is Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit, professor of bio-chemistry at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. The board operated in fiscal 1968-69 with a \$2,470,000 state budget and Federal grants totaling \$533,800. These funds support a staff of 56 technical and administrative personnel and a \$968,500 contract with the State Department of Public Health for technical services.

A statewide air monitoring network of 50 sampling stations is concentrated mainly in Los Angeles and the Bay Area. Little is known of the pollutant concentrations in the state's huge agricultural areas. Federal grants over the next three years are expected to help establish more monitoring stations.

The board works closely with the National Air Pollution Control Administration, a Federal agency with offices in San Francisco, and with local control districts such as the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

Twenty-four of the state's 58 counties are now in local control districts. This embraces only 50 per cent of the land area but about 90 per cent of the population. The state hopes to encourage the formation of more districts.

A number of the new districts are small and confined to single counties, although smog is no respecter of political boundaries. Problems are expected in these cases in achieving a coordinated air pollution program and in finding trained technical personnel.

The new federal law provides that a state may enforce its own controls on new auto emissions—provided it first obtains a waiver from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The procedure is complicated and time consuming. Unless the federal government simplifies the procedure, said the State Board, California will "continually be in the process of seeking these waivers."

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 4, 1969]

UNCERTAIN EFFECTS IN SMOG CONTROLS

(By Ernie Cox)

A spokesman for Bay Area industrialists says industry has spent \$100 million on air pollution control equipment since industry controls were adopted in 1960.

An official of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District placed the industry cost at between \$30 million and \$50 million.

Whatever the actual figure, it is evident that most Bay Area industries have gone a long way toward eliminating many objectionable features of their plants. Total elimination of industrial air pollution probably is a Utopian goal which never will be achieved.

Critics of the local air pollution control district say current regulations contain too many loopholes for variances and continuances for violators.

Industry spokesmen, however, contend that pollution control regulations must take into account both the technological and economic feasibility of control devices—and these factors may vary widely from one industry to another.

Principal spokesman for Bay Area industry

is Eveleth E. Hayden, executive vice president of the Bay Area League of Industrial Associations, Inc., with offices at 3124 E. 14th St., Oakland.

To put the problem of industrial air pollution into perspective, one must keep in mind figures released recently by the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District. These showed that automobiles and trucks contribute 71 per cent of the Bay Area's air pollution; back yard burning, 11 per cent, and industries the remaining 18 per cent.

Hayden says local industry leaders originally supported the formation of the Bay Area control district, formed in 1955, for several reasons.

They wanted to avoid a critical problem which they could see developing; they wanted to avoid some of the problems of the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District, and they preferred a locally controlled district rather than a state agency.

The League and its forerunner organization, the Alameda County Industries, Inc., has been closely associated with the writing of Bay Area air pollution regulations No. 2, which controls industrial smoke, and regulation No. 3, controlling fumes and other pollutants from solvents, inks and paints.

Its lobbying efforts with the smog control board and its 20-man advisory council have been both vigorous and effective when the industrialists felt proposed regulations would be too expensive or impractical.

Hayden says Bay Area industry favors, for instance, the broad "performance standards" used by the local district instead of so-called "specification standards" applied to industry in Los Angeles. The difference is important to industry.

The Bay Area pollution board simply sets a standard of performance required of industry and says in effect, "This is what is expected of you—how you accomplish it is your problem."

The Los Angeles district, on the other hand, sets up much more detailed specifications for individual industries, allowing for little flexibility or adaptation. Hayden says the latter method causes unnecessary technical problems, while adding nothing to the final result.

Bay Area industry was instrumental in writing the original information law as well as subsequent regulations.

In the key provisions for enforcement the Los Angeles and Bay Area districts are poles apart.

In Los Angeles, a suspected violating industry is given a misdemeanor citation, hauled into court and required to defend itself against possible fines.

The Bay Area district follows an "injunctive procedure" whereby suspected violators may either correct the conditions or apply to the district's three-man hearing board for a variance. Repeated violations can result in court injunctions or fines, but the process is a slow one.

Hayden and local pollution district officials both say they prefer the local setup because, while it is slower, it has resulted in far greater voluntary cooperation from industry—which they consider one of the keys to an effective control program.

In justifying industry's prominent role in writing regulations applicable to itself, Hayden explains, "We feel we have been helpful to the nontechnical members of the (Bay district) advisory council. Air quality is a technical matter—not a political problem."

He added somewhat ruefully, "There is a tendency on the part of uninformed members of the public to brand industry as the bad guys. We are the guys with the black hats."

In Contra Costa County oil refineries have been one of the biggest problems. One of them, Shell at Martinez, is still embroiled in controversy with neighbors who have filed a federal court action for damages.

Bob Crothers, whose title was recently changed from air sanitation director to in-

dustrial health director in the Contra Costa County Health Department, says he receives more complaints against sulphur compounds than any other. These are caused by refineries or related industries making sulphuric acid.

"The public is demanding increased controls," said Crothers. "A few years ago they might have put up with something objectionable. Now they demand it be eliminated. This creates a never-ending task for industry."

Crothers called the Antioch plant of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. the "best setup in the country." The plant, he pointed out is surrounded by farm land owned and controlled by du Pont; the plant is at least one-half mile from its nearest neighbor.

While such an ideal setup is not always possible, it seems clear that industry's annoyances will no longer be tolerated by the public as a necessary evil.

The California Air Resources Board currently has under study a set of new and stiffer air quality standards recommended by the State Department of Public Health.

These standards, if adopted, would be higher in many cases than standards currently in effect for the Bay Area. The state standards would have to be met in the local district.

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 5, 1969]

HOPES DIM FOR CLEAN AIR

(By Ernie Cox)

Can residents of the Bay Area ever expect to breathe really clean air again?

Probably not—if you're thinking of our pre-World War II environment.

Air pollution officials are sorry about that, because it's their job to clean up the air.

A simple fact of life is this: people cause pollution. More people cause more pollution. As certain as night follows day the Bay Area can expect thousands, perhaps millions, more people in the years ahead.

They will drive more cars, work in more factories, burn more private rubbish, light more furnaces and fireplaces, operate more diesel trucks, fly more jet airplanes.

A genuine concern for the future came recently from A. E. Schuck, professor at the Air Pollution Research Center, University of California at Riverside, where research is being done on the effects of air pollution on plants.

Professor Schuck believes man's use of fossil fuels such as gasoline and diesel fuel will result in the creation of 25 per cent more carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere in the next 30 years. This, he says, will cause a greenhouse effect, resulting in a rise in world temperatures warming the oceans and melting the polar ice cap. The combined effect, he says, could raise the levels of the oceans by 400 feet. High on his list for smog reduction is the replacement of the internal combustion engine.

The State Air Resources Board has adopted standards calling for successively tougher controls of auto emissions to 1974. But the attainment of such goals may not be technically or economically feasible. The auto industry has not yet indicated it will be able to meet the 1972 standards, much less those for 1974.

There is strong feeling on the part of some experts that the internal combustion engine has been made about as "clean" as is technically and economically feasible and that some radical new breakthrough is needed.

Alternatives suggested have included the steam engine, battery powered cars, and even the use of compressed natural gas. The state is currently involved officially in programs to test all three types of vehicles. Successful tests could have far-reaching effects on the future of motor transportation.

One of the first to go—assuming impres-

sive test results—may be the diesel driven urban bus. If you've even been caught behind one of these belching behemoths, trailing its black and stinking cloud, the news will be welcome.

There are about 57,000 diesel-powered vehicles in California. Ninety per cent are trucks and 10 per cent are buses. The Air Resources Board says the California Highway Patrol has authority to issue citations to any vehicle smoking excessively—and that in 1968 the CHP issued 8,686 citations and made 7,846 arrests.

Smoke from jet aircraft, increasingly significant as more and more planes come into use, is not now regulated by the Air Resources Board, nor does the Federal Aviation Agency have any regulation governing emission into the atmosphere. The National Air Pollution Control Administration has been directed by Congress to study the problem and report its findings.

The United States Public Health Service has estimated that the annual cost of air pollution is about \$65 per person. In the Bay Area the cost of pollution control equipment to industry, alone, is estimated at upwards of \$100 million, plus incalculable additional costs of maintenance and operation.

In addition, Bay Area motorists have spent an estimated \$12 million for exhaust controls on their cars and another \$15 million for crankcase devices required by tough new laws.

In the Bay Area there are 2,250,000 automobiles and about 10,000 industrial operations—all potential air polluters—such as auto body shops, refineries, foundries, paint shops, food processing plants, metal grinders, rock crushers, cement plants, chemical products, house painters—the list is almost endless.

A great deal is being done to abate air pollution but some local officials feel we are only "buying a little more time" with all the regulations. They expect the air pollution to reach a plateau, level off for a few years, then begin to climb again—unless something dramatic happens to eliminate the overwhelming pall of smog from the automobile.

While you cough and sneeze, wipe your eyes and worry and wait for "progress," there are several things the experts suggest you might do:

Learn as much as possible about smog, its sources, effects and control.

Keep your own car properly maintained and serviced through regular checkups of smog control equipment, ignition and carburetor.

Be prepared to foot the bill and support legislation for better smog control.

Make up your mind that everyone is a potential air polluter and decide to do what you can to lessen the problem.

The results could be like a breath of fresh air.

VIEWES OF HON. FRANK G. SISCOE

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times printed a letter addressed to it by Frank G. Siscoe, one of our outstanding diplomats, now retired.

The Honorable Frank G. Siscoe served 20 years with our Department of State and prior to that spent several years in international service with the Department of Justice.

During his long career with our De-

partment of State, he was principally concerned with our relations with the Iron Curtain countries. Before his retirement, he was director of the Soviet and Eastern Europe Exchanges. He is recognized as a leading authority on these nations.

Mr. Siscoe has now reassumed the practice of law in his native city, Plainfield, N.J. He is also teaching at Rutgers University and authoring a book on international affairs.

His views as expressed in the New York Times follows:

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1969]

VISIT TO RUMANIA

To the Editor:

While reaching for a plausible component to build his rather creaky structure of President Nixon's capricious image, James Reston in his June 29 column instantly assumed that the projected Nixon trip to Rumania is a blunder. True, it may prove to be; but it is much too early to make such a judgment. And if the decision to stop in Bucharest is ill conceived, the reasons will probably be others than that of affront to the Soviet Union.

The trip will almost certainly be hurried and frenetic, with men on the moon (hopefully) and too much else thrown in; another time might have been better. Too, probably Turkey and Iran deserve pats on the back more than does Rumania.

Despite these considerations, and within the context of U.S.-Soviet relations, a Presidential visit to Rumania (and to Yugoslavia, for that matter) is a sound move, especially if the astute Rumanians are willing. If the Soviets are ready for serious arms limitation discussions, then the talks will go forward, despite any flying visit.

One of the most egregious errors of the last year of the Johnson Administration was the anxiety to avoid giving offense to the Soviet Union during the extended Czechoslovak crisis. By its timorousness the United States completely eliminated itself as a factor to be assessed during the Soviet decision-making process. Granted, the Soviet Union might still have invaded Czechoslovakia, but it would have done so forewarned of prospective U.S. displeasure.

During last August-September I was on a trip to Eastern Europe, and I sharply recall the fears in Rumania and the expectation in Poland and Czechoslovakia that Rumania would be next. Whether President Johnson's hastily prepared warning to the Kremlin had any effect on the final Soviet decision not to intervene, no one in the West can say.

The Soviet Union is now on notice that the United States does have an interest in the peaceful development of Rumania. That is just about all that the Nixon trip will mean, and it does not serve any useful purpose to read more into it. It does not remotely mean any move directly prejudicial to Soviet interests.

Another salutary aspect of the forthcoming Nixon visit to Rumania could be the demonstration that we want friendly and, to the extent possible, normal relations with all countries, regardless of the character of their internal governments.

The time has long passed when anyone in authority should think that the U.S. is going to reform the world, or even parts of the world. This is a far more tenable and constructive position for the U.S. to follow than the pernicious meddling to insure "democratic" governments in countries with cultures and environments far different from our own. This view has its lesson for us in Vietnam as well.

To come back to Rumania: let us not be fearful of Soviet reactions, and let us not automatically condemn it as a mistake; but, on the balance, let us welcome the Nixon

trip, with its built-in limitations, as a sound move in a realistic world.

FRANK G. SISCOE,
WASHINGTON, June 30, 1969.

A VETERANS' VETERAN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1969, I had the pleasure of attending the 23d annual testimonial dinner and dance honoring Louis Del Balzo. Known as the veterans' veteran, Louis devoted many years of dedicated and unselfish service to the Greater New York Newsdealers Post No. 5810, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I commend to readers of the RECORD a portion of the statement presented before this honored group by Louis Del Balzo:

Reverend Clergy, Honored Guests, Mr. President, Fellow Veterans:

Perhaps the first thing I should say is that being a little fellow, I have always been advised that I should say as little as possible, so you can rest assured this speech isn't going to be long at all.

At any rate, the important things to me is that somehow this honor being tendered to me tonight is something I never expected or hoped to receive.

I don't have to tell you that many, many years have passed since I saw military service; and I feel blessed tonight many times:

1st: To my God for watching over me and making it possible for me to do my share in the service of the V.F.W., and, if I may modestly say, a few other organizations, some of which have been nice enough to send representatives here tonight to share with me this momentous evening.

2nd: To my wife for putting up with me all of these years while I was out on various chores for not only this organization but other worthy causes.

3rd: To my buddies in this post for this tremendous evening; and

4th: For being an American and blessed with the opportunities of living in this wonderful land of ours.

Now, I know that we have serious problems here, the college campus demonstrations all over the country, the poor people's poverty problems, young people's opposition to the service of their country, opposition to the draft, housing, labor, medical services, and many more. But if you think we have it bad, talk to some of the people who have visited South America, Mexico and most of the European countries.

Those of us who have been living here are blessed.

These past few years as Chairman of the Youth Activities Committee, I have been troubled by the draft card burnings, and draft evasion. Incidentally, a recent survey of the draft dodgers who have fled to Canada shows them to be very, very unhappy, and I predict that most of these youngsters will return to the United States and beg for an opportunity to serve in our military service, or if not, they will return and take the punishment the courts will impose upon them so that they can live in this country—the greatest in the world.

Youth activities—frankly with what some youths are doing today, I seriously wonder what they will be doing when they grow up. Now, when I was a kid, a person was a youth until old enough to enlist in the Army—and that was 17. Today, a person is a youth

until he completes school and that can be from age 23 to 28 or so.

Yet, despite this, our fighting youth—(Men—I call them)—are distinguishing themselves every day in the line of fire and we are all very proud of them.

I would like to tell you of my experiences as youth activities chairman, but these are too numerous to mention.

However, on the whole, my experiences have been gratifying and have given me a great deal of satisfaction.

This has been a memorable evening for me to have so many of my friends come and share it with me. I want to thank all of you for giving me the opportunity to serve you.

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an incisive interview with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Because of the significance of Dr. Paine's answers to a number of questions on the future of our national space program, I am including excerpts from that interview:

AS SPACEMEN LOOK BEYOND THE MOON—INTERVIEW WITH THOMAS O. PAINE, HEAD OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Q. Dr. Paine, what is the real meaning of America's putting a man on the moon? What benefit is there to people on earth?

A. There are a lot of benefits, and one important one is that America's view of itself—and the world view of America—has been upgraded and made more realistic. We are showing that we are a people who can do anything we set our minds to do.

I think Russia's first sputnik—which was a sort of "space Pearl Harbor"—startled us and raised some basic questions: whether we really were the adventurous people we thought we were, and whether we actually had the technical preeminence that we thought we had.

The manned landing on the moon, in a sense, is the culmination of America's satisfying everyone that it is indeed the leading technological nation that it thought it was before Sputnik blazed across the skies.

Q. How do you rate this as a technological achievement?

A. It is, of course, a major step forward on many broad fronts. It has required the United States to move boldly ahead in almost every branch of technology. We have involved directly some 400,000 Americans in the space program over the last decade. We've involved thousands of industrial contractors and universities, graduate students, workers, engineers.

The impact that all of this has had on our ability to do things in the United States—and to do them in new, novel and improved ways—has been very great.

Q. Yet people frequently ask: Is a moon landing worth 24 billion dollars?

A. The real answer to that question will have to await the judgment of history.

I think it is worth it. The 24 billion, of course, was spent over a decade. The average cost to individual Americans over the period has been a modest one in view of the returns that we have had. But history will have to be the judge.

Q. Will landing on the moon mean that the U.S. has won the space race?

A. Let me answer in this way: It's perfectly true that when the Soviets surprised us with the prowess which they had developed in space science and technology, we undertook a race, if you like, to redress this imbalance.

I don't believe, however, that the trip to the moon can be classified as a race in itself, and I don't believe that the attainment of a first landing on the moon marks a situation where two nations are coming down to a celestial finish line where one breaks the tape as it lands on the moon.

What the landing on the moon will demonstrate is that American space technology has matured, has come of age. It will demonstrate that we can do the thing we set out to do—which is to be able to leave the earth, to sail out on this new ocean of space for a matter of days to a destination measured in hundreds of thousands of miles, to be able to descend safely on the far shore, to get out and walk about and perform useful activities, and then to return safely to the good earth.

That's the real meaning of the accomplishment—not that we beat Russia in a moon race.

Q. Where does the space program go from here? Is the moon just a steppingstone?

A. The answer to that depends on the time scale you have in mind. If you mean next year, that's one thing. I'll interpret it as meaning: Where do we go from here, in the long-range sense?

It seems to me that in many ways our landing on the moon is analogous to the situation of the Portuguese navigators when Henry the Navigator sent them farther and farther down the coast of Africa and they were able to successfully navigate their crude caravels, to support their seamen for long periods of time, to maintain them healthy and alert, and were able to solve the problems of how you withstand the storms and how you land and bring home cargoes of ivory and slaves and spices.

We're, in a sense, at that initial stage now in space. The great exploration of the world which the European navigators were able to carry out following Henry the Navigator—the settlement of North and South America and Australia—these are things which still lie ahead in the space program. We haven't yet reached that point, but we have mastered space navigation.

WHAT \$4 BILLION BUYS

Q. That's another subject that people bring up: With all these problems on earth, is there any reason for spending 4 billion dollars a year in space?

A. Of course, 4 billion dollars a year is a lot of money—I'd be the last to deny that, being a skinflint Yankee. But you have to recognize that NASA's budget is only 5 per cent of our defense budget and only 10 per cent of what we spend on women's dresses, for example. NASA is only half the size of the General Electric Company. It represents, for our 200 million Americans, just cigarette money: 40 cents a week apiece.

So, although it is a lot of money—for the value that we're getting in challenging every part of American technology, in providing an exciting focus for a great deal of our new scientific and university work—this expenditure seems to me to be very well justified.

As to whether we should be doing it now, when we have so many problems here on earth, I will say this: If all programs, past and present, had to meet that test, everything would come to a grinding halt. Columbus would never have set sail, the Pilgrims would never have left home, men would have written no books or music.

We simply can't hold up all progress in art, in literature, in science and exploration until we solve all of the problems of mankind.

New-technology programs like the space program create new wealth which, in turn,

gives us the ability to distribute the wealth more broadly within our society to help meet some of our welfare and poverty problems.

Q. Is there a matter of national security involved in space exploration?

A. Yes, but in a somewhat secondary way. You may recall that, at the time of Sputnik and afterward, Premier Khrushchev used to brag audaciously about the great Soviet technological supremacy which their space spectaculars demonstrated. I think it was very dangerous for the United States to let the notion get abroad that it had become technically inferior.

It would now be very unwise of us to allow any other nation to think that they have attained great superiority over us in an area as important as space. It would be a destabilizing force in the world today to have such a situation exist—tempting others to rash action.

We don't know all of the ways in which space technology may affect future defense posture. We do know that, in the past, wherever man has flown farther and higher and faster, wherever he has developed new capability to observe from higher areas, to carry out operations in new media, this has had a major effect on the equations of international power. We're quite confident that this will probably be true again in space.

In any case, though, you have to remember that NASA is a civilian agency. Our job is to do the research, to develop the new capability. When it comes to applying this in the defense area, that is a job for the Department of Defense.

Q. Will you be doing more work with earth-orbiting stations now that the Air Force's manned orbiting laboratory has been canceled?

A. The main jobs that the Air Force was planning to do with a manned orbiting laboratory—essentially to prove out man's capability to carry out military operations in space—are not things that we will do in our Apollo applications program. We do not consider Apollo applications of any kind of substitute for MOL.

Q. Just what is the Apollo applications program?

A. The applications program will use the smaller Saturn I-B rockets left over from our Apollo moon program for earth-orbital missions. These are rockets which weren't used up in preliminary Apollo flights because we made substantially more progress than our rather conservative early estimates had led us to believe we would.

What we're going to do is put men into space for, first, 28 days and then 56 days at a time, giving them some advanced astronomical equipment with which to study the sun. We're going to find out how effectively man can exist in a weightless, space-station atmosphere and carry out useful work in orbit over extended periods of time.

We will get from this the engineering data that we'll need to design a subsequent large space station.

LOWER THE VOTING AGE?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of principle I support the lowering of the voting age to 18, although I feel that individual States should take the initiative since they maintain control over the voting regulations.

I was very impressed with an editorial in the Polish American, Chicago, Ill.,

CXV—1260—Part 15

Saturday, July 12, commenting on the 18-year-old vote and insert it into the Record at this point:

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE?

A resolution was recently introduced in Congress calling for lowering the national minimum voting age to 18. This is the latest move in the drive to lower the voting age which officially began in 1942 when legislation to that effect was first introduced.

It is argued by partisans of the resolution that our citizens in the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old bracket should be given the opportunity to participate in decisions which determine the course of the country they will be leading in the coming years, since they are better educated, better read, and more conscious of the expanding world around them than ever before in our history.

There also, however, seems to be a more basic reason for giving the 18- to 20-year-old citizens the privilege of voting. In most States in the Union, 18-year-olds must stand trial in criminal court—they are no longer considered juveniles under the law. In most States one need only be 18 years of age to marry without parental consent. In many States 18-year-olds may enter into written contracts and be held responsible. In many States this age group can make wills and purchase insurance.

The child labor provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it may also be noted, does not apply to one 18 or older. Welfare aid cannot be given to one 18 or over unless he or she is handicapped. Those in this age group have been given the responsibility of the lives of others as they drive cars and purchase guns and ammunition. All these privileges and responsibilities are given at or by the age of 18—but what about the privilege and responsibility of voting?

Since many Americans at the age of 18 hold jobs and pay taxes, whatever happened to the old principle of "no taxation without representation?" Further, our young men who are drafted into the armed services at 18 are carrying out our country's policies but have had no voice in choosing those who make those policies.

At the age of 18, most Americans have completed their formal education. They have just completed courses in the functioning of a democracy, and the founding of their country. They are at their highest peak of interest. That is the time, proponents of lowering the voting age argue, when they should be initiated into the responsibility and privilege of voting.

It may seem unusual, but the average person at 18 is better informed regarding his government than at 21. The young person at 18 is generally still in a stable home environment, while afterwards the average young person leaves home to work, serve in the armed forces, attend college, or be married. Often these young people move to other States with difficult residence requirements on registration and absentee voting.

Those who study voting behavior have noted that persons in the 21-30 year age bracket have one of the lowest voting participation averages in the electorate. They suggest that one cause of this is the denial of the vote between the ages of 18 and 21, when the enthusiasm is the highest. On the other hand, studies of the 18 and 21 voting group in Kentucky—where 18-year-olds may vote in state elections—have indicated that this unfortunate trend is to some extent offset by permitting this age bracket to vote.

The notion that youngsters do not reach an age of maturity and responsibility until their 21st birthday had its roots in antiquity and in a social order whose circumstances are no longer relevant to contemporary times. Just a half century ago, less than 30 percent of the high-school-age population attended high school and only 17 percent of that group graduated. Today, more than 85 per-

cent of Americans of that age group attend high school and more than three-quarters of them receive diplomas.

Proponents of lowering the voting age also point out that 50 years ago less than 600,000 attended college, less than 8 percent of the 18-to-21 population, while college enrollment today exceeds 5,000,000, pointing to the fact that almost half in that age group are attending college.

Finally, it should be noted that there is nothing sacrosanct about setting the voting age at 21. Both Kentucky and Georgia set the voting age at 18. Alaska and Hawaii set the age at 20.

It would thus appear that the proponents of lowering the voting age—a group which includes both of the recent presidential candidates—have a strong case in their favor. Whether they will succeed in their cause, however, remains quite another matter.

YOUTH AND TURKS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech, Peter Bommarito, international president of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, AFL-CIO, said:

There's a new look in the Labor Movement—and that is the healthy look of youth.

Mr. Bommarito, in reminding us that close to half of our population is under 25 years of age, called for a greater degree of communication between our generations so that we can assist these young people in preparing for the positions of leadership that someday will be theirs.

Those who know this outstanding labor leader are not surprised at this forward-looking position taken by him. Though he has been a member of the United Rubber Workers' Union for 30 years, Peter Bommarito is still a comparatively young man possessed with the desire to try new approaches to old problems. The young people of his great union will not find a "generation gap between themselves and their able International President.

We, in Akron, know of Peter Bommarito as a man with great concern for civic affairs. I have had the privilege of serving with him on the advisory board of the Salvation Army, and so know of the great contributions of time and effort that he has made in assisting this fine organization.

A veteran of the 1st Marine Division, Pete Bommarito saw action at Guadalcanal and a half dozen other Pacific battle areas. As a youth, he was a successful participant in the Golden Gloves tournament and many other athletic activities.

Peter Bommarito is proof that in the United States of America, there are no limits to the rise of a determined and dedicated young man. Most assuredly, the young people of his union might be assured of a fine future life if they were but to follow the example of their international president.

One of the outstanding national columnists, John Herling, recently devoted his column to Peter Bommarito's speech.

John Herling is known to all of us in the U.S. Congress as one of the greatest authorities on matters affecting the labor situation and on our economy. He is also author of the widely read John Herling Labor letter.

His column which appeared in the Washington News and other papers follows:

YOUTH AND TURKS
(By John Herling)

Pete Bommarito, president of the United Rubber Workers, is one of the lesser known labor leaders, which doesn't bother him as much as the danger that many of his rank and file membership don't know why they belong to a union at all.

More than 70,000 members of the Rubber Workers—with headquarters in Akron, Ohio, but more than 160,000 members spread over the country—are now under 25 years of age.

What in hell do they know about their union, President Pete demanded of a series of off-the-record conferences of middle leadership in his union? Very little, he says. They know nothing of what preceded them in this vale of insecurity. Nor will the union equivalent of flag-waving rouse them to an understanding of the advantages of their trade union.

"What can this young person be expected to know of the Great Depression, the sweatshops, the sitdown strikes . . . ? Many of the benefits for which union members struggled, bled and died were here when this young person arrived—so he easily assumes the benefits he enjoys always existed."

So the simple appeal to labor history, said Mr. Bommarito, cannot be expected to excite a young member to embrace unionism with passion. The appeal must be to the present: "Before he really accepts unionism, he is going to have to recognize it as a helpful method of getting at the things bothering him today."

He makes a point by recalling that in the late 1930's and early 1940's, men and women did not rush to join the unions just because the Knights of Labor had had a tough time of it in the last decades of the 19th century. The motivations of the 1930's were much more immediate.

The union leader's warning to his associate in long earnest meetings runs something like this:

"Young people will be concerned with issues that affect their way of life. If they find in our union a means of self-expression, a vehicle that will carry them toward participation, as full partners in our society, they probably will begin to develop respect for our union and its programs . . . If our union leaders just take their membership for granted because the contract has a union shop clause and a dues checkoff—then they will react with hostility."

This communication gap between the young members and the older Turks in the union, said Mr. Bommarito, can only be widened by impatiently hollering. "Why don't they understand, why don't they understand?" To which Mr. Bommarito replies: "If they don't understand, then you haven't really told them. You've just been talking to yourself."

Such a soliloquy is a dangerous artform for a union leader, Mr. Bommarito says. He urges that the union waste no time in starting an aggressive program of "new" and novel ways of involving young people in union affairs.

"We must make it clear that the union is their ally in the struggle for self-fulfillment. We must create for the young of this generation the same kind of opportunities for leadership expression of idealism that once were given us," Mr. Bommarito said.

"Most young people today are impatient, more independent and more aggressive than most people of the older generation. If they are interested in something, if they really

want it, they will go after it and count the cost later. Young people may not know much about 'solidarity forever', but they do know when they are being used. They resent injustice. They want to be heard. But that does not automatically lead them toward organization. They do not pound on the doors of union halls asking to be let in. Perhaps more of them would do so, but for one little fact—many of them do not yet know what a union is. It's our job to tell them."

That, said Mr. Bommarito, is what his union has set out to do. So, let's see how they do it.

THE CENSUS QUESTION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Karl O. Spiess, of Arlington, Va., recently called my attention to two editorials which he feels should have the wider distribution gained by insertion in the RECORD.

The first is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, dated July 7, 1969, relative to the census question. The second, from the New York Times of July 4, 1969, concerns a doctrine somewhat lacking in this age of violent dissent.

The two editorials read as follows:

THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT IN AMERICA

(By James Reston)

EDGARTOWN, MASS., July 3.—The spirit of independence is obviously strong in the American people this year. It is not the old "my country right or wrong" patriotism of the past—though this endures much more than the flag-burners think—but there has seldom been a time in American history when so many people in this country were publishing their own declarations of independence.

They are at it in the Congress, in the churches, and the universities. Everywhere, authority is being questioned and even challenged and defied. Presidents and priests, party leaders and chairmen of the board, city bosses, pompous editors, headmasters, and all other Establishment characters are in trouble.

The question on this year's "glorious Fourth" is whether this modern spirit of independence in America is destroying us or saving us. Who is the "patriot" on this Fourth of July—the protester who is defying the sordid horrors of the war in Vietnam or the man who says, right or wrong, let's go along?

THE FUNDAMENTALS

You can argue it either way, but the main point is that the country is probably strong enough to handle the independent spirit of the American people, no matter how violent. The country goes on. It listens to the President and occasionally to the press and the protesters of the right and left in Washington and the universities, but mainly it deals with the fundamentals of family and community life.

For a minority of Americans, family and community life are intolerable. In fact, they are a disgrace, particularly for the Negroes, but the Negroes are finally expressing the independent spirit too, and the nation has to listen to them, whether it likes it or not.

The violence in the universities dramatizes the same independent spirit. It often gets out of hand. It can be silly and destructive, but it is trying to say something important.

It is saying, I think, that the spirit of independence is not merely a national Fourth

of July celebration. It is often saying this very badly, but it is asserting what it feels to be a "new patriotism"—not of the nation alone, but of the human family.

This is not a wholly new idea. Loyalty began with the family and expanded to the tribe, the community, the state, and the region. It went on in ever-widening circles as the human mind expanded. It is going on now, for good or bad, to the even wider circle beyond nations to the world.

NEW WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

At least, this is one more expression of the independent American spirit. The country was founded on it and still makes room for it, on the right and on the left.

So we are having in the process a tremendous battle between opinion and authority, between the individual and the state, between loyalty to the nation and loyalty to mankind.

This is a rough business, but the spirit of independence in America is strong, and we shouldn't knock it on the Fourth of July, for that is what America is all about.

NO MYTH HERE

In suggesting there's something uncomfortably sweeping about the laws allowing the Census Bureau to ask whatever it wants and compel everyone to answer, we once asked, "Shall we become a nation where the government can jail anyone who declines to discuss the condition of his plumbing?"

We now find ourselves called to task by columnist Sylvia Porter, in an article based on an interview with a census official and entitled, at least in New York, "Census: Count the Myths." Here we find ourselves in the uncomfortable company of an otherwise unidentified "Southern newspaper" and a "recorded telephone message," both spreading malicious nonsense about the forthcoming census.

The fact is, though, that the Government can throw a citizen in jail for refusing to discuss the state of his plumbing. To be sure, it has never done so. The 60-day jail sentence for refusing to answer census questions has never been imposed, and the \$100 fine only rarely. Yet there is the law.

After telling us the compulsory provisions practically never need to be enforced, census officials next tell us the same provisions are absolutely necessary to statistical accuracy and the common weal. Also they add that we can trust them; they would never pry.

Well, some of us still believe the civics books maxims about a government of laws being preferable to a government of men. And in establishing the purity of present census-takers, Miss Porter provides a dandy illustration of the unwisdom of leaving everything to bureaucratic discretion.

She reports, "In 1880 and 1890, individuals were asked [such] questions as whether they often had to be restrained by a strait-jacket; the head size of any 'idiot' in the family; whether the respondent was 'habitually intemperate,' a 'tramp,' 'syphilitic,' or a 'habitual drunkard.' Now that was nosy!"

You bet it was; and the laws that allowed it are still on the books.

POSTAL CORPORATION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that seems to be developing considerable controversy in the 17th Congressional District of California is the administration's proposed Postal Corporation.

As an example of this controversy, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, first, a letter from the Torrance Postal Union of the National Postal Union, Post Office Box 3705, Torrance, Calif. Second, I would like to bring to their attention an article from the Gardena Valley News, Gardena, Calif., dated July 9, 1969, reflecting the position of Mr. Cruz Sosa, president of Local 1239, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO.

The above referred-to letter and the newspaper article follow:

JULY 10, 1969.

HON. GLENN ANDERSON,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Please accept this letter as an expression of opposition to the President's proposed corporation plan. The National Postal Union, California Postal Union, and Torrance Postal Union are vitally concerned about this Corporation Plan because it appears that for the first time the Corporation idea will receive some serious consideration in Congress. Our opposition is not so much to the Corporation idea as to "this" Corporation Plan in particular, and for the following reasons.

First must come the decision as to whether Post Office is to provide a "service" or a "profit." If the answer is "service" then much needs to be done to improve the lot, not merely the economics, of the Postal Employees which this Corporate plan does not do, for he is the one who actually performs this "service" and upon his selection, training, and skills will depend the success or failure of this venture. If the answer is to be "profit" then how much and what kind of service will be provided, and or curtailed, and at what price to insure a "profit"? Providing either adequate service or insuring a profit will involve or affect the employee a great deal and there is very little if anything for the employee in this Corporation Plan. Forgetting the "Right to Strike," there is not even the assurance of Binding Arbitration (Mr. Blount's testimony before full House P.O. & Civil Service Committee), and the loss of Civil Service Benefits—except for existing Retirement benefits—leaves the employee with a "Whole lot Less" than at present, which is pretty bad at best.

Right now there is the feeling among the Union ranks that the Postal Department is an embarrassment to the Administration and this is an opportunity to "dump" it. It is also our view that this would be very unwise at this time because there are also a number of Proposals, including your own Union Recognition by Law H.R. 9702, that deal with most of the Dept's problems and I believe a lot more effectively as well as a lot less expensively in the long run. If a Corporate Structure is necessary or beneficial at the top of the Department, why cut the legs from under it with the poor Labor-Management situation now in effect?

It is our hope that you concur with our findings and will oppose this Corporation Plan.

Sincerely,

FRANK A. DUSSEL, Jr.,
President, Torrance Postal Union.
CARLETA R. WOOD,
Secretary, Torrance Postal Union.

[From the Gardena Valley News, July 9, 1969]

LOCAL POSTAL CLERKS OPPOSE CORPORATION

The nations organized postal clerks are mustering "active opposition" in Congress against the Administration's postal corporation bill "for what it falls to do," a top union official said here today.

Cruz Sosa, President of Gardena Local 1239, United Federation of Postal Clerks,

AFL-CIO, listed three major objections to pending legislation which would convert the postal service into a Government corporation:

"First," President Sosa said, "it fails to give employees the right to strike even though we would no longer have civil service status."

"Secondly, it fails to give us unilateral access to binding arbitration."

"Third, it fails to establish true wage comparability with private industry prior to the transfer of employee into the corporate structure."

"MAKES US SCAPEGOATS"

The Gardena local spokesman cited an additional reason why the union, which represents the nation's 300,000 postal clerks, is mobilizing opposition to the bill in its present form.

"It would definitely make employees public scapegoats," Sosa explained, "by tying postal rates to every future salary increase."

"In other words," he added, "postal employees would be the only large group of Federal workers whose wages and fringe benefits would depend on the Corporation's ability to pay, either at the level of current rates (doubtful) or by forcing the public to pay increased fees for mail service."

Cruz Sosa, President, Gardena Local 1239, said the union's national leadership had reached its decision "reluctantly" and "only after fruitless consultation with top postal officials in Washington and a thorough study of the legislation itself."

RECOGNIZE NEED

He charged that "the Postmaster General himself has failed to give any consideration to the fact that even with the meager 4.1% pay increase effective in mid-July postal clerks are still more than \$800-a-year behind their counterparts in the private sector as of June, 1968—to say nothing of the astronomical rise in living costs during the 13 months since that time."

President Sosa emphasized that postal employees "do recognize the needs for postal reform," and are supporting the Postal Reform Act (H.R. 4) proposed by Representative Thaddeus J. Dulski (D-N.Y.), Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

He said even this bill needs to be amended, however, to establish statutory labor-management procedures and true collective bargaining for postal workers in place of the "very limited, management-weighted bargaining presently in effect through a Presidential Executive Order."

BILL TO COMPENSATE OUR SERVICEMEN IN KOREA

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time with the dangerous plight of our American servicemen in Korea. In light of the appalling war in Vietnam, we have a tendency to forget that Korea continues to be a hostile area in which tenuous peace is often shattered by attacks near the demilitarized zone. Only when we are faced with devastating matters such as the *Pueblo* incident do we open our eyes to the unhappy fact that Korea is as dangerous to our servicemen as Vietnam.

As you are aware, I have filed H.R. 9636 which would provide servicemen in and around Korea with tax exemptions comparable to those received by men

serving in Vietnam. Over 200 Congressmen have cosponsored it, I might point out.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a June 30 New York Times article which supports the need to compensate our servicemen in Korea who face such continual hazards:

SOUTH KOREAN TROOPS GUARD LONELY 36-MILE STRETCH OF CHAIN FENCE

(By Takashi Oka)

KOSON, SOUTH KOREA.—"Vigilance!" shouted the sentinel guarding a gun emplacement on the beach of this lonely, beautiful coast, the eastern anchor of the 151-mile demilitarized zone that separates South Korea from North Korea.

Vigilance is the watchword of the 12th Republic of Korea Division, which mans the easternmost 36 miles of the demilitarized zone. It is the longest sector held by one division and has the most rugged terrains along the demilitarized zone.

INCIDENTS INCREASE

"We anticipate North Korea will try to penetrate through the demilitarized zone and our security positions along the coast," said Col. S. Kim, assistant division commander. "Last year there were more than 200 incidents involving North Korean soldiers in my division area."

Last year was described by the United Nations command in Korea as the "bloodiest" since the 1953 armistice, which halted the fighting but brought no formal conclusion to the Korean war. In the last few years the North Koreans have stepped up their efforts to send agents into the south in what is regarded as an attempt to set up bases for guerrilla warfare.

Reaction Base 70—where the colonel was standing—sits atop a small hill overlooking the eastern end of the demilitarized zone. At the crest on the hill is a small wooden structure, which was the original guard post.

Below it, tunneled through the hill, are concrete bunkers connected by narrow underground passageways. The base, manned day and night by a 36-man platoon, was built five months ago at a cost of two million won (about \$7,150). Similar bases line the demilitarized zone from east to west, keeping guard over the chain link fence that has recently been built along the entire length of the zone.

The view from the base is spectacular. The eastern end of the chain link fence—built two years ago when North Korea stepped up attempts to infiltrate the South—marches across a stretch of beach and sinks into the Sea of Japan just below the base. Beyond the fence is a two-and-a-half-mile no-man's land, the demilitarized zone. Beyond that North Korea begins.

The coastline in this area, both north and south of the zone, is a series of gently curving beaches alternating with hillgirt promontories. It was off this deceptively quiet coast, about 90 miles to the northwest, that the United States intelligence ship *Pueblo* was seized by the North Koreans in January, 1968.

Inland, the mountains are sharp and steep. The chain link fence runs up and down the hills, and sometimes clings to their sides. It reminds a visitor of the Great Wall of China, and its message is similar: Keep out.

"The fence is useful," Colonel Kim said. "We also have claymore mines to trip infiltrators, flares, guns with starlight scopes, and early detection devices of various kinds. But our most important asset is our men—here in this platoon, and others like them."

PATROLS ARE NERVOUS

"It takes the enemy only 30 seconds to slit a hole in the fence, once he gets there," the colonel went on. "But we have men patrolling night and day right up to the mili-

tary demarcation line [the actual frontier with North Korea, running down the exact center of the demilitarized zone. As long as our boys stay awake and alive the enemy can't break through.]

Sgt. Kim Moo-nam, a slim, straight-backed sentry peering out at the DMZ with binoculars, said that he and his comrades were often nervous when they went out on night patrol.

"A couple of nights ago," he said, "we heard a rustling reaction. We waited all night, nervous as hell. The next morning, we found a dead boar."

Sergeant Kim rises at 6 A.M., goes through a brief basic drill, has breakfast, trains throughout the morning, cleans his weapons, and has lunch. In the afternoon he goes out on patrol for two or three hours, and again at night.

He has been in the army three years, and has a month more to go before being discharged in July. Before entering the army, he worked in a paper mill. He expects to go back to this job.

USE OF DDT CONDEMNED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1, 1969, issue of Conservation News, a newsletter published by the National Wildlife Federation, carries a news item reporting that a distinguished group of biologists at Stanford University had joined together to condemn the continued use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons. I feel that the report on the Stanford biologists' views would be of considerable interest to my colleagues and, therefore, I insert the text of the Conservation News article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STANFORD BIOLOGISTS SLAM DDT

The undersigned members of the Department of Biological Sciences of Stanford University condemn the continued use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons. We deplore recent efforts by the agricultural chemicals industry and its trade publications to discredit responsible scientists who are calling attention to the dangers of the dispersal and accumulation of these chemical compounds. The evidence is overwhelming that these persistent substances threaten the ecological systems upon which human life depends. Recent studies also suggest that chlorinated hydrocarbons which are now being stored in human tissues may have direct harmful effects on man himself. A list of scientific references supporting these statements is available on request from this Department.

Donald Kennedy, Professor and Executive Head.

Donald P. Abbott, Professor.
Isabella Abbott, Lecturer.
Marcia K. Allen, Instructor.
Allan M. Campbell, Professor.
Elizabeth M. Center, Instructor.
Paul R. Ehrlich, Professor.
David Epel, Assistant Professor.
John A. Hendrickson, Jr., Instructor.
Malvern Gilmartin, Professor.
Richard W. Holm, Professor.
Welton L. Lee, Assistant Professor.
Harold Mooney, Associate Professor.
Joseph F. Oilphant, Professor.
John H. Phillips, Associate Professor.
Peter Raven, Associate Professor.

Peter M. Ray, Professor.

John H. Thomas, Lecturer and Curator.

Donald M. Wilson, Professor.

Charles Yanofsky, Professor.

(Also signed by 59 Post-doctoral fellows, research fellows, associates and graduate students.)

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I am not very impressed with those who continually allege that this administration has done nothing to solve the Vietnam war. The Nixon administration has done more than the previous two administrations—who inadvertently involved us in this open end commitment in Vietnam—to reach lasting peace in Southeast Asia. It has combined long-range goals of regional peace with the immediate and pressing task of stopping the war. This administration has demonstrated its willingness quite patently, and I would like to enumerate the commendable efforts of both this Government and the South Vietnamese Government to bring the war to an end:

First, prior to January 20, we halted the bombing of North Vietnam and agreed to sit down at the conference table with the NFL, 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, Thieu offered to meet with the NFL for private talks without preconditions on a political settlement.

Fourth, on May 14, with Thieu's support, the President 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, the President announced the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. combat troops.

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

Seventh, 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.

I also want to commend the South Vietnamese Government for their cooperation and realism in adopting a workable and flexible policy in negotiating peace.

Now the burden of proof rests with the Communists. They have not demonstrated both in the immediate and far

past any desire to conclude the war. The allies have repeatedly demonstrated their willingness to negotiate and end the war. Let the Communists demonstrate their earnestness to end the war.

CURRENT POSTAL RESEARCH

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, with my full support, the Congress enacted legislation which finally gave status in the Post Office Department to its vital research and engineering activity.

Great strides have been made in the Department under that law, although—as is being made abundantly clear in our current full committee hearings on postal reform—there is still much to be done. The Department needs to have more authority, particularly over its financial affairs, if it is to really do the job at hand.

Nevertheless, progress has been made and much of the credit very properly can go to the original assistant postmaster general for research and engineering, Dr. Leo S. Packer, who regrettably was not continued in the new administration this year. Dr. Packer and his staff have laid an excellent foundation.

A story of the postal research work appears in the July 1969 issue of Government Executive, and I include the text of the story as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S ENTRY TO RESEARCH IS RECENT, PRACTICAL AND CONSERVATIVE

Only 3 years ago, Congress passed Public Law 89-492 to "encourage, advance and accelerate the research and development and construction engineering programs of the (Post Office) Department and to improve the administration of those programs." It was overdue.

The Department developed a basic plan to accelerate the application of modern technology to solve some of its outstanding problems, and divided it into four general elements:

It expanded technical program inputs to bear down on those problems which "are amenable to technological solutions."

In-house R&D capability was expanded and improved in such areas as conducting tests and evaluations of new equipment and systems in realistic environments.

It adopted a systems approach developed by the Department of Defense.

It expanded application of professional engineering talents in the field.

THE SORTING PROCESS

"The basic plan was primarily a simple one," Paul G. Hendrickson, Director of Operations for the Department and Acting Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Research and Engineering, told the House Subcommittee on Appropriations earlier this year, "and remains essentially the same."

In the last year, the Department let a major systems engineering contract to get advanced concepts for the processing of letter, flat mail and parcel post, as well as the collection and delivery systems. "This work should continue into Fiscal Year 1972," said

Hendrickson, "with the concept for an advanced letter mail processing system to be provided this year, followed by the parcel post and flat mail processing and collection and delivery systems concepts in Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971."

To understand some of the problems, Hendrickson cited the six-step procedure for mail handling, during an interview with *Government Executive*. "It is done fairly much by the numbers," he said:

1—The mail is flattened out so that it will be able to go through a letter sorting machine (LSM).

2—The envelope is "faced"—address side up, stamp in the canceling position.

3—The stamp is canceled.

4—A manual operation follows in that the letters are taken to the LSM for reading by the machine.

5—The machine sorts the mail according to areas of the country.

6—The letters are then "swept" manually into bundles and tied and placed in a sack.

"The manual operations," he observed, "are the holes in the present system. We believe we can get better equipment and do a more reliable job." (Of automation, he said: "We can stop the pyramiding of hiring a lot of people, but we have never believed we could eliminate jobs.")

Of specific machinery that will modernize the Department, the Bureau is working on:

ADVANCED OPTICAL CHARACTER READERS

Three design study contracts have been awarded, to process a much larger percentage of business mail. About 75 percent of post office business is done by large business, Hendrickson told *Government Executive*. "Even the third class [junk] mail is pretty good for us to handle. It is uniform size—unless there is a coupon on it or samples in it. Third class mail helps smooth out the work load; it can be set aside and processed later, when the higher class mail dwindles." (*Government Executive*, April 1969, p. 26).

(Of the ZIP codes, he said that in major post offices, non-ZIP mail is set aside to be handled by specially trained people—especially in large cities. Many times it misses a train because of this. "So," he said, "you're taking a chance.")

SMALL LETTER SORTING MACHINES

"We have over 250 of the multiple position machines in post offices right now. These are large machines about 70-feet long. One of our new programs is getting a six-position machine which can do the same job at about the same cost for the smaller post offices, which don't have the space of floor loading capacity that permits the use of a big machine.

"We are going to develop an electronic memory that can be replaced in the older units and included in newer letter sorting machines."

CODE SORTING

Said Hendrickson: "We believe the letters in the future will be delivered by a coding system. Every letter that comes into a post office now is treated as if it never went through another—even if it had in some different area. With a coding system, the mail will pass the facing and canceling operation and go directly to the decoders. It would automatically sequence the mail—down through the carrier, who now spends about an hour sequencing his own delivery by street and number."

The coding system is not a new one: Australia and Germany both use it; most of the large oil companies use it for billing.

"The machines, therefore, are already developed," Hendrickson said. "The Department would buy off-the-shelf equipment and use it in conjunction with other equipment it has in the system."

Another post office official told Congress: "We believe this may also reduce the amount

of training required to operate the letter sorting part of the process." Budget restrictions this year curtail the start on the scale "that it demands."

In a move to improve the letter sorting process, the Post Office Department let a \$3.9-million contract with the Vurroughs Defense, Space and Special Systems Group in Paoli, Pa., for the production and installation of 39 sorting machines in 36 post offices across the Nation.

PARCEL SORTING MACHINES

The Department has completed some engineering tests on a new tilted belt parcel sorter—the first of its kind in the U.S. It is American-made prototype, built in modular form.

"The preliminary tests indicate that we really should go ahead and get finally engineered units of each of the modules so that we can build parcel sorters for whatever post office requirements we may have, using the erector set kit of pieces," the witness told Congress. "We plan to do the final engineering on this system in the coming year."

MORGAN STATION FIRE

Conveyer belt handling of packages and heavy sacks of mails is an overdue project, Hendrickson indicated to *Government Executive*. "A large industrial (human) engineering program is now going on throughout the country—in all post offices."

Records show that a post office is generally an unsafe area to work. Officials started to look at this when the Morgan Station (Long Island) fire destroyed the office in late 1967. There were no casualties, but there could have been.

The Department is now going back to 50 large post offices to find out what the hazards are and to develop new designs.

The medical report of "casualties" closely examined during the study turned up an unexpected number of cases of hernias and mashed toes. This put a heavier emphasis on the studies under way. "It wasn't until we looked at the safety records and discovered the loss of time that we got concerned and found out why." Many women are hired by the Department to handle mail; they do not get special privileges, in this regard, "and they don't ask for any."

For the past two years, the Department has held symposia for industry to acquaint the business community with what it is trying to do. "This is patterned after something the Department of Defense has been doing for years," Hendrickson said.

"We started this in 1967 and we had one this year." About 200 firms participated in 1967 and about 300 last year. As an indication of the results here, when we first started we had about 34 contractors who were doing research and development work for the Post Office. Today, we have somewhere around 130 to 135 research and development contracts. So we have expanded our program into the business world and we have gotten a lot of attention."

Despite this involvement in mechanization, Hendrickson said: "Our prime job is not equipment development, but in getting equipment maintained, operated and managed correctly. We have enough equipment to handle mechanizing the post offices throughout the country, but we don't have enough people to maintain, operate and manage."

"We get a new piece of equipment, for example, and the contractor provides a maintenance man for a year at a salary of \$12 to \$13 thousand. Then the post office hires a man at \$7 to \$8 thousand under training—and when he is trained, he becomes valuable to industry." A solution to this dilemma would appear to make the trained man's salary competitive with industry, but this point was not commented on.

There is an inadequacy in laboratory facilities. He told Congress: "Last year we came

to you and said we had a plan. We still have that plan. At the present time we have 30,000 feet of test facility over the Washington Post Office. We feel that this is totally inadequate for our use. We need to be near a live mail facility." The Bureau is not allowed to test equipment in a post office. "Until we can," he said, "we cannot really show as rapid progress as we should."

THE BUDGET

Of future budget requirements, Hendrickson told Congress: "We have a five-year budget that continues to rise for the next two or three years. It was felt that this budget was nearing as much as could be handled this year. We could have handled a little more than this, perhaps, but this is a start. I think we are going to project about twice this amount before we are through."

And of advanced planning and the techniques being used by the Department: "For some time we did not really know where we needed to work. In short, we did not really know where we were. We have now defined where we are. We know what we are working on and what programs we are going to have for the near future. We now have to look to see where the payoff is going to be in the future and we are defining that now."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor today on the occasion of our observance of Captive Nations Week to pay special tribute to the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain who are forced to bear the heavy yoke of communism. It is also a time to renew our opposition to the cruel Soviet policy of maintaining a tight Communist stranglehold on East and Central Europe.

The people of East and Central Europe who comprise the countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania have traditionally been a self-governing people who thrived on intellectual, religious, and economic freedom. Innovation, piety, and prosperity which were once the conspicuous hallmarks of a people in love with life are now, under Russian tutelage, only sporadically discernible. While the Russian overlords have spared no device in their nefarious scheme to enslave these freedom-loving peoples, the recurrent need for the Russians to use brutal force shows upon what fragile support their Communist "order" rests.

That the 100 million people of East and Central Europe have maintained their desire and love for freedom is a tremendous tribute to a brave people whose spirit will not and cannot be forced into submission.

The necessity of our maintaining a constant awareness and concern for the plight of the peoples caught behind the Iron Curtain and the continuing threat of Soviet dominance was illustrated with absolute clarity in August of 1968 when Czechoslovakia, in the throes of unshackling its restive democratic spirit, was brutally and ruthlessly crushed by a

Russian invasion and occupation. The Russian action provided free nations of the world with a hard lesson, and we should never allow the significance of that brutal event to diminish in our minds. In this 11th observance of Captive Nations Week we pay special tribute to the Czech people and pledge our solidarity with their goals and aspirations. Their undying democratic spirit is lauded by free men everywhere.

Today, I received a letter from Mrs. Ann Zemleduch Muryn, a constituent concerned with the plight of persons caught behind the Iron Curtain. She eloquently stated what I think Captive Nations Week signifies when she wrote:

The list of captive nations is long, but someday those who are the captives will become freed from their bondage, for the spark of freedom has not died in their breasts. As witness the Czechoslovakians this year. All these nations will once again raise their own flags, for even while they have borne their chains and shackles these many years, even these bands of steel will break.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war the Soviet Union has become the captor and jailer, the oppressor and tormentor of tens of millions of helpless peoples in Europe in their homelands. Even before the end of that war some peoples in Eastern Europe had already been drawn within the Soviet network, but both these victims and their sympathizers in the West hoped that soon these peoples would be freed. Unfortunately, however, events took a decidedly different turn, and instead of succeeding in their attempt to free these peoples, the governments of the West witnessed the postwar enslavement of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian people. Gradually the Iron Curtain, raised by the Soviet Union between the East and the West, became stabilized and the isolation of 100 million souls from the free West was completed.

Many have hoped that the passage of time would gradually erode this barrier but the cruel crushing of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and last summer's invasion of Czechoslovakia clearly show the Soviet Union's consistent dedication to the domination and oppression of the captive nations.

The governments of the West are most anxious to help these peoples to regain their freedom. For more than two decades we have tried to negotiate with the Soviet Union for the betterment of the lot of these peoples, but our efforts have proved abortive. The Soviets have not even shown any willingness to negotiate in earnest about the fate of these nations, declaring that these peoples, living under "people's democracies" in their homelands, are "free and enjoy the overall protection of the Soviet Union." Of

course such talk has not deterred the statesmen of the West, and they have done their utmost to keep the issue alive in international diplomatic circles. But the Government of this Republic has done something definite to do just that, hoping that it will eventually help the cause of the captive nations in Europe.

In a joint congressional resolution and by a Presidential proclamation the Captive Nations Week was established in 1959, to be observed in the third week of July of each year. By enacting this joint resolution the Congress and the President were not only carrying out the wishes of the people of this country, but they were also carrying out our fine tradition of showing our utmost sympathy for the oppressed peoples. I am indeed proud to say that we have always felt, and still feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, a just and noble cause, a humane and humanitarian cause, and I am glad to participate in its observance on the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week.

THE MOON SHOT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing and watching and reading so much about the moon shot that one is almost at a loss to be able to add anything further.

However, yesterday morning when I had, along with my colleagues, the opportunity to personally view this spectacular launch, I fully realized, perhaps for the first time, how stupendous and unbelievable the achievement of blasting off from this earth actually was. The experience was far beyond my expectations and I noted that most of the surrounding audience, seasoned legislators, hardened Government officials, and worldly diplomats were all deeply affected by the incredible magnitude of the launch. It was certainly a day that I shall never forget and it will stand out as the most exciting event that I have ever witnessed.

I also had a personal interest in this particular historic launch, because Col. Buzz Aldrin, who will be the second man ever to set foot on the moon, comes from Montclair, N.J., a fine town in my congressional district. I know that I was, by my presence, representing the hopes and prayers of the people of Montclair for the safety and success of this historic exploration into outer space.

Colonel Aldrin himself has set the tone of his adventure in a very low-key yet profound manner when he said:

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.

POST-WORLD WAR II OPPRESSION OF UKRAINE BY COMMUNIST RUSSIA

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of the resolution which established Captive Nations Week, it is timely to take a look back at the oppression of the Ukraine by Soviet Russia which has occurred since World War II.

A summary of this oppression is a feature of the July 1969 issue of the WACL Bulletin, published in Seoul, Korea, by the World Anti-Communist League. Following is the text:

POST-WORLD WAR II OPPRESSION OF UKRAINE BY COMMUNIST RUSSIA

STALIN'S REVENGE ON UKRAINE

As the Soviet Union emerged one of the great victors over Nazi Germany, Stalin took pains to make it clear that the Soviet victory had been achieved by the Great Russians almost exclusively. Consequently, he initiated bloody purges and persecution in the non-Russian republics. The autonomous republics of the Crimean Tatars and the Volga Germans were liquidated as their punishment for collaboration with the Germans, a fate which likewise befell the autonomous oblasts of the Chechens and Ingushes in the Caucasus. (cf. Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, Special Report No. 4, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1955).

But Stalin's vengeance was wholly psychopathic in Ukraine. His promises of "national concessions" to Ukraine were soon forgotten. The MVD (the new name for the NKVD) hounded all those Ukrainians who were supporting the UPA—a herculean task, indeed. Moscow ordered wholesale requisitions of all foodstuffs in Ukraine and called up a general mobilization of all men from 16 to 60—this was before the final collapse of Germany. Thousands, untrained and ill-armed, were slaughtered under the fire of German tanks and guns.

(a) Fight against the UPA:

One of the primary tasks of the Soviet troops was to liquidate the Ukrainian underground resistance. Special detachments, known as *istrebitele* ("exterminators"), hunted members of the OUN (whom the Reds called "Bandierites," after Stephen Bandera, OUN leader) and the UPA.

The underground warfare of the UPA embraced the Western regions of Galicia, the frontier zones of both sides of the Curzon line and the Carpathian Mountains, including some areas of Carpatho-Ukraine and Slovakia. The fighting raged for several months, despite constant appeals on the part of Khrushchev and Manuillsky to Ukrainian insurgents to lay down their arms, automatic pardon being their reward. Since there were no surrenders, the Soviet command mounted large-scale offensives with as many as 30,000 special troops. Through the spring and summer of 1945 entire Soviet divisions were engaged in combating the UPA. In 1946 General Vasyl Ryzansky, the Minister of Interior of the Ukrainian SSR, threw large contingents of MVD troops into the fray. In 1947 the seemingly unconquerable UPA units ambushed and killed General Karol Swierczewski, Polish Defense Minister ("General Walter" of the Spanish Civil War).

On May 17, 1947, a tripartite agreement was signed between the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia, whereby all three Communist gov-

ernments agreed to join forces in putting down the Ukrainian guerrilla forces. This blow proved too much even for the Ukrainian spirit to sustain. Hundreds of the underground fighters were killed, several hundred others escaped through Czechoslovakia to West Germany or simply faded away throughout the USSR. On March 5, 1950, Soviet security troops ambushed and killed the UPA Supreme Commander, General Taras Chuprynka, in Western Ukraine.

It is estimated by Ukrainian guerrilla warfare specialists that by 1950 some 36,000 Soviet officers and enlisted men of the security forces had fallen at the hands of UPA freedom fighters. Although large-scale operations and raids by the UPA subsided after 1950, underground resistance, under different forms and techniques, exists to this very day.

(b) Destruction of Ukrainian Catholic Church:

Another form of Stalin's revenge over the Ukrainian population was his savage destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine.

After the death of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky on November 1, 1944, his successor Metropolitan Joseph Slipy tried to preserve the church and its 5,000,000 Catholic faithful within the existing Soviet laws and constitution. But in 1945 the MVD arrested all the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops: Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, Bishops Gregory Chomyshyn, Ivan Latyshevsky, Gregory Lakota, Mykola Charnetsky, Mykyta Budka, many other high-ranking prelates, and a number of priests, monks and nuns—all on the spurious charges of "collaboration" with the Nazis or of supporting the UPA. In 1946 a Soviet-approved committee of a few apostate priests and laymen, called a "synod" at which they abolished the Union of Brest (1596), by which the Ukrainian Catholic Church had been reunited with the Roman Catholic Church. They liquidated all church properties and schools, closed monasteries, and imposed the Russian Orthodox Church upon the Catholic population of Western Ukraine. Subsequently, other Ukrainian Catholic bishops were arrested or killed, such as Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovsky, who was arrested by the Polish security police and handed over to the Soviet government, and Bishop Theodore G. Romzha, who was killed in Carpatho-Ukraine.

Of 11 Ukrainian Catholic bishops only Metropolitan Joseph Slipy survived. Released in 1963 upon the direct intervention of Pope John XXIII, he was first made Archbishop Major, then Cardinal; he now resides in Rome.

(c) Cultural Russification:

Once the Soviet government had reorganized after the critical war years, it again commenced a shrewd and systematic policy of Russification in Ukraine. The Ukrainian language, although the official language of the Ukrainian SSR, was discriminated against. The so-called "linguistic theory" of Stalin was introduced to justify the Russian language as an "international language"; above all, it was the "language of Lenin" and the "language of Communism." Russian books, art, plays, films flooded Ukraine in unprecedented fashion. Ukrainian history and literature were ordered to be revised in order to demonstrate their dependence in the past, present and future in the "elder Russian brothers."

(d) Economic Exploitation:

Although Ukraine had been ravaged by World War II, the Soviet government paid scant attention to the economic needs of the Ukrainian people. It did restore a certain number of factories, mines and hydro-electric plants which had been destroyed by the war. But enormous quantities of machinery which had been moved to the east from Ukraine were never returned to Ukraine. Under the pretext of bringing in sorely-

needed specialized personnel and technicians, Stalin inundated Ukraine with Russians, while Ukrainian technicians, specialists and engineers were dispatched to other parts of the USSR.

In its agricultural policy the Kremlin revived and tightened the collective farm regime, making life on them even more unbearable. Western Ukraine and parts of Volhynia and Carpatho-Ukraine were collectivized, and all those Ukrainian farmers who showed the slightest opposition were sent to slave labor camps in Siberia and Kazakhstan.

2. UKRAINE UNDER KHRUSHCHEV'S RULE

(a) "De-Stalinization," "Thaw" and Ukraine:

The death of Joseph Stalin on March 5, 1953, ushered in a new and uneasy period in the history of the USSR and of Ukraine. "Collective leadership" in the Kremlin masked a bitter struggle for supremacy. An early casualty of the intra-party struggle was Leonid Melnikov, abruptly dismissed as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine. He was publicly charged with forcing the Russification of Western Ukraine, a charge brought to the fore for the first time anywhere. He was replaced by Alexander Kirichenko, the first native Ukrainian ever to hold this post. With the execution of Lavrenti Beria and the dumping of Georgi Malenkov, the surviving contestants, Khrushchev and Bulganin, embarked upon a policy of "peaceful coexistence" abroad and "peace" with their own hapless citizenry at home.

In 1954 Khrushchev, Stalin's "iron man" in Ukraine in 1938 and the holder of direct responsibility for many of the crimes committed against the Ukrainian people, began a new policy toward Ukraine. He now sought to woo Ukrainians by granting some nominal concessions and by cautiously following and espousing certain pro-Ukrainian policies, all with the obvious intent of appeasing the ever-recalcitrant Ukrainians.

On the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654), the Communist Party came up with new "theses" on the relations between Russia and Ukraine. Advanced was a "theory" to the effect that Kievan Rus had given rise to three Eastern Slavic peoples: the Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians. Hence the Russians could call Kiev "the oldest Russian city," leaving Lviv as the oldest Ukrainian city, since it was founded by the Ukrainians after "the division of languages."

Furthermore, in the same year of 1954 the Council of Ministers of the USSR made the Crimea a part of Ukraine to demonstrate the affability of Russian "brotherhood." (It is to be recalled that it was from the Crimea that Stalin had ruthlessly deported all Tatars for disloyalty to the Soviet regime and collaboration with the Germans.)

These and other gestures were intended to make the Ukrainians amenable to a new "economic scheme" Khrushchev had concocted: cultivation of the "virgin lands" of Kazakhstan. Some 800,000 young Ukrainian men and women were half-persuaded, half-coerced into leaving Ukraine as "volunteers" for the task.

Moreover, during the Khrushchev rule, large-scale strikes and rebellions erupted in the Soviet slave labor camps, most of them organized by Ukrainian political prisoners, notably by former members of the OUN and UPA. The first such insurrection flared up in Karaganda, the movement quickly spreading to slave camps in Vorkuta, Kingir, Tayshet, and elsewhere. Moscow reacted with its customary measures: mass executions and indiscriminate killing, as for instance the brutal slaying of 500 Ukrainian women prisoners in Kingir under the treads of Russian tanks. However, the revolts brought some relaxation of terror in Soviet prison camps (cf. *Encounter*, April 1956, London).

It was at the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956, that a now righteous Khrushchev assailed Stalin's crimes against the people and his unbridled terror, especially in Ukraine. Khrushchev stated:

"Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians, but there were too many of them and there was no place to which they could be deported."

In fact, it was impossible to effect these deportations because of the activities of the UPA.

This "de-Stalinization" policy of Khrushchev blew up in his face. It resulted in anti-communist and anti-Russian upheavals throughout the Soviet Russian empire, the rebellion in Poland and the world-rousing insurrection in Hungary in 1956.

By 1957 the Kremlin was confronted with a dilemma: whether to revert to the old Stalinist policy, thereby risking even further insurrections, or to initiate a truly liberal policy, which would favorably impress the emerging Afro-Asian nations which the Kremlin had begun to woo, posing as their great "protector and emancipator."

Khrushchev compromised by devising a series of measures which gave the appearance of "liberalization" but which in reality tended to enchain the Soviet Russian empire more tightly. These measures included decentralization of planning and management of agriculture, spiced with a few concessions to farmers; some decentralization of management of industry and some extension of local authority for the non-Russian republics. Much was made of an amnesty granted political prisoners, especially as it entailed liquidation of a number of the troublesome slave labor camps; "liberalization" of literature, whereby limited criticism was permitted party writers; "liberalization" of travel abroad by a limited number of citizens, and admission of foreign tourists. A number of Ukrainians and other non-Russian Communist leaders were elevated to the highest echelons of the party leadership and the administrative apparatus.

But parallel with this relaxation of terror, Moscow rigorously pursued a systematic Russification course in Ukraine.

(b) Khrushchev's Crimes against the Ukrainian People:

In 1959 the ebullient Khrushchev traipsed across the ocean to the United Nations in New York, provoking vast resentment and opposition on the part of U.S. ethnic groups and labor and veteran organizations.

Extensive hearings on the rule and policies of Khrushchev were held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives in Washington. In its final report, *The Crimes of Khrushchev*, Part II, his brutal treatment of the Ukrainian people were summarized as follows:

(1) As a Communist official, he played a leading role in the Moscow-made famine in Ukraine in the early 1930's in the course of which over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation;

(2) As Stalin's emissary in Ukraine in 1937-38, Khrushchev liquidated the entire organization of the Communist Party and the puppet Ukrainian Communist government; his hand was clearly visible in the genocidal murder of 10,000 Ukrainian men and women in the city of Vynnytsia in 1937-38;

(3) He played a vital part in the destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church and the liquidation of the Ukrainian intellectual elite (for instance, he ordered the arrest of Metropolitan V. Lypkivsky in January, 1938);

(4) During World War II, as a General in the NKVD forces Khrushchev was responsible for the wholesale liquidation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), including eradication of its members' families;

(5) In 1945-46, teaming with Molotov, Khrushchev ordered the liquidation of the

Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. Before it had run its course, over 2,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests were deported, executed or forced to accept Russian Orthodoxy, dominated by the Kremlin;

(6) Khrushchev was responsible for the "voluntary resettlement" of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and other non-Russian peoples in the "Virgin lands" in Kazakhstan, thereby contributing again to the genocide of the Ukrainians as a nation.

(7) Finally, he was guilty, as a member of the "collective leadership," of the mass murder of Ukrainian political prisoners in 1954-55 in Karaganda, Vorkuta, Norilsk and Tayshet.

Irresponsible and amoral, Khrushchev brought the world to the brink of atomic war when he placed Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962. Alarmed by excess unusual even in Communist Russia, his cohorts banded together and deposed him.

3. UNDER THE BREZHNEV-KOSYGIN RULE

No improvement or change in the position of the Ukrainian people has been noticeable since the removal of Khrushchev in the fall of 1964 and the assumption of power by a new "collective leadership," composed of Leonid Brezhnev, secretary general of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Alexei Kosygin, Premier of the Soviet Union.

The widening rift ideologically and politically between the Soviet Union and Red China began to preoccupy the Kremlin leaders. In addition, the constant unrest and opposition in the satellite countries, notably in Rumania, the perennial crises in agriculture, the rebellious Soviet intellectuals—all added to the trials of the new Kremlin chieftains.

Against this backdrop, the following developments are easily distinguishable during these past few years of the Brezhnev-Kosygin "collective leadership":

(a) Policy of Wooing Ukrainians Continues:

The policy of making Ukrainians feel as if they were "junior partners," begun under Khrushchev, has continued under the present regime.

Of the 12 members of the new Politbureau of the Communist Party's Central Committee, three are Ukrainians: Nikolai V. Podgorny (Pidhorny in Ukrainian), Alexander P. Kirichenko and Peter Y. Shelest, the latter succeeding Podgorny as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine when the former was elected Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1965.

Podgorny, accompanying Nikita S. Khrushchev to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in 1960, delivered a scathing address in Ukrainian assailing the United States, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada and those Ukrainian American leaders and organizations who sponsored "Captive Nations Week" and Ukrainian independence observances in the United States Congress. (In January, 1967, Podgorny also visited Pope Paul VI in Rome, apparently to discuss the "religious situation" in the Soviet Union. There was no public announcement to indicate whether the religious plight of the Ukrainian people had been discussed at all.)

Another prominent Ukrainian in the top echelon of the Soviet political hierarchy is Marshal Andrei A. Grechko, who succeeded Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, also a Ukrainian, as Soviet Defense Minister. Ukrainian generals and admirals are to be found in the Soviet army, air force, navy and other branches of the armed forces, and a number of Ukrainians serve in the diplomatic service, including the ambassadorial level.

(b) Religious Persecution:

The Soviet press in Ukraine periodically reports arrests, trials and deportations of "religious fanatics" and "superstitious people." Such trials were held in 1965 in Lviv,

Western Ukraine, at which some 20 persons were charged with practicing "underground Catholic religion." Among those arrested were Ukraine Catholic priests, nuns and several lay persons. In March 1966 the Soviet government sponsored widespread celebrations commemorating the 20th anniversary of the "liquidation" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. These jubilees evoked a strong protest on the part of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy in the free world. A special Pastoral Letter denouncing the destruction of Catholicism was signed by 18 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, headed by His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Slipy. The Soviet presses continue to spew forth books and pamphlets denouncing the Ukrainian Catholic Church as "always in the service of the counter revolutionary imperialists, including the American imperialists."

Religious persecution is not limited only to the Catholic Church in Ukraine. The number of Orthodox Churches has shrunk to a skeleton network. In October, 1966, in the city of Zhytomyr several persons were tried for giving religious instruction to children; all were either of the Orthodox faith or belonged to the Ukrainian Baptists' organization. A vicious attack on the Baptists in Ukraine appeared in the November 1966 issue of *Ludyna i Svit* (man and the World), published in Kiev.

Anti-religious tactics of the Communists include propagandistic undermining of the people's faith in baptism and matrimony and the discrediting of Christian burial by priests or ministers.

The present Kremlin leadership is thus not unique in betraying its fear of religion as a powerful force against the Communist ideology.

(c) Cultural and Linguistic Genocide in Ukraine:

But what is perhaps the most insidious and telling damage the Russian imperialists inflict upon Ukraine is that wreaked by the policy of cultural and linguistic genocide.

In 1966 the world was outraged by the trial and condemnation of two Russian writers, Daniel and Sinyavsky, for their non-conformist literary activities. Regrettably, little attention has been paid to what takes place in the cultural and literary sphere in Ukraine.

In 1965 and 1966 a number of Ukrainian writers, poets, researchers, journalists, literary critics and professors were arrested, tried and sentenced in Ukraine. At least 30 of these Ukrainian intellectuals were meted out this treatment in such Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Lviv, Odessa, Lutsk, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk. Most prominent among them are Ivan Dzyuba and Ivan Svitlychny, who were accused of writing anti-Soviet works and of smuggling to the West anti-Soviet works of another Ukrainian poet Vasyl Symonenko, who died in 1963 at the age of 29. Detailed reports on the arrests of the Ukrainian intellectuals appeared in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (April 1, 1966) and *The New York Times* (April 7, 1966). Protests by the Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile were addressed to the International PEN, the European Community of Writers, and UNESCO. Protests to the State Department in Washington were sent by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

The anti-Soviet and anti-Russian opposition in Ukraine was officially if unwittingly acknowledged recently (1966) by Peter Shelest, secretary-general of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and Alexander Korneichuk, top-ranking Communist playwright and ideologist. Among other things, they felt impelled to warn Ukrainian youth against listening to Western radio broadcasts, ending by assailing the United States for alleged support of Ukrainian "subversive nationalist elements" which, they claimed, were systematically infiltrating into Ukraine.

CONCLUSION

The history of the Ukrainian people for the past 50 years has demonstrated the undying desire of Ukraine to attain its national freedom and independence. Untold sacrifices in human and economic resources have been paid by the Ukrainian nation in quest of that objective. The severe and harsh persecution of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia, Nazi Germany and other oppressors and aggressors, past and present, have not been able to deflect the will of the Ukrainian people or to kill what might well be man's deepest instinct—that of being free.

In its search for freedom and national independence Ukraine is by no means alone.

Recognition of its plight, and that of other hapless nations, was formally extended by the United States in its famous "Captive Nations Week Resolution" of July 17, 1959:

"The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, north Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others . . ."

In giving a haven to Ukrainians fleeing from oppression and outright genocide in their native land, the United States and other hospitable countries of the free world have, in the last analysis, acted in their own best interest.

Where conditions have at all permitted, the Ukrainian infusion has invariably enriched both soul and body of the host country. Law-abiding, industrious, naturally independent of spirit and deeply aware of God and His grace, Ukrainians have often proved to be an invaluable catalyst on every continent they have reached, anywhere man seeks to build a viable society, everywhere where Nature's forces have had to be channeled into constructive directions.

But it is in coping with destructive forces within man himself that Ukrainians in the Diaspora have contributed most. Everywhere they have gone they have inevitably awakened man's conscience. They have served—and continue to serve—as the Free World's surrogates in an experience whose very existence too many men refuse to acknowledge: the extinction of freedom for individual and for nation.

It is in this wise that Ukrainians abroad have repaid many times over the many helping hands. The fate of Ukraine, they have demonstrated, is the fate of man and nation everywhere unless man continues to prize and to fight for freedom, not only in his own country, but over a globe that modern technology has miniaturized.

WAR-LIKE PROTESTATIONS

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, discussion of how a great Nation spends its resources and tax revenues is timely and vital to each of us. Mr. Rolf Stromberg, a writer for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, had interesting observations in his July 12, 1969, column about the appropriations bill scheduled for consideration by the House next Tuesday. I include his column, "War-like Protestations," in the RECORD:

WAR-LIKE PROTESTATIONS

At the most conservative estimate, the undeclared war in Vietnam costs us \$2.3 million an hour. An hour! Stun you? If you were earning \$10,000 a year, it would take you 230 years to make that much money.

If you read the newspapers, you'll learn that only a few Congressmen are distressed by those fantastic expenditures. But if you want to hear protests listen to the members of the House of Representatives, vigilant as always, when the 1970 appropriation for the National Endowment for the Arts reaches the floor on July 22, the scheduled date.

The amount being sought that fiscal year is at the most \$13.75 million plus administrative expenses. The administration's request is for \$7.5 million plus those expenses. Now, neither sum need be accepted by the House, which can lop away at these funds to its heart's content and probably will.

Congressmen who see nothing wrong with farm subsidies, who see it in the national interest to tolerate waste in defense spending, who approve of the oil-depletion allowance will vehemently argue against aiding the arts.

These men will look on artists as bearded beatnik types who are potentially subversive. If you think that's far-fetched, you should read some of the comments made at hearings held by the Appropriations Committee.

What does this prove? That people who talk like that know nothing about art and artists and nothing about national culture. Those attitudes make a mockery of any discussion about priorities in American life. People who cannot understand the imperative and immediate value of the arts prove also they know little about history nor, for that matter, their own society.

Look back over the centuries. What do we remember best of ancient Athens? Poets like Pindar; playwrights like Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes; sculptors like Praxiteles. Who was the wealthiest grain merchant in Periclean Athens? Esoteric scholars might know. The only reason most of us know Maecenas was one of the wealthiest men in Rome is that Horace wrote poems about him.

More people know more about Shakespeare than they do about Elizabeth I. Tourists visit tombs in Italy not for those buried there but to gaze at statuary by Michelangelo. The arts are the culmination—if you will, the apex—of a civilization.

But the arts are more than mere monuments. There is in each of us a creative instinct, a yearning to—in the ancient Greek sense—make something. Few of us have the talent; even fewer the genius.

The arts fulfill that inner urge in all of us. As a Gestalt psychologist might point out, it completes us. Not only in a creative sense but a practical way. Rarely in our daily lives do we have a day that is complete, with a beginning and an end, a feeling of order.

The theater, for example, music, too, gives us that. And we haven't even mentioned the need for beauty, or that artists usually mentioned the need for beauty, or that artists usually anticipate the future. They speak to us not only of our time, with sensitivity, but of the human condition in general. They do this with a candor and an honesty, with a set of standards that are rare anywhere.

We face in this country a crisis, and we aren't even aware of it yet. In the next several decades technological advances will increase leisure time for Americans. What will they do with it? Under population pressures present facilities will be utterly inadequate. Where are the appropriations to enlarge them?

Over a \$150 million in fund requests has been received annually by the National Endowment, which, prudent in its understand-

ing of Congress, has always been pared to the minimum. To be even pared further by a niggardly Congress. Sometimes soon you would think we'd realize we'd starved for the arts far too long.

You would think that Congress would know that Americans purchased almost a billion dollars' worth of musical instruments in 1967; that 17,000,000 students play musical instruments against only 2,500,000 twenty years ago. Somebody out in this sprawling nation really cares. Does Congress?

It would take just four hours of Vietnam spending to account for the minimum art request. What would we prefer to be remembered for a hundred years from now; having in this year 1969 furthered the career of a possible Shakespeare or having fought another battle in Southeast Asia? That's the question Congress must answer, and for such a small sum.

WORCESTER'S PARTICIPATION IN THE HISTORIC MISSION OF APOLLO 11

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, when Apollo 11 successfully blasted off at Cape Kennedy yesterday morning, the special pride and prayers of the people of Worcester, Mass., and all the people of our Fourth Congressional District rose and are riding with it and with the astronauts on their historic journey.

The special pride of the people of Worcester is generated first because Worcester is the birthplace of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the acclaimed "father of modern rocketry." Dr. Goddard was educated in our Worcester schools, attended the renowned Worcester Polytechnic Institute, received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees and taught at the internationally recognized Clark University in Worcester, and he conducted his early rocket experiments in the Worcester area.

It is interesting to reflect that his first liquid-propelled rocket rose 41 feet, traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds, and fell when the lower half of the nozzle burned off.

In New Mexico, on December 30, 1930, Dr. Goddard flew a rocket to an altitude of about 2,000 feet at a speed of about 500 miles per hour, which was perhaps the real beginning of our almost unbelievable modern achievements.

In 1945, Clark University awarded him an honorary doctor of science degree on which occasion he gave one of his extremely rare and limited press interviews. I think that all RECORD readers will be deeply interested in the prophetic words he expressed at that interview, as follows:

I feel we are going to enter an era comparable in its progress to that in which the airplane advanced, although that's saying a good deal.

It's just a matter of imagination how far we go with rockets and jet planes . . . I think it's fair to say you haven't seen anything yet.

Of course, we are doubly gratified that his gracious and vibrant widow, Mrs.

Esther Goddard, sees fit to maintain her home in Worcester and maintains also a tremendous and vital concern in the continuing projection of her husband's original, inventive genius.

We, in Worcester and the surrounding area, are naturally and additionally extremely proud of the substantial contributions our skilled workers and directors in the various industrial plants here have made to the technical integrity of the Apollo 11 mission vehicles.

I shall include below, by means of excerpts from newspaper articles, a partial listing of such contributions, together with an account of some key Federal personnel associated with the Apollo 11 mission who are of Worcester area origin.

Mr. Speaker, all the people of Worcester and our Fourth Congressional District join with every citizen of the United States and good neighbors throughout the world in fervent prayer for the safe return of three highly motivated, wholesome men, dedicated to the self-development of disciplined mind, persevering diligence, and invincible spirit. Upon their safe return from the moon, please God, we will further join our prayers in humble thanks and heartfelt entreaty that the real success of their mission will be reflected in a resultant global good will and understanding so essential to the final achievement of peace on earth.

The listing referred to above follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette, July 15, 1969]

CITY PRODUCTS IN KEY ROLES ON APOLLO 11 (By Robert A. Wood)

When the Saturn rocket blasts off Wednesday carrying its payload of astronauts to an historic moonlanding, a little bit of Worcester will be riding along.

Parts manufactured in Wyman-Gordon's North Grafton plant will be providing some of the muscle that hurls the multimillion ton payload into space.

In addition to the thrust package, Wyman-Gordon manufactures some 50 other types of parts for a variety of structural, propulsion, guidance and propellant handling applications.

These components are forged from virtually every metal and alloy known, including the high temperature super-nickel alloys and refractory metals.

Norton Co. worked on the exhaust nozzles that will be handling the hot output manufactured by neighboring Wyman-Gordon parts. Norton's protective products division has applied an aluminum oxide coating to the exhaust nozzles in the Agena rockets.

Once past the blast off stage, the Apollo astronauts still will depend on Worcester know-how, for Norton Co. has supplied the fancy recrystallized silicon carbide nozzles used to control steering changes in orbit.

Communication between the three adventurers in space and Earth-fettered Americans depends on the efforts of another Worcester firm, the David Clark Co. They manufacture a gadget that goes by the tongue twisting name of Apollo Extravehicular Mobility Unit Communications Carrier. This polysyllabic gizmo is a hearing-and-talking cap representing five years of design, development and redevelopment carried out jointly between David Clark and the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston.

TALK CAP

What looks like a skull cap and weighs less than 26 ounces is able to bring the sound of astro lingo back from close to the

moon with clarity comparable to that in a neighborhood telephone call.

Man will also land on the moon courtesy of Worcester's Honematic Machine Corp., one of the few companies in the United States to specialize in making cylinders. "And," says Allan Glazer, corporation president, "we're one of the few to go out on these way out specials."

The spindly shanks that will support the Lunar Excursion Module (LEM) on the moon's surface are manufactured by Honematic.

Engineered to perform at moon gravity, these supports are so slight that they would collapse under the 16 ton weight of the module here in earth's stronger gravitational field.

REMAINS ON MOON

The bottom half of the LEM, including legs, will be used for a launching pad for the module's return to the Apollo mother ship. Accordingly, it is left behind when the astronauts return to Earth. Honematic and Worcester will then have produced some of the first resident gadgetry on the moon.

Worcester also fathered the historic Apollo 11 time capsule. Created in the Sprague Electric laboratories by Dr. Robert S. Pepper, director of research, development and engineering, the silver anodized aluminum capsule contains messages from 74 heads of state, lists of NASA officials, and messages from Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon etched on a pure silicon disc.

Alden Research Center in Westboro is responsible for charting weather conditions all over the world pertinent to NBC coverage of Apollo 11. Westboro's Irving R. Tatro, manager of meteorological systems for Alden, will be shepherding some of the companies' finest facsimile reproduction machines at NBC's Apollo coverage center in New York.

SON OF CITY NATIVE

Tatro has charge of the APT (Automatic Pictures Transmission) device which reproduces what weather satellites see as they scan weather patterns on Earth. Other Alden machines receive weather patterns from the U.S. Weather Bureau, and pictures and print from Houston Control Center and all over the world in an effort to cover the astronauts from pad to water.

Perhaps the most important Worcester product to blast off for the moon is astronaut Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., son of a Worcester native. The elder Aldrin graduated from Clark University where he studied under Robert H. Goddard, pioneer rocket scientist.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, July 15, 1969]

MOON TIME CAPSULE DEVELOPED IN CITY

Apollo 11 will leave a time capsule on the moon that was developed and made in Worcester.

The 11-sided silver anodized aluminum capsule, a little larger than a quarter, resembles a lady's compact.

It contains a disc of pure silicon on which microscopic messages have been placed. This is a result of a new process in information technology called "Microperm," developed on a crash basis by Sprague Electric Co., 115 Northeast Cutoff.

The process was developed by the semiconductor division personnel, under Dr. Robert S. Pepper, director of research, development and engineering.

On the disc will be messages from 74 heads of state, lists of National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) officials, congressional committees, a quotation from the NASA Act signed by President Eisenhower in 1958, and quotations from Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon.

At the top of the wafer is an ultra minia-

ture replica of the plaque which will be attached to the leg of the landing gear of the lunar module. The plaque is signed by President Nixon and the three astronauts. It reads, "Here men from the planet earth first set foot upon the moon July, 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind."

[From the Framingham (Mass.) News, July 15, 1969]

FRAMINGHAM.—The Honeywell Computer Control staff in Framingham has reason to be even more excited than the people in other parts of the world in the Apollo 11 exploration of the moon, as the blast-off time approaches.

Not only has Honeywell at Framingham produced equipment for simulators in the training of astronauts, but it has also produced computers for the ground support of the space flights.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, July 15, 1969]

FORMER AREA MEN IN APOLLO 11 PROGRAM

Three former Worcester area residents have taken an active part in the preparations for tomorrow's Apollo 11 lunar landing mission.

Lt. Col. Frank W. Harding III, U.S. Air Force, son of Frank W. Harding Jr. of 35 Tory Fort Lane, is an engineer at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. He has primarily worked on the lunar landing module and during the mission, he will monitor the flight from an engineering evaluation room at the Mission Control Center in Houston.

Lt. Col. Harding previously served as project engineer for Apollo 9. He is a 1945 graduate of the old Classical High School, and received a bachelor of science degree from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1950 and a master of business administration degree from George Washington University, Washington, D.C., in 1961.

Harrison K. Brown, son of Harrison G. Brown of 10 Boyce St., is a project engineer at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., where the Saturn V rocket was developed. Brown is a graduate of North High School and received a bachelor's degree from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1939.

Lt. Kerry R. Sandstrom, U.S. Air Force, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Sandstrom of Jefferson, is an electrical engineer at the Houston Manned Spacecraft Center. He is assigned to the flight support division and has been responsible for scheduling the equipment used in simulating the space flight for training personnel both at the Space Center and Cape Kennedy.

He was graduated from Wachusett Regional High School, Holden, in 1963 and received a bachelor of science degree from Lowell Technological Institute in 1967.

[From the Framingham (Mass.) News, July 15, 1969]

ASHLAND MAN HAS ROLE IN APOLLO MOON MISSION

ASHLAND.—David L. Winterhalter, son of Mr. and Mrs. Philip E. Winterhalter of 27 Tri St., Ashland, has an important role in the Apollo 11 lunar landing mission.

He is a program manager, auxiliary propulsion systems, in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Office of Manned Space Flight in Washington.

This office is responsible for the planning, direction, execution and evaluation of NASA's overall manned space flight program.

Winterhalter, a graduate of Ashland High School, received a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering in 1959 from the University of Mass.

His wife, Suzanne, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Bradstreet Sr. of 97 Pleasant St., Ashland.

IN DEFENSE OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, a few hours after the death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Los Angeles, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, delivered a commencement address at the University of Southern California.

This address, "In Defense of the Younger Generation," is an eloquent analysis of some of the problems facing the young people of our own country and the world and bears reading again today.

As Father Hesburgh observed, his talk "reflects a dark moment in American history. The problem discussed in this talk will be with us increasingly in the days ahead, but, as you will see, I look upon them as opportunities, as much as problems. The uneasiness of modern youth has some legitimate bases and, hopefully, some better outlets than those we are presently seeing all over the world. The modern university is not blameless. It can stand some basic reform."

Mr. Speaker, I insert Father Hesburgh's perceptive address on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

IN DEFENSE OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION

(Address by Father Hesburgh)

On the way across town to the University of Southern California this morning, I stopped at the Good Samaritan Hospital, where Senator Kennedy died a few hours ago, to sympathize for a moment with his brother, Senator Ted Kennedy, and the widows of John and Bob. I told them that I would dedicate my remarks this morning to the memory of these two brothers, with the prayerful hope that their example might be much more persuasive than my words. The talk I have written is in defense of youth—something I know they would understand as they exemplified what I am trying to say: that the world needs the idealism, the generosity, the service, the concern, the great dedication of the young. These two brothers might have used their wealth for fun and games, luxury and ease. Instead, they gave their lives unstintingly to public service, in the interest of the poor, here and about the world. They gave what none of us will be called upon to give: their very lives and their youthful hopes. In doing so, they left both the young and the old of this world a legacy, and a new hope too, that out of their sacrifice will emerge a better America and, indeed, a better world.

I would like to begin today with a quotation from a famous author: "What is happening to our young people? They disrespect their elders, they disobey their parents. They ignore the laws. They riot in the streets inflamed with wild notions. Their morals are decaying. What is to become of them?" These words were written more than 2,300 years ago, by Plato, the Greek philosopher.

Another equally famous Greek philosopher, Aristotle, took an almost equally dim view of the young: "Young people have exalted notions, because they have not yet been humbled by life or learned its necessary limitations; moreover, their hopeful disposition makes them think themselves equal to great things. They would always rather do noble deeds than useful ones: their lives

are regulated more by moral feelings than by reasoning—all their mistakes are in the direction of doing things excessively and vehemently. They overdo everything—they love too much, hate too much, and the same with everything else."

I begin thus today just to assure the older generation that the generational gap looks much the same at a distance of twenty-four centuries, and likewise to remind this younger generation that they did not invent youth and all that makes it both attractive and difficult. I would like to say of the younger generation what Frenchmen are purported to say of women: *vive la difference*—long live the difference between generations. We need it. They do too.

This is not to say that the difference between generations is always exactly the same—even though Plato and Aristotle may strike a few responsive chords. For one thing, there are not only many more people around today—about half of them are young people. Twenty years ago there were thirty million Americans under twenty years of age. Today there are over eighty million Americans under twenty, and, in a few years, half of the population will be aged under twenty-five. This makes the younger generation more visible, more omnipresent, and, let's face it, a very substantial part personally of what America is. There is no reason to believe that they will be satisfied to be a silent or passive part of America either. Nor should they be.

If, as Aristotle says, they love too much and hate too much, that's a whale of a lot of vehement love and hate. But the real question is: What do they love and hate? I suspect that they do not love excessively the world we have created, or at least allow to exist and I suspect that they hate some things that are well worth hating and difficult to hate excessively: like war, inequality for millions of human beings on earth, poverty in the midst of affluence, hypocrisy in stating one set of values and following another, rhetoric instead of action, promises without fulfillment, empty words, qualities they often find in the adult generation. Maybe the most discouraging thing about youth is that every day they are getting older. On days like today they come of age, with the great temptation to become like everyone else. To compromise with the world as it is and ultimately, alas, to become the unwilling target of their own children's ire, as they, the youth of yesteryear, begin to do the useful rather than the noble deeds they once dreamed about in their youth.

Maybe the world of youth is too good to be true and lasting. Maybe instead of being so concerned about the idealism, the generosity, and the vehemence of youth, we should rather mourn the fact that youth passes all too quickly into the grim life of adulthood, when we find it so difficult to really love what is good and hate what is evil, and lose the simplicity of youth that can so easily repeat the prayer of the great Hindu poet, Rabindranath Tagore: "Lord, God, only let me make my life simple and straight, like a flute of reed, for Thee to fill with music."

During the past few months, I have visited over twenty large American cities, from Boston to Seattle, from Miami to San Francisco and Los Angeles, from Chicago and St. Louis to New Orleans and Dallas, attempting to raise money for higher education in general and Notre Dame in particular. A dismal task. Everywhere, the newsmen from press, television, and radio have asked me: "What's happening to this generation? Why the unrest, the protest, the revolt? Why pour so much effort and money into the education of a bunch of kooks?" I admit to a certain amount of unpriestly impatience at this line of questioning. Once in a New York press conference, I let myself go. "What you're really saying is that unless students are nice fellows like you, we shouldn't be in-

terested in trying to educate them." "I didn't say that," the reporter countered. "Then what are you saying?" I asked. This drew a large silence. I started over again—on the offensive, Notre Dame-like, I confess, "What is so good about you or your world?" I asked this reporter. "Is there nothing to be uneasy about, nothing to protest, nothing to revolt against?" Another silence, with the unspoken question in his eyes: "What set him off?" I tried to explain it. We might begin by trying to understand what causes the unrest, the protest, the revolt of the young people today, as in so many past generations, but even more so today.

I think there are several immediate causes. First, the young people of today have grown up in an affluent society that prizes intelligence, that provides the best schooling that this country has ever seen. The affluence of many of their parents has freed many of them from the grimy business of worrying where the next dollar is coming from. They have had more time to think, to discuss, to criticize, to read, to travel, to compare, to judge—this is the stuff of which good education is made. And it does have consequences.

In their earlier years, these young people probably took the American dream seriously and uncritically to heart: One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. How often they recited it in grammar school, without thinking what it really means. Then, for many of them, as they began to think critically, the dream seemed to acquire some of the aspects of nightmare: they learned that thirty million Americans, Negro, Mexican, Indian, poor white, but mostly black Americans, unlike them, attended inferior schools where twelve years of segregated education equaled only eight or nine years of the white school standard achievement. Partially because of this, much of the best of higher education was foreclosed for these deprived Americans. Then, they found that these thirty million represented twice as many unemployed and unemployable as whites, with the young non-white, four times as much. Black Americans, they found, generally lived in the worst houses, in the worst section of our cities, and were fated to continue to attend the worst schools which are located there, so that their frustration and lack of social mobility upward seem ever circular and inevitable.

Thus, the American nation they discovered is not indivisible, but clearly divisible into two nations: black and white, poor and affluent, hopeful and hopeless. Liberty means one thing to the whites, the affluent, and the hopeful, another to the black, the poor, and the hopeless. Justice likewise.

And so this generation of the young began to doubt the sincerity of the slogan they had repeated so often. It was the dawn of disillusionment, a coming of age even in youth. What I say here of the white youngster is, of course, even more poignantly true of the black youngster. For a while, they marched together in the South, together sensed new confidence in the rightness of their cause, new power in what they were able to achieve by protest and organized action against what they knew to be wrong, much less un-American.

Then the blacks, at least many of the new leaders of the new power structure called Black Power, decided to go it alone and the great majority of active, protesting white young people felt momentarily alienated again, with the loss of their newly-found cause of civil rights and their active participation in social change.

A new target was quickly found. Escalation gave greater visibility to the war in Vietnam, the draft bit more deeply into the company of the youth, the issues involved were more hotly debated nationally and internationally, and again the youth found a new outlet for their newly-learned tactics

and their yearning for personal involvement in a cause. They aimed indiscriminately at the obvious targets: draft cards, ROTC, Dow and napalm, induction centers, troop trains, and military recruiters. Even the flag took a beating at times, unfortunately, and patriotism, old style, almost became suspect in certain quarters.

Perhaps distracted or possibly annoyed by the noise of it all, too few of the elders really debated the issues or drew back from the mounting cost in lives and dollars. Few really asked about the morality of our national course in spending thirty billion dollars a year tearing up a plot of land and people, no-where near the size and population of the state of California, while the whole world of dire human need and misery merited only two billion dollars annually in critical assistance, with the bulk of our technical assistance manpower concentrated in the same small plot of land that absorbed over a half million of our troops at war.

THE STUDENT REVOLT

I have somewhat oversimplified and possibly overstated the problem, as do the young, but this was and is a real question of justice and morality that has many of our youth hung up as never before. This issue has poisoned the atmosphere of our campuses, has vitiated many other good and noble endeavors, has rocked our national political scene, complicated our foreign relations, and has more than anything else led to a deep and abiding frustration on the part of our youth.

It is one thing to disagree with compulsory military service, or to be disillusioned by the course of a particular war. But this generation is really hung up at the thought of having to take life and face death in a war that they not only do not like, but often abhor as alien to all that they think America should be doing in the world.

Some simply cop out, as the saying goes. They become conscientious objectors, or move to Canada or to the local equivalent of Haight-Asbury, taking refuge in drugs, or bizarre hairdos, or love-ins, or the other appurtenances of hippiedom. It should be said a very small number take this road which is, for the few that take it, the worst kind of blind alley and dead end. The great majority suffer in quiet frustration or erupt in occasional violence, or worry along hoping that somehow they will find a personal escape hatch in the walls that continue to close in around them.

It was all of this malaise over Vietnam that really triggered what I believe to be the final and probably most important act in the drama of the younger generations today: the campus revolt. Having been forced out of meaningful civic rights action, feeling themselves more or less helpless in the face of the Vietnam action seemed to worsen despite all their protests, the students finally decided that maybe they should seek involvement and reform where they were—in the colleges and universities. After thinking about it for a while, some even found here the root cause of their alienation from an establishment or a society that they judged to be impersonal, often irrelevant, sometimes immoral, and generally more difficult to move than a cemetery. Again, one must avoid oversimplification, for the targets for youthful criticism are many: their parents, neighborhoods, and cities, their church if they have not already disassociated themselves from it, their adult leadership from the President to their father, anyone exercising authority over them, even those faculty members or deans they judge as really disinterested in them and their lives and, especially, their hopes. You may ask at this juncture, how did it all get mixed up so quickly? How did the apathetic, disinterested generation of a decade ago suddenly get so critical, so ready to revolt against law and authority in any form, so quick to protest, to sit-in, to lie-in,

to tear-up-in, to raise-hell-in? How does a whole generation get so exercised, so suddenly, about the general state of society and humanity that they begin waving signs in Berkeley and end up by tearing Columbia apart, bringing down the government in Belgium and closing 23 of the 27 Italian universities, immobilizing France and the all-powerful De Gaulle, and telling their elders all over the world that everything is going to change or else. However it happened, it is happening and the phenomenon is no longer local, but national and international. Pick up a newspaper in London, Berlin, Tokyo, New York, or Caracas this week and you will find that half of the news is related to the student revolt.

WE HAVE STIMULATED THE YOUNG TO HOPE FOR THE BEST

While all of this is explosive, it need not be judged as all bad, unless you begin by assuming that all is presently good in the world, and that is a very difficult assumption to make in this city on this day. An atomic bomb is bad if it destroys people, their homes and their cities. But it is possible to control atomic energy and use it to accomplish a whole series of useful tasks.

This, it seems to me, is the opportunity that presently faces us today as we regard the revolt of the younger generation in the university. The world needs energy, imagination, concern, idealism, dedication, commitment, service. The world, with all its problems gets all too little of these great human qualities from the older generation. The world also needs reasonable criticism and peaceful protest as a constant spur to progress and for the re-dress of many horrible inequities and injustices that perdure in the world at its best. The world needs to change its structures too because, obviously, many of them are not producing the climate in which justice is available to all, not to mention opportunity, which is even more important to the young.

The problem is that we have stimulated the young to hope for the best. Twenty years ago, the United Nations proclaimed the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, but it is still only a declaration, not a fact for millions of human beings here and around the world.

Somewhere, somewhere, we have to get the young back into the human family, as a working part of the establishment, if you will. The price for this may well be a different kind of establishment, but that may not be a bad idea either. Perhaps because I have spent all of my adult life in the world of the university it seems to me that here is a good place to begin, for this is where the action presently is. After all, we in the universities have stimulated most of the ideas that set off this youthful explosion. We, better than any other part of the total establishment, should be able to devise the ways and means of involving the young in fruitful rather than destructive uses of their energy and their concern, their idealism and their generosity.

We might begin by devising new structures in the university for the active and meaningful participation of the students in their university life and education. We do this by creating on campus a community in which students have a real and not a phony role. If they are dissatisfied with the education they are now getting, there ought to be ways for them to be heard and to have their ideas seriously considered by the faculty and administration. This does not mean that all their ideas are good or that their desires should always be compelling, and it certainly does not mean that their ideas should be forced through under threat of violence. Rather, there should be a real dialogue which in itself is educative. One bit of advice our active students need to hear from faculty today is that action is most fruitful when

it is backed up, not by emotion, or mass hysteria, or noise, or violence, but by intelligent and competent leadership which is the fruit of a good education that is taken seriously during the years when it is available. Students need to hear that what seems most relevant to them today may be quite irrelevant ten years from now. Students need to hear that action without good ideas and goals and true values is empty posturing, a truly juvenile distraction from doing what is most important to the young: getting a first rate education.

The President of Yale University, Kingman Brewster, put this well:

"The tragedy of the highly-motivated, impatient young activist is that he runs the serious risk of disqualifying himself from true usefulness by being too impatient to arm himself with the intellectual equipment required for the solution of the problems of war and poverty and indignity. You and I have seen too many among our students of high promise squander their talent for a lifetime of constructive work at a high level for the cheaper and transient satisfaction of throwing himself on some immediate barricade in the name of involvement. Posturing in the name of a good cause is too often the substitute for thorough thought or the patient doggedness it takes to build something. . . . The chance to make a constructive difference in the lives of others, not the full dinner pail, is the highest reward of a higher education. If the impatient, anti-intellectualism of the radical left is not to seduce many of our best brains away from true usefulness, we and our faculties have to reassert again and again that emotional oversimplification of the world's problems is not the path to their solution."

I am in complete agreement with President Brewster, but, in defense of youth, we must see their side, too. They can buy this scheme of things if at least we elders really share their concerns, which should also be our concerns, and do something about them ourselves. We have to face head on and to discuss with students their concern for the relevancy of their education, and how we can improve our university structures to make them a more vital part of the learning community—both inside and outside the classroom. We have to give them an alternative to violent and destructive protest by sharing their concern for meaning in life, and by creating with them right now a meaningful community in the university, with all of us working together to establish and maintain worthwhile goals and values, and a vital expression of these in many university activities that are consonant with the university's role as a critic of society and an institution dedicated to the path of wisdom, and the achievement of justice for all, not just the favored few.

I am confident that this can be done if the elders have time for the young and if they both can learn to respect each other, and have greater tolerance for each other, and for the complementary rather than competitive roles that each can play in the university community. Students who like to learn by doing should give their elders credit for having learned something by what they have done, and it is not all bad. The Peace Corps, the poverty program, the teacher corps, VISTA, new civil rights legislation, the disarmament treaty, tutoring programs in the inner city, the conquest of hunger—all these were devised and launched by the elders, even though most of these programs were given new life and brighter spirit by the young. There can be many more such developments, and they will all make for better education and better community of life in the university. It is always better to revitalize a basically good system than to destroy it violently while having nothing with which to replace it. And, if that is true of our universities, it is even more true of

our families, of our cities, of our nation and our world.

LAUGHTER AND LOVE

The whole point of my remarks today is that the young can and should contribute to man's perennial task of remaking the world, especially since they are half of the world that needs remaking. Neither half, young or old, can do it alone. We elders may at times grow restive at their prodding, protest, and revolt, and they may find us impossibly slow when we do not think we can remake anything by tomorrow morning, with or without their help. It is likely that history will repeat itself and the gap between the generations will never be completely bridged by understanding, but I like to believe that there are other workable bridges, at least more workable than anything in common use today, and their names are laughter and love. Indeed, I can think of no better way of redeeming this tragic world today than by love and laughter. Too many of the young have forgotten how to laugh, and too many of the elders have forgotten how to love. Would not the dark tragedy of our life be lightened if only we could all learn to laugh more easily at ourselves and to love one another. It may sound quixotic, but I think this says a lot about the generation gap—how to understand it and how to cure it while we still have time.

**ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS
ENDORSES H.R. 10618**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the 1965 amendments to the immigration law became effective, there has been a decline in immigration from Ireland. Although visas are currently available in Ireland, some provisions of law make it difficult for the Irish to qualify for immigrant visas.

I am, and have been, most disturbed by the decline in immigration from Ireland, and I have, therefore, introduced H.R. 10618 to resolve the situation. I am pleased to say that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL), who is also ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee's Immigration Subcommittee, joined me in introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Our bill meets the need as it exists today—a need to keep the avenues of immigration to the United States open and thus bridge the gap until intending Irish immigrants will be able to meet the criteria for all immigrants, no matter from where they come.

H.R. 10618 proposes that unused visa numbers from fiscal year 1968 be returned to those countries which were unable to make use of them because of the new strict requirements in the law. Applicants for such visas will not be subject to the restrictive labor certification and system of preferences.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians has studied the provisions of H.R. 10618 and has endorsed it, and I submit a letter from the national president of the organization, Mr. Michael L. Delahunty, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN
AMERICA, INC.

July 11, 1969.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 1, 1969, and I sincerely apologize for the delay in not informing you that the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Inc. has endorsed Bill H.R. 10618.

The reason for the delay in not advising you earlier of our decision, was to check the attitude to the Bill throughout the country, and we can honestly say that we have found no adverse reaction.

I might mention that our National Chairman of Immigration, J. Frank O'Connor, was supposed to advise you of the aforementioned decision, however, I believe his delay in not bringing this matter to your attention was simply a question of finding an opportune moment to meet with you to discuss the Bill in detail, since he would like to see the period extended from two (2) years to at least three (3) or four (4) years, and the quota cumulative.

On behalf of our Organization and Ladies Auxiliary, I wish to thank both Congressman William Cahill and yourself for introducing this legislation. Let's look forward to the hearings and having the Bill out of Committee and on to the floor of the House.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL L. DELAHUNTY,
National President.

THE COMING GUERRILLA WAR

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in March, Alan Stang issued a report on an investigative trip to New Mexico, where he covered the trial of Reies Tijerina. Entitled "The Coming Guerrilla War," the report appears to be quite factual and contains some interesting information.

The author of the report, Mr. Alan Stang, is a former business editor for Prentice-Hall, Inc., and has been a television writer, producer, and consultant, and has written some bestsellers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Stang's report in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention to the reference made in the report to one Carlos Cansino, in these words:

At about the time of the famous guerrilla raid on the Courthouse, a revolutionary outfit called Brown Berets was formed among Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. Some time afterward, Carlos Cansino, who apparently came from San Antonio, established the Brown Berets in Albuquerque. He lived at 2801 Socorro, N.W., and drove a 1968 Ford Falcon, light blue in color, bearing 1968 New Mexico license plate 2-94567. It almost goes without saying that Cansino worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity and, while in Albuquerque, for the New Mexico State Welfare Department as a case worker. He also worked with *La Verdadera Asociacion de los Durantes*, helping the members collect donations for the needy, but left town after about two years, when some money turned up missing. He apparently went to Wisconsin, and at last word is now back in San Antonio.

From OEO sources, it is learned that upon his return to the city, Cansino

managed to get himself employed in one of San Antonio's OEO's projects, at \$700 per month. After considerable revolutionary agitation and hate-filled speeches, according to a San Antonio report, he was dismissed from OEO. The dismissal was vigorously protested by the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that "a new broom sweeps cleaner." With that in mind, let us hope that under new management the Office of Economic Opportunity will apply that broom to the Brown Berets, the Black Panthers, and any other agitators and revolutionaries who are found to be on the payroll of the OEO and who are not doing the job they are hired to do. From a variety of reports, there appears to be a considerable number in this category.

It follows:

THE COMING GUERRILLA WAR

Friday, the thirteenth, is said to be unlucky. And it is. On Friday, December 13, 1968, a jury in Albuquerque acquitted Castroite terrorist Reies Tijerina of kidnapping, false imprisonment, and assault on a jail—crimes committed when he led an armed guerrilla raid against the Rio Arriba County Courthouse on June 5, 1967. (See American Opinion, October, 1967.)

"I saw you, Reies Tijerina, at the side of the booth, with a pistol in your right hand, pointing it toward an office or door behind the phone booth," reporter Larry Calloway testified at the trial.

E. R. Gleasner, an Albuquerque real estate man, testified that Tijerina clubbed him on the head with a rifle butt.

Undersheriff Dan Rivera testified that Juan Valdez, a Tijerinista, pistol-whipped him in the jury room in Tijerina's presence.

"After a few minutes," Deputy Sheriff Pete Jaramillo told the jury, "Tijerina came up from behind me and stuck a gun in my ribs."

"Where's Sanchez?" he asked me. "Tell me where the ——— is or I'll kill you."

And Jaramillo also testified that one of Tijerina's raiders later told another: "Get some wire. . . . Reies has ordered us to take some hostages."

Witness after witness testified that Castroite leader Tijerina was at the Courthouse; that he led the guerrilla raid; that he had a gun and hit somebody; and, that he kidnapped two of the hostages he held in the Courthouse. For more than a month the trial went on. Then, after less than four hours of deliberation, the jury turned him loose. The verdict came "as a complete shock—and I guess I'm still in shock," says attorney Jack L. Love, one of the prosecutors (Ed Meagher, Los Angeles Times, December 15, 1968). "Never can I remember so completely misreading what the mood of a jury seemed to be."

Maybe Friday, the thirteenth, had nothing to do with it. An aura of violence surrounded the trial. Eulogio Salazar had been murdered before it. In a preliminary hearing, after all, he had testified that Reies Tijerina had shot him in the face. The star witness was simply beaten to death and shot in the head. As State Police Captain T. J. Chavez told the New York Times after the killing, "The people in that area . . . know pretty well now that some of these people can get to them." And, Reies reminded U.P.I. on the day of the killing: "Salazar was the only witness against me." So overt was the intimidation that Mrs. Dolores Romero, another prosecution witness who nailed Tijerina, was insulted, or threatened, or both, during the trial—right in the courtroom, by someone in the audience.

Maybe the jury got the message.

Indeed, maybe Judge Paul Larrazolo got

the message too. In his instructions to the jury, he said as follows:

"The court instructs the jury that anyone, including a state police officer, who intentionally interferes with a lawful attempt to make a citizen's arrest does so at his own peril, since the arresting citizens are entitled under the law to use whatever force is reasonably necessary to effect said citizen's arrest and to use whatever force is reasonably necessary to defend themselves in the process of making said citizen's arrest. (Emphasis added.)"

And this lends validity to Tijerina's argument that he and his troops went to the Courthouse to make a citizen's arrest of District Attorney Alfonso G. Sanchez. That's right, the District Attorney. Indeed, it creates the impression, does it not, that it was perfectly all right when the Castroite raiders shot and critically wounded New Mexico State Police Officer Nick Salz, after ordering him to surrender his sidearm.

The concept of "citizen's arrest" makes sense only in the absence of a police officer. Since the police naturally cannot be everywhere—and should not be—it follows that crimes will often be committed where an officer is unavailable, in which case a citizen may make an arrest. But if an officer is available, a "citizen's arrest" becomes unnecessary. If an arrest should be made, the officer will make it. Now, however, at least according to Judge Larrazolo, a guerrilla-style mob apparently may make an "arrest" not only in a police officer's presence, but against his orders. Indeed, a gang apparently may occupy a government building, announce the "arrest" of various officials—Judge Larrazolo, for instance—and if a police officer "interferes," it would be his own fault if he is hurt; which will come in very handy to the Marxist terrorists now operating openly in our streets.

In fact, if the mob happens to be a "lynch mob," bent on a lynching, it now conceivably could overrule a protesting police officer with the claim that it is making an "arrest."

Ed Meagher reports (Los Angeles Times, December 5, 1968) that, only a few days earlier, Judge Larrazolo said he might change his mind, "but I don't now think there is any legitimacy to their citizen's arrest, from what I've heard so far." Apparently, what he heard later did the trick.

Whether or not it means anything, I don't know, but Judge Larrazolo is a member of the Albuquerque affiliate of the Far Left's notorious Council on Foreign Relations.

As I sat in on the trial, the courtroom was full of Tijerinistas, who day in and day out apparently had nothing else to do. Once, just before a session, they passed the *Daily World* along a front row. The *Daily World* is published by the Communist Party. Directly in front of me was Patricia Bell, who has been writing Tijerina's appeals for funds, and at the same time was Santa Fe correspondent for the Communist *World* when it was called *The Worker*. Behind me, believe it or not, was an agent Tijerina had placed there to hear any secrets I might spill. Reies apparently still recalled my articles about him, and our earlier run-in on the Joe Pyne show. Reies' agent looked extraordinarily like Manolete, the bullfighter killed in Ronda in Spain, in 1947—a resemblance, which in that audience made him strangely out of place. He leaned forward as one of the ladies with me discussed potato salad with another.

Now Tijerina knows!

On the other side of the rail sat Tijerina's attorneys. They included Beverly Axelrod, a conspirator and former fiancée of Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the Communist Black Panther Party and a fugitive from justice. In *Color, Communism And Common Sense*, former top Communist Manning Johnson described how the Comrades assign white women to blacks they are try-

ing to recruit—which perfectly reveals Communist racism. Of course, now that he is recruited, Comrade Cleaver has a proper black wife. Imagine a Master Racist like Eldridge married to a honky like Beverly. What would Fuhrer Stokely say?

Apparently, Eldridge had too often kept her busy quite late. The bags under Beverly's eyes could hold her briefs.

Then there was Reies' attorney John Thorne, of San Jose, California, and of the American Civil Liberties Union—preeminently founded by Harry F. Ward, one of the top Communists in the United States.

And there was Reies' man William L. Higgs, who has also represented agitator James Meredith, and who entered the courtroom shirt unbuttoned and tie askew, his clothes literally streaked with dirt. He's not all bad, though. In the courtroom, he was very cordial to the boys under sixteen. In 1963, "civil rights attorney" Higgs was convicted of sexually abusing a minor male, and disbarred in Mississippi, where he lived.

Higgs, by the way, is white and a gringo. So is Thorne, and, of course, Beverly. But Judge Larrazolo is a Latin, as are District Attorney Sanchez and Assistant District Attorney E. E. Chavez—which adds more farce to Tijerina's claim that the gringo in New Mexico is denying the Latin his rights.

Indeed, the victorious Tijerina was later quoted (*New York Times*, December 22, 1968) as follows: "The cricket had no chance against the lion, so he jumped into the lion's ear and tickled him to death. That's what we're going to do to the United States—we're going to tickle him to death."

Could anything be clearer? The State of New Mexico gave Reies a trial costing about \$150,000 and did everything possible to protect his rights; but, he says he is trying to destroy the United States.

It sets the stage.

While the preparation continues.

BROWN BERETS READY FOR ACTION

At about the time of the famous guerrilla raid on the Courthouse, a revolutionary outfit called the Brown Berets was formed among Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. Some time afterward, Carlos Cansino, who apparently came from San Antonio, established the Brown Berets in Albuquerque. He lived at 2801 Socorro, N.W., and drove a 1968 Ford Falcon, light blue in color, bearing 1968 New Mexico license plate 2-94567. It almost goes without saying that Cansino worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity and, while in Albuquerque, for the New Mexico State Welfare Department as a case worker. He also worked with *La Verdad* *Asociación de los Durantes*, helping the members collect donations for the needy, but left town after about two years, when some money turned up missing. He apparently went to Wisconsin, and at last word is now back in San Antonio.

Another founder of this paramilitary group in Albuquerque is Maria Varela, of 1307½ Marble, N.W. She was born on January 1, 1940, in York, Pennsylvania, and attended Malverno College in Wisconsin, majoring in Speech and minoring in English and Art. She is a professional photographer. It goes without saying that Maria is a "civil rights worker": On June 29, 1965, she was arrested by the Jackson, Mississippi, Police Department for parading without a permit and resisting arrest. She has also participated in the Communist-backed harassment of grape pickers in Delano, California, directed by her good friend, Marxist Cesar Chavez. And during the 1968 campaign Maria worked as a Kelly Girl at Republican headquarters in Albuquerque, leaving with the intention of going to Mexico City to enliven the riots during the Olympics.

Miss Varela is a close associate of Castroite terrorist Reies Tijerina.

Then there is Gilberto Ballejos, also known as Gilbert Vallejos, of 1313 Marble, N.W., who

apparently took over the paramilitary Brown Berets in Albuquerque when Cansino left. American Opinion readers will remember him (March, 1968) as the same Gilberto Ballejos who bought and paid for the manufacture of bumper stickers praising Communist terrorist "Che" Guevara, while working for the local Office of Economic Opportunity affiliate. Gilberto left that job soon after American Opinion blew the whistle, and at last word is still out of honest work—devoting himself to the Revolution.

Brown Beret leader Ballejos is approximately thirty-two, and was born in Mountainair, New Mexico, where his mother, Cruzita, teaches school. His brother is Fred Ballejos, a graduate of Denver University now living in California. Gilberto attended the University of New Mexico for one year, and then a university in Washington, D.C., on a scholarship. About three years ago, he returned to Albuquerque, and went back to school majoring in Sociology.

While in Washington, he married—*Caramba*—Sandra, an Anglo. In fact, some of Gilberto's best friends are gringos.

The point is that the system apparently has been good to revolutionary Brown Beret leader Gilberto Ballejos. He isn't exactly an "oppressed toiler."

But he is a member of Reies Tijerina's *Alianza Federal de Mercedes*, also known as the Confederation of Free City States.

In a manifesto published by the Brown Berets at 318 North Soto, Los Angeles, California, we learn that these revolutionaries have a list of ten demands, one of which is the Communist-supported Civilian Police Review Board scheme, "to screen all police officers, before they are assigned to our communities."

The police are the enemy!

And there is a motto, "To Serve, Observe and Protect"; to serve with "vocal as well as physical support"; to observe with "a watchful eye," especially on law enforcement agencies; and to protect "by all means necessary. How far we must go in order to protect these rights is dependent upon those in power. If those Anglos in power are willing to do this in a peaceful and orderly process, then we will be only too happy to accept this way. Otherwise we will be forced to other alternatives."

David Sanchez is "chairman" of the Los Angeles Brown Berets, and the April 1968, issue of *El Gallo*—published by Marxist conspirator Rudolpho "Corky" Gonzales, who advocates violent revolution—says Sanchez has a great deal of respect for the heroes of many young Latin intellectuals. Che Guevara and Fidel Castro. The Berets' uniform of jaunty beret and washed-out Army fatigue jacket is an obvious takeoff on Che and Fidel.

Indeed, says John Bryan in the same story:

"Many of the policies of the Brown Berets are similar to those of the militant Black Panther Party for Self Defense with whom the Brown Berets have just signed an alliance for mutual defense."

"Like the Panthers, they advocate that their community arm itself for defense against the establishment and its police army."

In September of 1968 the Albuquerque Brown Berets* printed a "Proposal for a Training School for Brown Beret Organizers,"

*Others involved in local agitation include attorney William J. Fitzpatrick, of the Legal Aid Society; Richard J. Knott, another attorney; attorney Paul A. Phillips, head of the local American Civil Liberties Union—founded primarily by Communist Harry F. Ward, Gerald Goodman, another attorney; Allen V. Robnett, an electrical engineer at Sandia Corporation, and his wife, Jean; Bainbridge Bunting, a professor of sociology at the University of New Mexico; and Doreen F. Bunting; and Mrs. Helen H. Ellis, Social Consultant of the First Unitarian Church.

who would take a course lasting four to six weeks, five hours a day. We read that nine young people have been selected, who are "life-long victims of racism and oppression and therefore are the most qualified to assist their communities in fighting for change."

"Because of their new awakening to the movement, they are open to self-education and growth of perspective. This is the crucial moment to provide them an opportunity for study and analysis of the society they live in."

The school would be run, says the proposal, by revolutionaries Gilberto Ballejos and Maria Varela. Its staff would include Beverly Axelrod, teaching "Legal rights"; Reies Tijerina for the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; Rudolpho "Corky" Gonzales—the Red-Nosed Mutineer—for "Urban organizing, racism in education, the Chicano and Latin America"; Luis Valdez, who was trained in Red Cuba, for "Nationalism and culture"; Communist Eldridge Cleaver, for "Politics, Black Panther Party"; Castroite David Sanchez, for "History of Brown Berets"; Marxist Cesar Chavez, for "Organizing cooperatives, the campesino [peasant]"; and Maoist Ron Karenga of US, a revolutionary group from Los Angeles, for "Training youth."

In short, the Brown Berets is a racist, Communist-oriented outfit threatening violence. It is tied to Castroite Reies Tijerina, and led by professional revolutionaries, who, like their Communist partners, the Black Panthers, are attacking the police as part of the Communist plan to destroy our country.

REVOLUTIONARIES ATTACK POLICE

As everywhere else, the attack on the police in Albuquerque has many parts. For instance, there is Allen Cooper, a Caucasian about thirty, who claims to have been a founder of the Brown Berets, which Ballejos denies. Cooper is a member of Students for a Democratic Society, the youthful terrorists now doing their best to destroy our universities, and is President of Resistance Rush, located at 9621 Fourth Street, N.W., in Albuquerque. At one time, he was arrested in Caracas for leading violent demonstrations at the American Embassy there, and was expelled from Venezuela shortly thereafter. He went to Mexico City, where he participated in the usual militant, Marxist "student" activity, which led to the murderous Communist violence of the fall of 1968.

Cooper has been working with the Brown Berets and circulating a petition to recall the City Commissioners, in the hope that new Commissioners acceptable to the conspirators could install a "civilian police review board" which would harass the police.

Also part of the plot to handcuff the police by petition is Father Luis Jaramillo, of Old Town parish, and Reverend Titus R. Scholl, also known as Timothy Scholl, of St. Timothy's Lutheran Church, 1028 Tulane Drive, N.E. In 1968, Scholl was active in the Communist-staffed "Poor People's March." He attends Albuquerque City Commission meetings, where he criticizes the police.

These worthies have asked that completed petitions be sent to 119 Sycamore, N.E., the residence of one Katherine K. Hattenbach. Mrs. Hattenbach was born on October 27, 1939, in Maplewood, New Jersey, where she last lived at 476 Walton Road. Her maiden name is Karassik and she is a divorcee at this time. She arrived in New Mexico on or about March 22, 1968.

Mrs. Hattenbach is a graduate of Oberlin College in Ohio, and spent a year in Paris at the Sorbonne. From 1963 to 1966 she worked in Paris as a translator. Then for a year or so she worked in Madrid. She is now employed at the Bernalillo County Medical Center as a secretary to Dr. Ernest Simon, for which she gets \$330 a month from the University of New Mexico.

Why would a woman with such a background work for \$330 a month?

It seems she is close to Ed Vickery, a mili-

tant gringo revolutionist from Los Angeles, who accompanied Reles Tijerina to Washington for the Communist "Poor People's Campaign." Mrs. Hattenbach herself worked on the Campaign, during office hours, to the dismay of Dr. Simon, her boss. Indeed, she apparently has been using office supplies to print and mimeograph material for Tijerina's *Ahanza* and the Brown Berets.

In fact, her assignment in the war on the Albuquerque police is apparently to make available to the Brown Berets all medical reports on patients allegedly injured while being arrested, so that the information can be used in complaints of "police brutality."

Then there is Howard Butler Durham, also known as Jim Durham, of 8408 La Camila Dr., N.E. Mr. Durham is still another gringo, born on August 4, 1925, in Rigby, Idaho. He is a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, and an electrical engineer. He is a member of the Socialist N.A.A.C.P., of the Marxist Americans for Democratic Action, and of the United World Federalists, which is trying to dissolve the United States.

Mr. Durham is also very active in the scheme to impose a "civilian police review board" on the people of Albuquerque. The guidelines for his proposed board include the following: "A name which is not 'loaded' should be selected for the grievance committee (for example, 'Albuquerque Grievance Committee') in order to avoid the kinds of misunderstandings inevitable in the use of the phrase, 'civilian police review board'—care should be exercised not to refer to the grievance committee as the 'civilian police review board.'"

In other words, don't say "civilian police review board," because the idea has been thoroughly discredited throughout the country as a scheme to harass the police. Don't alert the victims in Albuquerque. Call the proposed civilian police review board a "grievance committee."

Mr. Durham works in the Systems Research Department of the Sandia Corporation in Albuquerque, which is vital to the production of our nuclear weapons. He holds a Top Secret clearance.

What it means, I don't yet know, but Gilberto Ballejos has been trying to get various Brown Berets to undergo some sort of sensitivity test at Sandia—the test to be administered by Jim Durham.

There is also a Stephen W. Denlinger, of 3004 Morris, N.E., Apt. 19, who is an instructor at the University of New Mexico's Center for Community Action Services, which naturally is supported with federal funds. His office is located at 2001 Gold, S.E., where the telephone number is 277-5321. His number at home is 299-6120. Mr. Denlinger has been distributing calling cards including both numbers, and stating that anyone brutalized by the police should call him at any time, so that he can immediately photograph the injuries.

And there is Beverly Axelrod, who lives in Espanola, and besides being Tijerina's attorney is editor of *El Grito Del Norte* (The Cry of the North). Every Friday night, the Tijeristas gather at Beverly's, where under her supervision they write various articles about "police brutality" for the next issue of her newspaper.

In her yard, Beverly keeps about six German Shepherds which she claims she has trained as watch dogs. One can't be too careful what with the crime rate these days.

SUPPORT FOR REVOLUTION

Indeed, the web of subversion in Albuquerque contains the usual endless strands. For instance, Henry Munoz, Jr., of Austin, Texas, is Equal Opportunity Director of the Texas A.F.L.-C.I.O. A man named Sherman Miles is also a Union official. On August 24-26, 1968, they stayed in Albuquerque at the Hilton Hotel, where they held several meetings with various Brown Berets. It seems they want

Carlos Cansino to return to Albuquerque, where they believe he can best use his talents as an Organizer. They told Ballejos they would try to arrange it and possibly hire Cansino at about \$12,000 a year; or get him a state or federal job in Albuquerque.

On one occasion, Munoz gave Ballejos \$300. He also mentioned that he might possibly be able to supply the Brown Berets with \$57,000 to train other Organizers.

Then there is Jerome A. Bailey, of 2908 Shirley St., N.E., who is State Representative of the Communications Workers of America, Local 8611, with an office at 2745-F San Mateo Blvd., N.E. Bailey has met with the Brown Berets and invited them to an Organizers' school for six weeks of training he would conduct, during which he would pay each of them thirty dollars a week. During the 1968 election campaign, Mr. Bailey worked for the Democrat Party, and gave the Brown Berets a sizeable supply of campaign material to instruct their "neighbors."

Bailey is also very interested in the Albuquerque City School Commission, which he would like to control. Toward this end he asked the Brown Berets to march on the Excelsior Laundry, which is owned by a member of the Commission.

Bailey is also a close associate of Castroite terrorist Reles Tijerina.

And there is an outfit called the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, which is located in the International Building in San Antonio, Texas, where its telephone number is 224-5476. The Executive Director of M.A.L.D. is Pete Tijerina. I do not know whether he is related to Reles Tijerina. On the Board of Directors are Levi Martinez of Pueblo, Colorado (one of Tijerina's lawyers) and Jack Greenberg, of the Socialist N.A.A.C.P.'s Legal Defense Fund in New York.

It seems that M.A.L.D. has a fund of two million dollars—donated apparently by the Ford Foundation—for use in the defense of Latins in trouble with the law. The establishment of organizations of attorneys to defend captured terrorists is of course a standard Communist technique, the best known example of which at the moment is the Communist National Lawyers Guild.

That the Ford Foundation is involved will not surprise readers of American Opinion. (See November, 1968.) Its President is Marxist conspirator McGeorge Bundy, formerly of the staff of the subversive Council on Foreign Relations. It was the Ford Foundation which financed the "experimental school district" in Brooklyn which almost caused the complete destruction of New York City's educational system in the fall of 1968. And it was the Ford Foundation which in July, 1968, sent \$630,000 for use in agitation among Mexican Americans to the Southwest Council of La Raza, headed by Maclovio R. Barraza—already officially identified by the federal Subversive Activities Control Board as a member of the Communist Party. When testifying about the matter in 1963, Communist Barraza invoked the Fifth Amendment sixty times.

Indeed, on November 6, 1968, Stuart Black, Thomas Wolman, and Norma Bragg flew into Albuquerque on T.W.A. and registered at the White Winrock Motor Hotel. They stayed in rooms 156 and 157, and paid with American Express credit card 040-827-035-3-808. They gave their address as 112 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

While in town the above worthies met with the Brown Berets and said they were employed by an O.E.O. outfit in New York called L.E.A.P. (Lower Eastside Action Project), which, they said, furnishes their credit card. They said that they had already been able to provoke some wonderful trouble in New York—in the schools, for instance, where they got about a thousand students to protest and walk out; and that with the funds they had now they would provoke much more trouble. They said they wanted to establish

communications between revolutionary groups from New York to California, that this was their reason for being in town, and that the Brown Berets had L.E.A.P.'s full support.

They also said that while in Albuquerque they might buy a ranch in the Manzano area belonging to somebody named Armijo; and that if they did it would be used as a hideout by fugitives from New York, after the usual spontaneous riots in that city were arranged.

And they said that they were also getting money from the Ford Foundation.

Fascinating, isn't it? People paid with your tax money, to provoke revolution in New York, turn up provoking revolution in Albuquerque.

They stayed in Albuquerque only one night, leaving via T.W.A. at 2:30 a.m. on November 7, 1968. Their rooms at the motel cost twenty-five dollars each.

Many of us wish we were "poor" enough to afford that.

BASE FOR REVOLUTION

Crucial to all the Communist activity in New Mexico is the famous San Cristobal Valley Ranch, about twenty miles north of Taos, in the heart of the territory Reles Tijerina is terrorizing. Readers will recall (American Opinion, March, 1968) that on March 17, 1950, at a meeting in Denver, the Communist Party decided to run the ranch for its own benefit; that the owner of record is Mrs. Craig Vincent, who previously was married to Henry K. Wells, a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York—for years the most important Communist training school—and that on June 12, 1953, Craig Vincent himself, under oath before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, refused to deny that he and his wife are Communists.

As far as I know, Comrade Vincent is still a member of the board of the Community Action Program in Taos—an O.E.O. agency—happily spending your hard-earned taxes.

His Communist ranch can easily house a few hundred people. In one room alone there are about 150 mattresses and cots. Indeed, Cleofes Vigil, who apparently lives there, says the residents have what they need to go underground for months at a time with no problems whatsoever, and that all vehicles entering the area can easily be seen. What it means, I do not know, but behind one of the cabins on the ranch there is a small building enclosed by barbed wire and bearing a large sign which reads: "Danger—Stay Away."

The informative Señor Vigil is a middle-aged man with a Cuban accent, who apparently finds time to write revolutionary poetry for *El Gallo*, the Marxist newspaper run by Rudolpho Gonzalez, the Red-nosed Mutineer.

Another resident of the ranch is William Longley, also known as Bill Vasquez. His wife is Henrietta Vasquez Tafuya, one-time secretary of the U.S. Attorney in Denver. At last word, he drives a white 1962 Plymouth, registered to Henrietta Tafuya, of 3360 W. Louisiana, in Denver.

Longley is a close associate of Rudolpho's. At meetings in his home with such guests as Reles' brothers, Anselmo and Cristobal, he has laughingly mentioned how amusing it would be if the Kit Carson National Monument were blown up by revolutionaries.

The brothers Tijerina apparently are often at the Communist ranch. So are Rudolpho and his gang from Denver. Vincent has so many friends. Once, for instance, a large group of Mexican nationals met there for two weeks. And Vincent has told the revolutionary Brown Berets to make themselves at home. It seems he "feels sorry" for the Mexican-American people. He says he wants the Brown Berets to meet at his Communist ranch quarterly.

Then there is Phil Reno, of 448 Hermosa Drive, N.E., who works as an economist at

the University of New Mexico. Reno writes extensively on "poverty" in Albuquerque. Recently, for instance, he handed a thirty-page report on the matter to the Albuquerque-Bernalillo Equal Opportunity Board, where Ballejos used to work.

Phil Reno is intimately associated with Comrade Vincent, and has been a Communist for about thirty years.

Among the many other revolutionaries now swarming over the Albuquerque area is Shirley Hill Witt, of 520 Sixteenth St., N.W. Mrs. Witt is a divorcee with two children, and came to Albuquerque, apparently from Ann Arbor, Michigan, on or about August 23, 1967, shortly after the raid on the Tierra Amarilla Courthouse. She is attending the University of New Mexico with a federal grant, and is working for a doctorate in Philosophy and Anthropology.

Since her arrival, Shirley has been a very active member of Tijerina's organization. She is also very interested in Indians, claiming to be part Indian, and is now agitating among the Indians in the Taos Pueblo area.

Then there is Aquiles Trujillo Jr., also known as Joe and as Gil Trujillo, of 300 Conchas, N.E., where his telephone number is 299-9351. He was born on March 3 1932, in Madrid, New Mexico, and is a brother of Brown Beret leader Tony Trujillo. Indeed, he has met many times with the Brown Berets, and is trying to help them in various ways.

He is employed as a Staff Assistant at Sandia Base, where his number is 264-8603. He has a Top Secret clearance.

Tony Trujillo, also known as Tony Garcia and as Albert Trujillo, was also born in Madrid, New Mexico, on February 12, 1936, now lives at 1305 Princeton, N.E., and is known to the F.B.I. as 839-305-A. On October 27, 1968, he was arrested for aggravated assault and given thirty days in jail, and will possibly be returned to the pen for a parole violation.

And there is Wayne G. Andrews and his wife Palmyra, of 140 Pleasant Ave., N.W., where the telephone number is 345-0723. Mr. Andrews works as a draftsman at Flatow, Moore, Bryan & Fairburn, Architects, in the First National Bank Building in Albuquerque. At one time, his wife worked for the O.E.O.

Andrews is a very close associate of Craig Vincent's, and he and his wife have met many times with the Brown Berets.

Also there is Maria Horn, of 315 Sixth St., S.W., Apt. B., who recently was convicted of disorderly conduct after attacking Albuquerque police sergeant Ben Chavez with a beer bottle. She is now working for S.E.R. (Service, Employment, Relocation, another O.E.O. outfit), as a secretary to S.E.R.'s boss, Robert S. Barela. Mrs. Horn is very closely associated with Katherine Hattenbach and Maria Varela.*

REYES WORKS FAST

As for Reyes Lopez Tijerina himself, he has been busily revolting during the past year as you would expect. In the summer of 1968, he was a leader of the Communist "Poor People's March" in Washington, where he stayed at the Embassy Hotel with Higgs, the Mississippi molester. You don't catch a fancy gent like Reyes sleeping in a muddy tent with the rabble. No, sir! And wouldn't you too like to be "poor and oppressed," so you could fly wherever and whenever you liked? For instance, on July 6, 1968, Reyes flew in from Washington with the molester for the weekly meeting of his *Akhanza* at 1010 Third St., N.W., in Albuquerque. Afterward, in private, his brother Cristobal Lopez Tijerina talked about training and arming their followers in the north.

Reyes gave his approval.

"We're going to have to dig up the machine-guns and clean and oil them," said Cristobal. "They've been buried for the past year."

Reyes approved again.

There was also some talk that, two or three days later, some twenty-five South Americans were to be brought to northern New Mexico for demolition and firearms training. Whether or not the training took place at the Communist San Cristobal Valley Ranch, I don't know.

Reyes also reported that one John DePugh was still in Chicago, soliciting money for a revolutionary school among the faculty at the University of Chicago. The school apparently is planned for Albuquerque and ostensibly will be a "vocational workshop."

Tijerina returned to Washington at two a.m. on July 8, 1968.

Along these lines, Reyes has recently formed an outfit called the *Comancheros del Norte*, headed by Pete Archuleta, the purpose of which is to give military training to his young followers in the north. Archuleta lives with Reyes' brother, Anselmo Tijerina. And the *Comancheros* have met several times with the Brown Berets, presumably to coordinate their various activities. On November 10, 1968, for instance, at a meeting in Tierra Amarilla, the speakers included Ballejos, Archuleta, Anselmo Tijerina, and a Gilberto Romero, who apparently advocated violence. Romero has been trying to get his good friend Ballejos to help him start a cell of the Brown Berets in Santa Fe, where he lives at 831 Calle Ninita, and his telephone number is 982-1622.

Gilberto Leandro Romero was born in Santa Fe on April 5, 1942, has a lengthy record and is known to the Albuquerque Police Department as Suspect 40-480.

On the weekend of October 19-20, 1968, Reyes Tijerina held his latest "convention," this time very near the Echo Amphitheater, which probably reminded him of his conviction for having insulted two forest rangers there two years before. Most of the revolutionaries you have been reading about were present of course, and Tijerina and the other speakers as usual denounced the police, calling them names.

Reyes announced that he was running for Governor to take votes away from Democrat Fabian Chavez, and that if the courts removed his name from the ballot, he expected all his followers to vote for Republican Governor David Cargo. You will remember that Mrs. Cargo has been a member of Tijerina's organization and that the Governor has run interference for Tijerina.

Reyes of course has become a hot cargo—red hot.

His real identity remains unknown. You will remember the demonstration, in my earlier article on the affair, that no proof exists that he was born in the United States. Since then, interested police officials in various places and agencies have unsuccessfully asked for help of the U.S. Department of Immigration and Naturalization in this matter. To no avail!

A source close to Tijerina now tells us, however, that in 1961 or 1962, Reyes went to Cuba, where he met with Communist dictator Fidel Castro; and that among other things Reyes says Castro gave him a Chinese manual on guerrilla warfare.

And in January, 1964, Tijerina apparently got in touch with Gordonio Hernandez Monroy of the P.S.M. (*Partido Comunista Mexicano*), who arranged a meeting in Mexico City with other P.C.M. leaders, to whom Tijerina tried to sell the *Akhanza* idea. They didn't buy it.

But Tijerina has been getting money from Mexico which conceivably comes from Cuba, says the source, and has established a Mexican branch of his organization. The plan apparently is to begin guerrilla warfare in New Mexico with the aid of hidden caches of arms, and when necessary to escape into Mexico and make raids on the United States. Whether or not it is the usual bragadocio, I don't know, but Tijerina claims the Mexican Government has promised that it will refuse to extradite him to the United States if the request is made.

He also says that, in the spring of 1969, he and his followers will execute a "mass occupation" of an area in New Mexico called the *San Joaquin del Rio de Chama*, which as you would expect was "ruthlessly stolen" about a hundred years ago from its "rightful owners," the "Indo-Hispanos" (don't ask me). And he has entered into a federal suit against the local boards of education, charging "discrimination" against the "Indo-Hispanos."

As far back as May and July, 1949, in "The Plight and Struggles of the Mexican-Americans," the official Communist magazine *Political Affairs* was laying down the line:

"The special historical development of the Mexican people in the United States as a conquered people, victim of American imperialist expansion, with close ties to Latin America, requires a new and special approach of our Party to the Mexican problem."

And in 1954, reformed Communist Louis Budenz, once Managing Editor of the *Daily Worker*, wrote as follows in *The Techniques of Communism*:

"At the Fourteenth National Convention of the Communist Party, held in 1948, the Mexican-Americans came in for special consideration. Here, again, the Soviet fifth column adopted an attitude which was designed to promote conflict in the United States and to make the Mexican-American issue one that could promote Communist agitation in Latin America against the United States." (Page 272.)

The Communists apparently have realized that there just aren't enough black people in the vast American Southwest who could be bribed, terrorized, killed and conned, as usual, into serving as the cannon fodder necessary to the creation of Communist revolution in the area. That is why the area until now has been so calm. But the plan is to use the large minority of Americans which is there—Americans of Latin descent; there are four or five millions of them throughout the Southwest—and to join that campaign, to the dismay of many of Tijerina's former followers, to the war the Communists are fighting in the rest of the country against American blacks.

As I write, a change in the revolutionary leadership is being made. Gilberto Ballejos apparently is out. It seems he has an insensitive and mercurial personality, and has been cancelling and rescheduling meetings with very short notice. Why waste your time, Gilberto? We are always there.

And at a meeting in Denver on July 18, 1968, several conspirators discussed the possibility of ousting Reyes Tijerina and merging his organization with the Crusade for Justice run by their boss—Rudolpho Gonzales, the Red-Nosed Mutineer. The plan included the appointment of Cristobal and Anselmo Tijerina to important positions in New Mexico.

But whoever runs it, it is going on. New Mexico is now beginning to experience the state of terror which the Communists have imposed on Vietnam—and on New York. In northern New Mexico, for instance, people are getting "assessment notices" from Tijerina's Confederation of Free City States, demanding three dollars per month, per household—whether or not they have ever belonged to his organization. The only qualification, apparently, is that one be Latin in origin. If the "assessment" isn't paid within ten days, the delinquent gets another notice, warning of a visit by El Mano Negro—the Black Hand, to you gringos.

And this of course is one of the same techniques the Communists have used to capture country after country; levying "taxes," not just because they want the money, but to create the impression that they are the legitimate government. The Communist Vietcong are doing that right now in South Vietnam, aren't they? You may even read that in your newspaper—which is the last to know.

Along these lines, in Canjilon, one of Tijerina's headquarters, where the raid on

the neighboring Tierra Amarilla Courthouse was planned, U.S. Forest Rangers John Drake and John Hayden have both been threatened. Reliable witnesses have heard machine-gun fire, from the home of Juan Valdez, for instance. New Mexico State Police Officer Nick Saiz says it was Juan who shot him at the Courthouse.

Jaun probably just "doesn't know" it is illegal to own a machine-gun. Maybe some advocate of confiscatory firearms legislation could explain it to him.

And on July 15, 1968, in the woods around Canjilon, an observer spotted two hairy, bearded white men, wearing combat boots and army fatigues, and armed with what appeared to be M-1 or M-2 carbines with thirty-shot clips. If I remember correctly, that's illegal too. The men also wore belt cases for fifteen-shot clips.

Indeed, in Albuquerque itself, in the South Valley, Tijeristas have actually been going from door to door to terrorize Latins. As everywhere else—as in Cuba, Algeria and China, and Harlem—the people the Communists are making suffer most, are the very people the Communists claim are demanding "independence" as the solution to their suffering.

In one case, a terrorist appeared at an Anglo home, presumably believing it was Latin, asked the lady of the house, through the screen door, what she thinks of Tijerina, and when she was less than enthusiastic asked what her horses are worth, whether she owns guns, and when her husband is home—and accused her of "racial prejudice" when she refused to answer.

Don't you know we don't need you people and there are enough of us to fill your jobs? he said. Don't you realize we could tie up this town and stop you from getting everything you need? "We can torch this town," he said.

He also tried to force his way into the house, but reconsidered when she showed him the muzzle of her gun.

We wouldn't let her do that in New York! Certainly one of the saddest aspects of this calculated terror is the fact that among the young men recruited into the revolutionary Brown Berets—as in Cuba, Algeria, China and Harlem—are victims who really believe, at least at first, that Tijerina is trying to do good. Hopefully, someone can get to them before they ruin their lives.

So there it is. Incredible though it may be—and it is incredible—a Castroite guerrilla war is being arranged for the American Southwest. Reles Tijerina, or whoever it is who gives the orders, may already have selected a day this spring or summer as *Der Tag*.

Only the people of New Mexico—regardless of origin—can stop it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, three American astronauts are today streaking toward the moon to attempt man's first landing. The plaque they will leave behind says, "We came in peace for all mankind."

Those brief words say more about America's goals and objectives in space and on earth than all the books and speeches ever written.

This week commemorates another Captive Nations Week. The very thought of men and women and children held in perpetual bondage by an alien system is

repugnant to people who wish to be free to think for themselves. The terrorism that is so characteristic of totalitarian regimes has no place on this earth. The very idea of enslaving whole peoples and whole nations behind a wall of silence and injustice belongs to the dark ages of man's past. It has no place in this age of exploration, discovery, and universal rejoicing over man's accomplishments and achievements.

One of our astronauts once described earth as "an oasis in the vastness of space." Unless men begin to treat this planet and all those who inhabit it with the reverence they deserve as fellow human beings, none of us will long survive.

With God's help, man will set foot on the moon within 4 days from now. Let us all sincerely pray that this greatest of all man's adventures will signal the start of a world where justice and tranquillity and human dignity are nourished and perpetuated for all time. A world where all people may be free and a world where nations like America will not have to observe a Captive Nation Week because the nations now held in Communist bondage will again be free as members of the world community.

GOLDA MEIR STANDS FIRM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tense situation which exists today in the Middle East; a situation which is constantly aggravated by the murderous acts of Arab marauders and by the continued refusal of the Arab governments to conduct face-to-face negotiations with the State of Israel.

While these wanton acts of Arab aggression continue, the four powers are involved in what may be an attempt to impose a settlement upon the Israelis and the Arabs. Israel bitterly opposes such a settlement, to the utter consternation of the rest of the world.

Is this, Mr. Speaker, merely an act of intransigence, or is it simply common-sense? Let us deal more fully with this matter.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the third verse of the 30th chapter in the Book of Numbers which states:

If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not violate his word, but he shall do according to all that goeth forth from his mouth.

Since 1938, the world community has sworn many oaths to the Jewish people and to the State of Israel; as of today, not one has gone inviolate. In 1938, Adolf Hitler vowed to the British that Czechoslovakia would be his last conquest; by 1945, 6 million Jewish souls had been turned to soap and ashes.

In 1948, the United Nations called upon Jordan to allow the members of the Jewish faith free access to the Old City of Jerusalem; yet until 1967, no

Jew, regardless of whether he were an Israeli citizen or an American in uniform, was permitted to set foot in the Holy City.

In 1957, the United Nations swore to maintain Middle Eastern peace through the use of its Emergency Force; in 1967, however, the world body reneged on its vow and meekly removed its forces at the insistence of President Nasser, thus leaving Israel at the mercy of her warlike neighbors.

Also in 1967, Israel watched in horror as the major maritime nations, who had previously vowed that free access and use of the Straits of Tiran were to be guaranteed to all nations, stood silent and inactive as Egypt closed that waterway to the ships of Israel.

The nations of the world, Mr. Speaker, have consistently "sworn an oath to bind their souls with a bond" in regard to Israel; and they have all too willingly and all too quickly violated their word. Can Israel now rightfully be assailed for refusing to accept the solemn vows of the four powers? Should she truly trust the words of the Soviet Union, a nation which professes, in its constitution, to grant freedom to all of its minorities, but which mercilessly and without cause persecutes its Jewish citizens?

Should she trust France, a nation which took her money but which refuses to furnish the arms which were purchased with that money?

Israel has fought three wars to maintain her independence and her very existence. We have no right, Mr. Speaker, to expect such a valiant people to stand idly by and watch as the four powers attempt to bargain away her hard won freedom.

Only by a face-to-face meeting between Israel and her Arab neighbors, the only just and righteous course, can peace finally be achieved. We must, Mr. Speaker, redouble our efforts to bring this about.

In an address before the Israel Parliament on June 30, 1969, the Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, dealt with the very subjects of the four power talks and of Arab terrorist activities. Under unanimous consent, I submit excerpts from that statement for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR IN THE KNESSET (PARLIAMENT), JUNE 30, 1969

1. ISRAEL'S POLICY TOWARDS CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

Ever since the opening of the Knesset's (Parliament) summer session on 5 May, belligerence along the cease-fire lines has increased in severity. Thousands of shells have been lobbed across the lines at the Israel Defense Forces positions and posts, as well as at peaceful villages and farmers working in the fields. There can be no doubt as to who initiated the firing. Witness thereto are the reports of the U.N. observers along the Suez Canal, who have determined the true facts. The President of Egypt admits it in his own declarations. The Prime Minister of Jordan proclaims his identification with Fatah and its actions. The actions of the Egyptian and Jordanian arms along the cease-fire lines are tantamount to a de facto cancellation of the cease-fire arrangements.

The frivolity of the authorities responsible for the violations of the cease-fire has resulted in the need for tens of thousands of

people to evacuate the firing zones, not only in the Suez Canal area but also east of the River Jordan. We regret the suffering caused to peaceful residents and we should be glad to see them return to work their fields. We should be happy if conditions were to be created which would enable farmers from both banks of the river to do their work in peace.

Israel, for instance, is well aware of the value and the blessing of water for development and growth, and I declare herewith that Israel has decided not to interfere with repair works of the Ghor Canal in Jordan, on the assumption that the Jordanian authorities will take effective measures which will stop their army and the Fatah in the region, as in other regions, from continuing to shell our villages and from infiltrating into our territory for the purpose of mine-laying and murder.

Israel has never initiated nor will she ever in future initiate fire if peace will be kept and if no attacks or shellings on our villages will be waged. I shall not go into the details of a series of actions taken in self-defense by the Israel Defense Forces with the purpose of silencing the sources of fire and shelling in the vicinity of the cease-fire lines and even at some depth from them. As I said on 5 May 1969, we shall act along the cease-fire lines on the basis of reciprocity. Anybody who fails to honor the cease-fire agreement and shoots at us cannot claim impunity from the results of his aggression. Those who attack us should not be surprised if they are hit sevenfold in response, since our main purpose in retaliating is self-defense and deterrence. Once again I wish to declare that Israel desires that the cease-fire arrangements be complied with fully, but he who violates them should not expect Israel to stand by idly.

2. THE IMPACT OF THE FOUR-POWER TALKS

It is impossible not to note the fact that the method of violating the cease-fire arrangements has grown in intensity and severity at the very time when the Four Power talks were being held. It is also impossible not to reach the conclusion that the rulers of the Arab States see in the Four Power talks an opportunity, nay, even a backing for ever growing belligerence. We are strengthened in our opinion that the rulers of the Arab States are encouraged by the hope that, in as much as they persist in their belligerence during the Four Power talks, even if they achieve no real military purpose thereby, they stand a chance of being the gainers politically.

I wish to re-emphasize that we are not accusing the United States and Great Britain, nor France, of the intention to aid or abet military aggression against Israel, but it is our duty to acquaint them with the results to which we are witness in reality: the Four Power talks have not brought about any détente nor the curbing of belligerence; they have not led to a more restrained and responsible attitude by the Arab States, nor have they promoted the creation of a climate of peace. The Powers' intervention is being construed by the Arab States as acquiescence to their refusal to open negotiations with Israel, and possibly even as a justification of this refusal.

Of a surety, the Four Powers which have undertaken to discuss the destinies of the Middle East are not of one piece and should not be treated as such, for each one of them has its specific attitude towards the State of Israel and to the problems of the Middle East.

The attitudes of countries, even though they be friendly towards each other, do not tally, but a distinction must be drawn between debate and the hostility which characterizes the policy of the U.S.S.R. towards the State of Israel. It is a fact that this Power undertook to represent the dangerous

policy of the most extremist elements within the Arab States.

3. THE SOVIET POLITICAL TACTIC

Israel's attitude throughout the years has been to encourage any move designed to ease tension in the world, and to welcome colloquy between the Powers aimed at peace. Our attitude all the years has been that it were better for our region not to become an arena for rivalry between the Powers, and as long as there was no identification of the Soviet Union with Nasserism, we hoped that colloquy with her on regional matters might make it easier to find a peaceful solution. But in view of the Soviet Union's recent policy, and recalling that her dangerous moves in the months of May and June 1967 kindled a conflagration in our region, we ask: what sign is there and what is the foundation for hoping that there exists a basis for colloquy with her on problems of the Middle East, which would take into account the requirements of the existence and development of Israel? What use can there be in attempts to reach conciliatory formulas and definitions with representatives of the Soviet Union, when there is no agreed common basis concerning Israel's right to attain such a peace, the content and pattern of which are customary and prevalent between nations and countries? Even if joint formulas are arrived at, what is their real worth when their basic content is not agreed upon?

On the eve of the Soviet Foreign Minister's recent visit to Egypt, somebody took the trouble to create the impression that there had been beneficial progress in the Soviet attitude towards the region's problems and concerning Israel's rights. Various publications set out to explain that Mr. Gromyko had gone to Egypt to secure Nasser's agreement to a moderate stand which the Soviet Union was about to propose to the U.S. We had no faith in these hopes, and indeed, after Gromyko's return from Egypt, we learn from those same journals that Gromyko has not secured Nasser's agreement to his proposals. Furthermore, from the joint communiqué issued by Gromyko and Nasser and from the Soviet declarations following the visit, we learn that despite their talks with U.S. representatives, the Soviets have become more accustomed to Nasser's stand than before the Four Power talks. Soviet policy—as heretofore—continues to subvert the Egyptian attitude, and the “progress” of which we were advised was as nought.

Let us hope that this experience will help in dispelling faith in baseless substitutes, and will acquaint political factors of the true situation. The tactics of Soviet diplomacy in serving the Arab States are not aimed at securing peace. The demarches of Soviet diplomacy are aimed at extricating the Arab leaders from peace negotiations, at creating as wide a gap as possible between the U.S. and Israel, and in the main, at regaining for the Arab rulers the losses sustained by them owing to their own belligerence, without their being obligated to make peace. And whilst diplomatic efforts persist, there is continued Soviet assistance for the military strengthening of Egypt, in arms, in training and in planning.

4. ISRAEL'S PRINCIPAL VIEW ON FOUR POWER INVOLVEMENT

There are those who complain of Israel's intransigence, and quote as an example our attitude to the Big Four talks. It would be a fatal error to try to explain Israel's stand in psychological terms such as stubbornness, suspicion and the like, whilst disregarding our balanced attitude, both in principle and in practice.

In principle, we do not hold with a situation whereby Powers arrogate to themselves the right to discuss the destinies of nations and countries, without the participation of those concerned, and in lieu of immediate colloquy between the nations themselves.

From the political and practical point of view—we cannot but react negatively to the discussions of Powers concerning our destiny, while we are fully aware that one of them is engaged in a trend hostile to us, as the outspoken representative of the Arab States, the rationale of the discussions being that the representatives of the other countries should try to reach a compromise with this Power.

5. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISRAEL-ADMINISTERED AREAS

Two years have passed since we have established Israeli rule throughout the cease-fire territories. Within a few days after the fighting stopped, we succeeded in restoring normal life to the new areas. This was rendered possible, of course, not only due to the abilities of the Israel Defense Forces, nor owing to a correct policy, but thanks to the fact that the population of the areas, with few exceptions, has abstained from aiding sabotage operations of the terrorist organizations and other irresponsible elements.

We have made it a line of our policy to have the inhabitants of the new areas administer their civil life themselves and, as far as possible, without the intervention of the military governments. In spite of the heavier burden this imposed upon the security forces, we have chosen not to disrupt the ties between the population of Judea and Samaria and their relatives and fellow Arabs in Jordan. We have done a good deal for the economic advancement of these areas. For instance: the Ministry of Agriculture, by means of local staffs from these areas, has initiated widespread operations in Judea, Samaria and in Gaza for the advancement of agriculture. My means of “field-days” and various training operations the acreage under cultivation has been considerably increased. Tobacco plots in Judea and Samaria, for instance, have grown in size from 15,000 dunam to 18,000 dunam (4,500 acres); citrus plantations have been sprayed with insecticide; cattle have been immunized and branded; successful operations have been carried out for the immunization of all poultry against disease, and indeed, poultry mortality, which two years ago exceeded a rate of 60 per cent, has been radically reduced. In the Gaza Strip manifold actions have been taken to advance local citriculture. Citrus exports are now carried out most efficiently thanks to mechanized packing plants set up for the first time in this area. Wage levels, standards of sanitation and transportation, as well as the employment situation, have of late shown improvements.

I am happy to point out that in the field of education, tuition during the second school year proceeds according to full normal routine—of course, without our interference in school curricula.

It is perfectly obvious to us that the Government of Israel is the only government in existence and in operation in the areas and must, therefore, shoulder the responsibility for the supply of services to the population—primarily, sources of livelihood. The ministerial committee for the administered areas is making progress in formulating agreed rules for increasing employment for the jobless, primarily within the areas proper.

Exemplary action has been taken amidst the Sinai Bedouin in all matters concerning their education and public health.

In spite of hesitations, we have decided again this year to enable Arabs who are foreign citizens to spend their vacations with their relatives in Judea and Samaria. Their sojourn in areas under Israeli administration will show them the extent of the distortions spread abroad about Israel and they will find out for themselves what abyss yawns between the lies and factual reality.

In general, it is our intention to persist in this balanced policy as long as security considerations will not oblige us to alter it.

Moreover, we have no reason to alter what we have laid down in the basic principles of the government:

"Israel will persist in her readiness to conduct negotiations—without prior conditions by any party—with every one of her neighbors, for the purpose of concluding a peace treaty. In the absence of peace treaties, Israel will continue to maintain fully the state of affairs as determined with the cease fire, and will fortify her position, with due consideration for the vital needs of her security and development."

We are fully determined to pursue this policy, in its security and in its constructive significance, both *de jure* and *de facto*.

6. ISRAEL-UNITED STATES DIALOG

I have already informed the public that I have received an invitation from the President of the United States, Mr. Richard Nixon, to meet him for talks in the White House. The date of the visit has not yet been fixed. I was happy to accept this invitation, not only for the opportunity it affords to establish contact with the President of the greatest Power on earth, but—no less important—for the precious occasion it affords to meet an old friend of the State of Israel. In view of the situation in the Middle East and of Israel's vital needs, the Government of Israel attaches great value to this friendly dialogue on problems shared by Israel and the U.S. I do hope that these debates will promote the fortifying of Israel and will advance the cause of peace in the Middle East.

7. ISRAEL HAS THE CAPACITY TO STAND FIRM UNTIL PEACE

I reject any fatalistic approach to the region's affairs. The situation in our region does not lack a remedy nor is it intractable of a solution.

Responsible political factors, friendly factors, can help in remedying the situation.

Governments desirous of advancing peace and security can influence the Arab leaders to forego the hopes for solution by means of a military decision, and to turn towards a solution by means of peace, colloquy, agreement—to encourage the heads of the Arab States to agree to meeting with Israel and to negotiate with her, with due respect and equality of values and a mutual regard for the future of all the region's nations. The forgers of public opinion can assist by casting a true light on the situation in our region, which would not permit forgetting the fear of the danger facing Israel all the years up to the climax of May 1967, would not distort Israel's desire for peace, and would not cover up for belligerent trends against Israel.

Anyone favoring the advancement of peace in the region will not deny Israel the right to acquire the conditions and weapons requisite for her defense, for strengthening her defensive-deterrent power. There is no better guarantee for the protection of Israel and of peace as well. For only if those who wish us evil despair of the hope for a solution by means of violence and our destruction, only then will the beacons of peace be kindled.

Enemies who look forward to our failure comfort themselves with the hope that Israel will not be able to survive for long under such tension. We have heard this version continuously for twenty years now, and even more so since our victory in the Six Day War. In spite of false prophecies, Israel stands firm along the entire length of the cease-fire lines; and we shall not be moved from our positions.

Sabotage activity has disappointed all those who hoped by means of terror to undermine our way of life.

The laying of mines and booby traps along the way to the Western Wall and in the crowded street of a town is a typical indication of the nature and methods of the sabotage organizations. The intention is to sow panic and fear among us. But I can speak

for the whole nation when I say: these shameful deeds achieve exactly the opposite effect. All honor and respect to the Israeli men and women who continue their way to the Western Wall, without regret or restraint, and continue their way of life in busy Tel Aviv. These provocations teach the people of Israel to carry on bravely and purposefully.

And we are right to put our faith in this people, its sons and daughters, in the border villages and the cease-fire lines, whose bravery is revealed in every hour of danger and in all its pride.

We cannot ignore our difficulties, but the tension and want prevalent throughout the Arab countries are demonstrating to the Arab leaders, perhaps for the first time, the acuteness of the dilemma of choosing between aggression and peace. Responsible, thinking people in the Arab world must sooner or later begin to doubt the policy of impasse of their leaders.

The Arab leaders would do well to correctly evaluate the results of their aggression and should truly estimate the suffering they are bringing upon their people.

Our military activity, in reaction to the aggression, has already proved our potential. Although acts of aggression are multiplying along the Suez Canal, we again appeal to the rulers of Egypt to reconsider and change their policy. They intend to cause us suffering and harm, and may create a situation which is even more unbearable to them than to us.

We have no better alternative than to stand firm against tension and pressure. We did not choose the firing situation along the cease-fire lines or the existence of shelters in the border villages, and we are not the ones to determine how long this situation will last. It will not succeed in weakening our strength. We have the power and ability to stand firm and we have enough breath to wait as long as necessary, until our attackers prefer peaceful co-existence to aggression.

"SOUNDS OF SUMMER"—PUBLIC TELEVISION AGAIN HAILS PITTSBURGH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we can all be grateful to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Ford Foundation for providing the country with a different and refreshing 18-week series, entitled "Sounds of Summer," seen each Sunday evening between 8 and 10 p.m. over the national educational television station.

By focusing on the most outstanding summer festivals and cultural events taking place around the United States this summer, the series has the twofold advantage of providing viewers with a wide variety of entertainment while also bringing to the TV screen many events that would not otherwise find a national audience.

I am very pleased that last Sunday's program saluted Pittsburgh. "Pittsburgh: A Festival of Folk" featured the Tamburitzan folk dancers of Duquesne University—who are now on a cultural exchange tour in the Soviet Union—and the American Wind Symphony, performing the "Pickel Suite," dedicated to the

H. J. Heinz family of Pittsburgh for their encouragement and support of Pittsburgh music.

The summer series is another feather in the cap of "public TV," which merits our support as well as our attention.

REPORT ON MAY-JUNE 1969 TRIP TO WESTERN EUROPE, MIDEAST

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray McHugh, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Copley News Service, has just returned from an extensive trip to Western Europe and the Mideast. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very fine report Mr. McHugh has written on his 5-week trip. It is an excellent analysis of the current situation in that part of the world, and I believe that it deserves wide attention. The report follows:

REPORT ON MAY-JUNE 1969 TRIP TO WESTERN EUROPE, MIDEAST

(By Ray McHugh)

The five-week trip took me to Britain, France, Spain, Greece, Austria, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and occupied areas of Syria. Combined with my late winter visit to Scandinavia and West Germany, it has formed some strong impressions of the European and Mediterranean scenes.

Two major points stand out:

1. Western Europe faces a period of intense political uncertainty aggravated by increasing inflation. Communist and socialist parties are making determined efforts in several countries. France has just named a new president who faces major tasks; the unpopular Labor government clings doggedly to power in Britain; West Germany votes in September and Willy Brandt, the leading disciple of "détente", will run a strong race; the Italian government has finally collapsed and we may see the Communists bid for a place in a coalition; Greece finds itself more isolated and more frustrated; Turkey faces elections this fall and while conservatives are expected to win there promises to be much more turmoil and more anti-American displays.

(Turkish ports are now closed to the Sixth Fleet because of riots, leaving only Greek and Spanish ports and Naples open to U.S. warships.)

2. Basic solutions in the Middle East seem as remote as before the Six-Day War of 1967. If anything, the Arab and Israeli positions are hardening. A new war does not seem likely this year, simply because Nasser is not ready and the Soviets are fearful of the consequences of another Arab defeat. Next year? Events in Cairo and Moscow will probably answer that question.

I still found no evidence to support the wishful-thinkers who claim Russia is eager for détente and waits only a signal from the West. On the contrary the picture of Russia that was painted for me was a country growing more repressive at home, more dangerous abroad.

I had heard more than one warning that as the Kremlin clamps down on a pregnant liberalism at home, it is losing any interest in cooling useful distracting international tensions—unless, of course, it can get unilateral concessions from the west.

The political uncertainty in Europe range from Sweden to Turkey.

There will be a change of leadership in Sweden in October with the ultra liberal, anti-American Olov Palme succeeding Tag Erlander as Social Democrat premier. Palme is deeply involved in the Swedish anti-Vietnam propaganda program, is a darling of student radicals, a public supporter of Hanoi and the Viet Cong and a vocal critic of the United States. The anti-American demonstrations in Stockholm on July 4 are an indication that things are going to get worse before they get better. It's my personal opinion that we should continue to withhold an ambassador, follow up protests already made by Frank Shakespeare, director of USIA, and resist all suggestions that U.S. deserters given sanctuary in Sweden be granted amnesties.

France has weathered the resignation of Gen. DeGaulle in surprisingly good fashion. In fact, a visitor is struck by a sense of relief that DeGaulle has left the scene.

It's interesting to note that President Nixon is highly regarded in all the countries I visited and there are still many favorable comments about his February-March trip. With the exception of Sweden, anti-American and anti-Vietnam war fever seems to be cooling. In Spain and Greece the governments simply won't tolerate any displays.

Although few Europeans would put it as well, the London Economist recently gave this enlightened appraisal of Vietnam:

"It is arguable that the cost of victory, in terms of bloodshed, is proving to be too great; but the cost of betrayal would be even greater . . . It is an illusion to imagine that the United States can agree to a compromise peace that would amount to a sell-out and retain any credibility in Asia. Nor in Asia alone; for in this shrunken world credibility is indivisible."

Europeans fears that America might return to isolationism also seem to be declining since the election of Mr. Nixon, although I think the bigger factor is the ever-growing involvement of American business in Europe. This constitutes an expanding commitment of its own.

At any rate, Paris is once again a friendly city or as one restaurant owner put it:

"France has got her smile back."

How long this continues will depend on Pompidou's ability to check inflation, the threat to the franc and a scheduled round of wage demands by French unions, heavily backed by the Communist party.

Alain Poher who was the anti-Gaullist center candidate for president made a disappointing showing in both the first and second round elections primarily because the French farmer and small merchant was worried about his ability to withstand the Communists. You noted that Jacques Duclos, the Communist leader, almost beat Poher in the first round voting June 1. That narrow squeak sealed his doom in the runoff against Pompidou.

Poher would probably have moved faster than Pompidou to restore traditional U.S.-French cooperation and to rekindle French interest in NATO. Pompidou cannot turn abruptly away from the DeGaulle pattern. But a significant change has already taken place in Paris. There is an obvious effort underway to woo Americans and the strength the Communists showed in the election has raised again the fears of a Popular Front government.

Communist hopes obviously hinge on confusion. Pompidou is under great pressure—because of DeGaulle excesses—to devalue the franc. Inflation is eating up the wage increases that were granted workers last June after the near revolution. If he can stabilize the situation, France will move step by step back into full Western partnership, I think. If he fails, France will see turmoil and demands for new elections that could sweep away the substantial Gaullist majority in the Assembly and open the

door to a possible Socialist-Communist coalition.

It should not be overlooked that West Germany, the most prosperous country in western Europe, has already made several responsible moves to help lessen French economic problems. And there is honest appreciation for the U.S. moves in late 1968 and early 1969 to slow up the franc.

The departure of DeGaulle does not make British entry into the Common Market automatic, but Pompidou's early moves indicate that French opposition will be much less severe. The French seem ready to let other ECC members decide the issue. France once held itself aloof from Common Market programs, but Paris, I think, now has come to the realization that it needs all the help it can get from its neighbors if it is to solve its economic woes. DeGaulle's haughty ideas of grandeur are fading rapidly.

Entry into the Common Market—even if it comes—is not likely to solve the mess Harold Wilson has led the British into.

Wilson has not been able to increase Britain's productivity, he has surrendered to the extreme left elements of his party and the Trades Union Council in dropping a very mild Taft-Hartley type of law that would have limited some of the outrageous wildcat strikes that are costing Britain millions and now he finds the IMF and the World Bank imposing "banana republic" conditions to credits.

The British are getting only 50 per cent of a loan at the time of agreement. The other half is held back, contingent on reviews by international bankers of the British economy and the government's policies. It shows how far the once proud British have fallen.

Despite the fact that Labor has not won a significant election in two years and must stand today as one of the most unpopular governments in British history, there is little likelihood of an early change. Wilson does not have to call elections until March of 1971 and it is unlikely that his members of parliament will rebel in any "no-confidence" vote. They are as vulnerable as the prime minister. Things can't get worse for them they reckon; but they can get much worse for Britain. In fact, several bankers in the "City" told me candidly that they expect another devaluation of the pound this fall.

London has fallen behind Rotterdam and Antwerp among European ports and traffic is declining steadily. A British ship line owner told me he refuses to use British ports because of the intolerable labor conditions created by the Communist-influenced Dock Workers Union.

The wildcat Ford strike late last winter also is costing Britain a substantial part of the European car boom. (Western Europe has outgrown even the United States as a market for new automobiles.)

From the military point of view, the situation in Britain is critical. Defense cuts are leaving the army and RAF nothing but shells and the Navy is fast becoming a home defense force. The Labor Government's glowing pledges of full NATO cooperation can be looked at as a smokescreen to hide the pathetic state of affairs.

Military men in London are beginning to speak quite bluntly to Americans. It's off the record, but I've never heard such anti-government sentiment from generals and admirals. I heard one fairly high defense official use the word "traitorous" in describing Britain's military state. Words like that were unthought of only two years ago.

Even if the Tories can reclaim power in the next 12 months, the retreat from east of Suez appears to have reached a point of no return and for all practical purposes it's a retreat from east of Gibraltar. The services are losing their best NCOs and junior officers. The reserves are being scrapped on the theory that they won't be needed in a nuclear war. (The burden this theory puts on the United States as a "policeman" is obvious.)

Labor cites money as the cause of the defense cuts, but the pacifist and militant left of the party is determined, in the view of Tories, to destroy the British military establishment and all it stands for before they are forced from office.

One word about the Tories. Ted Heath is the titular head of the Conservative party, but he is a lackluster leader with problems. I heard many who believe Sir Alec Douglas-Home (Macmillan's successor) will head the next government in an interim role until a younger, more articulate figure emerges. Don't count out someone like Julian Amery, particularly if the Conservative tide is running strongly.

While I was in London, the Rhodesian issue came to a head and I had a chance to talk with Rhodesia House officials, "City" bankers with wide African experience and with members of parliament. The consensus was that the Wilson government, through errors of omission and commission—particularly its resort to the U.N. to brand Rhodesia "an enemy of world peace"—has solidified a situation that may take 25 years to resolve.

On Rhodesia, I refer you a recent statement by Elspeth Huxley:

"We in Britain cannot now extricate ourselves from the mess. We are on the escalator, going down, and there's something nasty in the basement. The United States is about the only hope we have. If it could persuade Mr. Wilson to snap out of his imperialist dreams of flags, rebels, governors, oaths of allegiance and so forth, there is no reason why a reasonable compromise that would secure the political advancement of Rhodesia's Africans without first obliging them to starve to death could not be reached."

In Spain I had the privilege of talking with Gen. Franco, Minister Fraga, the men who negotiated the U.S.-Spanish treaty extension, the American officers who manage our military aid programs and those who command the big air base and communications hub at Torrejon.

Despite rumors to the contrary, Franco looks hale and hearty at 76. His mind is quick and there seems no doubt about who is in charge. He is reportedly set on restoring Prince Juan Carlos de Bourbon to the Spanish throne. The prince, 31, is the son of Don Juan, the exiled pretender to the throne.

Also, despite reports prevalent in Washington, Torrejon is vital to the Air Force. The base pumps more jet fuel than any base in Europe. Its troposphere communications center is essential to Sixth Fleet operations and handles traffic from all over southern Europe, the Mediterranean and the Middle East—even as far as Pakistan.

Gen. Ben LeBailly, who commands the U.S. bases in Spain, calls the Spaniards "the best friends we have anywhere in the world."

This judgment was confirmed, apparently, in the Madrid decision to accept a two-year extension of the treaty. This spared the Nixon administration a bitter fight with Fulbright's forces over ratification of a new pact.

The current treaty runs until September of 1971. Now talks are to begin this summer. The Spanish want help to modernize their armed forces that are largely equipped with World War II weapons; they feel they should get some kind of favored trade treatment and they want some kind of security arrangement with the United States because they feel the presence of the bases and the changing nature of the Soviet power threatens to involve them quickly in any crisis.

President Nixon has talked of bringing Spain back into "the European family of nations." This could mean NATO, but the Spanish indicate they would prefer a regional defense pact that would not involve them with Scandinavian and northern European states who they believe have been unfairly critical of the Franco regime.

The Spanish have close ties to many of the Arab countries (they just returned the en-

clave of Ifni to Morocco to remove a point of tension). They represent U.S. interests in Egypt and they are critical of American policy in the Middle East. They express fear that it is opening wide the door for Russian penetration of the Mediterranean and will lead to eventual Soviet domination of all of North Africa.

Madrid officials argue that the United States should put its prestige solidly behind the 1967 United Nations resolution on the Mideast. They argue that this would give the U.N. the primary responsibility for peace and the integrity of Israel, would release the U.S. from its unspoken commitment to the Jewish state and would allow the United States to begin rebuilding its once excellent relations with the Arab world. (Many officials in Greece share this view.)

In Greece, economic activity is intense, but the still resolved political and diplomatic issues hang heavy. The military-backed government has now been in power for two years and there are some dangerous signs of frustration. Most of it is aimed at the United States.

The government resents the delay in the appointment of a Nixon ambassador and sees it as an attempt by Washington to express displeasure with the Athens government. The top men in Athens regard this as interference in Greek affairs and liken it in many ways to the Soviet attitude toward Czechoslovakia.

Gen. George Anghelis, chief of the defense staff and regarded as the No. 2 man in the Greek setup, was particularly outspoken. Premier Papadopoulos is more restrained, but nevertheless critical.

The Greeks also resent the embargo of arms promised them under NATO defense agreements. While their cooperation with U.S. forces, particularly the Sixth Fleet, remains exemplary there is growing anger. The criticism of Greece, which is outspokenly pro-U.S., compared to Washington's silence on Turkey's anti-American demonstrations, the insults from Sweden, the leftist moves of Italy and other countries outrages them.

Even erstwhile political leaders of the center and right regard the situation as dangerous. One former high cabinet officer who was once imprisoned by the military-backed government recommends that a new ambassador be named as soon as possible and that the appointee be a private citizen, not a career diplomat. (The government is very suspicious of our State Department.)

One man who might have great influence in Athens is Gen. William Quinn, USA, Ret., who is now a vice president of the Martin-Marietta Co. Quinn once headed the military aid mission in Greece and his name has been submitted to President Nixon.

I understand that Quinn is opposed in the State Department on the grounds that since he is a professional soldier his appointment would be construed as support for the government. Nonsense. It seems far more important that the next ambassador be a man who can command the respect of the government and its attention. A career diplomat might well find himself ignored and the situation would simply grow worse.

Many in Athens with prominent business posts or former political experience fear that a continued cold shoulder from Washington will (a) force the military leaders into some form of neutral left-leaning Nasserism, or (b) lead to political chaos in which the loud and leftist Andreas Papandreu would emerge as a leader.

There is argument as to whether the present government would win an election. Prices are going up and this brings discontent in a city like Athens, but in rural areas and smaller cities, the colonels appear to be popular.

A man like Quinn might negotiate with the colonels to secure the much-sought elections. He could quietly use the NATO arms

as a lever, restoring them in return for pledges.

If some such tactic is not employed, I'm afraid we risk a serious situation in Greece. Looking around the Mediterranean, we can hardly afford to lose such a friend and such geography. (We might also look at Britain's experience in Rhodesia.)

"Since World War II," Anghelis said, "you have pursued your own self-righteous concept of democracy and look what it has cost you—China, Egypt, most of the Arab world and much of Africa."

"People in your State Department insist that they know how to run countries better than the people who live in them. Your record isn't very good."

"Are you going to throw Greece away, too?" Despite this political backdrop, the Greek economy is moving ahead, though men like Economics Minister Evamblos frankly admit that the country desperately needs more foreign investment.

Tourism is up about 20 percent this year—some 2 million people, about 500,000 Americans. Hotel construction is being pushed and Evamblos is talking about doubling the tourist traffic next year.

Extremely attractive terms have just been announced for foreign investors and these will probably bring another influx of money, but the do-nothing stance of Washington is probably as big a barrier to economic growth as to political stability.

Austria, by contrast, is a country which is enjoying both prosperity and political stability. I stopped in Vienna primarily to get Austrians' views of the eastern European situation and to make an effort to enter Czechoslovakia. (The Czechs said "no.")

The fears of last summer that Moscow might decide to march into Romania and Yugoslavia, too, have subsided, although the Yugoslavs are described as still "anxious" about the Brezhnev Doctrine. There is great uncertainty about Kremlin policy. Russia is looked on as increasingly repressive, particularly toward its own would-be liberals. This augers ill for the satellites, most Austrians agree.

"It's unfortunate that the mood of nationalism in the satellites coincides with a mood of nationalism in Moscow," said one Viennese official. "There's no doubt who will prevail."

"There also is no doubt that there will have to be liberalization inside Russia, before there can be true relaxation and independence in the satellites."

The Austrians continue to argue against any American trade offensive in eastern Europe, "unless you and your Congress are ready to extend long-term, low-interest credits."

The view is that the Communist nations have little to sell to the United States and that Americans are at a disadvantage in what is essentially a barter economy.

An interesting Austrian sidelight is the fact that the country continues to receive a steady trickle of political refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia and even Albania.

They are processed in camps and most are whisked away to Canada, Australia or South Africa, three countries that compete vigorously for eastern European exiles.

I've left the confused Middle East for last, because it is so contradictory. Seeds of truth can be found on both sides. So can seeds of ambition, avarice, hatred and stubborn pride.

Little Lebanon which has tried for 20 years to remain on the Arab sidelines may ironically be the next victim. The presence of more than 250,000 Arab refugees in a country of 3 million is developing finally into an explosive situation that the pro-Western Lebanese may not be able to handle.

While Israel feels time is on her side, Lebanon—and Jordan—feel time is running against them. In both countries the hatred of Israel remains intense, but the organiza-

tion of the refugees into guerrilla forces has added a new dimension. Backed by anti-Israel, anti-American demonstrations, the refugee groups literally forced one Lebanese government to resign. The refugee groups are demanding the right to harass Israel from bases inside Lebanon. They already have won this concession from Jordan.

Lebanese business and political leaders fear, with reason, that if the guerrillas attack Israel from Lebanon, the Israelis will occupy the water-rich southern region of their country. But if they don't permit the raids, the refugees could spark riots that would tear Lebanon apart and end the country's delicate Moslem-Christian balance.

Incidentally, Arab intellectuals and El Fatah leaders from the American University in Beirut can argue tellingly about the "legality" of the Arab claims in Palestine, but one can't escape the impression that the time for legalistic arguments has long passed.

Neither Jordan nor Lebanon appear to have the military force either to threaten Israel, or to control the Arab refugees. The Jordan army apparently gives the El Fatah some support—I experienced one of its barrages at a kibbutz near the Sea of Galilee—but the loss of equipment in the Six-Day War and the loss of strategic territory leaves it at a definite disadvantage.

The real local contest in the Middle East is between Israel and Egypt, with Algeria growing in importance as an Egyptian ally. Even in that contest, despite her lack of size, Israel holds important strategic advantages, notwithstanding the huge Russian input of arms.

I met and interviewed Golda Meir, Abba Eban, Moïse Dayan and other top Israeli officials. They are adamant. They do not want a Big Four settlement or an "imposed" peace. They insist they will not withdraw from occupied areas until Nasser comes to the conference table—a highly unlikely event. They insist that Jerusalem is now an integral part of Israel and that they will not give up the Golan Heights that were wrested from Syria or the lands controlling the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba.

There will have to be major changes in the Arab and Soviet positions—or another war—before these views will change, I'm afraid.

Mrs. Meir also flatly rejects any resettlement of Palestinian refugees in Israel, although she offers them indemnity payments and technical assistance to resettle in other Arab lands.

"They would constitute a Fifth Column here," she said. "If you ask us to commit suicide, at least allow us to choose the method."

Israeli leaders are bitter about the refusal of Arab states to undertake the resettlement of refugees who have lived in squalor in Lebanon, Jordan, the Gaza Strip, etc., for more than 20 years. They charge that the Arab leaders have looked on these hapless people as a weapon to be used against the Jews, not as human beings in need of assistance.

(Israel recently contributed \$3 million to UNRRA for Arab refugee relief, although Mrs. Meir admits "it is only a token.")

Men like Dayan and Gen. Haim Bar-Lev, chief of staff, minimize the threat of the guerrillas and the border clashes with regular Jordanian, Syrian and Egyptian forces.

Dayan says the guerrillas have been "schmalztified" by the American press.

Bar-Lev says much of the action along the Suez Canal has been a figment of Nasser's propaganda machine, although he confirms that there have been many artillery duels, some raiding by both sides and some air battles.

Israeli jets, he said, have shot down Egyptian MIGs within sight of Cairo.

He also said Nasser is continuing with the systematic removal of the civilian popula-

tion from a 30-mile wide strip along the canal and he regards this as the prelude to concentrated Egyptian military action.

One factor that could change the military situation dramatically, in the view of U.S. officers in the Mediterranean, is the presence of an estimated 400-500 Egyptian and Algerian student pilots in Russia.

"If they came back overnight, flying fighters and bombers, it would be a new ball game," said one Air Force general.

Both Bar-Lev and Dayan, however, seem confident that a new war will not come this year. No Israeli, however, looks beyond the spring of 1970—if Nasser is still in power.

In virtually every conversation in Israel, there is an undercurrent of hope that if the Jews stand firm, Nasser will be overtaken by the pressures of Egypt's needy millions.

Might they get someone worse?

"It's hard to imagine anyone worse," said Mrs. Meir.

The price for Israel also is high. Military service has been extended. Economic growth is affected. Prices creep higher and the "garrison" atmosphere can be depressing. But civilian morale appears to be high. A visit to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem uncovered no anti-war signs.

SPOTLIGHT ON VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article appearing in the July 7, 1969, edition of *The Nation*. It refers to an interreligious study team which visited South Vietnam to investigate political arrests and imprisonments under the Thieu-Ky regime. A member of that group was my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative JOHN J. CONYERS.

The report of the imprisonment of President Thieu's opponent, Truong Dinh Dzu, in the last election for advocating a negotiated peace was certainly disturbing. The Conyers' group found that the practice of political arrest and imprisonment in the Republic of South Vietnam is even more widespread than this seemingly isolated case indicates. There are at least 20,000 political prisoners in South Vietnam, most of whom are classified as Communists. As *The Nation* points out:

The de facto criterion of communism is opposition to the war policies of the dictatorship, but even that is not essential.

A citizen of South Vietnam who advocates coalition government or steps toward ending the war is liable to arrest and imprisonment as a "Communist."

I congratulate Mr. CONYERS and his associates for their efforts in verifying the nature of political freedom under the Thieu-Ky regime, and submit the *Nation's* report of their findings for the reading of my colleagues:

SPOTLIGHT ON VIETNAM

If the American people have not lost all collective moral sense, then the full significance of continuing intervention in the Vietnamese civil war must have been kept from them. That the latter alternative is the case is suggested again by the media attention paid to the May 25-June 10 visit to South

Vietnam of a U.S. interreligious study team, sent to investigate stories of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment by the Thieu-Ky regime. The coverage was so scanty that there was little danger the average newspaper reader or TV viewer would be diverted from his preoccupation with the troubles of Joe Namath.

Members of the study team were Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of the Boston College Law School; Rep. John J. Conyers (D., Mich.); Bishop James Armstrong of the United Methodist Church; Mrs. John C. Bennett, wife of the president of Union Theological Seminary; Allan Brick of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; John deJ. Pemberton of the American Civil Liberties Union; Rabbi Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary and Adm. Arnold E. True, U.S.N. (Ret.).

The itinerary was as respectable as the participants. The delegation met with President Thieu and South Vietnamese government officials, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and members of his staff, and conferred with religious leaders, legislators, attorneys, students and a variety of persons of different political persuasions.

"The government of South Vietnam," the report acknowledges, "was helpful in providing data, permitting team members to visit prisons, and in making accessible certain prisoners." The auspices under which the tour was conducted, and the character of the investigators, preclude any suspicion of bias or unfairness. What emerges must be accepted as definitive—and it could scarcely be more destructive of the claim that we are fighting for the free choice of the people of South Vietnam in determining their future.

Before leaving for Vietnam, the team conferred with members of the White House staff and received assurances that the number of political prisoners in South Vietnam was decreasing. In Saigon a few days later, the American Embassy official most familiar with the problem of political prisoners admitted that the number is increasing steadily and, further, that this increase will continue as the U.S. "pacification" program extends further into the countryside. The American Embassy stand is that the prisoners are an internal concern of the South Vietnamese government. This is a convenient fiction to cover an inconvenient fact—that the U.S. mission is ferreting out suspected "Communists" in Vietnamese villages and turning them over to extra-constitutional "Military Field Courts" which lack any procedural safeguards and which in many cases employ torture to extract confessions or information.

Political prisoners in South Vietnam number at least 20,000, and 25,000 is a more likely figure. All are classified as "Communists," although many are guilty of nothing more than advocating a coalition government or steps toward ending the war patterned on President's Nixon's proposals. The *de facto* criterion of "communism" is opposition to the war policies of the dictatorship, but even that is not essential. In the Chi Hoa jail the survey group saw 200 children between the ages of 10 and 14; the charge against some of them was likewise communism.

The group met Truong Dinh Dzu, runner-up in the 1967 Presidential election, who was arrested in May 1968 for an interview in which he advocated a dialogue with the National Liberation Front. As Dzu had envisioned future developments, the real Communists would get only 20 per cent of the vote in a free election, and would thereafter have a role like that of the Communist parties of France or Italy. This probably under-rated the Communist strength, but it would hardly justify a five-year sentence, subsequently commuted to three.

Another celebrated prisoner interviewed by the group was the Buddhist leader, the Venerable Thien Minh. Although Thien Minh speaks excellent French and adequate English, a condition of the interview was that

he could talk with his visitors only in Vietnamese. Thien Minh asserted: "I have committed no offense except that I want peace." Originally he was sentenced to ten years on a charge of assisting draft resisters; his term was subsequently reduced to three years.

If the number of political prisoners in South Vietnam is assumed to be 25,000, that, in a country with a population of 17 million, is the equivalent in the United States of 300,000 political prisoners. In his talk with the study group President Thieu pleaded that in wartime, and considering the unfamiliarity of his country with the democratic process, he cannot relent in his severely repressive policies. But in that case there never will be democracy in South Vietnam; authoritarianism only breeds more authoritarianism. Even if all American forces should be withdrawn, leaving the Thieu government or a successor supplied with American arms, the prospect is for a permanently repressive regime patterned on Chiang Kai-shek's police state on Taiwan. No doubt such an outcome would be quite acceptable to many in the Nixon Administration, but that peace can be established on any such terms is political fantasy. And time is running out, both for Mr. Nixon and the dubious allies we have selected to represent us in that unhappy country.

"A CALCULATED RISK"

The Army's new Sheridan tank has just completed its first round of combat tests in Vietnam. The kill score: one dead, three severely burned and several other casualties reported—all Americans.

The dead GI and his hideously burned comrades are victims of an Army "calculated risk." This gamble was to send the newly designed Sheridan tank into battle even though a test manager warned long before it left the United States that it was prone to breakdowns and deficiencies that would jeopardize U.S. troops.

High-ranking Army officials have repeatedly told Congress that the Sheridan tank has been operating satisfactorily under Vietnamese combat conditions. Yet, in a still secret report, the Pentagon admits that the "calculated risk" has "shaken the confidence" of the crews operating the new tank. The report elaborates further on the reasons the crews feel somewhat insecure:

The tank has had "16 major equipment failures, 125 electrical circuit failures, 41 weapons misfires, 140 ammunition ruptures, 25 engine replacements (caused by overheating), and persistent malfunction of the 152-mm. cannon."

Also depressing the crews is the Army's field manual on the Sheridan, which did not arrive in Vietnam until after the first sixty-four tanks had been in combat for six weeks. The 20-page manual advises the Sheridan crews as follows: The electrical system is prone to failure; the weapons firing system is not reliable; the new type of combustible cartridge is subject to malfunction.

This is not to say that any of these deficiencies were unknown before the "calculated risk" was taken. The test manager warned:

The Sheridan is of questionable dependability and unknown limitation. I do not believe that a combat situation where mission and lives depend so heavily on equipment reliability is the best environment to question and resolve these problems.

The project manager made this statement on November 5, 1968; on February 8, 1969, the tank was on its way. On February 15, one week after the tank went into combat, one of the Sheridans hit a mine that would not have severely damaged some of the Army's older tanks. The explosion ruptured the hull of the Sheridan, ignited the ammunition and killed the driver.

Later, an enemy round struck one of the new combustible shells as crew members wrestled to extract it from the chamber of

another tank after it had misfired. Three GIs suffered severe burns.

What effect have these "accidents" and the critical combat field report had on the Army's current plans for the Sheridan tank and its continued deployment in the field? Just announced: 171 new Sheridans are to be shipped to Vietnam.

THE ANSWER TO POVERTY

One year ago the poor of the nation sat on Congress' doorstep, believing that if they drew attention to their poverty, they would receive adequate federal assistance. They came to Resurrection City from great distances, trusting in strangers for their daily needs. Some traveled from California to Washington in school buses, bearing the bounces, the weariness, the strangeness, the homesickness and the homelessness because of their hope in the government.

They endured torrential rains, flooded "streets" and poor plumbing in their plywood town. From most persons they received derision; the contempt of the many mingled in unequal ratio with the real kindnesses of the few.

Some attention was paid to them by Congress, and some concessions were made—an increase of food stamps, investigations like that of Sen. George McGovern's Select Committee on Hunger and Human Needs. But the most tangible result of their ordeal came to them last month when Congress acted in direct response to Resurrection City. The House voted 327-50 to ban all sit-ins, camp-ins and sleep-ins in the capital. The poor, they stated, had "disrupted the seat of government and destroyed public property."

The cost of living rises and welfare is being cut; the poor have the answer to their demonstration of what poverty really is: no more Resurrection Cities. Congress dislikes being bothered, especially by the poor.

TO HIM THAT HATH

The National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States reports that the Department of Defense plans to spend nearly \$4 billion in fiscal 1970 to feed an average of slightly under 3.5 million servicemen. A major part of this sum goes for labor, capital items, etc. For food alone the allowance is \$1.7 billion, which breaks down to about \$500 per person per year. Even allowing for the government's purchasing power this does not seem excessive, but the government has the same advantage in purchasing food for the poor, and under the Nixon Administration's present allocations the poor stand to get only \$77 per person per year.

The ratio of 6.5 to 1 may be regarded as reflecting the solicitude of any prudently managed, normally predatory government for its armed services; but in another, purely civilian, area an even more atrocious discrimination is practiced. Confronted with statistics on malnutrition in the United States, the average well-meaning citizen comforts himself with the thought that at least the poor kids get a good hot lunch at school. But do they? A story by Gene Blake in the June 4 *Los Angeles Times*, and some nationally collected data, indicate that they don't.

According to a suit brought in federal court in San Francisco by the California Rural Assistance League on behalf of needy children in three counties, the state last year received \$25 million in federal funds and commodities to subscribe an average of about 825,000 lunches daily in participating school districts; but school officials arranged to supply to all the children a lunch worth 55¢ at a reduced price of 35¢. Those who have the 35¢ eat, those who haven't go without. The papers set forth that in one Monterey school district, one out of every two wealthy or middle-class children benefits by the program, but only eleven of the district's 803 needy children receive a free or reduced-price lunch, and three times as many teachers and other adults eat the cut-rate meals.

CONGRESSMAN BURKE AND FAMILY ENJOY RELIGIOUS SERVICE AT WHITE HOUSE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman I have often wished that the many people I represent could spend some time with me and share some of the happy events that occur and happen to a Congressman here in Washington. One recent event, which I am sure had they been granted opportunity, they would have enjoyed as much as my family and I did, occurred on Sunday, June 29, 1969. My wife, Evelyn, my two daughters, Shelly and Kelly, and I, were invited by President and Mrs. Nixon to join them on the occasion of what was the seventh in a series of nondenominational services held at the White House. Perhaps one thing that was important to me was the fact that it was a family occasion and I was not only extremely impressed with the simplicity, but also with the sincerity of the event.

As we drove onto the White House grounds on that beautiful sun-drenched Sunday morning, the quiet and beauty of the gardens and the house which the President calls home, easily placed one in the proper frame of mind for the service.

My family and I and the other guests of the President, which I estimated to be about 250, were greeted by Mr. and Mrs. Nixon in the foyer of the White House, and then were guided to the East Room, the largest room.

In the East Room the guests generally dance to the music of one of the service bands or string orchestras or witness popular acts of the day, after elaborate dinners; but on this particular Sunday morning, the room was filled only with empty chairs, a movable pulpit, and the scent of the many beautiful flowers.

There was no indication merely by looking at this room what particular religion or sermon would be presented on this Sunday, but we soon learned that we were to be a part of a history-making event since we were to hear the first rabbi in history to conduct religious services for the President in the White House.

Representatives from other major faiths in America had conducted the nondenominational services on prior Sundays. It was Rev. Billy Graham who opened the first service for President Nixon and this was followed by Dr. Richard Halvorson, Presbyterian; Dr. Louis Evens, Presbyterian; Dr. R. H. Espy, Baptist; Dr. Edward Latch, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives; His Eminence Terrence Cardinal Cook, Catholic; Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Reformed Church of America; and now by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City.

The choirs which sing the opening selections and other hymns during the service are selected from local churches in the Washington, D.C. area.

In opening the White House for these

services, the President has invited guests from every strata of life from the White House cooking staff to Members of the Cabinet and the U.S. Congress.

On the Sunday that I attended the service, guests included Julie and David Eisenhower, members and family of various White House staffs, some from the public, newly appointed Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger and his family, Secretary of HUD and Mrs. George Romney; Secretary of the Treasury and Mrs. David Kennedy; Secretary of Commerce and Mrs. Maurice Stans; Secretary of Labor and Mrs. Shultz and their daughter, Cathy; a number of foreign ambassadors and their families including those from France, Niger, and Guinea.

Also attending with their families were Congressmen ROSS ADAIR of Indiana; DEL CLAWSON and CRAIG HOSMER of California; WILLIAM CRAMER of Florida and JOHN DUNCAN of Tennessee, Senators GURNEY, GOLDWATER, and BOB DOLE with their families.

The service on June 29 opened with the prelude and opening remarks by President Nixon. This was followed by the doxology and prayers by Dr. Finkelstein. Mr. Geoffrey Simon directed the choir which represented the long established Washington Christ Lutheran Church which was founded more than 75 years ago. The choir itself during worship service at the church performs anthems ranging from compositions of the 11th century to present day arrangements. The choir at the White House service sang the hymns, "We Gather Together", "Now God Be Praised in Heav'n Above", and "O God, Our Help in Ages Past." This was followed by the benediction and the postlude.

It is true that the East Room of the White House, where the services were held, can hardly be compared with some of the cathedrals, churches, or temples throughout the world, but to me, the simple but dignified setting for the service by Dr. Finkelstein at the request of the President of the United States, was one of the most memorable that I ever had attended.

I had a warm feeling as I looked around, and my mind wandered over some of the many problems that we face in our country today. I thought of our Constitution and of its framers. I share the belief with many others, that our constitution as drafted by our forefathers, was guided by God Almighty. I could not help but feel that this government of ours was truly a government under God. I had the feeling that we, in our Nation, still have unbounded faith in God and in ourselves, and that we—with God's help—will find answers to the many problems that are dividing our country today.

I left feeling in my heart that we Americans will as a people, go forward in the name of God Almighty to even greater greatness. That we are a good people and that we are not filled with hate but with love, and for this reason we will work not only toward solving the problems facing our people today, but that we shall follow the light to a path which will give to all a better tomorrow for God, our country, and for all of our people.

ASTRONOMY TEAMS WATCH FOR STRANGE HISTORIC MOON FLASHES—POPE ASKS PRAYERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

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

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 16, 1969]

TWO ASTRONOMY TEAMS TO HELP TELL SCOPE OF APOLLO 11

(By Dolores Frederick)

The eyes of 200 worldwide observatories—including two astronomy teams in Pittsburgh—will be focused on the Apollo-11 as three U.S. astronauts attempt the first lunar landing.

Astronomers at Allegheny Observatory in Riverview Park aimed their telescopes at the moon last night—hours before the scheduled Apollo-11 blast-off—to look for clues to events which were missed in former missions.

MOON FLASHES

Wallace R. Beardsley, assistant professor of astronomy at the University of Pittsburgh, said astronomers will be especially on the lookout for "moon flashes."

"Astronomers for 400 years have individually spotted these flashes," Prof. Beardsley said, "and we're not sure if they exist or even if they are caused by what is believed to be escaping gas from lunar cracks."

His team and other astronomers at the Clutter-Dorseyville Observatory manned by Rody J. Clutter and Charles H. Le Roy are working in Project LION—a Lunar International Observers Network set up by Smithsonian Institution at Cambridge, Mass., to observe the Apollo-11 mission.

Astronomers have failed to determine whether these flashes are volcanic emissions or just sunlight reflected from a glassy surface rock.

If moon flashes are spotted, Prof. Beardsley said "we will radio Smithsonian Institution which in turn will contact NASA so that the astronauts can investigate the sightings."

Prof. Beardsley pointed out flashes have been sighted around the crater Aristarchus which was suspected of having a volcanic eruption during the Apollo-10 mission.

NOT CONFIRMED

However, the eruption was not confirmed because the spacecraft was behind the moon and out of radio contact with Mission Control at Houston.

Other lunar areas, including the smooth spot known as Mare Crisium, and eight suspected craters will be closely watched by the worldwide astronomy network.

The craters are Messier, Theophilus, Menelaus, Manilius, Hyginus, Alphonsus, Gassendi, and Grimaldi—all of which can be seen by the command module at times during its lunar orbit.

The flashes, Prof. Beardsley said, usually appear as reddish spots when they hit the space vacuum and are particularly bright on the dark side of the moon.

Prof. Beardsley related that confirmation of the flashes and of the existence of lunar gases will help scientists determine the composition of that celestial ball of reflecting light which has stirred the hearts—and minds—of man since the beginning of history.

In addition to the "moon flashes," Prof. Beardsley said astronomers will be looking for:

The reflection of Apollo-11 as it soars to

and from the moon. The spacecraft carrying Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael L. Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr. will be registered as a flashing light—much like a star.

"Water dumps"—the ejection of excess water from the spacecraft. It should appear as a brilliant flash, Prof. Beardsley said, adding that "nobody saw them during Apollo-10 because it was cloudy."

District astronomers will begin viewing the Apollo-11 at 9 p.m. today when the moon becomes visible in the night sky. Viewing will be limited to two hours—the time it takes for the moon to sink below the horizon.

However, astronomers will gain more viewing time each day. Prof. Beardsley said Saturday and Sunday the moon will be visible to astronomers until midnight and 1 p.m.

OUT OF VIEW

Although the actual landing of a man on the moon will be out of view for the Pittsburgh astronomers, Mr. LeRoy, coordinator of Pittsburgh's moonwatch teams since the first satellite was launched in 1957, said astronomers "in other parts of the world might see it as a reflection of ruffling moon dust."

The Allegheny Observatory—headed by Dr. Nicholas E. Wagman—will use its 13-inch refractor, 31-inch Keeler reflector, and a giant 30-inch Thaw refractor. A 21½-inch reflector will be in operation at the Clutter-Dorseyville Observatory.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

POPE ASKS WORLDWIDE PRAYER FOR APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS

CASTEL GANDOLFO, ITALY.—Pope Paul VI asked Christians around the world yesterday to pray to God for the Apollo 11 astronauts. He said their mission shows man is a "giant."

Pope Paul devoted his first public speech since he arrived here Thursday to the moonshot. He spoke extemporaneously and enthusiastically from a window of the papal Renaissance palace where he is spending a period of rest before his planned trip to Uganda July 31.

An audience of tourists and Romans on a weekend outing packed the courtyard below the window and the square outside the palace, where loudspeakers relayed the papal words.

"Let's devote our thought to the astronauts," the Pope began. He called the Apollo 11 mission a "most unique and wonderful fact."

"Science and technique manifest themselves in such an incomparable and audacious way as to mark the peak of their conquests and to allow for the forecast of more conquests of which even the imagination fails to dream now."

"Science fiction comes true," the Pope said.

"Man is at the center of this undertaking and appears to us as a giant, appears to us as divine, not in himself but in his principle and in his destiny."

"Honor, then, to man, honor to his dignity, his spirit, his life. And let us pray for the scientists and the heroes of this fabulous undertaking."

AFRICAN CULTURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, President Banda and the National Parliament of

Malawi have taken positive steps to preserve the culture of their part of the world.

Not only does the President find miniskirts or trousers on women offensive and repugnant in public places, but it is indicated that persistent offenses of this nature could result in deportation.

Apparently the President is trying not only to maintain decorum, but to perpetuate a high standard of morals and decency in his country.

I include a news article from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, July 16, 1969:

MALAWI PRESIDENT BANS FEMALES IN PANTS

LANTYRE, MALAWI.—Women may not wear trousers when the president is present, according to a statement from the office of Malawi President Hastings Kamuzu Banda.

A statement Monday said any woman with the audacity to wear miniskirts or trousers in the presence of Banda could be deported.

Those types of dress are "offensive and repugnant," it said.

"To save embarrassment to all, no female wearing a mini skirt or short dress which exposes any part of the thigh, or trousers, will be allowed entry to any state residence, parliament or any function where his excellency the president is present," it said.

Banda banned short shorts and miniskirts last March after a young European girl wearing shorts stared at him as he drove thru Blantyre.

"Deportation cannot be ruled out for any * * * in wearing them to the embarrassment of President Banda and the government," the statement said.

Trousers are not subject to a general ban. But Malawi members of parliament attacked trousers as unfeminine earlier this year.

POLITICS ON THE AIR ROUTES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the issue of international air routes to the South Pacific is one with which we are all familiar. With increased transportation needs and subsequent air transportation problems, it is a matter that must be resolved as soon as possible.

One of my constituents, Mrs. Etta Wexler of Great Neck, brought a July 5 New York Times editorial to my attention. Since it bears consideration, I would like to include it in the RECORD:

POLITICS ON THE AIR ROUTES

When President Nixon first upset the trans-Pacific airline route awards made by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the last days of the Johnson Administration, it was said that he was undoing an act of political favoritism.

But hope that Mr. Nixon would thereupon eschew politics in exercising his authority over the granting of international air routes is now dead. He has gone far beyond the interventions of the Johnson Administration by twice rejecting C.A.B. recommendations that Continental Airlines be awarded a South Pacific route and by framing his own suggestions in such a way as to make Eastern Airlines the only acceptable candidate.

Even when generous allowance is made for the inordinate complexities of trans-Pacific routing, it is difficult to find a reasonable

defense for President Nixon's action. It denies a through route to Continental, a small airline already operating in the Pacific with an excellent record for efficiency, a reputation as a fare-cutting maverick and friendly connections with the Johnson Administration. It confers another benefit upon Eastern, a giant airline in which the Rockefeller family has a substantial holding. It will neither contribute to balanced competition in the airline industry, nor enhance public confidence in the Presidency.

Mr. Nixon is not the first chief executive to play politics in granting international air routes. President Eisenhower's record was bad and President Truman's was worse. It might be possible to limit, if not eliminate, such political intrusions by repealing the President's power to reverse the C.A.B. But that is only one of a number of feasible solutions to a vexing regulatory problem. The Commerce committees of the House and Senate ought to lose little time in holding public hearings for a full airing of the issues.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, we are now marking the 11th observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a melancholy anniversary, for it reminds us that, in spite of the great wars for freedom in this century, in spite of the outlays of treasure and blood, vast areas of the globe, and a vast portion of humanity, do not yet know the freedom and independence that they deserve, and that we have sought for all mankind.

There is something appalling in the very idea of "Captive Nations"—entire lands, with all their peoples, held in bondage, literally walled in, subjugated by the armed might of a totalitarian empire, ruled by despised countrymen who serve only the dictates of their Kremlin masters and the imperatives of Marxist ideology.

It is a sorry duty to call the roll of the two dozen States that have passed into captivity in the 50 years since the October Revolution in Russia. No more lamentable catalogue exists in the annals of human history.

These lands of great pride and ancient heritage have all fallen before the juggernaut of the armed doctrine of communism. They have had imposed on them regimes so grotesque and so vicious as to deny their history and efface their culture. Their arts are stultified, while only propaganda thrives; their religions are persecuted, while a secular cult is established. Individual liberty is stifled, for the Communist regimes know they could not survive unfettered political activity by free men.

The nature of the Communist rule is in defiance of all civilized tradition, and in violation of the ideals of personal liberty and national sovereignty that we all honor. These nations have become prison-houses for the human soul, presided over by men whose dogma denies the existence of the spiritual realm.

Vallant challenges to this Bolshevik hegemony date from its very beginning.

The resistance to tyranny, widespread but most spectacular in such states as Poland and Hungary, has been as heroic as its brutal and bloody suppression has been odious. Only last summer, the Communists overwhelmed the frail, incipient independence of Czechoslovakia by armed might, brazenly revealing their repulsive character for all to see. The Brezhnev Doctrine has served to put all on notice that suppression by force is to be the fate of any captive nation whose people are not sufficiently subservient.

It is not only consolidation the Communists seek, but expansion—relentlessly into South America, into the Mideast, into Southeast Asia, wherever men would be free. When this process is completed, when all the world is captive, then, the Marxist dialectic proclaims, we will have arrived at the "end of History."

Mr. Speaker, it is during Captive Nations Week that we have special occasion to express thoughts that are always with us. We have the opportunity, and we acknowledge the obligation, to tell the jailers of those unhappy lands that we are wary of them, and alert to their designs; and to show the captive peoples that the world has not forsaken or forgotten them. The American people reject the Communists' claim that these people must remain forever in servitude. We renew the efforts we are making in behalf of justice throughout the world and rededicate ourselves to the ideals that have kept us and so much of the world free.

Our dedication, though, could not be greater than that of the captive nations. For the fact remains, that in spite of decades of propaganda and indoctrination, in spite of all terror and repression, the will to be free still moves and inspires the captive millions, more so now than perhaps ever before. No greater tribute to their inward strength and resolution, no more telling accolade to the indomitability of the human spirit, could be imagined.

Mr. Speaker, we have need to hope, and compelling reason to believe, that the future holds the deliverance of the captive nations. Where the Communists expect the future to bring "the end of History," free men foresee and promise instead the end of tyranny.

HELPS HANDICAPPED YOUTH

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, President Richard M. Nixon recognized that—

One of the great, distinguishing characteristics of the American people is their readiness to join together in helping one another.

In giving recognition to individual efforts that extend the human dimension to persisting forms of need, the President gave his support to the great contribution being made by those persons who work for the betterment of their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the President, the Members of Congress, and the American people to the efforts of United Cerebral Palsy Kenosha County, Inc., in Kenosha, Wis., to meet the problems that confront handicapped youth. Following is an article from the Kenosha News of July 1 which explains this great effort:

EFFORTS MADE TO MEET PROBLEMS THAT CONFRONT HANDICAPPED YOUTH

(By Sheri Nye Seefeldt)

"Just because he's handicapped, why can't my child go to camp?" is many Kenosha parents' plaintive cry when the balmy days of summer arrive. For their children who are kept busy in organized activities during the school year are left to shift for themselves in the summer months.

The sadness of this situation lies in that the handicapped child is almost forced to stay indoors, watching television or playing by himself, because most summer activities offered are geared for the child with no real disabilities. The handicapped child just can't compete. Even if he has the will, he often doesn't have the way.

But thanks to a group of concerned Kenoshaans who saw and filled the great need of the handicapped child in Kenosha, there is a place named Friendship Camp, located on the grounds of the Kenosha County Conservation Club in Bristol. The camp serves children aged six and over who are physically or emotionally handicapped.

One Kenosha parent had this to say about the camp: "The children look forward to it for months in advance and always talk about it. It's a supervised activity and I'm so grateful that we have such a thing."

The day camp, which serves more than 50 handicapped children a week and will serve a total of more than 100 by the time camp is out July 31, will open its doors to the public for the first time Sunday. Open house will be held from 1 to 5 p.m. at the campsite on Hy. A.H. west of Hy. 45. Rain date will be July 20.

SHE HAD A GOOD TIME

When I visited the camp, I was approached by one little girl who was waiting for the bus to take her home (camp runs from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Thursday). She tugged on my arm and made it a point to tell me "I had a good time today."

Kenoshaans who visit the camp Sunday will be able to see these "good times" for themselves. Luther Metcalf, camp director and his counselor staff will take visitors through a simulated camper's day.

The activities at Friendship were about the same as at any other day camp with swimming, boating, fishing, arts and crafts, nature hikes, archery, singing, games and a rifle range. However, at Friendship Camp, the activities are adapted to the disabilities of the campers.

"The different handicaps make no difference with the campers," Metcalf told me, "only personalities."

One longtime camper is confined to a wheelchair. But she has no trouble with running relays because she's pushed by the campers who can walk.

During boating on the lagoon at the Conservation Club, the campers wear life jackets and are rowed by a certified Red Cross instructor. Hot dogs are used mostly for the cookouts because they are easiest for the campers to roast by themselves.

MASTERS TRAMPOLINE

A trampoline is set up for the campers who can use it. One boy who is hard of hearing, learned to operate perfectly on the trampoline through only signs and gestures with a counselor.

In arts and crafts, the campers have made

self-portraits out of material remnants, shakers for July 4, sit-upons (what camper doesn't) and a Friendship Camp banner. They complete one project each session.

Music is a favorite with many of the campers. Guided by their counselors, they sing and do actions to sing-and-dance-a-story records. One of these is "Noah's Ark."

While the majority of the campers go swimming in the afternoons at Paddock Lake, the ones who can't do so stay at the campsite and participate in arts and crafts or watch movies. There are also a slide, swings, teeter-totters, and a merry-go-round on the campsite, as well as perceptual motor equipment (a pyramid, balance beam, mats and tires).

Although camp is now in its second week, parents may still register their children for one or all five of the remaining weeks. Parents can contact the Kenosha Achievement Center (KAC), 1218 79th St., which operates the camp and provides bus transportation for the campers. One week of camp is \$7.

A few paid camperships are available to allow parents of limited financial means to send their handicapped child to Friendship Camp.

SPONSORED BY UCP

The state-approved camp is sponsored by United Cerebral Palsy Kenosha County Inc. (UCP). The camp executive committee is made up of William Hearn, executive director, KAC; Mrs. Michael Thompson, president UCP; Dr. John Richards, president of the Kenosha County Day Care Services; Donald Ricci, educational consultant; Elmer Ungemach, legal consultant; George Connolly, commerce consultant; and the Rev. Paul Mitchell, Kenosha County Association for Retarded Children (KCARC).

Metcalfe and Elwood Knutson, assistant director, lead a staff of 15. Veteran counselor, Miss Donna Courson, a special education teacher at Weiskopf Special Education Center, is chief counselor and assistant; and Mrs. Robert Durdik, a music teacher for the Kenosha Unified School District, Mrs. Charles Malinsky, a guidance counselor at Lincoln Junior High School; and Miss Lillian Larson, a speech therapist in the Unified District, are her counselors.

Assistant Counselors are Susan Buss, a physical therapy student at Marquette University; Jacqueline Koo, nursing, University of Wisconsin at Madison; Susan Walker, psychology, Ripon College; Therese Rozinski, special education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Carolyn Ruffolo, elementary education, Edgewood College, Madison; Ruth Rodgers, special education, University of Wisconsin-Parkside; Alice Bode, special education, Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee; and Wayne Hansen, social work, Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire.

Laurence Bruch is a former Friendship camper who is now putting his valuable experience to work as a counselor there. He is a special education student at UW-M.

Tremper High School students, Keith Talon and Rosemary Quilice are camp aids.

REBUTTAL TO THE WASHINGTON POST

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. William B. Covert of Alexandria, Va., has written to me expressing his grave concern about the editorial

policy of the Washington Post, and particularly about a lengthy and quite opinionated article carried in the Post recently entitled, "Alexandria, After 100 Years Still Facing to the South."

Mr. Covert intends his letter to serve as a rebuttal to the Post, and I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,

July 7, 1969.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: As a loyal and conscientious employee of the Washington Post, I find myself in the embarrassing position of having to voice my disapproval of that journal's editorial policy, which I think is typical of a tendency on the part of the liberal press to divide the country. I have particularly in mind the recent dig in the Post about "Alexandria After 100 Years Still Facing to the South."

As a rebuttal to this slander on the good name of the Southern people you may, if you wish, use this item which appeared in a project of mine (The Potomac Sentinel) on July 1, 1969:

PROPAGANDA STRETCHES THE TRUTH

On the night of June 15, 1969, Georges Pompidou, who served as Charles de Gaulle's Prime Minister for six years, was elected President of France. In commenting on Pompidou's victory a Washington Post foreign correspondent in Paris wrote:

"During a heated National Assembly debate last year one of George Pompidou's opponents told the then Prime Minister: 'With your sardonic smile and your thick eyebrows, you remind me of the devil.'"

"In his successful campaign for the French presidency, Pompidou trimmed his bushy eyebrows, and as one opponent complained he came across not as Satan but as Santa Claus."

This kind of talk is reminiscent of the description of the current American President as the "New Nixon" in contrast to the "Old Nixon." The "Old Nixon" was the devil incarnate in the eyes of the ultraliberals, whose bad image of him was a creature of their own concoction. Since winning the election in 1968 a disgruntled member of the opposition complained: "Too bad the new Nixon is no improvement over the old one."

As a matter of fact there is a "new Nixon" and an "old Nixon." The "new Nixon" is an older Nixon, with the wisdom gained through experience, whereas the "old Nixon" was a younger man, but keenly aware that he "did not know it all."

Propaganda, according to the dictionary, is a means of "spreading doctrines, principles, printed matter, or speeches, for the purpose of promoting a cause, political, religious, or military." Propaganda became an important phase of modern warfare and was well organized by both Germany and Britain in World War I. More recently, it has become evident that propaganda has developed into an important activity of government and private interests at all times. Propaganda can be either a truth or a lie, depending on which cause one is espousing. If one is forced to accept an ideology against his will that process is known as "brainwashing." If a lie is repeated often enough, according to the Marxist theory, it will eventually become accepted as truth.

I learned about propaganda as a weapon of deception during World War I. On being discharged from the Canadian Army during that conflict I returned to Washington in March, 1918. Asked to join a campaign to raise funds for the Liberty Loan Drive, I offered my services. I found myself on a stand with two other soldiers who had returned from the front. I was dismayed to

hear them accuse the Germans of brutality during the invasion of Belgium, such as, for example, officers cutting off the hands of babies. I would have had to see with my own eyes such barbarous acts before making a testimony to that effect. There may have been some isolated cases; I do not know. But a German version might have changed these innocent little babies into 14-year-old "Monsters" who were struck down just as they were on the verge of tossing hand grenades into the ranks of the oncoming troops of the Kaiser.

I have seen propaganda used in political campaigns—scurrilous attacks made on members of both parties, the names of men of integrity dragged in the mud while knaves of the worst sort were elevated to the status of national heroes.

Pursuing the matter further, in the July issue of the Potomac Sentinel is another reference to propaganda, as follows:

"We are greatly disturbed by the statement of a lady psychiatrist in a TV broadcast, who cited figures to insinuate that conscientious objectors were the recipients of more medals proportionately, than combat troops. Also they were more masculine and less inclined to homosexuality. With all due respect to the lady, one questions the source of her information. Sounds like propaganda designed to create an army of conscientious objectors. If that result were achieved wouldn't the Nation find itself in a sorry mess?"

As ever,

(Bill)

WM. B. COVERT.

P.S.—You may use this in part, in whole, or not at all, as you see fit.

If this is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, please send me a copy.

ROAD TO A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, President Thieu's proposal on elections is a clear and ringing challenge to the Communists to "put their money where their mouth is." In so many words, he has asked them to prove—in fair and free electoral competition—their claim that they represent the majority of the South Vietnamese population. He says he and his government will pledge from the outset to accept the results of such elections and has urged the other side to do the same. And to assure that the vote is a fair and fully representative one, he has offered eminently reasonable conditions for holding elections.

This is surely a major step by our Vietnamese ally toward peaceful settlement of this terrible conflict. It is an offer to settle by ballots rather than bullets, and entirely on the basis of the freely determined will of the South Vietnamese people. President Thieu and his colleagues have clearly placed their nation's interests above their own by taking this risk for peace. They have indicated to their own people and to the world that they want an honorable end to the war. They have shown the way to the other side.

Let us hope the other side will take up this challenge. They have so often proclaimed their interest in restoring peace to the Vietnamese people. They now have

the opportunity to help do so, and in the fairest and most democratic means possible—through the free and open voting process.

President Thieu's proposals deserve our full support. They are entirely consistent with our own objective of helping assure self-determination for the South Vietnamese people, and they are in the tradition of democracy and fair play, which we, as a people, so widely admire. We urge the Communist side to give them serious heed.

A BILL TO AID THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the utility of the St. Lawrence Seaway—a transportation link of fundamental economic importance to this Nation—is being seriously threatened by a financial crisis. Under its present funding structure, the Seaway Corporation is being forced to steer a course between Scylla and Charybdis.

On the one hand, if it maintains its present toll rates it will be unable to fulfill its financial obligations to the U.S. Government. On the other hand, if the Corporation raises its rates, it is likely that trade will slacken, thereby leaving the Corporation in similar financial straits and causing grave harm to the economy of the Midwest.

It is thus with a sense of great urgency that I introduce today legislation to solve this dilemma—legislation which balances the right of the U.S. Government to receive a reasonable return on its investment and, at the same time, permits the seaway to perform its vital economic function.

The mechanism for getting the debt-ridden seaway off its financial shoals is a simple one. The bill provides that the \$148 million of outstanding St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation indebtedness to the U.S. Treasury shall be converted into a permanent U.S. investment in the Seaway Corporation. This is very easily accomplished by exchanging preferred stock of the Corporation for its \$129 million of outstanding 50-year bonds and \$19 million of accrued interest debt.

The Seaway Corporation would thus no longer be obligated to repay the \$148 million debt, which it must now pay by the year 2009. Instead, it would pay, in perpetuity, a fair dividend return on the Government's equity investment. This dividend would be the same amount as the Seaway Corporation is now paying to the U.S. Treasury in interest payments.

If this measure is not passed, there is a danger that the Corporation will fall hopelessly behind in meeting its statutory financial obligations over the next 4 years. Under the present arrangement

as set forth in the St. Lawrence Seaway Act of 1954, as amended in 1957—the Corporation is required to pay from toll revenues its operating expenses, maintenance expenses, interest on its indebtedness and, in 50 years time, the capital which it borrows from the U.S. Treasury.

On the basis of the Seaway Corporation's own estimates of cargo to be shipped over the waterway during the next four shipping seasons, the Corporation, after paying operating and maintenance expenses, is likely to fail to pay \$2 million in interest on its outstanding indebtedness. It will, moreover, be unable to make any repayment of the \$19 million of back interest which has accrued since the seaway's opening in 1959, nor will it be able to repay a single dollar of its \$129 million bond indebtedness, either in the next 4 years or in the foreseeable future.

The past record of the seaway supports the feasibility of my proposed solution. In the first 10 years of its existence the seaway has been more responsible, financially, than any other waterway in the continental United States. It has paid the entire costs of its operation and maintenance, nearly \$15 million. In addition, during this period, it has paid to the U.S. Treasury over \$29 million of interest.

If this bill were enacted, the seaway would continue to pay its own way. The only significant change would be to make the Federal Government's investment in the Corporation permanent, thus relieving the Seaway Corporation of its obligation to repay the \$148 million indebtedness.

Toll revenues would continue to pay operating and maintenance expenses and to yield in dividends, the same return on the Treasury's invested capital that the Corporation is now obligated to pay in interest. In addition, with tolls maintained at the present level, increased traffic on the waterway would allow the Corporation to return to the Treasury some \$220 million in dividends over the next 40 years.

In short, under this bill the seaway would continue to operate without Federal subsidy.

Since the seaway together with the Great Lakes is quite literally a fourth seacoast of the United States, the Federal Government should retain ownership of the U.S. share of the seaway in perpetuity. The Government should not try to amortize the costs of its investment over 50 years—it should, instead, seek to be paid a fair annual rate which in time will repay its investment many times over.

The U.S. Government has made a long-term, if not permanent investment in every other major U.S. transportation system.

The seaway is very much like an ocean ship channel serving a particular geographical area; yet ocean ship channels have not had to repay invested capital or to pay interest, and, in fact, have not even had to pay their operating and maintenance costs.

For example, through fiscal year 1965,

the Federal Government has paid on behalf of the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to the sea, \$54,631,336 in construction costs and \$113,346,844 in operating and maintenance costs; the Houston ship channel \$34,449,257 in construction costs and \$32,605,276 in operating and maintenance costs; the Sacramento deep water channel, \$39,551,254 in construction costs and \$10,740,586 in operating and maintenance costs; and the Mobile, Ala., channel \$14,275,026 for construction costs and \$15,221,599 for operating and maintenance costs.

Furthermore, over \$2 billion of Federal funds have been invested in inland waterways in addition to some \$113 million annual appropriations for their operation and maintenance. Inasmuch as tolls are by statute not allowed to be charged, not one cent of this huge capital investment has been repaid.

Mr. Speaker, by any measure the bill which I am introducing today is a modest one. It is in keeping with the principle of the 1954 St. Lawrence Seaway Act—that the seaway is to pay the full costs of its construction and operation. No subsidy is provided for in this bill.

The bill in no way puts the seaway on comparable footing with other major U.S. transportation systems, all of which have enjoyed for many years and continue to enjoy large direct or indirect Government subsidies of capital expenses, operating and maintenance expenses, or both.

In terms of the seaway's financial dilemma, the bill works no miracles. The Seaway Corporation would continue to be financially responsible for all major costs of the great waterway. As a result, the Seaway Corporation would probably continue to operate in the red until some 56 million tons of cargo annually are carried over the seaway. Last year 48 million cargo tons were shipped. It is estimated that the 56-million-ton level will be reached sometime in the early 1970's.

The bill is, however, clearly sufficient to achieve its objective: it would eliminate any foreseeable need for increasing seaway toll rates above their present levels, either in the next four shipping seasons, 1969 to 1972, or thereafter, and within the next decade it would probably make possible a decrease in the present toll rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action on this measure that would be fair to everyone involved—to the Seaway Corporation, the U.S. Treasury, the users of the seaway, and to the American public.

DR. ABE SILVERSTEIN CERTAIN FOR SPACE HALL OF FAME

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Ohio has made a massive contribution to putting a man on the moon, including, of

course, the man himself, Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta. Our Case Institute of Technology at Cleveland gave the United States its first Administrator of NASA, Dr. T. Keith Glennan. And, right from the beginning of America's space efforts, Dr. Abe Silverstein of the Lewis Research Center was in a key role. His efforts have contributed immeasurably to the magnificent achievements our Nation has made in space. As the following salute from the Plain Dealer points out, Abe Silverstein's name will be among the first on the list in history's hall of fame for pioneers in the space age.

The article follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, July 14, 1969]

DR. ABE SILVERSTEIN CERTAIN TO RATE IN SPACE HALL OF FAME
(By William D. McCann)

CAPE KENNEDY.—When historians write about persons who played vital roles in America's man-on-the-moon program, one of the first on the list undoubtedly will be Dr. Abe Silverstein, who gave the Apollo project its name.

Dr. Silverstein, director of the Lewis Research Center here, was one of a handful of men who in 1958 organized the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and most of its subsequent manned and unmanned projects.

In a recent interview, he recalled picking the title Apollo out of a Greek mythology book in 1960 after his committee had failed to come up with a suitable name.

"I thought the image of the god Apollo riding his chariot across the sun gave the best representation of the grand scale of the proposed program," he said. "So I chose it."

When the first Russian Sputnik was launched in October 1957, the United States began to take a hard look at its space plans.

The decision to set up a civilian agency to conduct a massive space program grew out of a March 1958 report by a presidential committee headed by Dr. James R. Killian, then president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The committee's recommendation for an aggressive exploration project was endorsed by President Dwight Eisenhower.

In April 1948, Dr. Hugh Dryden summoned Dr. Silverstein to Washington to help put the civilian space agency together. At the time Dr. Silverstein was associate director at Lewis. Dr. Dryden was then director of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics (NACA), the forerunner of NASA.

Congress passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act in July 1958 and NASA was established officially by law the following October. Dr. T. Keith Glennan, then president of Case Institute of Technology, was named first administrator. Dr. Dryden became his deputy, and Dr. Silverstein became director of space flight programs.

Under Dr. Silverstein's leadership Project Mercury, the nation's first man-in-space project, was organized and the groundwork laid for Gemini and Apollo.

"When Mercury got started and was successful, there was no doubt that we needed to develop followup programs," he said. "So we went ahead."

Then late in 1959 at Wallops Island, Va., Dr. Silverstein headed a meeting in which the Apollo idea was born.

In early Apollo planning three alternatives were studied for getting man to the moon: direct landing, earth orbit and direct landing and lunar orbit and landing. Scientists finally settled on the third choice after deciding that building a massive rocket capable of direct landing on the moon—without the need for a lunar landing vehicle—was out of the question.

In addition to pioneering plans for manned space flight, Dr. Silverstein also laid early plans for innumerable unmanned flights including communications and weather satellites.

He also headed a committee that set up the Saturn series of launch vehicles, including the use of liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen propellants.

In November 1961, Dr. Silverstein returned to Lewis as director and headed a major expansion of the center. Within two years he increased Lewis personnel by 2,000 to 4,800 and made the center NASA's primary installation for both research and development of rocket propulsion.

Today Lewis is responsible for NASA's Atlas, Atlas-Agena, Thor-Agena and Thrust Augmented Thor-Agena launch vehicles. Atlas-Agenas sent Mariner IV to Mars, the Ranger Spacecraft to the moon and launched such satellites as Nimbus and Lunar Orbiter.

Lewis also was responsible for developing the Atlas-Centaur rocket, the nation's first high-energy vehicle, which sent Surveyor flights to the moon. Centaur also launched the two Mariner spacecraft that will fly by Mars on July 31 and August 5.

Lewis scientists have been working on nuclear and electric-powered rockets for future long-term space missions to distant planets.

Although he has been away from Apollo programs for several years, Dr. Silverstein has his hopes and plans riding high with Apollo 11. He believes the pace of the U.S. space program may speed up rather than slow down after a successful manned moon landing.

"Our space program is one of our few national projects that have been successful," he said. "I think that Apollo will be successful and the American people do not turn away from success."

Dr. Silverstein added that an end to the Vietnam war should bring an even greater expansion of the space program—and other national projects, too.

One of the biggest values of the space program so far has been its effect in stimulating education, he declared. "Its role in encouraging new ideas and encouraging invention is often overlooked."

A native of Terre Haute, Ind., Dr. Silverstein was graduated from Rose Polytechnic Institute with a mechanical engineering degree in 1929. He began his scientific career at Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., where he helped design the full-scale wind tunnel.

At Langley, he headed aerodynamic research that led to increased high-speed performance of most of the combat aircraft of World War II.

Later at Lewis, he was responsible for the idea, design and building of the nation's first supersonic propulsion wind tunnel. This research contributed greatly to the development of supersonic planes.

MAYOR CHARLES STENVIG OF MINNEAPOLIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an American-style revolution—at the ballot box—occurred in Minneapolis, Minn., on June 10, 1969. Police Detective Charles Stenvig, running as an independent candidate for mayor, was elected by the people of his city.

Certainly Mayor Stenvig's election is

classic "grassroots" political action. His victory is an example of what American people can do when they close ranks and work toward a goal which they themselves believe in.

Mayor Stenvig and his independent supporters—which included none of the old-line politicians and heavily financed pressure groups—took on the whole establishment and by hard work and people-to-people contact have secured for themselves the leadership that they felt was necessary for their city.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting report on Mayor Stenvig appeared in the summer 1969 issue of the Law Officer, official publication of the International Conference of Police Associations, which I place in the RECORD for our colleagues' attention:

MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DETECTIVE SWEEPS IN—STENVIG ELECTED MINNEAPOLIS MAYOR

When 41 year old Police Detective Charles Stenvig filed to run as a candidate for Mayor of Minneapolis, the general comment by politically sophisticated was, "He doesn't stand a chance!"

Today he is Mayor.

And he swept the election by grabbing a whopping 62% of the vote.

The almost unbelievable story of Stenvig's accomplishment includes the fact that his opponent was a prominent alderman and President of the City Council.

Even though Stenvig led the field of the three major candidates in the Primary, the results of the election caught the most knowledgeable by surprise. Stenvig, himself, admits that he never expected to beat his opponent by so overwhelming a majority.

Stenvig, a political independent, completed a surprising drive to power by defeating Republican Dan Cohen.

Stenvig overwhelmed Cohen, who is president of the City Council, by 75,748 votes to 46,739.

The turnout was considered heavy for a city election.

Stenvig told admirers jubilantly after the outcome, "Maybe some people would say this isn't the time and place to do it, but I'm going to make my first appointment now. My chief adviser is going to be God, and don't you forget it."

Earlier Stenvig, who emphasized law and order throughout his campaign, appeared at a victory celebration of his campaign workers.

He said: "Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all my terrific workers and especially my wife and family for everything they've gone through in this campaign, and that's been plenty."

"I also want to thank all you good citizens of Minneapolis for your vote of confidence, and I won't let you down. Thank you."

Stenvig, who is also president of the Minneapolis Police Officers' Federation and a vice president of the International Conference of Police Associations, will be sworn in July 7 as the city's new chief executive.

Stenvig is also chairman of the ICPA Periodicals Committee.

He will succeed Arthur Naftalin, a DFLer who decided not to seek reelection after holding the office for four terms beginning in 1961.

Stenvig entered the mayor's race last January but was rated an underdog in the primary campaign against Cohen, 7th Ward alderman since 1965, and Gerard Hegstrom, 8th Ward alderman and the DFL endorsed mayoral candidate.

Stenvig, however, led in the April 29 primary election with 30,230 votes, or 41 percent of the total. Cohen finished with 21,899 votes, or 30 percent. Hegstrom finished third and was eliminated.

Hegstrom, who had Naftalin's support in the primary subsequently endorsed Cohen. Naftalin, however, remained aloof following Hegstrom's defeat.

Stenvig's performance represents a break with tradition in a city that normally gives its votes in citywide elections to candidates affiliated with a political party.

One City Hall personality who has been close to local politics since the 1930s said recently that he could not recall another case of an independent who has fared as well as Stenvig.

Royce Givens, Executive Director of the ICPA said from Washington, D.C. that he knew of no other police officer who had become Mayor of a large metropolitan city while still employed in police service.

Cohen attempted to build a coalition of labor, DFLers and Republicans after the primary, but Stenvig with his stress on a need for firm law enforcement clearly had broad support throughout the city.

Stenvig's strength is reflected in the fact that he outpolled Cohen in all but two of the city's 13 wards.

According to unofficial figures, 55 percent of the city's registered voters went to the polls. In the mayoral race two years ago, the turnout was 48 percent.

One question raised by the outcome of the mayor's race is the administration of the police department.

During the campaign Stenvig would not say whether he would reappoint Chief Donald Dwyer, although he said frequently that Dwyer would be "at the top of the list."

Stenvig adhered to a basic campaign platform that he spelled out in a position paper (consisting of a single sheet) which he circulated before the primary election.

The first of 12 points in the position paper dealt with law enforcement, which Stenvig described as the "mayor's No. 1 responsibility."

In the paper, Stenvig said "I believe in strong, fair, law enforcement, and as your mayor would not let a few hoodlums dictate the policies for the majority of the hard-working, law-abiding citizens of Minneapolis."

He did not name the "hoodlums" but said that they frequently could be found leading demonstrations on behalf of causes espoused by black and white civil-rights militants.

He publicly advocated taking "the handcuffs off our police" to allow them "to do the job they were hired to do by protecting the lives and property of the responsible, law-abiding citizens from the hoodlum and criminal elements that are so evident in our city today."

Stenvig said his human-relations program could "be summed up in one saying, the Golden Rule. If everyone followed this we would take big steps forward."

Stenvig ran an unconventional campaign that consisted of virtually no media advertising and that relied heavily on personal contacts by the candidate. He cruised the city in a 1940 sound truck and attempted to blanket all wards with lawn signs.

In a preliminary statement filed with the City Clerk's Office last week, Stenvig reported donations of \$14,971, disbursements of \$7,997 and unpaid obligations of \$3,314.

He had a volunteer committee of about 800 workers. Some of his hardest campaigners came from the ranks of the police federation.

Cohen's campaign statement showed expenditures of \$36,797. His campaign structure was headed by five paid staffers, including John Deardourff, a campaign consultant from Washington, D.C.

He was endorsed by the Minneapolis Central Labor Union and the Minneapolis Building and Construction Trades Council.

He also had the backing of President

Nixon, Minnesota Gov. Harold LeVander and a committee of city DFLers headed by James Rice, chairman of the 5th Ward DFL Club.

The Charles Stenvigs live in a neat, three-bedroom ramblar in the southeastern corner of Minneapolis and worry about everyday things like mortgage payments, permissive social attitudes and their own lack of leisure time.

A visitor to the white house in the 5600 block of 35th Ave. S. would find that the mayor-elect of Minneapolis is a man of positive attitudes about things other than politics.

He would also find that Stenvig is an occasionally frustrated man who hopes that the pressures of public life will relent enough now that the election is over to allow him to play some golf or to fly a plane.

But Stenvig, a police officer for the past 13 years, is definite about one thing:

"I'll have to take more time with the boys in the future," he said during a recent interview. He gestured towards his two sons who were playing on the floor, Todd, 3, and Tommy, 14 months.

The Stenvigs also have two daughters, Terri, 13, and Tracy, 11. Taken together, the Stenvigs call their children "the four Ts."

The Stenvigs are frank in discussing their family life and they make it clear that they subscribe to old-school notions about things like discipline, the value of the home and family life, and sex education.

"You have to start them young," Stenvig said in discussing discipline. "I can't see my children going over and wrecking someone else's furniture."

"They look for discipline. They need it," Mrs. Stenvig said.

"I think to have love in the home you need discipline," Stenvig concluded.

"I definitely don't see the need for sex education starting in kindergarten," said Mrs. Stenvig, as the conversation switched to another topic. "We got along fine. We were in junior high school when they started."

"I think it has its place in school but I think they also can go overboard," Stenvig said.

"It used to be that playing Monopoly and having popcorn was a big thing. Now home is just a stopping-off place. It isn't the Rock of Gibraltar it used to be. I feel there's just too much outside activity. As far as morals go, I think they are too loose. We need more of a return to home. I also think we need a little bit more of a return to God," Stenvig said.

Stenvig was brought up in south Minneapolis as a member of St. Luke's Lutheran Church where his mother sang as a soloist. His father sang in an American Legion male chorus.

Although he and his family now attend Minnehaha Methodist Church, an early interest in music has continued.

He was a drummer in bands through grade school, high school, and the Army.

Tracy plays the clarinet and Terri plays the violin. Both girls study the piano.

Stenvig himself talks somewhat wishfully about some day joining a "combo," perhaps after he is retired.

"Dixieland and jazz, that's what I like," he said.

Mrs. Stenvig, 38, is three years younger than her husband. Like him, she went to Roosevelt High School and they started dating in 1948, shortly after he was discharged from the service.

Although she was several years behind him in high school, she remembers Stenvig as an athlete—and particularly as a champion golfer.

They were married in 1951, while Stenvig was working towards his degree at Augsburg College. She worked as a teller in a bank to help him through Augsburg, Stenvig recalls now.

Once a par golfer, Stenvig has had to let his game slip since becoming an officer in the Minneapolis Police Officers' Federation in 1963.

"I hope to play a lot more golf," Stenvig said. "But I'd probably shoot in the middle 80s now. That's kind of a letdown. You have to play a great deal—really concentrate—and with a family, that's not fair."

Stenvig began flying a plane after he was recalled into the service following his graduation from Augsburg.

He has pursued his interest in flying since then and now belongs to a flying club. Through the club he has part ownership in a four-seater Cessna.

The Stenvigs now live in a \$20,000 house at 5604 35th Ave. S. in what Stenvig describes as a "working neighborhood."

Stenvig simply shakes his head when he thinks of the years of house payments ahead.

However, he isn't bothered too much by the little-sleep routine of a campaign because "I'm used to it."

He describes himself as a "night-owl," who rarely goes to bed before 1 a.m. and is usually up by 6:15 a.m.

Neither Stenvig nor his wife smoke but each will drink a highball or beer.

Stenvig's tastes in food are easily satisfied.

"He doesn't like anything fancy," his wife said. "I eat a lot of hamburgers and french fries," Stenvig explained.

The furnishings in their home aren't fancy either, but were chosen for comfort. A sofa and a couple of chairs covered in a simple brown pattern are arranged in the living room with Formica topped tables nearby. Hanging on a wall over a piano is an oil painting entitled "Moonlight: Fisherman's Village."

A stereo is placed underneath a picture window, next to a television set—black and white. Stenvig's drums are set up in a rumpus room downstairs.

In a hallway off the living room a set of book shelves with an encyclopedia and other educational books are conveniently located for the Stenvig youngsters.

Stenvig said he would like to be able to do more "light" reading but as federation president his time was spent studying "things from a police angle and from a business agent's angle."

"Now," he said, "I'll have to keep up with the business of the city."

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a fine American has recently retired after many years of outstanding and faithful service to his country, his State of North Carolina, and the University of North Carolina from which he graduated.

During his long and distinguished career Dr. Frank Porter Graham upheld a strong American tradition—that of uplifting and improving his community and his country.

He has always been a staunch advocate of academic freedom, "the open platform," the right of labor to organize and bargain freely with employers, racial equality, the ultimate triumph of human wisdom and the best impulses of the human spirit.

He has shouldered his obligations with

good humor and fierce dedication and has time and again proved that honest, decent citizenship is the most vital feature of democracy. Mr. Graham's citizenship is living proof that democracy can never be better than are the citizens who make up that democracy.

Since 1951 he has been an international civil servant—the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan, trying to get those two Nations to resolve their differences. He has spoken with eloquence all over the country on the merits of the United Nations; his energy is boundless.

He was called upon repeatedly during and after World War II by the administration to handle difficult assignments. He served on the National War Labor Board, 1942 to 1945; the President's Commission on Civil Rights, 1946; U.S. Representative on the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations Security Council to effect a cease-fire between the Dutch and Indonesians, 1947 to 1948.

He served out an uncompleted term as U.S. Senator from North Carolina in 1949 and 1950 but was defeated in a runoff primary for reelection.

For many years he was president of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and under his inspired leadership that institute of higher learning proliferated handsomely.

Frank Graham's service to this Nation will be greatly missed; his ability as an educator, however, will continue to influence our future generations.

He can be justly proud of his career and accomplishments. It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to send along my warmest personal wishes for a long and happy retirement.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, and as one who has consistently introduced, advocated, and supported congressional resolutions and other efforts designed to encourage and promote the restoration of freedom to captive nations, I am, indeed, very happy to again participate in this further and most worthy salute to the courageous peoples still suffering under the suppressive yoke of Communist domination.

The people of these United States and this Government very deeply regret, and most earnestly urge the Communist leaders to give up their unlawful dictatorship over all these captive peoples and permit them to resume their right to self-government. The captive countries that suffer under the oppressive rule of these dictators have the continuing, pledged support of our Government and our citizens in their just aspirations for personal freedom and national independence.

Through this annual formal observance of Captive Nations Week, we shall continue to work and urge and hope that the Communist regimes may be persuaded and convinced that subjugated nations should be granted their God-given right to freely govern themselves as they see fit.

Let us persevere in our cause and may the good Lord speed the day of our common success in united effort to promote the liberty of the heroic peoples of the captive nations.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969, which was adopted by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsible to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania:

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nation's Week, July 13 to 19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

JOSEF LETTERICH,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

THE TECHNIQUE OF PERPETUAL CRISIS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure that the FBI had tapped the phone of the late Reverend Martin Luther King for internal security reasons emphasizes the warning that civil rights leaders are targets for subversive elements who are not the least bit interested in furthering the social progress of the Negro people. In extensive remarks on October 4, 1967, for instance, I pointed out that testimony by various Negro ex-members of the Communist Party in the United States confirmed the charge that the CPUSA used the aspirations of the Negro people to create dissension in the Nation. With regard to Dr. King it was noted that:

While one would be shocked to find Martin Luther King consistently cooperating with the KKK, his history regarding pro-Communist persons, causes and organizations is a matter of record.

Apparently, I was not the only one concerned about Dr. King's questionable associations. The Washington Star of June 19 reported that the then Attorney General Robert Kennedy and the FBI were concerned enough to tap Dr. King's phone in the interest of internal security. The Star article by Jeremiah O'Leary stated that FBI Director Hoover revealed the contents of two memorandums in which the Attorney General "expressed concern about possible infiltration of the race issue by Marxists and spoke of allegations that the Negro leader was closely associated with Marxist ideas and followers."

The article further stated:

Kennedy, according to the Evans memo, was concerned about reports that King was a student of Marxism, that he was associating with a New York attorney with known Communist connections, but that he did not espouse Marxism because of his religious beliefs.

The nationally syndicated columnist, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, in a column appearing in the Shreveport Journal of July 5, commented on the perpetual crisis technique which was used by Dr. King and which has been a standard device used by the Communist movement throughout the world. Unfortunately, the technique of creating crises to attain a predetermined goal has been refined and implemented by violence by such anarchistic groups as the Students for a Democratic Society.

I insert the Roosevelt column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal, July 5, 1969]

"PERPETUAL CRISIS"—KING'S TECHNIQUE
(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The recent revelations that the late Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy had authorized a wiretap on the telephones of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. have made it possible to begin to examine objectively King's actions and behavior.

Hitherto, objectivity had been almost impossible in an emotionally charged atmosphere. To supporters of Dr. King he had become a symbol of the legitimate drive by Negroes for progress, identity and achievement. Some revered him as a quasi-saint but his enemies hated him as an agitator and a radical supporter of Communist causes. There were those too who would have disliked anybody who supported social change, however needed.

Who then was the real Martin Luther King? Why is it important that we seek to understand this controversial man whose influence reaches beyond the grave? The reason is simply that his behavior presented a pattern which increasingly characterizes the American political scene today—this is the so-called "perpetual crisis" technique. King admitted his role in creating a "crisis packed situation" in his book "Why We Can't Wait." He declared:

"The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violent direct action are not the creators of the tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We

bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with."

In other words, Dr. King was admitting that he was acting as a catalyst of "crisis-packed" situations. But at the same time, he dialectically used the slogan of "non-violence" as a cover. Consider how his physical presence in cities throughout the nation led to violence of riot proportions. Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. Thus, everywhere King went, he left a trail of violence in his wake—bringing "tension" as he called it "out in the open."

The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1958, he was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

"It was regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident."

On many occasions, like Chicago in 1966, he went to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, added to the riot-producing tension. This is the pattern of behavior revealed in the still unpublished reports circulating in the Justice Department. On the floor of the House, Rep. John R. Ashbrook (R-Ohio) referred to these reports saying that in July of 1966, King and his assistants were "contacting and enlisting street gangs" and inciting them to violence against Mayor Daley, policemen, slum lords, bankers, businessmen and school administrators. Ashbrook pointed out that in the same month, "during looting, gunfire, rock-throwing, Molotov cocktail barrage, King reportedly sped from one spot to another ostensibly to quiet things, but reporters noted he seldom got out of his car."

King's actions disappointed many Americans, black and white, who felt he had a rare opportunity to align himself with an important cause and work for the solution to social ills through our democratic process. But it became increasingly clear to those who were not blinded by political expedience or emotional propaganda that he was in fact not doing this. Shortly before King's death, Louis Waldman, a leading labor lawyer in Chicago, made this perceptive analysis of Dr. King's "perpetual crisis" politics. Waldman said:

"The philosophy and purpose of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce 'crisis' situations and 'tension.' Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence . . ."

"The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement throughout the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany both on his road to power and after power came to him . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions. Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, or provoking 'tensions' as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties and to constitutional government."

This was a damning indictment from a man who praised nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights and it came not from a racist, but from a man who has been a champion of civil rights for decades. Now it is clear that such hitherto unheeded warnings had a solid foundation which was known to a number of top government officials at the time although they cynically supported Dr. King's disruptive activities. As a result, the "perpetual crisis technique" continues to be used on the nation's streets and is escalating on our campuses.

THEY ARE ON THE WAY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

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

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 16, 1969]

THEY'RE ON THE WAY

CAPE KENNEDY.—Apollo-11 hurtled into space on a pillar of flame today, carrying three astronauts and the dreams of mankind on a historic voyage to sift the dust of the moon.

Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin rode their 3,242-ton space machine toward a brief earth orbit exactly on time at 9:32 a.m. If all goes well, Mr. Armstrong and Col. Aldrin early Monday morning will become the first men ever to set foot on the moon.

"Everything is go," reported the astronauts as Apollo-11 curved gracefully over the Atlantic, visible for miles in the cloudless sky.

Apollo-11 rose majestically off launch pad 39A, leaving earth on man's greatest adventure with an awesome bellow that shook the beaches where hundreds of thousands of spectators, the largest crowd ever to watch a launch, were jammed.

After making final checks in their 115-mile high parking orbit over earth, the astronauts were to kick their spaceship off on the 250,000-mile journey to the moon.

The next step, almost immediately after leaving orbit, was to separate from the third stage of the enormous Saturn-5 rocket, spin around and pull the lunar landing module out of its housing atop the rocket stage.

"All engines are looking good," reported Mr. Armstrong four minutes into the flight.

"It's bright," remarked one of the crew, peering out the moonship window as the spaceship raced at 8,500 mph toward earth orbit.

The astronauts were pronounced "rested, fit as a fiddle and ready to go" by a physician after they awoke at 4:15 a.m. They breakfasted on the ritual meal of steak, eggs, toast, coffee and orange juice.

Last night President Nixon told them "you carry with you a feeling of good will in this greatest adventure man has ever undertaken."

The eight-day flight returns to earth on Thursday of next week, bringing back precious samples from the moon. But they may not be the first samples. As Apollo-11 soared aloft, the Soviet unmanned spacecraft Luna 15 was rushing toward the moon.

Launched last Sunday, it was expected to reach the moon early tomorrow and many experts felt the Russian flight would turn out to be an attempt to scoop up lunar rock and return it to earth before Apollo can come back.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson and many other government leaders watched the launch. An estimated million or more spectators jammed the coast.

Janet Armstrong was here to watch her husband begin his adventure, but the wives of Col. Collins and Col. Aldrin remained home in Houston.

The astronauts retired early last night after eating a steak dinner. The final portion of the six-day countdown began on schedule at 11 p.m. Technicians began pumping frigid liquid oxygen into the Saturn-5 rocket two hours later.

It was the climactic step in America's

eight-year, \$24 billion drive to fulfill the goal set by President Kennedy when he challenged the nation to try to land men on the moon this decade and safely return them to earth.

The men of Apollo-11 are scheduled to turn man's ages-old dream into a reality Sunday when Mr. Armstrong and Col. Aldrin leave Col. Collins in lunar orbit and fly their landing ship "Eagle" to a gentle touchdown on the moon's vast arid Sea of Tranquility.

Mr. Armstrong, 38-year-old civilian commander of the mission, is set to crawl feet first through a 32-inch square hatchway, ease slowly down a nine-rung ladder and set the first foot on the dark, sandy surface at 2:21 a.m. Monday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1969]

THERE ARE 5,600,000 PARTS, SIGN REMINDS SATURN WORKERS

ORLANDO, FLA.—The Martin Marietta plant here makes a small instrument package for the Apollo spacecraft. It is no bigger than a small suitcase, but workers here are not allowed to forget its importance.

On one window of the "clean room" where they put the parts together hangs a sign warning:

"If all of Saturn 5's 5,600,000 parts worked with 99.9 percent reliability, there would still be 5,600 defective parts."

APOLLO 11—U.S. PRIDE IN ACHIEVEMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with Apollo 11 successfully in orbit and the landing of the first human on the surface of the moon expected Monday, I join with millions of Americans in hearty congratulations and thanks to NASA and Dr. Werner von Braun, along with their many prime contractors, for their unswerving dedication in pursuit of expanding man's horizons and to keep America first in space.

Special commendation must go to the many, many unnamed members of the teams of scientists, technicians, craftsmen, engineers, and workers, both military and civilian who have backed up America's commitment for aerospace progress.

Likewise, acknowledgment must be given to the role of the American people—the taxpayers and productive Americans who were called upon, gave of their substance and who now, with pride in U.S. achievement, follow the moonshot with a rewarding sense of personal contribution—that they, too, participated in this historic first.

And, finally, I share with millions of Americans in every walk of life—with free men the world over—in lauding the courage and daring of Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin Aldrin, our U.S. astronauts, for undertaking the personal risk involved in realizing this new page in earth's progress.

We all follow their journey—with prayer and pride in achievement—anticipating the proudest moment of all when Old Glory, the symbol of the Nation and

people who make this possible, is unfurled, the first flag to fly on the surface of the moon.

STUDENT OPINION

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs is one of the finest of the student organizations seeking to represent student opinion on some of the questions that have stirred so much concern on campuses.

The council meets in an annual conference to study and discuss international problems, and to adopt resolutions reflecting its point of view. The example of day-in day-out concern set by the council over the years, and the informed and rational dialog that marks these annual conferences, is enormously encouraging, especially in these confused times. I commend to the House for study the conclusions of the 1969 conference on several of the most important problems facing the United States:

RESOLUTIONS

NOTE.—Resolutions passed by a majority of the participants of the 24th Annual National Student Leadership Institute on World Affairs, sponsored by the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs, June 14-21, 1969.

RESOLUTION ON HUNGER

Faced with the acute problem of world starvation, we feel the urgent need to express our feelings on this problem. First is the understanding that starvation brings about an immense physical and mental health problem; secondly, it promotes pain and misery among human beings; thirdly, it causes ill feeling between the have and the have-not peoples of the world. Therefore, we will dedicate our services to waging a battle against world starvation. We urge your help in all projects aimed to battle hunger, such as our March on Hunger, and aiding migrant workers, ghetto dwellers, and other deprived peoples of the world.

Noting the hunger which is prevalent in many rural and urban areas in the United States,

Further noting that CIRUNA is a strong advocate and adherent to the principles embodied within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Cognizant that Article I of the above-mentioned Declaration states that "All Humans are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Pleased to mention that the preceding statement means that all humans should express solicitude about others who are not adequately fed,

And distressed and wretchedly disappointed at those who orally condemn the right of hunger to exist, but yet fail to yield to the tenets of practicality and activeness,

Therefore be it resolved that we concern ourselves with the problem of hunger, by asking each delegate to pledge to return to his or her campus, and seek to raise funds which will be sent to the national office for distribution to the needy.

RESOLUTION ON MIRV

We call upon the President of the USA and the Congress to immediately halt the testing of Multiple Individually Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRV). We further ask, in the name of future generations, that the U.S. immediately initiate strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, including in some way representatives of the People's Republic of China, France and the United Kingdom. We are of the opinion that completion of testing of MIRV and its deployment by the U.S. will increase Soviet uncertainty about our nuclear strategic capabilities, endanger the prospects for an agreement to limit offensive/defensive strategic missile systems, and initiate a new dangerous spiraling of the nuclear arms race. It would decrease, not improve, our national security. Further, the deployment of MIRV warheads on land and sea-based ICBM's would complicate the problem of inspection of any missile system arms limitation agreement. While present systems can be identified with aerial satellite surveillance, if MIRV warheads were deployed it would necessitate on-site inspection of missile sites, greatly complicating the opportunities for agreement with the Soviet Union.

We urge that the President freeze the development and deployment of MIRV now, and that he call upon the Soviet Union to reciprocate by freezing its development of its less advanced MIRV system. We believe that this action, coupled with delay in approval and deployment of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System, will ensure the most propitious atmosphere and context for successful strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

We, the participants of the National Student Leadership Institute, are in a generation unsure that there is a future. Our lives have known only the threat of global nuclear destruction. We look for hope and optimism, but see none in the spiraling nuclear arms race. If we are to create a future for ourselves, for our children, for all those we love, we need to begin first by ending an insane nuclear arms race by halting ABM and MIRV deployment and entering into arms talks with the Soviet Union NOW, so that the future of world peace will be secured.

RESOLUTION ON APOLLO 11 FLIGHT TO MOON

Considering the resolution in the UN General Assembly on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and

Believing that outer space should be utilized for the advance of all nations, and

Realizing that the Apollo 11 flight is man's initial venture into this international domain,

We therefore condemn the decision of the U.S. Congress stipulating only the American Flag should be carried to and placed on the moon, and

Furthermore express disappointment over the U.S. Government's violation of the above-stated principles and

Urge that both the United States flag and the United Nations flag be carried aboard the Apollo 11 flight.

LOANS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the paradox of American medical education is that only the truly rich can afford the long and expensive training needed to enter the exceedingly well-paid ranks of the American doctor. Others who apply

must borrow money, depend on parents, in-laws and working wives to survive the 10 to 12 years of training to become a doctor.

This system has several very unfortunate consequences. First, medicine becomes a socially inbred profession with, in a recent typical year, about 60 percent of medical students coming from the upper 14 percent of the population's income segment. A further defect is an attitude, bordering on bitterness, among young doctors who understandably resent many years of deprivation during training and who then abandon part or all of the humanitarian motivation which brought them into medicine. Too many then concentrate on making up for lost time in achieving high earnings.

One way to remedy this situation is to provide much better scholarship and loan programs for medical students. The resistance to this approach has been, again paradoxically, a general lack of sympathy for students who will soon be earning large incomes.

To break this cycle, we established, under the Health Professions Education Act, a student loan program to allow more middle- and lower-income students to enter medical training. Another goal was increasing physician production.

These goals are jeopardized today by a sharp reduction in funds available in fiscal year 1970 for this loan fund. Unless the \$15 million requested for this fund is increased by at least \$10 million, many medical students will have their continued education threatened.

The president of the Student American Medical Association, Edward D. Martin, recently testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on this need. His statement was enhanced by numerous excerpts from letters written by medical students who described what the loan fund has meant to their education. I include Mr. Martin's statement, with these excerpts, below.

I also include a summary, by medical school and congressional district, of what the reduced loan fund allocations mean to specific schools.

The House will soon consider this matter when the appropriations bills are presented. We shall do our country a distinct disservice if we fail to supply funds for loans to medical students, especially since we have encouraged these same medical schools, through other programs, to expand their classes. Without loan funds available, there may well be empty seats this fall in our medical school classrooms.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF THE STUDENT AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I am Edward D. Martin, of Kansas City, Kansas, a senior medical student at the University of Kansas. I am appearing here today as President of the Student American Medical Association. S.A.M.A. is an autonomous organization with more than 24,000 active medical student members in 93 American medical schools, and over 35,000 affiliate intern and resident members.

The purpose of my testimony is to strongly urge on behalf of our membership that this subcommittee increase the 1970 appropriation for the Health Professions Education Loan from the proposed \$15,000,000 to the

full amount of \$35,000,000 authorized in section 742 of the Public Health Service Act.

There are eight facts which, in themselves, speak for the necessity of an increased appropriation in this critically important loan program.

(1) There is a clearly documented health manpower shortage in our country which is becoming more acute year by year.

(2) Medical education and living expenses across the country have risen sharply in the past few years.

(3) An appropriation of \$15,000,000 this year will result in an effective decrease of \$10,316,000 as compared to last year. Thus, the number of medical students assisted (at an average loan of \$1,146) would drop from 12,375 to 7,545 leaving 4,830 students without necessary funds.

(4) The projected increase of 900 entering freshmen next year over last year will compound this problem considerably.

(5) Each year, significantly larger numbers of students come from middle and lower income families and from minority groups and have less available family support.

(6) The availability of long-term loans from private sources is decreasing and are unevenly available both by state and by individual students.

(7) The Guaranteed Loan Program of the Office of Education will not be able to substitute for the increased need for financial support.

(8) There are a significant number of medical students for which this program is the primary means of support and a significant number would be forced to leave school if funds were not available.

The shortage of physicians in the United States is clearly documented. In order to maintain the 1959 ratio of physicians to population—"a minimum essential to protect the health of the people of the United States"—we will require 40,000 more physicians by 1975 than the present output of U.S. medical schools and continued immigration of foreign physicians can provide.¹ The Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association in 1967 stated that the nation's shortage of physicians was reaching "alarming proportions".² The shortage of physicians in our inner cities and in rural America is acute and is rapidly worsening. The President's Commission on Health Manpower, the A.M.A., the A.A.M.C., and numerous other organizations concerned with health care have all stated that there is an acute need for more physicians and health professionals. Without increased and sustained support of the federal government for student, faculty and schools alike, this need will not be met.

School expenses which averaged \$1,271 in 1964³ have increased substantially. The median annual tuition for 45 private schools is \$1930 with some tuitions as high as \$2595 per year. The median tuition for public schools is \$618 for in-state students and \$1220 for non-residents.⁴ Books and supplies average \$200-\$250 per year and the mandatory microscopes cost incoming freshmen another \$700-\$750. Living expenses have increased proportionately and where the average non-school costs were \$2,000 in 1959, \$2,846 in 1964⁵ they were closer to \$3500

in 1968. These increases have placed an increasing burden on the already strained financial sources that help sustain the medical student through the 4-5 years past an already costly college education. A family's contribution to these expenses (which represented 32% of the medical students income in 1964) is heavy even in families with income up to \$15,000, critical when other children are in the home or in school, and overwhelming to the increasing number of families with incomes less than \$10,000 whose children are in medical school.

The Federal Capital Contribution of \$15,000,000 last fiscal year was supplemented with \$11,429,000 from the revolving loan fund which was not extended for this year and will augment the proposed 1969-70 appropriation by only \$1,113,000. Thus, while \$26,429,000 was available last year, an appropriation of \$15,000,000 this year will result in a real cut of \$10,316,000. (See Appendix A). The result of the \$15,000,000 appropriation this year will decrease the percentage of medical students aided from 35% to 20%, and decrease the amount funded of that requested by medical schools from 74% to 39%. The medical school share of the cut will reduce funds for medical students by \$5,558,000 and if the average loan remains at \$1,150, 4830 medical students who received loans last year will have no funds available this September. (See Appendix B).

The substantially increased demand on existing school, state and federal funds is reflected by the projected increase of entering freshmen next fall. The AAMC has estimated that there will be an increase of over 900 new freshmen next year which is almost an increase of 10% over last year's entering freshman class of 9,727.

A most important factor in the consideration of funds available for students is that there has been a successful and widespread effort by medical schools to increase the number of medical students from minority groups and lower socio-economic families. Coupled with this is the clear trend which has been established in many schools toward an increasing percentage of students who are not from affluent professional families. These students cannot obtain the considerable family financial backing that children of affluent families can. In the past this has served as a major obstacle to many students and it is only through programs such as the Health Professions Education Act Loan Program that less privileged students can be guaranteed equal opportunities to become practicing physicians. The \$15,000-25,000 total expense of 4 years of medical school is a considerable barrier to overcome when you are from a family with limited income, and are unable to work part-time because of increasing clinical and basic science responsibilities.

There are some who argue that the Guaranteed Loan Program of the Office of Education would substitute for the decrease in the Health Professions Education Loan Program. From all data available it is clear that this will not be the case. A 1968 U.S. Office of Education Survey⁶ concluded that these loans were not available to all students on an equal basis due to lack of lender participation, or a lack of available funds in a majority of states. Also students unknown at a bank, out-of-state students, students from rural areas, and students from low-income families were found to have difficulty obtaining loans. The experience of students in a large number of states indicates that these loans are quite difficult to obtain. With the current prime rate of 7½% and the rate

¹ Health Manpower Perspective 1967, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1967.

² Janson, Donald, AMA Panel Asks Drive to End Doctor Shortage. New York Times. June 20, 1967, p. 1.

³ Marion E. Altenderfer and Margaret D. West, How Medical Students Finance their Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, June, 1965.

⁴ Medical School Admission Requirements, 1968-69, ed. Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Illinois.

⁵ Altenderfer, op. cit.

⁶ A Study of Federal Loan Programs, coordinated by the College Entrance Examination Board and supported by the U.S. Office of Education, John I. Kirkpatrick, Study Director, 1968.

of interest on the loan being 7%, it is even more unlikely that this source will serve as a replacement source or even provide the funds provided in 1968-9. The uneven characteristics of the program are further demonstrated by the fact that, for both 1967 and 1968, 60% of the total amount loaned and 55% of the total number of loans originated in only seven (7) states. This report's general conclusion was that the *Guaranteed Loan Program had not fulfilled the need in the past and it is our feeling that there is no indication it will in the future.*

The availability of long-term loans from the private sector is decreasing due to increasing prime interest rates and the inability of students to have enough collateral to meet the requirements of local banks. In fact, the largest single source of private guaranteed loans, the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation, is having increasing difficulty continuing their program and are seriously considering ceasing their efforts in this area—possibly leaving another 1200 students a year without funds.

We have, in the past month, received over 1700 letters from students across the country supporting an increase in the funds available over last year. Over two hundred of these students have indicated that they have exhausted their sources of possible income and without the support of this program will be in jeopardy of having to leave school. For example, I have included selected comments from these students in Appendix C.

The House of Delegates of the Student American Medical Association with representatives from 86 schools unanimously support increased federal loan programs for all health science students for the reasons above and a recent survey of medical students at schools as diverse as Bowman Gray, Cincinnati, SUNY-Downstate, The University of California at San Francisco, North Dakota, Kansas and Georgetown has shown that over 90% of the students support an increase in the appropriations for this program. We have also received over 400 letters from faculty members who strongly support such an increase. The Illinois State Medical Society has recently passed a resolution supporting an increase in the appropriation to medical students through this program, and the Massachusetts Medical Society in a recent letter to a national officer supported at least a continuation of the program at the \$26,000,000 level. I quote from this letter: "With the present manpower problems in the country it would be short-sighted policy to reduce any program that will give us more doctors" (John W. Norcross, M.D., President, The Massachusetts Medical Society). Of the 2100 letters from students and faculty we have received on this issue, only one has supported the cut.

Mr. Chairman, we strongly urge an increase in this appropriation to the authorized level of \$35,000,000. Without increased resources for long-term loans, medical students all over America, many without adequate support and facing increased living and educational expenses, will be facing a severe financial crisis next September. There are no alternative sources for many of these students and a significant number will be forced to compromise their education or leave school altogether. In a nation facing a growing health care and manpower crisis, and in those states where 1 physician must often serve up to 8,000 or 10,000 people, these future physicians, each and every one, is a national resource that cannot be considered anything but as a high priority concern of Congress. This is the generation of physicians who with a renewed concern and commitment face the health care problems of tomorrow and they sincerely request your aid in helping them through the hard school years until they become physicians and can begin to provide medical care for the American people.

APPENDIX A

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM—PROGRAM SUMMARY

(Funds available from Federal capital contributions and revolving fund)

Type of school	Number of participating schools			Total enrollment of participating schools			Number of students assisted			Percentage of students assisted		
	1968	1969	1970 ¹	1968	1969 ¹	1970 ¹	1968	1969 ¹	1970 ²	1968	1969 ¹	1970
Medical.....	93	98	100	33,595	35,117	36,017	12,484	12,375	7,544	37	35	21
Dental.....	47	50	52	14,075	14,833	15,392	5,944	5,892	3,593	42	40	24
Osteopathy.....	5	5	5	1,819	1,876	1,915	977	969	590	54	52	31
Optometry.....	10	10	10	2,031	2,243	2,355	745	739	450	37	33	19
Pharmacy.....	48	51	73	10,025	10,907	18,309	2,097	2,079	1,268	21	19	7
Podiatry.....	2	3	5	425	643	1,070	211	209	127	50	33	12
Veterinary medicine.....	12	14	18	2,561	3,774	4,942	797	790	482	21	21	10
Total.....	217	231	263	64,531	69,383	80,000	23,255	23,053	14,054	36	33	18

FISCAL SUMMARY

Type of school:	Fiscal year 1968 amounts allocated	Fiscal year 1969 amount allocated	Fiscal year 1970 ² amounts allocated
Medical.....	\$14,736,357	\$14,240,726	\$8,681,922
Dental.....	6,822,117	6,777,734	4,133,098
Osteopathy.....	1,044,946	892,880	544,634
Optometry.....	856,113	883,332	538,189
Pharmacy.....	1,810,357	2,019,517	1,231,067
Podiatry.....	234,800	306,034	189,916
Veterinary medicine.....	1,154,786	1,308,777	797,616
Total.....	26,659,476	26,429,000	16,113,000
Federal capital contribution.....	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)
Revolving fund.....	(11,659,476)	(11,429,000)	(1,113,000)
Average loan.....	1,146	1,146	1,146

¹ Estimated.² Estimated on basis of Nixon's budget recommendation (15,000,000 + 1,113,000).

APPENDIX B

Fiscal year	Federal capital contribution (in thousands)	Revolving fund (in thousands)	Total (in thousands)	Medical student share (in thousands)	Funds requested by schools (in thousands)	Percent	Borrowers		
							Number	Percent total	Average loan
1968.....	\$15,000	\$11,659	\$26,659	\$14,736	\$16,884	87	12,404	37	\$1,180
1969.....	15,000	11,429	26,429	14,240	19,030	74	12,375	35	1,150

NIXON BUDGET

1970.....	\$15,000	\$1,113	\$16,113	\$8,681	\$22,023	39	7,545	20	\$1,150
-----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	----------	----	-------	----	---------

Source: Based on figures available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the American Association of Medical Colleges.

ALABAMA

C. PAUL PERRY, JR. Since my father is disabled, my entire financial support for medical school comes from this fund. Please urge the House Appropriations Committee, on my behalf, to reconsider this proposed cutback.

WILLIAM M. PATTERSON. It is only with this assistance that I have been able to complete this first year in medical school. . . I was one of these students and could not have possibly financed my first year without it. My father is employed by the Gadsden, Alabama Fire Department with a modest salary. He has raised seven children of which three of us are still in school and he is due to retire this coming year. My wife is employed as a typist also with a very modest salary therefore, my sources of income are very limited.

GEORGE D. MILLER. During the past two years, I have received a substantial loan from Health Professions, but I have had to work part-time approximately 19 hours per week to make ends meet in spite of the loans. . . I am sure that my case is typical of many medical students in this country. We need the Health Professions money in order to continue our education.

ARIZONA

THOMAS S. BAILEY, JR. If it had not been for this program, I don't believe I would have been able to finance my way through

my first two years here at the University of Arizona.

ARKANSAS

ERNEST C. CLIFTON III. Presently I am a sophomore medical student. For the past two years I have received a total of \$2875 from the Health Professions Loan Program. Without this program my first two years would have been a serious financial problem, one which would have prevented my attendance.

SAN FRANCISCO

W. C. SOUTHWORTH. Personally, it would have been difficult if not impossible for me to complete medical school without funds from the Health Professions Loan Program.

JOHN ASARIAN. I have received loans in the past under the program and would not have been able to be in medical school without those loans due to financial limitations.

FREDRIC S. MENDES. The financial aid I have received as part of the Health Professions Loan Program has been essential for my entering and my continuing my medical education. Without the aid of this program a medical education for myself would have been fraught with unsurmountable financial hurdles which, I believe, would have prevented by participation in higher education.

STEPHEN J. BARTOK. I am receiving my M.D. degree in June, some five weeks away. If it had not been for the financial aid that I have received from this program, I would

not be receiving this degree. I am married, the father of three children, my wife is a medical secretary—but even with her help off and on throughout these four years, I could not have managed without outside financial aid. This program is invaluable to some twenty or so of our friends, also. I cannot stress enough to what degree many of us owe our higher education to this program. If there is a cutback, I can assure anyone who asks that there will be a drastic cutback in the number of doctors who can serve the public.

ROBERT E. and BONITA K. VESTAL. Considering the exorbitant cost of medical education, whatever we have saved or can earn in brief periods of academic holidays is grossly inadequate to meet the years expenses. We are forced to rely heavily on borrowed funds, realizing fully the weight of our responsibility to commence repayment as soon as possible. We are anxious to complete our training soon, to begin putting our service to use in the community and to remove our debt quickly. If loan funds are not available, this already long and expensive process will simply have to be prolonged and made even less efficient, perhaps even more costly than it is.

CALIFORNIA

RICHARD R. HAMILTON. My parents own a 40 acre farm in Colorado and work out to support me as it is now, but this fall my younger sister will enter college and cause additional stress on the family budget. I've received \$2,000 in loans that have made my attendance here possible where otherwise it wouldn't have been.

GWEN J. HALL. I am a freshman student at the University of California, Irvine-California College of Medicine with no means of support other than what I can earn or obtain through student financing. I have attempted to work during the school year because I was unable to obtain financial aid and found that my studies have definitely suffered; in other words, I have not been able to take full advantage of my education, and that which I have missed has been wasted. Also, I have not been able to work enough to meet my expenses and have just about exhausted my savings for next year.

E. N. CARLSEN. My medical education just would not have been possible without your loans as I had no private sources to go to who could afford giving loans.

COLORADO

PHILIP K. DIRKSEN. As a third year medical student at the University of Colorado Medical Center, the Health Professions Loan Program is the only source available to me for a substantial amount of financial aid which has been required yearly. . . . Without this financial assistance I will be unable to continue my medical education.

ILLINOIS

JERRY L. HAOG. My home bank will not grant me a loan because of "tight money," my state refuses my loan application because I am "studying out of state" and now the federal government wants to diminish one of the few remaining channels of support open to me.

LUTHER V. RHODES III. Quite simply I could not survive the expenses of my medical education without the money from the program.

EDWARD OKLAN. I am a first year medical student at the University of Chicago and have received a Health Professions Loan for the current academic year. The money is vital to my being able to continue my medical studies. My father is disabled and unable to aid me in any way and the amount of time necessary for medical students does not permit me to work to finance my education.

JEFFREY D. BECKWITH. My wife and I live in a "change-over" (semi-slum) area of Chi-

cago, with no car, no shower, no lawn, no air-conditioning, and 3rd hand furniture we have repainted. We eat well by comparison—shopping 6 local food stores (that takes time). I walk my wife to and from the laundromat so she won't be attacked.

We would save money except for my medical school and \$2000/year tuition fee; to make up the difference, I have to have a loan of \$1200 a year.

GORDON BAUMBACHER. As a third year student at Northwestern University Medical School, I, like many of my classmates, would have found it impossible to finance the high cost of my medical education without aid from the Loan Fund.

ELLIOT G. LEVY. I hope to be able to continue these loans in the next few years, but if such an act goes through Congress, I don't know where I will turn for money.

THOMAS FILARDO. Without the financial assistance of the Health Professions Loan Program, medical school would be a nearly impossible burden.

RANDALL L. TRUE. I am a medical student who would not be a medical student were it not for the money I have received through the loan and scholarship program.

RICHARD ELLIS. I am currently a sophomore medical student at the University of Illinois School of Medicine. I am from a lower income family and presently am living in a sixty dollar a month apartment which I share with another student. I eat one meal a day and spend \$7.50 a week on food. I get \$35 every 6 weeks selling my blood at Pres. St. Luke's Hospital and I get an occasional \$10 for participating in research experiments as a "guinea pig". My mother sends me an occasional \$5 from money she gets from social security (my father died in March 1968). I pay \$134 a quarter in fees and am fortunate in having a legislative scholarship which waives tuition of about \$66 a quarter.

I work on my vacations and have spent my summers as a factory worker in a zinc plant and as a laborer for the New York Central railroad. I am presently \$7,000 in debt. I have never owned a car and presently I live in an Italian-Puerto Rican neighborhood near the school.

I want you to understand, I do not need more than what I have now. I am proud to be in medicine and I hope I will someday be able to help people like the ones here in this neighborhood, but what I have now is possible because I am currently in the Health Professions Loan Program. I haven't borrowed more than I need just to keep above water. Without it I'll drown—as will my roommate and the four other guys living in this area.

Last week they paid money for volunteers for liver biopsies which carries about a quarter of a per cent risk of fatal hemorrhage. I inquired the day after I heard about it but they already had more than enough volunteers which shows that many others are in my situation.

RANDALL D. GORE. I am currently attending the Chicago Medical School, for which the tuition and fees alone amount to \$2600 per year. Up until this time I have borrowed a \$2000 from the Health Professions Loan Program, and without further assistance in the coming year I will not be able to continue my medical education.

My wife is currently employed at three jobs; she is a full time elementary school teacher, engages in tutoring children after school hours, and is a restaurant cashier on weekends. She has not had a day off since Christmas and will continue unless her health is jeopardized.

Up until this past summer I have been able to contribute substantially to the costs of attending medical school by parachuting into remote areas of the western states for the purpose of suppressing forest fires in the capacity of a U.S. Forest Service Smoke-jumper. Due to the increasing body of knowledge the medical student must now master,

summer vacations have been eliminated by our school for the sophomore, junior, and senior years, thereby curtailing any source of summer income.

My father is a lumber salesman and is unable to contribute funds for my education.

GEORGIA

MICHAEL N. HARRIS. I attend medical school 10 months a year. It costs me \$4,500 a year to pay for medical school and living expenses. I am only available for 2 months to earn money to pay my expenses. My parents are not living, I have no income from my family, and last year I borrowed \$2,500 from the Health Professions Loan Program. I am grateful for the availability of the loans. This program enables me to pay for my medical education.

INDIANA

LONG G. ANDREWS. I have calculated that my first year of medical school has cost me around \$3,000 and at my summer job previous to this school year I made approximately \$1,500. Thus as you might guess it would have been impossible for me to get to school without the Health Professional Loan and Scholarship. . . . With the increased expenses, tuition and decreased pay it will be impossible for me to continue without the support of the Health Professions Loan Program.

JON KELLY. Now I have a hundred and eighty dollars in savings. I have no extra sources of income now but this summer I will get \$700. I can get no help from any friends or relatives. My tuition next year at I.U.M.C. the Indiana University School of Medicine will be \$1,000. I am really depending on the Health Professions Loan.

PATRICK L. FOLEY. I am presently a medical student at Indiana University School of Medicine completing my first year. I was able to attend medical school this year only because I was fortunate enough to receive a loan. I feel that there are many medical students presently enrolled who have found and will find themselves in the same situation.

IOWA

RICHARD FRANKHAUSER. Many of us are already deeply in debt, due to our previous education, and could not stand to borrow large sums of money at high interest rates. I depend on this loan as a means for obtaining money for my education.

THOMAS M. ALTEMIER. Unless adequate financing is available it shall be extremely difficult for me to continue school. My father is unable to either give or loan me sufficient amounts of money to permit the loss which a 50% reduction in my loan application would require. Furthermore, I shall not be able to work for a long enough time this summer to earn sufficient amounts.

SHAN R. BAKER. Most of the medical students I know are in the same position that I am. I worked during my entire undergraduate work and I am currently holding a part time job. Medical school is so demanding that one cannot possibly support themselves on a part time job.

I have borrowed \$4400 since I entered medical school two years ago and I will have to borrow more to continue my education the next two years.

SARAH J. CHILTON. I am currently twenty-five years of age, single, and financially independent as of ten years ago. As I entered into Medical School with little financial reserve, I have had to rely heavily upon scholarship and loans for financing my medical years of tuition, room, board, and living. As a result of obtaining only 50% of my financial requests from the two previous years, I am presently working 25-30 hours weekly in order to meet monthly financial demands in addition to increased tuition and living costs. As a single female, with no financial assistance I am finding this financial situation increasingly more difficult to meet.

KANSAS

KENT HUSTON. I feel I could not have financed my first two years of medical school without these loans. Other sources for loans are not adequate at present and would be much less so with the proposed reduction. These loans keep medicine from being the "profession of the rich."

ROBERT MORRIS WENTZ. As I prepare to begin my third year of medical school at Kansas University, I find myself in serious need of financial assistance for the coming year. I had hoped to obtain a loan from the Health Professions Loan Program, but funds for these loans have been cut rather drastically over the past few years at our school. If the cut proposed for this year occurs, many medical students, including myself, will find themselves in serious financial difficulty with few other sources of financial assistance available.

JAY PAUL CONSOLVER. While I can obtain a student loan from my hometown bank (and I have and will most likely continue to do so), this still does not offer a large enough amount for me to pay for my education. The Health Professions Loan Program is the essential part of the financing of my medical education. If the program is cut as drastically as indicated, the continuance of my medical education will be in doubt.

KENTUCKY

JAMES K. BARNES. In medical school the only possible way I could have gotten to where I am now (I am finishing my junior year) is through the scholarships and loans offered through the national Health Prof. Services. I have no other sources of finances to support myself, my wife, and my children through the remaining part of my education.

G. L. NICHOLSON. I have devoted the last six years of my life, and have already expended what resources I had, to arrive at the place I now occupy. I, like many others, had little to start with and have nothing now. It is no exaggeration to state that since I am already living on an absolute minimum, any lack of this substantial aid could bring my medical studies to an abrupt halt with two years still to go.

RICHARD J. TAYLOR. To put it simply, if you cut the loans, you may also cut my throat. I am a freshman, married, and both my wife and I are in school, and we direly need the money.

MARC H. TANENBAUM. I am very personally involved as without the financial aid from this program I would not be able to afford medical school.

PAUL DAVID REESE. My total expenses every year are approximately \$3500, including \$1500 tuition. I receive \$1800 to \$2000 in loan and scholarship through the Health Professions Program. To help make up the deficit of \$1500 I borrow \$1000 a year from the Ohio State Higher Education Loan Assistance Program and work summers. However, since there is no summer vacation the clinical years part of this deficit cannot be made by loans alone. What further source of income is there now? My parents, of course, but with my father a clergyman and my sister in college this source is also very limited.

LOUISIANA

EUGENE M. LOUVIERE. At this moment, I am completing the final weeks of my first year of medical school. Had it not been for the money available to me from the Health Professions Loan Program I would have been financially unable to attend school this year. My expenses for the term amounted to approximately \$3000. Of this amount, I was able to pay \$1300 from personal resources; the remainder was loaned to me through the program.

THOMAS RICKEY. I'll be a sophomore at LSU Medical School next September and without such a loan as the H.P.L.P. I'm not sure I can make ends meet. If it weren't for

the \$2200 I received from the H.P.L.P. I couldn't have spent my freshman year in medical school.

MICHAEL P. HAYDEL. When I decided to enter medical school I was led to believe that I could count on this program to finance my education. I am completely dependent on this program, as well, as the money I make during the summer months, to pay for my books and fees.

JAMES P. DAVIS. Without the Health Professions Scholarships and loan programs it would be impossible for me and many of my friends to be in medical school—it is almost the difference between me becoming a doctor and not.

THOMAS B. ANDERSON. I am at present completing my sophomore year at Tulane University Medical School, and am writing because I fear that such actions may seriously affect my ability to continue my medical education.

CONNECTICUT

FRED HYDE. I have personally benefitted from federal loans as an undergraduate and during my first two years of medical school. Many of my brightest classmates have also benefitted from these loan programs and have made and will make in the future inestimable contributions to the health professions. Without these kinds of loan programs we and many others could never have considered entering health professions.

MICHIGAN

MICHAEL D. MOLESKI. As a student at the University of Michigan Medical School, I have used this fund since my first year of medical school, and with the arrival of our first child, my wife and I will be forced to rely even more heavily on this fund. I also am acquainted with several students at other universities (Wayne State and Marquette) who would not have been able to begin their medical educations without being able to draw freely from the Health Professions Fund.

PETER M. BORUTA. I have been able to put myself through the last two years of medical school only with the help provided through the Health Professions Loan and Scholarship Program, even though I received only about 64% of the amounts applied for. Still, with a part-time job, and some stringent economy I managed to keep my debts to a minimum. A further reduction in loans and scholarships, in the face of rising tuition and costs, will be a financial disaster for me.

DAVID SPERRY. I want to work in Appalachia under the health programs set by the Appalachian Regional Commission in concert with local groups. This job does not lead to affluence. If money for medical education is not available, I and a number of my fellow students, would have to concern ourselves explicitly with making money so that we can finish our education. Appalachia would be passed over.

MILTON YOLLES. As a married medical school student with 1 child, I would find it impossible to complete my medical education without adequate aid from the Health Professions Loan Program.

GREGORY ZEMENICK. There are very few other pathways open to me. Without this loan I would be seriously affected, even to the point of dropping from school.

With the shortened vacation time, the work load and the jobs that are available, the money I earn is insufficient. Loans are difficult to get and interest is often prohibitive.

DAVID A. VANDER WALL. If such programs are not available to me my medical education may be seriously jeopardized—as well as, indirectly, the health care of those persons I would have treated as a physician.

R. M. FISHER. I have received health Professions Loans and scholarships for the first two years of medical school. My financial status is such that it would be impossible

for me to continue my medical education without this aid.

JAMES D. BRODEUR. Presently, my wife is unemployed and recovering from a recent pregnancy and successful delivery. Our new son is well and healthy, but of course is an added expense to our already overburdened budget.

Our only hope of continuing as we are is through our ability to obtain low cost loans and grants from the medical school. If this money was cut off we would surely flounder.

ELLEN K. HINTERMAN. I myself am supported in my education entirely by these loans and a scholarship, and without the loan, I would be forced to discontinue my education. I personally know of many other medical students in the same position.

JAMES YECKLEY. If this occurs my medical education will likely be delayed or even stopped. Even with the present appropriation I have found it necessary to borrow money from outside sources which due to the high interest rate have put me in tremendous financial debt. Should I have to borrow more extensively from these sources I will be forced to drop out of medical school in order to make money to continue my education.

NEW JERSEY

STEPHEN M. SACHS. This is to express my great distress and concern over the proposed cutback in funds available under the Health Professions Loan Program. I, for one, am at a loss as to how I shall be able to continue my medical education next year without this program's aid in paying my tuition of \$2350.

MISSISSIPPI

THOMAS E. SHEFFIELD. I am now in my second year of medical school and I have received approximately 33 1/2 % of my finances through the loan program, provided to medical students, specifically the Health Professions Loan Program. This source of money is vital for my continued status as a medical student due to the fact that my wife has a low paying job and my parents are unable to provide financial assistance since they make approximately \$6,000 per year. Because of the increasing cost of medical education, the necessity of loans such as that provided by the Health Professions Loan Program will be of increasing importance to me.

SIDNEY SIMPKINS. Over 75% of my medical school financing comes from a Health Professions Loan. The other 25% comes from summer jobs and in-school work. It is essential for me to continue to receive this loan if I am to continue my medical education.

I would estimate that at least two-thirds of the rest of my class share this same situation.

CARL W. GRAVES. I am a first year medical student at the University of Mississippi Medical School. I am a veteran and also draw a 10% disability compensation check from the VA. I feel that if appropriations were cut back to what the House Appropriations Committee requested I would be unable to continue my education.

BARBARA J. SANFORD. With the cutback in this loan program, it would be extremely difficult for me to continue my medical education, for my medical education is totally financed through loans.

RONNIE CHRISTIAN. I am a freshman medical student here in Jackson and I intend to return next year, to this school. However, if this bill is passed by Congress, it may be a near impossibility for me to continue school.

JACK A. MCNEIL. This year is my freshman year at the University Med. Center. It would not have been possible if it weren't for the loan funds which were made available to me.

I am married and have a five year old daughter, who starts to school in September. My wife works and earns our personal living expenses. She is now expecting our second child in the fall.

Without further aid my medical career will be over. There is no way I can finish my education without loan funds.

NEW YORK

ALAN M. HOLLACE. Any large cutback in the Health Professions Loan Program threatens my ability to remain in medical school.

STEVEN H. GOLDE. My enrollment in New York Medical College is currently being financed by a Health Professions Loan. Neither myself nor my family are able to contribute substantially towards the required tuition and fees. Without the aid of a long-term, low interest loan, my medical education might well come to an end.

JOSEPH PAUL GEISS, JR. I am a first year medical student at State University of New York Upstate Medical Center in Syracuse, New York, and have utilized these funds to assist me in financing my first year of medical school.

My mother is a schoolteacher and is the sole provider for our family of four children. Her salary is not sufficient to support a family and also meet the constantly rising costs of education in this country. Two of us are students at this time and a third will enter college in September, 1969. We are all attending State supported institutions since we can't afford tuition at private institutions. We assume summer and part-time jobs to help defray expenses, but we cannot finance our educations entirely on our own and must rely on financial aid in the form of scholarships and loans.

ROSEMARY BELLINO. I am from a rural Upstate area. I would have found it extremely difficult to finish college and go to medical school if it were not for state and federal aid.

ALLEN I. BERLINER. After having just managed to survive financially this year after already being cut in loan funds I see very little way that I could continue my education if further cuts are made.

MICHAEL A. SAMACH. From a personal point of view, such a cutback would be disastrous. A significant portion of my medical education has been financed by these loans, and if they were lost or even severely diminished in amount, I truly would have trouble finishing school.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK BIN. My wife and I are both medical students at Cornell, and we have full scholarships and borrowed \$1,500 this year and still had to work in labs to get enough money *this year*. If funds are cut—we got to work more in labs etc. and our studies begin to suffer.

PAUL A. MCGEE. I am writing this letter because of the fact that I am graduating in June and have, over the last 4 years, borrowed \$7400. Without this money, it would have been impossible for me to go through medical school.

MARTIN ECKER. My entire medical school career was based on the assumption that there would be federal funds available in the form of loans if and when I needed them.

MINNESOTA

DOROTHY ANN RITTER. I am a sophomore medical student at the University of Minnesota. Because of my Illinois residency, I must pay non-resident tuition here, which is currently \$420/quarter. Next year we expect a minimum tuition increase of \$125/quarter. Books and supplies are also expensive; very few medical books are less than \$20.00 plus tax. This past year my *only source* of income was my Health Professions Loan of \$700/quarter; out of this came tuition, books, rent, food, bus, insurance, etc. I am completely self-supporting of necessity since I come from a family of seven children of which five are now below college level and living at home. It is financially impossible for my parents to give me any aid. There is no time to hold down a job.

Without the Health Professions Loan Program I will not be able to finish. I am as certain of that as I am that I would not now

be finishing my second year if it were not for my current loan.

GARY COONEY. I have relied heavily on this source in financing my education thus far and frankly don't know where to find the necessary money to make up the deficit which will result should the proposed reduction in funding be effected.

DUWAYNE A. HANSEN. I am a sophomore at the University of Minnesota Medical School. I am married and have 3 children. I am absolutely dependent on this source of funds to continue my education. Without it for the coming two years, the last two years have been wasted, for I shall not be able to continue.

NORTH CAROLINA

FREDRICA E. SMITH. During the past two years I have been able to go to medical school because the Health Professions Student Loan Program has lent me money for tuition. Tuition at Duke University is increasing by \$300 for the year 1969-70, to \$2050. A decrease in loan money available to me would be a financial disaster at this time.

JOHN M. PETERSON. I am enrolled at the Duke University School of Medicine, where in the next twelve months tuition alone will cost me \$2487.50 (This represents a small savings, since by taking a summer course I will avoid a portion of the tuition increase which is effective in September). To this must be added board and room. I take most of my meals in the hospital cafeteria, where for about \$2.50 per day one can eat adequately. The demands of medical studies leave me too little time to economize by doing my own cooking. The apartment which I rent costs \$70 per month. It is small, old, and minimal as regards comfort and appearance; nevertheless, I hope to save by finding a cheaper one in the fall at, hopefully, about \$50 per month. The items listed total \$4,000, and include no books, instruments, laundry, clothing, insurance, travel, or recreation, which will bring the figure to about \$5,000.

Against this amount, I am able to borrow \$200 per month from my parents, who tell me that this is about the limit of their means, and who have already had the major part of the expense of my undergraduate education. I hope to obtain another Health Professions Student Loan for this year. If it is not granted, then I don't know what I will do.

JAMES BOYLSTON. As a senior medical student, I will no longer be affected by changes in federal loans to students. However, were it not for such loans, I would not have been able to begin, much less complete, my medical education.

PENNSYLVANIA

PHILIP JOHN KLEMMAN. I will be as direct as possible in stating my case: without the Health Professions Loans, or with any substantial reduction therein, I will not be able to finance my medical education. I am already \$5,000 in debt from my undergraduate loans.

JUDY BRIGGS. What more can I say than this: for me, medical school would have been impossible without Health Professions.

STEPHEN J. GERGANTZ. My parents left Hungary after the 1956 revolution and came to this country in 1959 with \$200.00. In the beginning they were unable to find employment only as unskilled laborers due to language difficulties.

Today my father works as a machinist in a local factory. My mother worked as a maid just a year ago. She now works as a cleaning woman for the local college.

My father had an injury at work in 1956 whereby he became 25% disabled.

My approximate expenses for this school year were \$3,500. I don't expect to earn a sufficient amount from summer work. I still haven't found a summer job. If I wouldn't receive a Health Professions Loan next year I would have to apply for a regular bank loan at higher interest rate, and may not even re-

ceive one, or drop out for one year from school and work.

HELENE PAVLOV. I am a freshman student at Temple University School of Medicine. Two weeks prior to commencing classes my father became ill and unable to work. Had it not been for the Health Professions Loan money available for emergency purposes I could not have started and completed my first year in medical school.

ARTHUR GLASER. Eight years of education is a great expense and many students, including myself, have been, and are, dependent on loans to continue their education. Without these loans I would not have been able to pursue an education, especially a medical education.

ARTHUR S. TISCHLER. I am a medical student at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia. For the past academic year I have been completely dependent for medical school tuition and living expenses on a health professions loan and a small amount of summer earnings. The prospect of a large cut in appropriations for the program is most disturbing since this could seriously hamper or even end my medical education.

LEWIS YECIES. Personally, I depend upon the Health Professions Loan for a large part of my financial aid. If this loan had not been available and without any substitution, I seriously doubt that I would have embarked upon a medical career; rather, I would have probably remained in the field of biochemistry where my tuition was covered by my grant as well as providing a stipend.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DANIEL D. WHITCRAFT, III. In my own case, approximately one half of my medical expenses must be met by scholarships and loans I have received from this program. A reduction of any size especially one as formidable as that currently being considered by the House Appropriations Committee may very well make the cost of a medical education prohibitive for me.

M. BRITA BERGEN. Since I am also receiving a private bank loan and \$1,000 in state aid (Pennsylvania), there is little likelihood of finding another source of financial aid should my health professions loan be decreased. In effect, this program is *critical* to the continuance of my medical education.

FRANCINE SAN GIOVANNI. I am entering my 3rd year at Georgetown U. Medical School and our tuition alone is \$2,250. I rely very heavily on your loan funds and see no possible way to obtain enough money to continue my education in their absence.

VIRGINIA

RODNEY L. HITE. I will be entering my third year at the Medical College of Virginia in August of this year. The threat of decreased financial aid for the coming session is a serious one. I have had no family support for my undergraduate studies, and I am unable to receive any for medical school. Medical school is a full-time responsibility, and I am unable to work and receive an M.D. degree from evening studies as I did in undergraduate school. I am dependent upon financial aid in the form of scholarships and loans.

DANIEL C. WILLIAM. I am a single 23 year old first year medical student at the Medical College of Virginia. Economically, my family would probably be classified as lower-middle class; my widowed mother earns about \$7,000 per year as a purchasing clerk, I financed myself via summer work and a substantial low interest loan. I've decided this was the only feasible way to finance my medical school education since my family funds became exhausted. Originally, I intended to continue working and borrowing the necessary balance for my remaining three years in medical school.

It was frightening enough to realize that in just three years I'd be 26 years old, \$8,000 in debt, and still many years away from

medical practice. I'm sure this fact alone had discouraged many would-be doctors in the past.

And now, this proposed cut-back in loans! Just how in heavens am I supposed to get through medical school? I can work just so many hours a day, can sell my blood and plasma just so often, and prostitute my body so many times for medical research. It's no wonder so many doctors lose their idealism by the time they graduate.

If, in the future, I'm denied a loan, frankly I don't know where I'll turn.

OKLAHOMA

GERRY L. MADDOUX. Having first earned a BS degree in chemistry and an MS degree in virology/cancer research in order to obtain the needed background for my intended life work, I found myself in dire need of financial aid upon entering medical school. Since first-year students are not permitted to engage in part-time work (at least at this medical school) I found that a health professions loan would be the only feasible way in which to borrow a large sum of money (in my case, \$1,400) for a considerable period of time (4 years at least).

Failure to obtain a health professions loan could possibly necessitate my temporary withdrawal from medical school.

UTAH

MARY ANN McDONNELL. To be very blunt, without almost complete financial aid of some kind, I do not go to medical school. This year I received help through a Health Professions Loan and Scholarship. If I do not receive help in the next three years (I am a freshman), I can forget about becoming a physician.

I have been told all my life that I cannot ever become a doctor because my family has no money to put me through school. Without this financial aid, this may become a reality.

NEW JERSEY

ARON H. R. SWERDLIN. Presently, I am on a full scholarship and a partial low interest loan. Without this assistance, it is almost impossible for my financial needs to be met. My family cannot assist me in any way and between summer employment and financial assistance I am able to get by. Without this assistance, I might be forced to withdraw!

F. R. SCHWARZ. There are many other students who are intelligent enough to become doctors but who also do not have the finances necessary. This fund makes it possible for not only the wealthy to become doctors but those who are from more moderate income backgrounds with the desire and ability to become doctors.

OHIO

EVERETT M. BUSH, PATRIC M. WALL, JEFFERY L. RIZOR. We feel that such drastic cutbacks in the funding of this program will have serious effects on our securing the necessary educational funds. There are three reasons for our concern:

(1) After the first year Ohio State's program is a 12 month program thus precluding summer employment for its students. The cost of a medical education, more than

\$3000 yearly, would then rest solely on the shoulders of our families.

(2) None of our fathers are professional men themselves and such an expense would be a difficult burden on our families.

(3) Most importantly we want and need only loans, not gifts, to finance our education. Our ability to fulfill the terms of these loans would not be questionable.

MARSHALL ZABLEN. I am a junior medical student in my 7th year of college. I am 24 years old. I devote 80-90 hours/week to my studies eleven and one-half months of the year.

I am unable to earn the \$1700 tuition and my living expenses (\$1300) while I am pursuing my studies.

LAWRENCE D. KRABILL. I am married and we have just had our first child. I am ready to enter my third year of medical school and really need the support that the Health Professions Loan Program offers to keep going for the next two years.

MARVIN SHIE. I have been anticipating borrowing almost the total amount of the cost of my education over the next three years. Should the Health Professions Program not have sufficient funds available to advance me the amount I need to continue my medical education, I would be quite hard pressed to meet my financial obligations to the medical school.

DENNIS R. WENGER. I am a medical student from a rural area who was fortunate enough to receive aid through the Health Professions Program. This program has also been of tremendous benefit to many of my classmates who would otherwise have had tremendous financial difficulty in getting a medical education.

ROBERT FRISCHER. . . without the money coming in from one of the Health Professions Programs next year, I will be forced to drop out of medical school and try to find a job.

TENNESSEE

ISAAC RAVIZEE. Let me say that it would have almost been impossible for me to receive my freshman year medical education had it not been for this loan program.

WISCONSIN

ROBERT J. SCHLAGER. At the present time I have a Health Professions Loan which is enabling me to attend the university. Without such a loan, or even with a substantial cut in my present loan, I am afraid that I would not be able to afford the high cost of education.

— I have used the money from the program to help get me through my first year of medical school, and am hoping to achieve the same loan for next year. If I don't receive the loan I don't think I'll be able to continue medical school.

LOREN G. LARSEN. Several years ago after I had decided that I could not go to medical school because I was receiving no financial aid from home, I learned that the federal government was making funds available to medical students since there was such a great shortage of doctors. So I took a chance. I have now invested two years of my life and piled up an enormous debt.

Without the same level of financial aid I will not be able to continue school.

MARYLAND

ELIZABETH CAROL LANCASTER. From this program I was able to borrow one-fourth of the tuition for my first year of medical school at Johns Hopkins. This fall tuition is increasing, but my resources are not. My sister is still in college, and my father's salary as a public school teacher is the same that it was during the past years. This cut-back would seriously affect the finances of my family.

NEBRASKA

MERLENE F. McALERY. The Health Professions Loan Program is absolutely essential for the continuation of my medical education. My family is able to give only token assistance and four years of pre-med depleted my own savings from summer jobs.

DENNIS F. KOZIO. Many students at this medical school apply for loans through this program, and most find the present amount of support available inadequate, thus requiring a difficult search for other loans. In the past year, many of these other loan sources have been required to restrict those students who are eligible to a smaller and smaller number. Government guaranteed loan money through local banks is just not available, the banks refuse to loan out money to students at the interest rate these loan programs specify, government backed or not.

TEXAS

WILLIAM R. NELSON. I would certainly have been unable to complete my first three years of medical school without the loan program. I have utilized the program all three years and plan to use it next year. In fact, I was expecting Congress to increase the funds to this program so that I could obtain a maximum loan for the first time since I started medical school. A 50% cut in this program could very well prove disastrous to my medical career at this point.

WASHINGTON

MAX D. WALKER. I come from a family of seven with an income less than \$5,000 per annum. Obviously, I have not received, nor could reasonably expect to receive any financial assistance from the family. I was able to put myself through college by tightly regulating my budget, working long hours during the summer, and part-time during the academic year.

However, with the added expenses of medical school education: books, instruments, microscopes, tuition, inter-hospital transportation; and with the exhausting demands upon the evening and weekend hours; I find it is no longer even fictitiously possible to pay for my education. There simply are not enough hours in the year for me to work enough to meet the astronomical expenses.

Since I cannot earn enough to pay for a medical education, and since I cannot anticipate assistance from my family or relatives, I find it obligatory to accept a loan in order to continue my education. Without the loan there is no choice; remaining in medical school is impossible.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM MEDICAL SCHOOLS

	Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970		Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
ALABAMA					CALIFORNIA				
Medical College of Alabama	06	\$175,000	\$157,064	\$72,300	Loma Linda University	33	\$171,934	\$175,151	\$81,609
ARIZONA					University of California, Irvine	35	144,761	125,175	54,334
University of Arizona	02	15,810	30,461	27,708	Stanford University	10	160,077	158,492	76,846
ARKANSAS					University of California, Davis	04	0	22,845	21,646
University of Arkansas	02	162,000	192,285	88,103	University of California, La Jolla	35	0	22,845	21,430
					University of California, Los Angeles	26	163,041	186,574	97,410
					University of California, San Francisco	05	201,000	212,000	114,729
					University of Southern California	21	161,461	136,598	65,806

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM MEDICAL SCHOOLS—Continued

	Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970		Congressional district	Fiscal year 1968	Loan allocations, fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
COLORADO					NEW YORK				
University of Colorado.....	01	\$172,428	\$168,487	\$86,587	Columbia University.....	13	\$100,000	\$127,000	\$108,451
CONNECTICUT					Cornell University.....	17	45,000	72,000	76,846
University of Connecticut.....	01	0	14,277	13,637	Mount Sinai School of Medicine.....	17	0	23,797	26,842
Yale University.....	03	167,488	167,535	78,578	New York Medical College.....	18	162,000	242,260	114,079
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					New York University.....	17	286,536	206,762	116,027
Georgetown University.....	00	131,000	218,939	103,039	State University of New York, Brooklyn.....	12	166,000	198,000	167,766
George Washington University.....	00	235,937	197,520	94,163	State University of New York, Syracuse.....	34	172,000	138,600	87,886
Howard University.....	00	203,060	196,568	90,050	Albany Medical College.....	29	155,775	133,742	62,127
FLORIDA					State University of New York, Buffalo.....	39	222,861	193,712	89,185
University of Florida.....	02	117,587	112,525	54,118	University of Rochester.....	36	94,000	133,900	66,672
University of Miami.....	12	160,000	159,920	78,578	Yeshiva University.....	24	226,842	192,285	96,545
GEORGIA					NORTH CAROLINA				
Emory University.....	04	143,279	135,000	65,373	Duke University.....	04	186,476	56,500	75,114
Medical College of Georgia.....	10	100,000	95,931	89,401	University of North Carolina.....	04	90,000	66,600	54,000
HAWAII					Bowman Gray School of Medicine.....	05	100,000	108,993	53,467
University of Hawaii.....	00	24,703	24,887	16,235	NORTH DAKOTA				
ILLINOIS					University of North Dakota.....	01	45,000	29,000	20,564
Chicago Medical School.....	07	40,000	43,966	49,710	OHIO				
Loyola University.....	10	205,237	178,958	87,020	Ohio State University.....	15	270,000	135,000	134,643
Northwestern University.....	13	310,414	262,250	122,305	University of Cincinnati.....	02	130,000	140,000	92,648
University of Chicago.....	02	169,988	145,166	71,002	Medical College of Ohio.....	09	0	0	7,576
University of Illinois.....	07	183,000	202,500	169,716	Case Western Reserve University.....	21	198,415	167,059	77,927
INDIANA					OKLAHOMA				
Indiana University.....	07	478,128	375,531	193,318	University of Oklahoma.....	05	201,578	196,568	95,678
IOWA					OREGON				
University of Iowa.....	01	242,585	236,549	107,151	University of Oregon.....	03	168,970	167,059	76,629
KANSAS					PENNSYLVANIA				
University of Kansas.....	03	225,293	230,362	108,235	Hahnemann Medical College.....	03	247,308	207,038	96,111
KENTUCKY					Jefferson Medical College.....	03	339,916	344,114	159,539
University of Kentucky.....	06	165,440	145,643	67,971	Pennsylvania State University.....	17	18,000	41,881	32,685
University of Louisville.....	03	180,000	176,103	79,660	Temple University.....	04	256,000	164,162	127,932
LOUISIANA					University of Pennsylvania.....	01	90,000	157,500	118,624
Louisiana State University.....	01	291,652	251,303	112,997	University of Pittsburgh.....	14	129,000	152,863	88,318
Do.....	04	0	0	6,926	Womans Medical College of Pennsylvania.....	02	108,694	118,035	51,951
Tulane University.....	02	280,000	245,116	111,697	RHODE ISLAND				
MARYLAND					Brown University.....	01	0	9,518	4,112
Johns Hopkins University.....	03	190,000	178,006	83,557	SOUTH CAROLINA				
University of Maryland.....	03	216,000	225,000	116,892	Medical College of South Carolina.....	01	32,000	45,000	67,500
MASSACHUSETTS					SOUTH DAKOTA				
Boston University.....	08	135,000	105,300	71,651	University of South Dakota.....	01	45,454	46,166	20,563
Harvard University.....	09	268,277	277,005	122,954	TENNESSEE				
Tufts University.....	09	97,000	91,159	106,070	Meharry Medical College.....	05	143,836	131,837	65,372
MICHIGAN					University of Tennessee.....	09	0	0	0
Michigan State University.....	06	12,846	30,600	18,832	Vanderbilt University.....	05	94,000	110,420	50,652
University of Michigan.....	02	390,805	384,099	174,694	TEXAS				
Wayne State University.....	13	260,372	254,635	120,573	Baylor University.....	22	172,000	155,913	74,464
MINNESOTA					University of Texas, Galveston.....	09	234,000	224,238	131,179
University of Minnesota.....	05	180,000	205,200	141,355	University of Texas, Dallas.....	03	108,000	116,100	91,565
MISSISSIPPI					University of Texas, San Antonio.....	21	10,869	46,080	49,570
University of Mississippi.....	03	175,000	152,780	71,218	UTAH				
MISSOURI					University of Utah.....	02	130,000	124,699	56,281
St. Louis University.....	02	258,678	220,842	105,420	VERMONT				
University of Missouri.....	08	166,006	171,819	77,496	University of Vermont.....	01	81,000	85,500	54,333
Washington University.....	01	170,000	173,247	81,176	VIRGINIA				
NEBRASKA					Medical College of Virginia.....	03	148,000	168,300	99,790
Creighton University.....	02	130,000	139,500	67,105	University of Virginia.....	07	60,000	63,000	63,000
University of Nebraska.....	01	90,000	85,500	84,638	WASHINGTON				
NEW HAMPSHIRE					University of Washington.....	01	117,000	122,159	74,031
Dartmouth Medical School.....	02	36,000	45,000	22,945	WEST VIRGINIA				
NEW JERSEY					West Virginia University.....	02	121,540	26,100	58,012
New Jersey College of Medicine.....	13	135,000	157,541	66,240	WISCONSIN				
Rutgers the State University.....	15	15,000	9,788	6,612	Marquette University.....	04	215,000	195,616	90,049
NEW MEXICO					University of Wisconsin.....	02	153,000	192,760	89,400
University of New Mexico.....	00	42,000	47,118	24,677	PUERTO RICO				
					University of Puerto Rico.....	00	110,000	104,225	65,155
Total							14,736,357	14,240,726	7,924,353

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD, AMERICAN PHYSICIST, PIONEER OF MODERN ROCKETRY AND SPACE FLIGHT (1882-1945)

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this country's ability to land men on the moon—the most staggering technological achievement in history—stems largely from the pioneer work in rocketry carried out by Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard. Born in Worcester, Mass., educated at Worcester Polytechnic Institute and Clark University, Dr. Goddard paved the way for the United States space program with the experiments he conducted while teaching physics at Clark University. On March 16, 1926, he launched the world's first successful liquid fuel rocket from a field on the outskirts of Auburn, Mass., a community in my congressional district.

Dr. Goddard's early experiments—hooted at by people outside the scientific community 40 years ago—have earned for him the title "father of the space age."

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch on Dr. Goddard prepared by his widow and a Washington Evening Star article written by his early patron and friend, Harry F. Guggenheim.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD, AMERICAN PHYSICIST, PIONEER OF MODERN ROCKETRY AND SPACE FLIGHT (1882-1945)

Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, American physicist and engineer, was the pioneer scientist and engineer who laid down the technical foundations for most of today's prodigious developments in long-range rockets, missiles, earth satellites, and space flight. He founded a whole new field of science and engineering, now grown into a multibillion-dollar industry.

In the course of his pioneering work, Dr. Goddard—

1. Was first to develop a rocket motor using liquid propellants (liquid oxygen and gasoline) (1920-25).
2. Was first to develop and launch a liquid-fuel rocket (March 16, 1926, at Auburn, Mass.).
3. Was first to launch a liquid-fuel rocket which attained a speed greater than that of sound (mach 1) (1935, near Roswell, N. Mex.).
4. First developed gyro stabilization apparatus for rockets (1932).
5. First used deflector vanes in the blast of the rocket motor as a method of stabilizing and guiding rockets (1932).
6. Received the first U.S. patent on the idea of multistage rockets (1914).
7. First explored mathematically the practicality of using rocket power to reach high altitudes and escape velocity (1912).
8. Was first to publish in the United States a basic mathematical theory underlying rocket propulsion and rocket flight (1919).
9. First proved experimentally that a rocket will provide thrust in a vacuum (1915).
10. Developed and demonstrated the basic idea of the bazooka during World War I (1918), though his plans lay unused in the U.S. Army files until they were put to use in World War II.

11. First developed pumps suitable for rocket fuels, self-cooling rocket motors, variable-thrust rocket motors, practical rocket landing devices, and forecast jet-driven airplanes, rocket-borne mail and express, and travel in space.

At his rocket proving range near Roswell, N. Mex., Dr. Goddard developed during the 1930's large and successful rockets which anticipated many features of the later German V-2 rockets, including gyroscopic control, steering by means of vanes in the jet stream of the rocket motor, gimbal-steering, power-driven propellant pumps and other devices.

A crowning irony is that if his countrymen had listened to Dr. Goddard, the United States today would be far ahead of the present position in the international space race. There might, in fact, have been no race. Several times in his career, and especially in 1940, he tried to interest our Armed Forces in the potential of rockets, but met only with courteous inaction.

Dr. Goddard began his pioneer experiments in rocketry long before other scientists or engineers in the United States or Europe had perceived the full value and promise of the rocket. He continued until his death in 1945, at which time he was engaged in developing jet-assisted takeoff and variable thrust liquid propellant rocket motors for the U.S. Navy.

Dr. Goddard was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882. He was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1908. Upon graduation he obtained a position as an instructor of physics at W.P.I. and at the same time began graduate work at Clark University. He received his M.A. from Clark in 1910, his Ph. D. in 1911. He was a research fellow in physics at Princeton University in 1912-13, and the following year joined the faculty of Clark University, where he became a full professor in 1919.

He began his interest in rockets at the age of 17, in 1899. As early as 1908 he carried out static tests with small solid-fuel rockets at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. In 1912 he worked out the detailed mathematical theory of rocket propulsion, and showed that the rocket, because it needs no air to push against, could be sent to the moon or into space, provided an efficient motor could be developed.

Upon returning to Clark University in 1914, he began to experiment with larger rockets. By 1916, he had reached the limit of what he could do on his own resources. The Smithsonian Institution came to his aid, and with this help he was able not only to continue his work on solid-propellant rockets, but to begin the development of liquid-propellant rockets as well.

After the entry of the United States into the first World War in 1917, Dr. Goddard volunteered his services to the Nation, and was set by the U.S. Signal Corps to the task of exploring the military possibilities of rockets.

He succeeded in developing several types of solid-propellant rockets intended to be fired at tanks or other military objectives, from a launching tube held in the hands or steadied by two short legs—devices similar in many respects to the bazooka of World War II. These developments he successfully demonstrated at Aberdeen Proving Grounds a few days before the close of the First World War. They were the basis of the great U.S. developments in solid-propellant rockets in the Second World War.

In 1919 he summarized his mathematical explorations, the results of his solid propellant research, and some of his space flight ideas, in a classic paper entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," published by the Smithsonian Institution. That paper today is one of the basic documents in technical rocket and jet propulsion literature, and the source of numerous developments that have come about since its appearance.

In the following two decades he produced

a number of large liquid-propellant rockets at his shop and rocket range at Roswell, N. Mex. These rockets are now in the National Air Museum, Washington, D.C. Other early components are displayed at the museum at Roswell, N. Mex.

This research work was made possible by financial assistance from the Smithsonian Institution, Daniel Guggenheim, and the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation. In the mid-1930's he reported on the progress of his liquid propellant work in "Liquid Propellant Rocket Development," published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1936. The work in New Mexico was described in further detail in 1948 in a book edited posthumously from Dr. Goddard's notes, and published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., under the title "Rocket Development."

He again offered his services in the Second World War, and was assigned by the U.S. Navy to the development of practical jet-assisted takeoff, and liquid propellant rocket motors capable of variable thrust. In both areas he was successful, and demonstrated the resulting devices in tests at Annapolis. The work continued until his death in 1945.

Dr. Goddard was the first modern scientist who both perceived the possibilities of rockets and space flight, and undertook the enormous work of bringing them to practical realization. He lived to see his dream of rocket power come to fruition. His idea of the ultimate in rocket development—flight into space—has now become a reality. His contributions are recognized as among the most important technical achievements of modern times, marking as they do a turning point in the history of mankind.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

GODDARD DESERVES NICHE AS FATHER OF ROCKETRY—A SCIENTIST'S DREAM OUTLASTED THE TAUNTS

(NOTE.—Harry F. Guggenheim, president and editor-in-chief of Newsday, a Garden City, Long Island, newspaper, was for many years a close friend and supporter of Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry. Goddard's research and experiments, many of which were supported by the Guggenheim Fund for the Promotion of Aeronautics, paved the way for the Apollo project. Here Guggenheim reminisces on the impact of this pioneer of space flight.)

(By Harry Guggenheim)

There is a special place in our thoughts for Robert H. Goddard. He was to the moon rocket what the Wright brothers were to the airplane.

He has been dead now for almost 25 years. He died without the fame that accrued to the Wright brothers in their lifetime. But he died still believing that man would one day shatter the fetters of Earth's gravity and stride majestically into the vast reaches of space. I wish he were here now to share this moment. It belongs to him.

Goddard was a physicist and professor at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., when I first heard of him.

In 1898, when he was 16, he read H. G. Wells' "War of the Worlds" which, as he would later write personally to Wells, "made a deep impression. The spell was complete about a year afterward, and I decided that what might conservatively be called 'high altitude research' was the most fascinating problem in existence."

He devoted himself to that problem with prodigious energy for the rest of his life. It would cost him isolation, ridicule, and eventually years of his life. "God pity a one-dream man," he wrote as he began his work.

Goddard began to experiment with small rockets as early as 1908.

Eleven years later he published a paper entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," which espoused the theory that

rocket power could lift a large payload to great heights if the rocket were designed to use its fuel effectively.

IDEA OF LUNAR LANDINGS

He was careful to mention the possibility of lunar landings only casually, lest he frighten away potential sponsors. But despite his almost indifferent mention of the subject, the press seized upon the paper with gross exaggeration.

The headlines were all similar to this one: "Modern Jules Verne Invests Rockets to Reach Moon."

It wasn't so, of course, but the effects were to cause Goddard considerable humiliation.

Goddard was embarrassed—he had intended to stress only the scientific aspects of his research—but he was not deterred. He continued his experiments, without public attention, and on March 16, 1926, launched the first liquid propelled rocket. It rose 41 feet and traveled 184 feet in 2.5 seconds.

The flight was so inconspicuous that no one paid any attention. But Goddard considered it a feat equivalent to the Wright's first airplane flight.

Three years later, on July 17, 1929—almost 40 years to the day before Apollo 11 would take off for the moon—Goddard tried again. This time he had a model 11½ feet long, 26 inches wide, and weighing 35 pounds when empty. It rose 20 feet above the 60-foot launching tower, turned right, rose another 10 feet and then crashed to earth 171 feet away.

Goddard instantly considered the experiment a success. But as he and his associates were surveying the scene, according to his biographer, Milton Lehman, "they heard the shriek of a siren. They looked up to see a police patrol car, two ambulances and a convoy of automobiles stopping in Aunt Effie's farmyard. Two policemen, perhaps expecting catastrophe, inspected the rural scene, saw the steel tower, and asked questions. . . . Neighbors were saying that an airplane had crashed and exploded."

Goddard tried to quiet the policemen's fears, but two reporters who had come with them were already inspecting the charred field.

"The moon-rocket man," one reporter said. "How close did you get this time?"

Again Goddard was adrift in a sea of publicity. Lehman wrote:

"He wanted to tell the public that, yes, the rocket would be man's great prime mover. Yes, it would eventually reach the moon. But the public kept asking the same old question. When would it happen? When will your rocket do what you say it can do?"

"The headlines and front-page stories were all that he feared. They made him out as a reckless moon seeker, a public amusement." His neighbors in Worcester, afraid that "Moony Goddard" was going to wipe them all out in some mad experiment, demanded that he remove his tests. Goddard was distressed.

But, ironically, that very publicity was to give him a new lease.

At that time, Charles A. Lindbergh was a guest in my home in Port Washington, N.Y. I had met him when he came to Roosevelt Field for his historic flight to Paris—from which, I anticipated, he would never return. He did get back, much to my surprise, and subsequently became a consultant for the Daniel Guggenheim Fund for the Promotion of Aeronautics. This was a fund created by my father to promote research and education in aeronautics and to help encourage flying as a means of transportation. I was then the fund's administrator.

Lindbergh and I had talked on several occasions about the potential of spaceflight. He had often expressed the opinion that airplanes, confined as they were to the Earth's atmosphere, would ultimately prove too "limited" for the full scope of man's aspira-

tions. We had discussed rocketry for its potential in delivering large quantities of mail over great distances.

On this particular day, we were discussing the work of the fund, when Mrs. Guggenheim interrupted us to read aloud from the New York Times an item about a rocket exploding near Worcester, Mass., the day before. When she finished reading the fascinating account of the scientist and his problem with his neighbors, I suggested to Lindbergh that he visit this man Goddard in behalf of the fund and discuss his work.

Lindbergh did call and Goddard, quite surprised, invited him to come to Worcester.

In their meeting, Goddard confessed his vision of one day soaring through the Earth's atmosphere into the reaches beyond. He explained the differences between rockets and the techniques he believed could be employed for invading the unknown limits of space.

From this meeting, Lindbergh returned impressed by the scientist and his ideas. We agreed that support should be obtained to underwrite Goddard's experiments. Lindbergh made the case to my father, Daniel, as I left to begin my duties as ambassador to Cuba. Daniel Guggenheim endorsed our proposals and agreed to provide the funds for a 2-year period. After his death, the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation took up support of Goddard's work until 1941.

These grants made it possible for him to give up teaching and, for the first time, to devote his full energies to rocket research. They also enabled him to move from New England, where his neighbors regarded him as a nut, to Roswell, N.M., where he would have freedom, privacy and open space.

During the years that followed, I was able to observe the man and his work first-hand. I was deeply touched by his modest, self-effacing manner, his cheerfulness, and his optimism.

NUMEROUS DISAPPOINTMENTS

His disappointments were considerable.

Once, in 1935, Lindbergh and I journeyed to Roswell to watch a test flight. It failed. He refused to accept it as any more than a temporary setback, a problem to be solved. He did solve it, and later, in writing to explain what happened he said, with that wry pleasantness that marked his whole demeanor: "I have not yet forgotten fate for bringing the matter of the gasoline orifices to my attention just at the time you and Colonel Lindbergh were here."

His letters were examples of clear and descriptive prose.

By 1940, Goddard had built a rocket that was very similar to the German V2 missiles which were to assault London three years later.

Goddard and I visited Washington to urge military leaders to consider the military potential of rockets, but they were not interested. It was not until the end of the war that the oversight was obvious. Questioned by Army officers about the devastating V2, a German scientist incredulously replied: "Why don't you ask your own Dr. Goddard?"

His investigations, as the American Rocket Society would say after his death, covered almost every principle involved in both the theory and practice of high-power rockets.

Among his inventions are included the first liquid-fuel rocket, the first smokeless powder rocket, and the first practical automatic steering device for rockets. It is no wonder that the rocket society would concede to Goddard the almost single-handed development of rocketry "from a vague dream to one of the most significant branches of modern engineering."

But it goes far beyond that. He left us more than inventions. He left an example of the extraordinary accomplishments that await the man who perseveres. He left a testimony to the power of one solitary indi-

vidual to effect change and to transform the future.

And most of all, he left a vision.

"He never lost the dream," his wife, Esther, has said.

"He knew that he would build something that would go higher than anything had gone before, and that eventually man would explore space, with the moon only the first step."

"Have thought of him often in these days of preparations for that 'first step.' When he died his work was generally unrecognized; now it is about to be fulfilled.

"How many more years I shall be able to work on the problem I do not know," Goddard wrote to H. G. Wells in 1932. "I hope as long as I live. There can be no thought of finishing—for aiming at the stars, both literally and figuratively, is a problem to occupy generations.

"So that no matter how much progress one makes, there is always the thrill of beginning."

CHESAPEAKE BAY THERMAL POLLUTION PROBLEM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, environmental scientists and conservationists for many years have warned of the dangers posed to fish and wildlife by "waste heat" which is introduced into your waterways by nuclear electric power generating plants. The Atomic Energy Commission in its licensing of such plants refuses to take into consideration the thermal pollution resulting from use of huge amounts of water for cooling purposes.

The Washington Post of July 10, 1969, carried an article on this thermal pollution problem, particularly as it relates to the Chesapeake Bay, by Hal Willard. So that my colleagues will be assured of an opportunity to be familiar with this problem, I include the text of Mr. Willard's article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PLANT'S WASTE HEAT A MAJOR CONCERN

(By Hal Willard)

A new phrase is being injected into the language to describe a phenomenon scientists are beginning to regard as one of the most important problems in our environment.

The phrase is "waste heat," the residue from one of the greatest aids to man's progress, comfort and convenience: electricity.

It has become important because of the tremendous increase in recent years in the consumption of electricity and the consequent need for more and bigger generating plants.

"Waste heat" is replacing "thermal pollution" because the new term is more accurate and in some cases heat can be beneficial.

Waste heat and what to do about it is of particular concern to the Washington region, because nuclear power plants produce considerably more of it than do conventionally fueled plants. More than a dozen nuclear reactor units are either operating, under construction or planned in the Middle Atlantic area. That is more than in any other area of the country.

One of the installations is the two-reactor plant being built on the Bay at Calvert Cliffs. A safety and licensing board of the Atomic Energy Commission authorized issuance of

a construction permit for the plant on June 30. The permit was issued Tuesday.

An immediate protest was filed with the AEC, Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel and Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel by Del. Werner Fornos (D-Anne Arundel).

Fornos said the permit, which the AEC can countermand if it acts within 45 days, "leaves me exasperated and shocked, and is totally contrary to the public interest."

He said he hoped the AEC would hold the "construction permit in abeyance until such time as all parties concerned are absolutely certain that irreparable harm will not be caused to the Chesapeake Bay."

Scientists and engineers alike admit that no one is "absolutely certain" at this point what effects the increasingly larger nuclear-powered generating plants will have on the environment.

One of the Nation's leading environmental scientists, Jerry Davis, an aquatic ecologist with the AEC, says "the accelerated growth of the electric power industry will result in so much hot water that the thermal loading of our lakes and streams must now be considered a major stress, whose impact on the environment is largely unknown."

Davis spoke recently in Pittsburgh at a conference of the Health Physics Society and illustrated the newness of the problem by saying that less than \$1 million in public money is being spent this year to study it.

(The Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., building the Calvert Cliffs plant, has budgeted about \$1 million for ecological research over a seven-year period that began in 1968.)

He said electric companies cause the problem, but the AEC supports most of what little research there is—even though waste heat from nuclear reactors being used now by power companies constitutes less than 1 percent of the actual pollution problem.

The rest of the waste is heat disgorged into the air and water from fossil-fueled (coal or gas) generating plants. But the number of nuclear plants is on the upswing. Only 13 are operating now, but 46 are under construction. Many more are planned.

Lee C. White, outgoing chairman of the Federal Power Commission, said in a speech in Seattle last month "it has been estimated that by 1980 the power industry will require one-sixth of total freshwater flows from the entire land mass of the United States for cooling purposes."

The great quantities of water are needed to cool reactor components, but don't actually come in contact with radioactivity. In the case of the plant being constructed on the Chesapeake Bay, the water will be used to condense steam that operates turbines back into liquid so that it can be recycled through the plant.

White said, "There is serious debate as to the extent of damage thermal pollution can cause with many in the utility industry pointing to the experience of existing atomic plants to show the lack of significant deleterious effects. However, with the great increase in use of nuclear generation . . . we cannot afford to wait until many more plants are built before action is taken to determine what impact heated cooling water will have, and how we can avoid undesirable effects."

Ecologist Davis points out that the experience of one plant in a body of water cannot be used to illustrate what will happen in another body of water.

"There are too many variables," he said. "Water temperature varies for one thing, and sometimes a degree or two makes the difference."

He said in a paper for the AEC that "it is certain that the release of large quantities of heat to an environment will induce alteration, sometimes with profound changes in the local flora and fauna."

"Paleoecological studies indicate that vast plant and animal communities have developed, flourished and perished in the past in

phase with, and probably in response to, small, persistent changes in temperature. Even the great glaciers of the past ages are believed to have been caused by climatic temperature shifts of but a few degrees.

"Under some conditions an increase of only a degree or two may cause profound changes in the species composition, with those species less tolerant of the higher temperature either reduced in number or eliminated. . . . In aquatic environments, temperature changes trigger migration and spawning of both invertebrates and fishes. Temperature controls the hatching of all eggs, the emergency of aquatic insects, the continuance or cessation of parthenogenetic reproduction, the multiplication rates of plankton organisms and many other activities. . . . aquatic organisms generally have narrower limits of tolerance to temperature extremes than most land forms."

In his Pittsburgh speech, Davis also pointed out that it is possible for benefits to be derived from temperature increases.

He said there are places where "warm water in effect is being used for irrigation in aquaculture." He cited an instance in Japanese waters in which oysters were not spawning because the water was too cold. The oyster beds were "irrigated" with warm water and went into production.

In his paper, he said "spawning of oysters and many other mollusks is triggered by no more than a one-degree change in temperature. Some fish and other animals, particularly in cold-water environments, are attracted to areas of warm water. Although this may benefit the angler, there are unanswered questions about the ultimate result of luring animals away from their normal habitat to live with a higher metabolic rate in restricted warmer sites."

Broadening the scope of his observations, Davis said "biological accumulation of radionuclides or poisonous industrial and agricultural wastes from a contaminated aquatic environment is strongly influenced by water temperature. In general, the rate of uptake increases with rising temperature."

"Warm water lessens the capacity of waters to assimilate organic wastes, since oxygen solubility decreases with increased water temperature. Some of the important diseases of marine and fresh-water fishes and of marine shellfishes appear to flourish at higher temperature."

Existing Maryland standards for Calvert Cliffs area of the Chesapeake Bay stipulate that the water drawn out, used to cool and then discharged back into the Bay not exceed 90 degrees when it is returned—and it cannot be more than 10 degrees warmer than it was when it was taken out.

The Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., builder of the plant, is making its plans based on this standard.

The company admits that it has no idea what effect the plant operation will have on the Bay, but has hired Dr. Ruth Patrick, an ecologist with the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences, to conduct a continuing study of the situation.

Company spokesmen say that if Dr. Patrick discovers that anything harmful is happening to the Bay and its environs as a result of plant operations changes will be made. Opponents of the plant maintain that corrective measures could come too late.

The Bay's environs take in a lot of territory, in the view of Dr. Clifford Beck, the AEC's deputy director of regulation.

In addition to the two-unit plant being built at Calvert Cliffs, he cites a two-unit plant under construction at Surry on Hog Island, Va., in the James River, which empties into the Bay near its mouth on the Atlantic Ocean.

One plant is producing electricity at Peach Bottom, Pa., and two more are under construction. A plant also is under construction at Three Mile Island, Pa., and one is pro-

posed at Susquehanna in Salem Township. All of these are on the Susquehanna River, which flows into the Chesapeake Bay at Havre de Grace.

Another plant is operating at Shippingport, Pa., and others are under construction and proposed in New Jersey, Beck pointed out.

The only other parts of the country where there are similar, but not as extensive, concentrations are in New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont and Maine, Michigan and Northern Illinois.

No evidence has yet been produced of deleterious effects on the Bay but Del. Fornos, in his protest to the AEC about the construction permit for the Calvert Cliffs plant, cited troubles in Florida.

In a letter to the AEC chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Fornos said he had recently visited the Turkey Point generating plant of the Florida Power and Light Co. on Biscayne Bay and that "hot water" discharged from the plant "killed shellfish, algae and crabs in a 300-acre area . . ."

The existing plant there is fossil-fueled but the company has two nuclear plants under construction, which would produce much more heat than fossil plants.

Fornos told Dr. Seaborg: "I hope that you will see fit to call a special meeting of all agencies concerned to make sure that the public is protected before it is too late. We cannot afford, for temporary economic gain, to destroy this great body of water (Chesapeake Bay) on which so many of us depend."

STUDENT OF RELIGION, PAUL WYCKOFF, OFFERS A REFRESHING VIEW OF TODAY'S YOUTH

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the radical student, the student advocating violence as a means for change, has been so much in the media that one does not get a very positive picture of today's youth. Having recently participated in a tour of 50 American college and university campuses, I know the majority of today's youth have a much more positive approach to life than that. I would like to make available for my colleagues a clipping from the Dayton, Ohio, Daily News by staff reporter Benjamin Kline picturing one such young man, Paul Wyckoff. He epitomizes the idealistic youth of today, but he has gone a step further. He is not looking for the answers. He has them through his faith.

The article follows:

PURDUE ENGINEERING GRAD—ALL A'S AND A RELIGION THAT MAKES IT ALL POSSIBLE

(By Benjamin Kline)

Very few of Dayton's new college graduates came home this past week with a diploma that notes "highest distinction" for perfect, straight-A grades.

Even fewer would tell you that "God worked in my heart" to make the achievement possible.

But that is the message of Paul W. Wyckoff, of Kettering, who received a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering at Purdue university last Sunday.

About five minutes with Paul at the Wyckoff home, 932 Cottonwood Rd., introduces you to a young man who may be the most radical radical this side of Berkeley.

"Yeah, I'm a fanatic," he says. He grins and

opens his Bible to the 12th verse of the first chapter of the Book of John:

"But as many as received Him. He gave them power to become the sons of God, to those who believe on His name".

The son of a Chrysler Airtemp division vice president, who is also an engineer by training, Paul says he made his decision to accept Christ when he was a small boy.

"I was curious, you know, about who God is, who I am and how the two might fit together. The Bible is the key emphasis at our church, Fair Haven Christian and Missionary Alliance, so I knew some of the things the Bible said.

"The main thing I knew was that God loved me, and that sin cuts off the possibility of getting to know Him; that sin is spiritual death, that Jesus Christ died to pay the penalty for the sins of men."

Paul says he made his personal commitment following a Sunday night church meeting, but he made it at home, by himself. He wants you to know he "didn't go rolling down any aisle."

Paul acknowledges that he was no juvenile delinquent at Fairmont West high school and, by standard societal measures, hadn't fallen from earthly grace.

"But that's the danger," he quickly interjects. "We kinda stack ourselves up against each other instead of trying to measure up to God, whose standard is perfection."

During his freshman year at Wheaton college, where he got B's in a creative writing course and in ROTC, Paul doesn't feel he was "stacking up" very well.

Then, as a Purdue sophomore, he says his faith began to grow and he became involved with a campus group called Navigators, a nonsectarian organization whose members meet for prayer and Bible study.

He thinks he knows some of the reasons why God—particularly organized religion—has been taking a beating from the "now generation" of college students.

"One thing is the image. Whatever you picture God in your mind, it's not what He is. He's a spirit; he operates independently of time and space."

College students almost without exception, Paul believes, "are searching for joy, peace, security, purpose and meaning in their lives and hope for the future."

It's all in the Book, John says, and he plans to enter some form of Christian ministry—perhaps campus ministry—to promote it.

"The idea of what it means to be a Christian has been all fouled up," he believes, "as a series of thou shalt nots, instead of a love relationship with God."

To a generation of cynics, it's perhaps rather idealistic, and Paul, the mechanical engineer with the fantastic 6.0 grade average understands that.

"It's ridiculous, let's face it, in rational

terms to pray and ask Christ to come into your life, but somehow God makes it work."

Paul leaves Monday for a summer training program conducted by the Navigators in Washington, D.C. He has applied to a Chicago theological seminary but if the draft board calls, he says he probably will not seek C. O. status.

War, poverty, racial discrimination—"a fairly advanced result of sin," he says simply. "And the answer is to preach the word."

The way a lot of people view religion these days. Paul's enthusiasm, his truly radical stance, is kind of weird.

The way he tells it, though, is kind of wonderful.

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON PEACE TALKS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, excerpts from Gen. George Washington's letters covering peace talks with the British following their defeat at Yorktown indicate how we would be dealing with Communists at the Paris talks—if knowledgeable patriots were in charge.

Neither war nor enemies change in tactics it seems. General Washington, in 1872, felt the British were stalling at peace talks and wrote, "their only aim is to gain time that they may become more formidable at sea, form new alliances, if possible, or disunite us."

General Washington's admonition against the common enemy then should be basic foreign policy today against the Communist menace.

We, if wise, should push our preparation with vigour; for nothing will hasten Peace more than to be in a condition for War—and if the Contest is to continue, 'tis indispensably necessary.

What a variance from the leadership of today. George Washington exerted positive action and got peace for his people—where are we going?

I include the following article:

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1969]

PEACE TALKS IRKED GEORGE

(By Ferrel Guillory)

In much the same way Americans are showing impatience at the sluggishness of the Vietnam negotiations, George Washing-

ton once expressed exasperation at the slow pace of peace talks in Paris in 1782.

Writing to James McHenry, one of his secretaries during the Revolutionary War and later a Secretary of War, Washington accused England of stalling the Paris talks which followed the British military defeat at Yorktown.

The original manuscript of Washington's letter to McHenry was recently donated to the Library of Congress by Sol Feinstein, a collector who lives in Washington Crossing, Pa. The letter, in a good state of preservation, is now on display in the second floor gallery in the Library of Congress.

A statement announcing the exhibition of the letter says it is "written in Washington's clear distinctive hand." A Library spokesman said the letter is authentic.

The letter was written by Washington on Aug. 15, 1782, ten months after Cornwallis surrendered for the British at Yorktown. The peace talks in Paris began soon after the battle with Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, John Adams and Henry Laurens as the American team of negotiators.

Early in the negotiations the British conceded the American demand for total independence, but later raised as an issue the restoration of property to British loyalists living in the colonies or compensation for property lost in the war.

Washington felt the British were stalling and wrote that they "are guilty of more duplicity than comports with candid Minds."

"Tis plain," Washington wrote, "their only aim is to gain time that they may become more formidable at Sea—form new Alliances, if possible—or disunite us."

At this time still the top general of the colonies, Washington advised continued military readiness. "Be their object what it may," he wrote, "we, if wise, should push our preparations with vigour; for nothing will hasten Peace more than to be in a condition for War—and if the Contest is to continue, 'tis indispensably necessary."

The negotiations finally ended on Sept. 3, 1783, when the peace treaty was signed, the colonies having won most of the vital negotiating points. The issue of property restoration and compensation was settled by the American negotiators pledging to have the congress of the states pass a resolution urging the colonists to adjust claims with the loyalists—a compromise favorable to the Americans.

The Library of Congress also announced that Feinstein soon will donate a collection of documents pertaining to the Revolutionary War, including additional letters by Washington, along with letters of Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine and Lafayette. The Library said the manuscript collection will be included in the historical materials it will assemble to celebrate the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

SENATE—Friday, July 18, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art from everlasting to everlasting, with whom there is neither beginning nor end, we beseech Thee to accompany the voyagers in space, granting unto them sturdy spirits, peaceful souls, poised minds, wisdom and power in every action that their mission amid the splendors of Thy universe may open to mankind a new age of spirituality, of

international morality and universal peace.

O God, be with us in the Senate of the United States teaching us not only to do Thy will but how to do it, that we may faithfully serve Thy purposes for this Nation and all mankind.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 17, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE POPULATION PROBLEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the