

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DIFFICULTIES OF COMPUTER COMPONENT OF PROPOSED SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Dr. Glenn K. Manacher, of the Institute for Computer Research, University of Chicago, has furnished a report of his views on the proposed Safeguard ABM system, emphasizing the difficulties of the computer component.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF DR. GLENN K. MANACHER,
FOR THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

I am honored to furnish a report of my views of the new version of the ABM system being proposed by the Administration. I have had direct experience with the ABM project. I have also had experience with computer languages and systems, especially their design and implementation. This experience is relevant since ABM will be heavily dependent on a computer for decision-making, discrimination, guidance and control.

None of the opinions in this report in any way reflect the views of the University of Chicago or any part of it.

My period of employment on the ABM project terminated in 1965. However, I have since that time and am today engaged in computer research at the University of Chicago. I remain in contact with non-classified information bearing on the computer systems used in the ABM system, via public and private sources.

The concept I represent today is that there is a practical limit, at least at present, to the sophistication and mass of detail that may be built into such complex systems as the ABM without compromising reliability.

I will present my main points, reserving more detailed discussion for the appendix. The points raised are in no particular order.

1. The decision-making capability of the computer lies almost entirely in the "software" or in another word, the programming. Senators, let me explain what I mean by the term "programming." Suppose I wanted to find out how many times the word "military" appeared in yesterday's Congressional Record, I would have to write a program to tell the machine how to organize its elementary capabilities to find the word. This, many more times complex, is what a program means in terms of the highly sophisticated operation of the ABM.

2. The ABM effort may be one of the largest, if not the largest, coherent programming efforts ever organized. The problems of management, coordination, and quality control on software effort of this size are known to be very difficult, and schedule failures are the rule rather than the exception.

3. All other large software systems have presented tremendous problems in the areas of maintenance, integrity and updating that could not in my judgment be tolerated by ABM. One exceedingly well-known system, for instance, has an "update manual" that comes out about bi-monthly. A recent issue is being included as an exhibit. It details several hundred unresolved errors covering just this period. The system in question has been in

existence for about four years, and a large staff is kept busy trying to keep it up-to-date and to remove bugs as they are discovered.

4. No other system of comparable size has been presented with the problems of precise control and synchronization in so-called "real-time" that the ABM program must face. This means that the computer cannot slip behind the jobs it must control; it must keep pace with all of them simultaneously.

5. The problems of designing a testing scheme that will mimic a real attack are acute and will recur as long as the adversary can significantly change the character of the attack. It appears, moreover, that the only testing of the system that will be done will be with tapes that contain data simulating an attack. These tapes represent the best approximation of an attack we can devise. There may, however, be subtle differences between the simulation and the real attack that are not detected. Proponents of the system who are familiar with it point out that there are limits to how unexpected or unconventional an attack can plausibly be made. Nevertheless, there is a wide divergence of opinion within the field as to the degree to which a series of simulations, however cleverly devised, can shed light on the expected performance of the system under a real attack.

6. The complexity of the programming effort will presumably be simplified by the inclusion of human beings who make early decisions where judgement rather than data processing is required. One can imagine that these people "load" a program appropriate to the attack into the machine. However, the sheer size of the programming effort, as opposed to its complexity, may be increased thereby.

7. Large programming efforts are especially prone to errors which cause them to fail entirely. Programs which attempt to extract maximum performance from a machine are particularly prone to this trouble.

8. If other large efforts are a guide, the software development of this project is at a state which does not make reliable estimates of its performance possible at present. It may be estimated from inferences drawn from Sec. Laird's testimony that a thorough shake-down of the software is about three years away.

9. There is no science of software development to help make judgements such as these firmer; each case rests on its merits. There are, I believe, general guidelines to past experience relating program size to development difficulty, and these can be summarized in a table, which appears as table 1 in the appendix.

10. If we accept the soundness of the DOD estimates, particularly the 95% kill rate of Minuteman under an all-out S-9—MIRV attack, the ABM system, assuming it works and can be shaken down on schedule, appears to be the soundest short-to-medium term technical solution to the preservation of an invulnerable second-strike deterrent.

11. From a technical point of view, I believe that Safeguard represents a sound re-deployment of the components originally designed for NIKE-X.

I now wish to offer some judgements about the matters discussed above.

1. As I understand it, the mainspring of the pro-ABM argument is the "classical" one of preserving an invulnerable second-strike force while avoiding dependence on hair-trigger responses, and I personally believe that it cannot be faulted on this ground.

2. The purpose of this posture, as I understand it, has been succinctly stated by Prof. Albert Wohlstetter at hearings conducted by the Armed Services Committee. It is to in-

sure that at no level of acceleration of "conventional" hostilities can either side calculate it to his interest to start a nuclear war.

3. The argument is thus made persuasively that ABM might play a crucial role in maintaining deterrence. It is my judgement that ABM might also play a role in destabilizing deterrence, precisely because of the technical factors I have outlined. For instance, suppose that both sides wish to hedge on the possibility of the failure of deterrence. Say they choose to develop preemptive weapons at a level of deployment somewhat below destabilizing. If these calculations are based on an assumed high level of ABM that unexpectedly fails to materialize, one or both sides may find themselves propelled willy-nilly into preemptive capability.

4. Many of my colleagues believe that the discovery in the system of a minor bug or even a fairly large number of such bugs would not be destabilizing since the adversary would not know what they were, or be able to take advantage of them. This, in my judgement, brings up grave issues: How much of this nature could an adversary find out by espionage? Could knowledge of the existence of a large number of bugs, even without knowledge of their exact nature, goad an unwise adversary into the assumption that he enjoyed however temporarily a preemptive advantage?

5. From many unclassified sources has come the unanimous judgement that the Russians do not have anything comparable to the NIKE-X computer. Since this is the heart of the system's decision-making capability, it follows that they could not at present proceed with their own "Safeguard" system. The American MIRV deployment may be regarded by Russia therefore as more destabilizing to deterrence than the Russian MIRV deployment appears to us.

6. My central conclusion follows. The ABM software system is complex, incomplete, immature, and risky. Its technology has no precedent in many important respects. Its delivery date is subject to sharp slippage. These problems will be ameliorated by virtue of the excellence and conscientiousness of the people working on it, and every effort will be made to simplify it and subject it to the broadest range of simulated tests human imagination can devise. The risks will thereby be reduced. But there is no one today who can tell this Committee whether the risks will be reduced to an acceptable point on a realistic timetable.

This element of risk must be taken into account, especially in the context of a build-up of preemptive weapons that is usually assumed will occur concurrently. If the risk of failure or setback of MIRV systems is sharply less than risk for the Safeguard system, the concurrent development of both may lead straight into preemptive capability for one side or both, a situation viewed by many as irreversible. My colleagues' view of this disturbing possibility leads some of them to wonder whether negotiations, however unproductive they have been in the past, might not produce results of a lesser degree of risk.

I believe this issue of risk is being avoided and I am very uneasy about it. The question, "What is the risk of deploying Safeguard?" is meaningless unless one states candidly one's assumptions about all competing weapons systems: their deployment and the constraints on their deployment.

I am sure of one thing: The weighing of risks is very delicate. Alternative proposals or proposals for combinations involving ABM with partial inspection, etc., obviously also involve risk. But it is not clear at present which course offers least risk, and I think that a thorough analysis will result in an

unusually large table of alternatives and combinations. I would not hesitate to recommend the deployment of Safeguard if it were clear that this were part of the pursuit of the course of least risk. What worries me is not that ABM will or will not be deployed, but that the choice will blunt the search for policies of least risk.

I wish to add two more remarks.

1. Despite its problems, my own observation and that of my colleagues is that we should press on with software development and research, and that this effort should not be affected by any decision with regard to deployment of the system or part of it.

2. There is a strong feeling among the scientists in the ABM project that if an overseeing commission of the type proposed by Dr. Killian were to probe every facet of the operation, every component—including those that seem esoteric—could be translated into simple English suitable for public understanding. There is a great deal of feeling that much of what is known and solidly understood, both of a classified and unclassified nature, is not at present being properly translated into public terms and that indeed there is much distortion. Moreover, there is no easy way for individuals inside the project to correct the distortion when it occurs. There is also some feeling that such a commission might help to create a freer flow of information within the project.

The following details may be of interest.

I believe that there is almost universal concurrence among software (i.e., programming) people that the ease with which a program can be written, maintained, and "debugged" is a function of several variables, and that the size of the program is a crude but good measure. The above terms may need explanation. A program as written generally contains "bugs". These are program errors. There are trivial ones which involve, let us say, a key punch error. But there are non-trivial ones which arise not so much from the encoding of the problem as from subtle and rarely-exercised discrepancies between the assumptions and structures present or latent in the program, and the formal statement of the problem. In general, attempts to make programs as efficient as possible sharply increase the incidence and subtlety of bugs.

In a similar fashion, as the uses and expectations of a program change, and bugs are uncovered, the program must be subtly and carefully modified almost as though it were a living thing. In general, the larger a program the more difficult the problem of maintenance and the higher its proportionate cost. For the largest programs, the figure of 50% is often heard as a ratio of maintenance to total program cost.

The size of programs is generally measured in words or lines of code. I believe that the following expresses the current state-of-the-art in this area:

Program size: 100; characteristics: Logically almost trivial. Can be "debugged" with very little effort.

Program size: 1,000; characteristics: Logically complex. Usually written by one person. The person writing the program can usually devise a strategy to test the program thoroughly and thereby to eliminate bugs.

Program size: 10,000; characteristics: Logically so complex that it will likely be written as several subprograms. Often programs of this size are designed for use by many people as "service programs". Complete debugging unlikely to result from efforts of authors alone; may require help of users. Errors may occur months from time when program was believed to be debugged.

Program size: 100,000; characteristics: Written by moderately large groups. Almost always is a service program of some sort. Reasonable strategy to debug is virtually out of the question. Bugs remain for years because they are discovered faster than corrected. Se-

rious maintenance problems because of these factors.

Program size: 1,000,000; characteristics: [Conjectural].¹ Keeping track of parts of program a very difficult job. Maintenance barely manageable. Some bugs never corrected and some never noticed.

It should be borne in mind that the size of programs envisaged for the Safeguard system will have to be in the upper part of table 1 (100,000-1,000,000 word range or larger).

In addition, Safeguard programming is done, I believe, in a somewhat peculiar style in which the programs must operate in precise periodic "time slots" in order to control the interceptor missiles. This is done in order to synchronize the outgoing signals to the intercept-missile control. There is virtually no body of experience to draw on as a precedent for this new and untested programming art. Moreover, the time slots make the problem of program debugging even worse than the suggestions of table 1, as does the constant need for major reprogramming [p. 96].² Also, the main functions—guidance and discrimination, must be done concurrently.

It might be thought that a computer program could be constructed that could remedy "bugs" in another computer program. It can be shown with mathematical rigor, however, that such a program is impossible.

In order to make it clear just how persistent a problem "bugs" are, I am including a part of a sort of "correction manual" sent out approximately bi-monthly by IBM. It concerns the central operating control system "OS" used by all large IBM model 360's. I believe that IBM maintains a staff of perhaps 50-250 programmers whose sole purpose is to maintain OS.³ It is IBM's most central and most important program. The enclosed list covers just some of the unresolved errors for this period. (OS has been in existence for about four years, and is close to million-word size.)

How can a customer run a shop when he is dependent on such a program? The answer is simple. He is likely to depend on only a very few services provided, and his operation is likely to consist of repetitive usage of these services. If these services involve no bugs, he is in good shape.

I have reason to believe that a tentative operating package of software for Safeguard has or will shortly be completed. However, there are indications that the Safeguard software groups are spiritedly looking at all sorts of new principles and theories as guidelines for future development. This suggests that the software may not yet be in a state of maturity.

These observations jibe with an estimate that a reliable working system—software included—is regarded by the DOD as about three years away. This may be inferred from the testimony of Messrs. Packard and Laird [p. 198] as follows. Since this testimony says that deployment following prototype success would mean a delay of three years, it can only mean that this is the length of time prototype success may take. The main obstacle to prototype success at the present time is software. Therefore, it seems to me, the defense department has the bulk of hardware ready to go, so it figures: Why not just deploy the hardware and maintain the prototype testing program? This is typical "PERT-chart" thinking and is completely understandable. The basic idea is to do as much as possible in parallel.

¹ There are few, if any, programs in existence of this size.

² All page references are to the March 6-March 28 hearings, "Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems."

³ OS "bugs" occur in its "real" environment, not in synthetic tests.

However, there are occasional misleading bits of testimony on this score. The "shake-down" of the "system" in Montana mentioned on page 276 obviously refers to an incomplete system. Mr. Laird's testimony on p. 127 to the effect that the system is working, in which he invites members of the Committee to watch an interception on Kwajalein, is similarly misleading, and the interception he speaks of is, I suspect, from some earlier generation of system.

To my mind, the most important modification of the technical claims made by DOD in connection with the conversion of Nike-X to Safeguard is the current representation of Safeguard as a system with only a certain probability of interception. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it is regarded, apparently [p. 211] as a valuable protector of second-strike capability even if it protects only a fraction of our deterrent power. This claim makes it easier for its proponents to stop claiming miracle results, narrows the discussion, anchors it to principle, and makes it vastly more honest.

Secretary Laird makes it clear that an ABM system protecting only some fraction of Minutemen sites would be acceptable. This is not a compromise with mutual deterrence (hereafter MD), as the fraction of Minutemen remaining intact after a strike obviously constitutes a deterrent.

Let P_1 be the probability for a missile to survive a heavy attack with Safeguard protection, and let P_2 represent the probability that the system will perform reasonably near expectation.

Suppose P_1 and P_2 (as defined above) turn out to be fairly low. Is there still deterrence? The discussion is tricky. If P_1 is low, the statistical argument above is still valid. If P_2 is too low, the system would not pass simulated tests. The fact that it must pass simulated tests means that it will have at least moderately high value, say, for the sake of argument, 5. There is an interesting though vaguely disturbing argument which says that an adversary simply cannot afford to attack in this case because finding out whether his attack could cripple the system is too costly. In other words, the system acquires a sort of "bluff value." When undergoing modification for "bugs" of some subtlety, the system would be left "up" with a subtly defective program, to be sure, but again the price of a probe would be too great. Whether bugs serious enough to undermine the system could be detected by espionage is a subject which can be debated, though even among skilled programmers and engineers such debates quickly become reminiscent of a sequence from *Dr. Strangelove*.

If the ABM system is only moderately reliable, it may be a good idea to come fairly close to automating some of the intended responses to some threats. For instance, in the event of absolutely unmistakable evidence of an overwhelming attack, I am hard pressed to believe that an "emptying the holes" policy would not be in force.

In the event of an "accident," or stray missile, the precoded policy would of course be to ride out the attack, ABM or no ABM.

The intermediate cases are the difficult ones, where one wishes to involve administrative decision and to avoid hair-trigger responses. If one believes that an attack that looks "intermediate" can in fact only be "intermediate," then conventional hardening may well be sufficient. However, there may be ultimately believable forms of attack which would make it impossible for Minutemen to be fired before bearing the brunt of the attack. In this contingency, Safeguard looks like a necessity.

The system may possibly be compromised in its MD capability by virtue of its dependence on the PAR (perimeter acquisition radar.) In the hearings, the testimony was conflicting as to the viability of the system once the PAR is gone. My personal belief is

that the system will be viable although both P₁ and P₂ will suffer from the loss of PAR. Since we must assume that PAR will be attacked early, we must base calculations on the assumption that it plays no role in actual ABM defense. Similar considerations apply acutely to MSR (missile site radar).

The rather cloudy account in the testimony of the emergence of the SS-9—MIRV threat is hard to follow. The threat is a combination of large size improved guidance, and massive MIRV carrying capacity.⁴

Is the development of MIRV automatically an attempt of first-strike capability? Secretary Laird is asked [p. 201] and refuses to answer, implying that perhaps our MIRV is not wholly defensive. Senator Symington quotes Dr. Enthoven's opinion to the effect that SS-9 was, at least at some time in the past, intended *defensively*.⁵ The picture one gets is mixed and ambiguous. Was there a studied attempt to put together a first-strike weapons system, or did pieces of it just evolve?

These considerations lead me to believe that the determination of what can be done mutually is of enormous importance and ought to take precedence over unilateral efforts, because unilateral actions are necessarily at the limits of reliable technology and are therefore inherently risky. The policies built on such risky technology are likely to both count on and hedge the risk, and call the combination "prudence", rather than more risk.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the House to the work of the Republican task force on earth resources and population, a very active, interested group of Members who, under the imaginative and very energetic leadership of Congressman GEORGE BUSH, of Texas, is currently conducting a series of hearings into the complexities of these two vital subjects, population and earth resources.

Although our investigations are not yet complete, it is already quite clear the two questions of earth resources and population are inextricably linked together, that each one affects the other in a myriad of ways, and that a truly concerted national program to deal with either of these questions must clearly recognize this close relationship.

Our task force hearings so far have centered on learning precisely what the Government's policy is in these areas at the present time—what the executive agencies are now doing. A number of distinguished officials of the executive branch have met with us to discuss and

⁴The chart on p. 285 [which incidentally seems to be off by a factor of 10 on the abscissa] clearly shows that many small missiles are far more dangerous as a first-strike force than one big one. The danger, for instance, of 25 1-megaton weapons to hardened missile sites is probably greater than (say) 3 8-megaton weapons.

⁵How long is the SS-9 countdown? If it is more than 30 minutes, it is almost assuredly intended at least in part as a first-strike weapon.

explain their programs. For instance, several weeks ago, Dr. Thomas Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, offered an excellent briefing on the applications of earth resources satellites.

On July 10, the task force was particularly honored to have the President's science adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, join us for a significant and wide-ranging discussion.

It occurs to me that Dr. DuBridge's brief opening remarks may be of special interest to other Members of the Congress who were not present at that meeting, for in it he sums up in a succinct and cogent manner—as is his custom—some of the most important issues facing this Nation. His remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF DR. LEE A. DUBRIDGE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Task Force: It is a pleasure to be here today to discuss with you some of the most important issues facing this Nation. We are in need of new ideas for coping with resource and population problems in a democratic society.

I note that you have considered these matters with a number of competent people and that you anticipate further discussions to develop a perspective of the range and priorities of problems facing the world today. One of the foremost of these, as you have heard, is the question of population growth and its consequences to society.

It is quite apparent that humans cannot continue to increase their numbers indefinitely. Already in several nations, population growth is so rapid as to nullify economic gains. Other more fortunate countries such as our own will be faced with the housing and employment needs of an unprecedented number of people in the next few decades. We will have to develop new techniques for coping with this situation in a more rational manner than we have in the past if our already crowded metropolitan areas are not to become hopeless tangles of humanity.

But we cannot divorce the question of population growth from the related matters of food supplies, natural resources and environmental quality. These are interdependent factors, no one of which can be treated separately without considering its impact on the others. For example, in our foreign programs we cannot advocate population stabilization as the sole solution. People must have enough to eat and economic improvement must proceed if developing nations are to take their place in modern society. The President in his Foreign Aid Message outlined fresh approach in this area based on moral principles and "a world order of peace and justice." To stimulate private enterprise he proposed the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to encourage development, he advocated emphasis on technical assistance, international cooperation, food production and family planning. Incidentally, with regard to these latter two factors, I would like to quote an interesting point which was expressed in the President's Science Advisory Committee Report on the World Food Problem.

"We are faced with the apparent paradox that a reduction in mortality should reduce rather than raise the rate of population growth. If this is the case, reduction of malnutrition among children, by increasing the quantity and quality of food supplies, may be a key factor in solving the population problem of our time."

On the domestic hunger front, the Administration has proposed an expansion of family food assistance and a special program for needy pregnant women and mothers of infants, as well as administrative actions to improve the national response to inadequate nutrition. In addition, there will be a White

House Conference on Food and Nutrition this fall which will recommend how the private food market can be used to improve the nutritional status of Americans, and how Federal food programs can be improved.

But food should not be our only concern. With unprecedented prosperity, Americans are using the products of technology at an ever-increasing rate. This is placing new demands on resources as well as threatening the quality of our environment. Rising power requirements necessitate the development of techniques to meet them; greater housing needs require the provision of adequate amounts of building materials without exhausting supplies; increased water consumption requires new strategies for conserving this important resource.

Meanwhile, the undesirable by-products of progress increase in our environment and, at best, are costly to control. At worst, they bid fair to overwhelm us. To cope with this situation, the President recently established a Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council of which I am the Executive Secretary. The Council has initiated actions to deal with pressing environmental problems of air pollution, water pollution, land pollution and noise. Specific concerns in these areas include solid wastes, automotive vehicle pollution, noise abatement and handling of toxic materials. In addition, a sub-cabinet level committee on outdoor recreation has been established.

The Council is supported by a Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality which will advise the President and the Council on matters assigned to it.

Mr. Chairman, I have deliberately kept my remarks brief so there will be an opportunity to respond to any questions you may have. As you mentioned in your report on the activities of this task force, Mr. Chairman, it seems as though we are "having to run fast in order to stand still." And yet, progress is being made in all of these areas. It is progress based in good share on research into new methods for solving these problems. We will have to continue to emphasize research if we are to meet the challenges of a world swept up in change.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Southern Conference, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, composed of 14 Southern States, met July 11-13, at Norfolk, Va., to coordinate the policies and communities programs of that region for the coming year. It is reassuring to me to note the timely statements regarding our security which were issued by National VFW Commander in Chief Richard Homan on the occasion of that conference.

Mr. Homan spoke out plainly about some of the many dangers facing our country. He warned of the challenge of Soviet naval and maritime growth, spotlighted by the appearance of a Soviet naval task force steaming near our east coast en route to Cuba.

Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Homan's statements merit the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET FLEET VISIT TO CUBA

A few columnists, analysts and commentators have suggested that the visit of a Soviet naval task force to Cuba on July 20, 1969, is the result of President Nixon's plans to visit Rumania. This reasoning may be true, but I doubt it. The general public never knows why closed societies such as the Soviet government does anything, and they never tell.

As a rule, the Soviet government acts for substantial reasons and with the intention of following through on what they have begun. When Sputnik went into orbit, the Soviet Union had emerged with a long-range and well-planned space program. When the first few Soviet fleet units trickled into the Mediterranean, we saw the beginning of a long-range and well planned political, military and naval influence in and around the Mediterranean basin and along the northern rim of Africa. Therefore, it is my personal conviction the Soviet government has closed the power gap at sea, that Soviet naval expansion, both qualitatively and numerically, has reached the state where fleet units can try their rudder as an influence in this hemisphere. It is my belief that the Soviet leaders learned a lesson less than a decade ago, when their ships tried and failed to deliver missiles to Cuba. Those missile carrying ships were met and turned away by a more powerful U.S. fleet. Now, a Soviet cruiser capable of launching nuclear tipped missiles, plus several destroyers, submarines and supporting ships, are visiting Cuba with impunity. There has been no hint of a diplomatic transgression. Now we see a fleet of 50 or 60 ships in the Mediterranean. During certain operating periods we see a Soviet "Sixth Fleet" that actually outnumbers the American Sixth Fleet.

It should be noted that the recent announcement of the Soviet Navy's visit to Cuba came at a time when the missile cruiser was reportedly operating in mid-Atlantic. I believe we are witnessing the beginning of a new expansionist phase in Soviet naval and maritime diplomacy and influence. The Soviet Navy has reached such a threshold that the Soviet government hopes to reap a new harvest of world opinion from its new strength at sea.

It is anticipated that we will see more visits by Soviet fleet units to this hemisphere once respected for its Monroe Doctrine.

The question for Americans to answer is this: Will we maintain a balanced military posture capable of countering Soviet military capabilities at sea, on land and in space, or will we depend on the Soviet government's peaceful intentions to avoid a direct confrontation?

Until the Soviet government renounces its publicly stated aim for world domination, we have no choice. Superior military strength remains our best bet to deter aggression.

STATE BLOCK GRANTS THWART
WAR ON CRIME

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 22. The conditions revealed in the article point out a major weakness in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; a bill which includes many provisions initiated in the House.

This weakness lies in the fact that the States and State administrative agencies have been given the major responsibility for distributing the funds that have been made available to wage a more effective campaign against crime in our Nation. The States have failed to allocate these funds in a responsible manner and have failed to put them to their maximum usefulness. In doing so they have neglected the crying needs of the large urban areas which need the money the most.

This regrettable condition exists as a result of the Cahill amendment to H.R. 5037, which later became the basis for title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This was the amendment that gave the States the major responsibility in administering the act and we are now seeing the damaging effects of this amendment. The block grants to the States, which exist as a direct result of the amendment have proven to be a major obstacle in the battle against crime. It has created a situation in which anticrime funds are not being used where they are crucially needed, but have been channeled by the States to other areas of lesser need. Thus, the potential benefits of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in fighting crime in the big cities have been largely negated by the provisions of this amendment.

This danger was apparent to many of us in the House and along with 146 of my distinguished colleagues I voted against the amendment, which subsequently passed by a vote of 256 to 147. The precise breakdown of support for the amendment was 172 Republicans and 84 Democrats for; while opposition was four Republicans and 143 Democrats.

We see more clearly than ever before the need to channel Federal aid directly to the municipalities where the need is greatest and we must not allow the States to continue to divert these funds to the other less urgent purposes.

I am sure that each Member is concerned about the problems and issues raised in this article and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

BIG-CITY MAYORS FIND FAILURES IN STATE
CONTROL OF CRIME DRIVE

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Many of the nation's Mayors are complaining bitterly that the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is proving to be a failure in the larger cities.

They say the states, which have been given the prime responsibility of administering the act, are building a new layer of bureaucracy, robbing the cities of administrative talent and distributing the funds on a per capita basis that ignores the concentration of crime in urban areas and enriches rural and suburban sections where crime is at a minimum.

These complaints, which have been mounting in the year since the law was enacted, have become widespread and now are leading some Mayors to press Congress for changes in the law. The United States conference of mayors this week adopted a resolution urging Congress to amend the law to permit direct grants to the cities.

Vice President Agnew acknowledged that the complaints may have merit and promised the mayors that the Nixon Administration would look into the matter, although the act is geared to the Administration's

philosophy of channeling grants through the states.

Previously, the National League of Cities had surveyed municipalities with high crime rates and concluded that the funds were "being dissipated broadly without regard to need."

The comment of Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis was typical.

"Experience to date," he said, "demonstrates that the involvement of the states weakens rather than strengthens Federal assistance for the larger cities in the field of law enforcement."

The act is designed to upgrade the quality of the police and the courts through grants and technical assistance. By June 30 all 50 States are expected to have their plans completed. The initial \$29-million in block grants to the states is being distributed, and the grants are expected to total \$300-million by 1970 and \$1-billion a year thereafter.

In passing the act last year, Congress, over the objections of the cities, provided that most of the money under the act go to the states in block grants. The states were authorized to set up planning and administrative agencies and to decide how the funds would be distributed locally. This mirrored a trend in the Federal Government to take control away from Washington and bring the states more into the administration of aid to the cities.

Mayor James J. H. Tate of Philadelphia said Pennsylvania's experience under the act was typical.

GOT MINIMUM AMOUNT

"During the current year, Pennsylvania received \$880,000 for planning purposes under the act," he said. "Congress established a floor of 40 per cent for planning by local governments; but there was no ceiling or maximum amount which a state could allocate to local governments if the state wishes to realistically deal with the problems of law enforcement within its jurisdiction."

"Regrettably, the State of Pennsylvania has retained 60 per cent of the planning funds to create a new state bureaucracy, and the absolute minimum of 40 per cent has been allocated to local governments. The 40 per cent has been distributed to eight geographic regions of the state, on a population basis."

He said Philadelphia received \$62,419, or 7 per cent of the total planning grant received by the state but that Philadelphia had 25 per cent of the major crimes in the state.

Mayor Naftalin said a similar system was at work in Minneapolis and most other cities.

CITIES' NEEDS DESCRIBED

"The states inevitably dilute attention to the needs of the larger cities because they regard their primary responsibility as state-wide and thus place on the same level the needs and demands of urban, suburban and rural communities, regardless of the degree of need," he said.

"In the process of developing their capability, states reach out to raid cities of very scarce professional personnel who have training and experience in law enforcement planning," Mr. Naftalin said.

He said all this has added up to "partisan influence, administrative clumsiness, unfair treatment of the cities and, generally, a failure to meet the purposes of the act."

Charles H. Rogovin, administrator of the act in the Justice Department, said that the distribution of the bulk of the funds was left up to the states by Congress but that the Administration was doing what it could to help the cities.

"We told state planning agencies they should give special consideration to urban areas with pressing needs and make certain there was adequate representation by local government officials," he said. "Then we took another step—making a total of \$1.1-billion

of discretionary action funds available to the nation's largest cities for special anticrime or prevention projects."

He said the Administration planned to award \$100,000 to each of those cities soon and would give that type of grant priority in the future.

But the mayors are convinced that as long as the bulk of the funds go to the states the cities will not receive money proportionate to the crime. They are mounting what many consider a futile campaign to change the law.

THE TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEM

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the recent remarks of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from South Carolina on the textile situation. I believe that the Senators have performed a useful service to the Members of this body and to the public at large by opening inquiry and discussion into the facts surrounding the textile import problem. As a further contribution to this inquiry, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum in response to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina of July 10, 1969, prepared by the Textile & Apparel Group, American Importers Association, from my State of New York.

For ease of reference in following the memorandum, I would also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, together with the materials which he placed in the RECORD at that time, be printed in the RECORD following the Textile & Apparel Group memorandum.

I hope that this material and the continuing discussion on this important subject will prove to be of value to the Senate.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR HOLLINGS' STATEMENT OF JULY 10, 1969

This memorandum is in response to a statement by Senator Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1969, pp. 19000 et seq. This memorandum deals only with the material on the textile situation and does not comment upon general material at the beginning of the statement based upon a report of the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

For ease of reference, copies of Senator Hollings' statement are attached hereto. This includes a reprint of a "Memorandum on the Performance of the U.S. Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports" of the American Importers Association, Textile & Apparel Group.

The argumentation and the version of the facts set forth in Senator Hollings' statement do not disturb the basic contentions of the Textile & Apparel Group that imports have not caused or threatened serious injury to the American industry producing textile and apparel products, and that there is no economic justification for the imposition of quotas or other import restrictions on imports of such products.

We repeat that every economic indicator shows a pattern of growth in the textile and apparel industries and there is no indication in the available data that these industries are being injured or are threatened injury by imports. These conclusions are emphasized by the tables included in Senator Hollings' remarks.

Senator Hollings' contention apparently is not that these industries have been injured or threatened injury, but rather that despite their growth, performance has been below the average performance of all industries, of the nondurable goods industries, or of the economy as a whole.

This is a novel standard by which to measure the impact of imports. If every industry must perform as well as the average, the concept of average is meaningless. We do not believe that industries are entitled to import protection if they show none of the signs of injury and are growing, even though this performance might be below the national average.

In this connection, Senator Hollings takes issue with our use of the word "phenomenal" in our sentence "The textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth since 1961 through 1968." We agree with the definition of "phenomenal" as meaning "extraordinary" or "remarkable" and stand by our statement.

We believe that the performance of the domestic economy as a whole from 1961 through 1968 has been phenomenal, and believe the performance of the textile and apparel industry is not less phenomenal even though, measured by some indicators, slightly below the average for all industries, especially since performance has been above the average measured by other indicators.

Thus, we believe it is phenomenal that textile industry sales have grown by 55.6 percent from 1961 to 1968, and that sales of the apparel industry have grown by 67.7 percent in the same period.

We think it is phenomenal that profits, before federal income tax, of the textile industry have grown by 116.6 percent over the period and that profits for the apparel industry have grown by 181.3 percent.

We believe that this performance is extraordinary, and we believe that this is remarkable.

What is particularly phenomenal, extraordinary, and remarkable, is that in the face of this record of performance the textile and apparel industries nonetheless feel that they have a claim to invoke the extraordinary remedy of import controls.

We find it notable also that whereas Table I of the Senator's statement shows the percentage change in sales for the textile and apparel industries and for manufacturing industries (the point being that growth for textile and apparel were below the overall average) the same computation is not shown for profits. That computation, based on figures in Table 2 of Senator Hollings' statement, would show that for the period 1961 to 1968, while textile profits were growing by 116.6 percent and apparel profits were growing by 181.2 percent, profits for the nondurable goods industries grew by 78.5 percent and profits for all manufacturing industries grew by 104.4 percent. (See Table A attached.) Surely, this is "phenomenal" even by Senator Hollings' standards for "phenomenal."

It is also phenomenal that sales in 1968, as shown on Table 1 of Senator Hollings' statement, for the textile mill products industry, grew by 11.62 percent over the previous year, and apparel grew by 14.02 percent over the previous year, whereas sales for all manufacturing grew by 9.82 percent over the previous year. Certainly, then, by Senator Hollings' own standards, the growth in sales was at least phenomenal in 1968, the year in which the textile and apparel industries com-

menced in earnest their pleas for special treatment by way of import control.

Table 2 is misleading in that profits as a percent of sales is used as the only measure of profitability. The textile and apparel industries have been traditionally low margin industries. Nevertheless, it is interesting that during the period 1961 to 1968, when import competition was presumably increasing, these ratios increased substantially from 4.4 percent to 6.1 percent in the case of textile mill products, and from 2.7 percent to 4.5 percent in the case of apparel—hardly an indication of injury.

A more meaningful measure of profitability is the rate of profit on stockholders equity shown on Table B (attached).

Although textile mill products are somewhat below the average for all manufacturing corporations, and for the nondurable goods industries, the rate for apparel is above. This is the very sector—apparel—where imports are supposed to be hurting the most. Here again, the ratio has shown upward movement. From 1961 to 1968 the rate increased by 30.1 percent for all manufacturing corporations, 20.7 percent for nondurables, and by 59.6 percent for textiles and 55.2 percent for apparel.

We would make the same arguments with regard to Table 3, the value of shipments, where the increase from 1961 to 1968 in shipments for the textile mill products industry was 53.2 percent and home goods and apparel 49 percent. Here again the apparel industry in 1968 out-performed the average for all manufacturing corporations.

Similar comments could be made with regard to Table 4, the index of industrial production.

Table 5 with regard to employment shows a lower rate of employment increase for the textile mill products and apparel industry than for all manufacturing. Nonetheless, the table shows absolute increases in employment of substantial magnitudes. This is particularly significant in view of the large increases in production in the industry indicating increased levels of productivity. The nation as a whole has been enjoying one of the lowest rates of overall unemployment in its history. The trade press is replete with statements emanating from textile leaders that they simply cannot get enough labor. As the Tariff Commission report stated, this is an industry in which labor shortages exist.

What is important is that all of these indices show a rising level of production, sales, profits, employment and shipments. One may quibble about whether or not this is "phenomenal," but certainly one cannot seriously argue that these figures demonstrate injury.

In point 6, supported by Table 6, brushing over the fact that mill consumption of fibers has increased by 47 percent in the period 1961 to 1968, the technician who prepared this statistical data gropes for a comparison with growth in personal consumption expenditures and consumer disposable income. This is a non sequitur. This suggests that somehow the textile industry has a right to a constant share of the consumer dollar.

What is particularly objectionable about point 6 and Table 6 is that comparisons are also made to broad woven goods production. The only thing that the table really shows, given the relative performance of mill consumption and broad woven goods production, is that broad woven goods production is losing out to other kinds of textile production. It does not take a great deal of familiarity with this industry to know of the massive shift away from broad woven goods to knit goods, both for apparel and other end uses. Certainly, however, it makes no sense to compare broad woven goods production alone to mill consumption.

Senator Hollings is apparently of the opin-

ion that the man-made fiber industry is part of the textile industry. The Standard Industrial Classification system, however, utilized by the U.S. Government Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, in all official publications, shows the textile industry as a separate group (major group 22), apparel as a separate group (major group 23), and man-made fibers as a part of major group 28, chemicals and allied products (2823 and 2824).

Certainly, man-made fibers compete primarily with raw wool and cotton fiber. If man-made fibers are a textile product, so are raw cotton and wool. Most technicians agree that the "textile industry" begins with yarn, excluding monofilaments and grouped filaments. We do not believe, therefore, it is legitimate to include what are termed "primary" man-made fiber products in Table 7-A.

Whether the man-made fiber industry is a textile industry, or a chemical industry, it is certainly an industry which is not in need of protection. Production (excluding glass fiber) increased from 1,846.1 million pounds in 1961 to 4,781.8 million pounds in 1968, an increase of 159 percent.

Point 7 involves the old chestnut of the competitive relationship of products at earlier and later stages of processing. The argument in Senator Hollings' statement is that the importation of any products in the textile and apparel complex affects the producers of products at all earlier stages of production. Thus it is argued that imports of apparel have an adverse effect upon fiber producers.

However, the more realistic standard which has been a traditional part of American law and which is embodied in international standards (GATT Article 19) in judging import impact is whether a product is directly competitive.

The Trade Expansion Act provides in Section 405(4):

"An imported article is 'directly competitive with' a domestic article at an earlier or later stage of processing, and a domestic article is 'directly competitive with' an imported article at an earlier or later stage of processing, if the importation of the imported article has an economic effect on producers of the domestic article comparable to the effect of importation of articles in the same stage of processing as the domestic article. For purposes of this paragraph, the unprocessed article is at an earlier stage of processing."

The House Ways and Means Committee in its report stated:

"The term 'earlier or later stage of processing' contemplates that the article remains substantially the same during such stages of processing, and is not wholly transformed into a different article." (H. Rept. 1818, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., 1962, p. 69.)

The Section does not comprehend a "directly competitive" relationship between apparel and yarn, or apparel and fabric, or fabric and yarn, since from each stage to the next, the article has been "wholly transformed into a different article" and the article does not remain "substantially the same." In any event, the importation of a finished garment does not have a "comparable" effect on fabric production as importation of fabric.

This traditional standard makes sense since the competitive factors in the importation of apparel for instance are separate and distinct from those involved in yarn importation, and certainly the competitive impact of apparel imports is markedly different on the apparel and on the yarn sectors—one direct, the other indirect and remote.

The other consideration which makes the

analysis in point 7 misleading is that the chain of production can be analyzed forwards as well as backwards. The users of imported yarn are American knitters and weavers, and the users of imported fabric are American apparel manufacturers. The Tariff Commission estimated that over two-thirds of textile imports are further processed in the United States. Thus, imports of yarn and textiles are benefiting the American industry.

Table 7-B not only disregards the concept of "directly competitive," but is erroneous in that it also embodies an unrealistic segmentation. What the table purports to show is the indirect effect upon the production of fiber producers for apparel end use without including the entire production of their industry as must be done under present law. Production for apparel end use involves only about 40 percent of fiber production in the United States with the remainder being taken up by fibers for industrial goods, household goods, and other end uses. If fiber producers have increased production by 159 percent since 1961, are currently running at a high level of capacity, are adding new capacity, and are highly profitable, with increasing employment what sense does it make to segment out 40 percent of their production?

The text accompanying Table 7-B creates the impression that somehow the impact upon the apparel industry is being measured, although the table itself measures the indirect impact on the fiber industry, after unjustified segmentation. The high percentages shown by the table distort reality and are thus essentially meaningless.

Table 7-C directly contradicts Senator Hollings' stated agreement with the import-

ers that this is an all fiber industry. This table measures imports of wool products against consumption of wool. This simply does not make sense, given the rapid shift by the American industry from wool to man-made fibers and to blends of wool with man-made fibers, a shift which has been much greater in domestic production than in the imports.

We would agree, however, that overall measurements based on mill consumption of fibers is a crude measurement of competitive impact. It is, however, the only method by which any overall figure can be reached. As we stated in our basic memorandum:

"Even in the overall figures discussed above, there are a number of distortions when all imports and domestic products are combined in terms of weight. The most valid and revealing comparisons are separate comparisons by the major categories of yarns, fabrics, and apparel."

We have been able to bring up to date the Tariff Commission computations for these major sectors as shown on Tables C, D and E (attached). By this more realistic method of measuring import impact, the ratio of imports to consumption is at low and relatively stable levels: 1 percent for yarn in 1967, 5.9 percent for fabric in 1968, and 6.4 percent for apparel in 1968.

We believe that these tables are the most accurate measure of the impact of imports on the textile and apparel industries, avoiding the distortions inherent in analyses based upon fiber consumption. This was the method utilized by the U.S. Tariff Commission and is, in our view, conclusive that this industry is not being injured or threatened injury—let alone seriously injured.

TABLE A.—PROFITS OF THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED TO NONDURABLE AND ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

[Profits before taxes data in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		Nondurable goods		All manufacturing	
	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)	Profits before taxes	Change (percent)
1961.....	589		331		13,862		27,508	
1962.....	724	22.9	415	25.3	15,114	9.0	31,863	15.8
1963.....	721	-5	414	-2	16,421	8.6	34,924	9.6
1964.....	947	31.3	553	33.5	18,324	11.5	39,567	13.2
1965.....	1,268	33.8	644	16.4	20,260	10.5	46,487	17.4
1966.....	1,272	3	740	14.9	22,610	11.5	51,787	11.4
1967.....	982	-22.7	728	-2.1	22,050	-2.4	47,772	-7.7
1968.....	1,276	29.9	931	27.8	24,756	12.2	55,405	15.9
Change, 1961 to 1968.....	116.6		182.2		78.5		101.4	
Average annual change.....	13.57		16.51		8.7		10.8	

Source: Federal Trade Commission-SEC.

TABLE B.—RATE OF PROFIT ON STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY, FOR ALL MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS, CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING NONDURABLE GOODS, CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS, AND CORPORATIONS MANUFACTURING APPAREL, 1961-68

[In percent]

Year	Rate of profit on stockholders' equity			
	All manufacturing corporations	Non-durable goods	Textile mill products	Apparel
1961.....	15.6	15.4	10.4	5
1962.....	17.3	16.2	12.5	14.3
1963.....	18.1	16.8	12.3	17.4
1964.....	19.4	17.8	15.7	16.5
1965.....	21.3	18.4	18.9	19.1
1966.....	21.9	19.2	18.1	21.2
1967.....	18.8	17.5	13.7	22.0
1968.....	20.3	18.6	16.6	22.

Source: Federal Trade Commission-SEC.

TABLE C.—COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE YARN—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION, 1963-67

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963.....	6,723.5	40.5	107.2	6,656.8	0.6
1964.....	7,252.7	33.2	127.2	7,158.7	.5
1965.....	7,847.5	47.8	108.6	7,786.7	.6
1966.....	8,488.5	121.8	77.9	8,532.4	1.4
1967.....	7,692.8	79.0	94.1	7,677.7	1.0

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

TABLE D.—BROADWOVEN FABRICS OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE FIBERS—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC MERCHANDISE AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION 1963-68

[In millions of square yards]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963	13,612.0	614.0	668.9	13,557.0	4.5
1964	14,366.0	582.0	693.0	14,254.0	4.1
1965	15,230.0	837.0	539.2	15,527.8	5.4
1966	15,265.0	1,022.0	592.0	15,695.0	6.5
1967	14,814.9	853.7	534.6	15,134.0	5.6
1968 ¹	15,195.0	923.5	525.7	15,592.8	5.9

¹ Conversion from linear yards to square yards for production on the same basis as computed by the Tariff Commission for previous years.

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

TABLE E.—WEARING APPAREL OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE FIBERS—U.S. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC MERCHANDISE AND APPARENT CONSUMPTION, 1963-68

[In millions of pounds, raw fiber equivalent]

Year	Production	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports to consumption
1963	3,152.5	135.0	21.4	3,318.3	4.1
1964	3,341.5	157.8	25.2	3,474.1	4.5
1965	3,468.5	186.1	26.4	3,628.2	5.1
1966	3,617.6	193.7	28.9	3,782.4	5.1
1967	3,622.9	225.0	32.2	3,815.7	6.0
1968	3,971.0	268.1	38.2	4,200.9	6.4

¹ As shown on table 7-B of Senator Hollings' statement.

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission, Bureau of Census.

[Excerpts from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 10, 1969]

EFFECT OF U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY ON BASIC MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we are in the 7th month of the 91st Congress and of the new administration. Congress has been patiently awaiting the development of administration programs in many areas before rolling up its own sleeves and getting down to the task of legislating solutions to the difficult problems which challenge the health, welfare, and economic security of the American people.

Included in the major problems requiring our attention is that of our Nation's foreign trade policy, especially as it relates to our basic manufacturing industries. Many of America's basic industries are facing strong and increasing import competition. Some indication of the wide-ranging extent of this problem is given in a recent report of the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

Using U.S. Government statistics, the council made a computer analysis of employment, output, and foreign trade of 349 of the Nation's 425 manufacturing industries as defined at the 4-digit level of the standard industrial classification. The correlation of foreign trade data with domestic employment and output data at this level of industry classification is a difficult undertaking. Data were available to make such an analysis possible for the period 1958 through 1966 for a total of 313 industries.

Mr. President, the 313 industries accounted in 1966 for about two-thirds of total employment in all U.S. manufacturing industries. They supplied 85 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods in 1966. Products like or competitive with the out-

put of these 313 industries accounted for 99 percent of total U.S. imports of manufactured goods in 1966, and of 85 percent of U.S. exports. These data show that the 313 industries are quite representative of the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy.

Of the 313 industries, the council found that there were 128 which experienced a balance of trade deficit in 1967. These 128 industries accounted for 25 percent of total employment in all manufacturing industries in 1966, and for 29 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods. Imports of manufactures were concentrated in the product lines of these industries to such an extent that articles like or competitive with their output accounted for about two-thirds of the total imports of manufactured products in 1966, but their exports accounted for only 12 percent of total U.S. exports.

From the point of view of the impact of this imbalance in foreign trade on the United States, it is most significant that the balance of trade deficit in these industries was equivalent, at the value of shipments per worker in each industry, to a net loss of nearly 368,000 jobs. For the most part, these 128 industries are labor-intensive industries, so that the lost employment opportunities represent the waste of an especially precious asset to the Nation; namely, job opportunities for comparatively unskilled workers.

It is our hard-core unemployed, residents of economically distressed inner city areas, and the less developed sectors of our Nation such as the Appalachian region, who are the principal victims of the loss of job opportunities represented by the extreme foreign trade imbalance in the products of these 128 industries.

Mr. President, Members of this body are aware that I have been vigilant, in season and out of season, in my efforts to secure relief from excessive import pressures for the textile industry. My efforts to contribute to a solution of the textile import problem should not be taken, however, as any indication that I am less interested in the comparably distressed position of other basic manufacturing industries in my State and in the Nation.

Mr. President, economic hardship to U.S. manufacturing industries stems primarily, though not exclusively, from our trade with Japan. The previously mentioned study of the Trade Relations Council shows that in 1967, of our foreign trade in manufactured products, we experienced a deficit of \$1.3 billion in our trade with Japan. Our next largest deficit was incurred in our foreign trade in manufactures with West Germany, where we suffered a deficit of nearly \$600 million—large but less than half as great at that we experienced in our trade with Japan.

Mr. President, the experience of my own State is a reflection of what is happening broadly in the Nation as a result of the inordinate volume and rate of increase of imported manufactured goods. South Carolina has made strenuous and highly successful efforts to attract manufacturing industries to establish facilities and jobs within the State. This is part of the major and important efforts which the entire South has made to escape from the limiting economic effects of being merely an agricultural economy.

We currently have 786,000 residents of our State who are employed on nonagricultural payrolls, and 330,000 of them are employed in manufacturing occupations. During the past 10 years, employment in manufacturing industries in South Carolina has increased more rapidly than total employment on non-agricultural payrolls. In 1967, there were nearly 3,800 manufacturing establishments operating in South Carolina with an annual

payroll of about one and a half billion dollars. Of the major industries located in our State, the following experienced a foreign trade deficit nationally in 1968:

Textile mill products, \$437.3 million. At the output per worker shown by the 1967 Census of Manufactures of \$21,232, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,600 jobs.

Apparel and related products, \$674.5 million. At an output per worker of \$15,224, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 44,316 jobs.

Lumber and wood products, \$317.2 million. At an output per worker of \$19,316, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 16,418 jobs.

Paper and allied products, \$431 million. At an output per worker of \$32,546, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 13,240 jobs.

Stone, clay, and glass products, \$515.1 million. At an output per worker of \$24,412, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 21,103 jobs.

Iron and steel mills and foundries, \$1,430.9 million. At an output per worker of \$32,613, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 43,880 jobs.

Miscellaneous manufactured articles, \$416.7 million. At an output per worker of \$19,889, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,951 jobs.

These seven basic manufacturing industries are of major importance to the economy of South Carolina. Together they provide employment for 222,000 residents of our State, over 70 percent of the manufacturing jobs in the State. Neither my State nor the Nation can afford to ignore the fact that U.S. foreign trade in products like or directly competitive with the articles produced by these seven industries resulted in a deficit of \$4.2 billion. Further, we must be concerned about the loss of 180,508 new or existing jobs in these industries.

Mr. President, to this point in my remarks I have not alluded to the very serious import problems affecting the domestic footwear industry. There are no footwear manufacturing plants in the State of South Carolina, but in view of my general interest in the national aspects of the foreign trade problems affecting our basic manufacturing industries, I am, of course, familiar with the serious plight of the domestic footwear industry.

In 1968, our Nation had a balance of trade deficit of \$377.3 million in footwear. In that year, domestic consumption of leather footwear amounted to 804.0 million pairs of shoes, of which imports supplied 175.4 million pairs. Thus in 1968, imports were equivalent to 21.8 percent of domestic consumption, up sharply from the import penetration ratio of 5.8 percent in 1961. There can be no question about the fact that the domestic footwear industry is faced with a very serious problem.

The rapid increase in the penetration of the domestic market by imports has contributed to an absolute loss of 3,100 jobs in the industry during the 1961-68 period. The latest data for the month of May 1969 shows that employment has decreased by an additional 6,000 jobs in comparison with the average employment in 1968.

Mr. President, my priority of attention to the import problems of the textile industry is based upon the fact that the textile and apparel group accounts for 182,000 of the 222,000 jobs provided by this group of industries in South Carolina.

It is not merely on the basis of employment in South Carolina that the textile import problem calls for priority of attention. With 2,525,000 workers, the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade fiber producing

industries are by far the Nation's largest employers of workers among manufacturing industries.

But I say to my friends from other States who are concerned, as I am, not only with textiles but with steel, footwear, glass, wood products, paper, chinaware and pottery, synthetic organic chemicals, and electronic products, that the national policy we establish in the textile import area should be useful in guiding the way to a legislative solution in these other basic industrial product areas. I ask them, therefore, to join with me in setting about to exercise in a constructive way the initiative which belongs to the Congress under our Constitution to fashion a policy for the regulation of foreign commerce in the textile area with the realization that in so doing, they will also be contributing to the establishment of national policy for the regulation of imports in the product areas of these other basic and import-sensitive manufacturing industries.

Mr. President, this brings me in my remarks to a specific consideration of the policy problems which some people believe to exist in applying a corrective to the excessive importation of textile articles into the United States.

When Secretary of Commerce Stans together with his associates traveled to Western Europe and then to the Far East to consult with our Nation's trading partners concerning the textile import problem, he found that he had been preceded by an advance man not of his choosing who had undertaken to brief representatives of the foreign governments and their textile industries concerning that person's concept of the textile import problem. I refer, Mr. President, to the general counsel for the American Importers Association who traveled in advance of Secretary Stans to present information evidently intended to fortify the other nations to resist the invitation of the United States, expressed through Secretary Stans, to engage in meaningful consultation in regard to the U.S. textile import problem. These views on behalf of the American Importers Association are set forth in a memorandum which, with unanimous consent, I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as Members of this body are aware, those of us who have been concentrating on the search for a solution to the textile import problem during this and preceding administrations encounter frequently arguments conceived by Americans who act as apologists for maintaining the status quo in defense of the assumed economic interests of those foreign countries who are the principal suppliers of imported textile articles into the U.S. market.

These arguments have a sameness in quality and in concept. Much of the content of the paper distributed on behalf of the American Importers Association consists of such arguments, newly adorned with statistical array.

Mr. President, the memorandum of the American Importers Association serves a useful purpose by bringing out into the open and reducing to writing the arguments being used behind the scenes in opposing the achievement of an agreeable solution to the textile import problem. It deserves our careful study, and it is now my purpose to take up one at a time the contentions of the importers' paper and to refute them with incontrovertible fact. I shall support my analysis of that paper with statistical data compiled from official sources and ask unanimous consent that my numbered tables be inserted at the appropriate places in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, first, the importers assert that "the textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968." The word "phenomenal" means extraordinary or remarkable, according to Webster's Third International Dictionary. The record shows that the textile industry's growth has been neither extraordi-

nary nor remarkable. In the data presented in my table 1, it is established that during the period 1961 through 1968 the average annual rate of growth in the sales of textile mill products and apparel was below that of the average of all manufacturing industries in the United States. Can a below-average rate of growth fairly be described as "phenomenal," Mr. President?

TABLE 1.—U.S. SALES OF TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING, 1961-68

[Sales in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)
1961	13,398		12,365		356,424	
1962	14,449	+7.84	13,241	+7.08	389,917	+9.40
1963	15,092	+4.45	13,696	+3.44	412,678	+5.89
1964	16,249	+7.67	14,880	+8.64	443,072	+7.37
1965	18,028	+10.95	16,263	+9.29	492,201	+11.09
1966	19,513	+8.24	18,110	+11.36	554,180	+12.59
1967	18,672	-4.31	18,170	+0.33	575,427	+3.83
1968	20,841	+11.62	20,718	+14.02	631,911	+9.82
Average annual change		+6.64		+7.74		+8.57

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Second, the importers' memorandum, under the heading "Analysis," offers the statement that "every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries." I have just shown that this is not the case when measured by the sales of the industry. Now let me turn to the next indicator referred to by the importer, that of profits.

My table 2 shows that profits of both the textile mill products and apparel industries, whether measured before taxes or after taxes, expressed as a percent of sales, persisted far below the average of all manufacturing industries, and below profits of the nondurable goods industries, to which textiles and apparel are most closely identified, throughout the 1961-68 period. The ratio of profits after

taxes to sales for the apparel industry remained less than half that of the nondurable goods and all manufacturing industries throughout the period while those of the textile mill products industry failed to rise above 60 percent of the average of all manufacturing and nondurable goods industries by the end of that period.

Mr. President, can two basic manufacturing industries be said to evidence "a picture of health and growth" from the standpoint of profits when their earnings rate remains from 40 to 50 percent below that of the average of all manufacturing industries and of the nondurable goods sector of manufacturing industries throughout the most recent 8-year period?

TABLE 2.—THE COMPARATIVE "PROFIT" PERFORMANCE OF THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

Dollar amounts in millions]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Textile mill products:								
Profits before taxes	\$589	\$724	\$721	\$947	\$1,268	\$1,272	\$982	\$1,276
Profits after taxes	\$280	\$354	\$354	\$507	\$694	\$702	\$540	\$654
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	4.4	5.0	4.8	5.8	7.0	6.5	5.3	6.1
After taxes (percent)	2.1	2.4	2.3	3.1	3.8	3.6	2.9	3.1
Apparel:								
Profits before taxes	\$331	\$415	\$414	\$553	\$644	\$740	\$728	\$931
Profits after taxes	\$157	\$212	\$189	\$318	\$377	\$432	\$420	\$507
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.5
After taxes (percent)	1.3	1.6	1.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4
Nondurable goods industries:								
Profits before taxes	\$13,862	\$15,114	\$16,421	\$18,324	\$20,260	\$22,610	\$22,050	\$24,756
Profits after taxes	\$8,450	\$9,150	\$10,011	\$11,611	\$12,983	\$14,564	\$14,429	\$15,546
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	7.6	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.0	8.4
After taxes (percent)	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.3
All manufacturing industries:								
Profits before taxes	\$27,508	\$31,863	\$34,924	\$39,567	\$46,487	\$51,787	\$47,772	\$55,405
Profits after taxes	\$15,308	\$17,727	\$19,481	\$23,208	\$27,521	\$30,934	\$29,008	\$32,069
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent)	7.7	8.2	8.5	8.9	9.4	9.3	8.3	8.8
After taxes (percent)	4.3	4.6	4.7	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.0	5.1

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Third, the importers point to the fact that shipments in 1968 were larger than shipments in 1961 by some 55 percent as though that in some way corroborated their claim of "phenomenal growth" by the U.S. textile industry. The fact of the matter is, as my table 3 establishes, that shipments of textile mill products and apparel increased at a slower rate than the average of all manu-

facturing industries. Again, Mr. President, the question may fairly be posed: Is an expansion in the value of shipments at a rate below that experienced by the average of all manufacturing industries any evidence of "phenomenal growth"? In my book "below average" is not equal to "extraordinary" or "phenomenal."

TABLE 3.—VALUE OF SHIPMENTS BY THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

[Value of shipments in millions of dollars]

	Textile mill products		Home goods and apparel		All manufacturing	
	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)
1961.....	13,999		36,997		370,612	
1962.....	15,154	+8.25	39,555	+6.91	399,696	+7.85
1963.....	16,537	+9.13	39,759	+0.52	417,291	+4.40
1964.....	17,808	+7.69	41,750	+5.01	445,552	+6.77
1965.....	19,318	+8.48	44,909	+7.57	483,343	+8.48
1966.....	20,407	+5.64	49,609	+10.47	528,448	+9.33
1967.....	19,241	-5.71	51,206	+3.22	548,542	+3.80
1968.....	21,458	+11.52	55,126	+7.66	603,718	+10.06
Average annual change.....		+6.43		+5.91		+7.24

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Business Statistics," 1967; "Survey of Current Business," June 1969.

Fourth, the importers' text is unclear but implies that production of textile mill products and apparel increased rapidly over the period. The fact of the matter is that in production, as in the case of the other indicators which I have discussed, the performance of the textile mill products and apparel industries was significantly below the average of all manufacturing industries.

A rate of increase well below the average of all manufacturing industries cannot fairly be characterized as a rapid increase. The word "rapid" connotes some relative measure. If we gage the pace of production by the benchmark of the average of all manufacturing industries, we find that production of textile mill products and apparel increased relatively slowly, not rapidly. This is shown by my table 4.

TABLE 4.—INDEX OF PRODUCTION IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

[1957-59=100]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Index	Change (percent)	Index	Change (percent)	Index	Change (percent)
1961.....	107.1		112.1		109.6	
1962.....	115.3	+7.66	118.9	+6.07	118.7	+8.30
1963.....	116.9	+1.39	125.6	+5.63	124.9	+5.22
1964.....	122.9	+5.13	134.1	+6.77	133.1	+6.57
1965.....	134.9	+9.76	145.1	+8.20	145.0	+8.94
1966.....	142.5	+5.63	150.1	+3.45	158.6	+9.38
1967.....	142.0	-0.35	147.6	-1.67	159.7	+0.69
1968.....	150.4	+5.92	149.4	+1.22	166.2	+4.07
Average annual change.....		+5.02		+4.24		+6.17

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Fifth, the importers cite a gain of about 300,000 workers in the textile mill products and apparel industries as additional evidence of "phenomenal growth" between 1961 and 1968. The facts are again contrary to the impression which the importers' statement purports to convey.

In my table 5 I have traced the growth in employment in the textile mill products and apparel industries compared with all manufacturing and compared with the growth in the Nation's total labor force. It is very significant, I believe, that the average annual rate of change in employment in the textile mill products industry is only about half that

of all manufacturing industries, and is well below the rate of growth in the Nation's total labor force. Clearly the textile mill products industry is being retarded in its capacity to generate new employment to accommodate its share of the responsibility for providing jobs for the Nation's ever-increasing labor force.

It is of interest that while the apparel industry is increasing employment at an average annual rate far below that of the average of all manufacturing industries, it has maintained a growth of employment in excess of the rate of growth in the Nation's labor force. Realistically we must recognize

that the tremendous quantities of broad-woven and knitted fabric being imported into the United States are the raw material for apparel plants, where it is cut and sewn into finished textile products. The apparel industry is being forced, as other American industries before it have been forced, to attempt to stay alive in the face of import competition by reducing its costs wherever possible, including the substitution of cheap foreign-produced fabric for the more expensive domestic article.

The employment growth rates in my table 5 clearly suggest that the victim of these

combined pressures is the textile mill products industry whose employment growth rate is significantly below that of the apparel industry—though, as I have already pointed out, growth in apparel employment is far below the rate of growth in all manufacturing industries.

In any event, Mr. President these data certainly do not support the use which the importers attempt to make of the overall change in employment; namely, as support for their thesis that the textile industry has enjoyed a "phenomenal growth" during the past 8 years.

TABLE 5.—EMPLOYMENT IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING AND WITH THE NATION'S TOTAL LABOR FORCE, 1961-68

[Employment data in thousands]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing		The Nation's total labor force	
	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)
1961.....	893.4		1,214.5		16,326		73,031	
1962.....	902.3	+1.00	1,263.7	+4.05	16,853	+3.23	73,342	+0.43
1963.....	885.4	-1.87	1,282.8	+1.51	16,995	+0.84	74,571	+1.68
1964.....	892.0	+0.75	1,302.5	+1.54	17,274	+1.64	75,830	+1.69
1965.....	925.6	+3.77	1,354.2	+3.97	18,062	+4.56	77,178	+1.78
1966.....	961.5	+3.88	1,398.8	+3.29	19,186	+6.22	78,893	+2.22
1967.....	951.5	-1.04	1,390.7	-0.58	19,434	+1.29	80,793	+2.41
1968.....	984.9	+3.51	1,416.8	+1.88	19,740	+1.57	82,272	+1.83
Average annual change.....		+1.43		+2.24		+2.76		+1.72

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Sixth, the importers turn to statistics concerning the mill consumption of fibers in a further effort to bolster their notion that the textile industry has enjoyed phenomenal growth and is the picture of health. They content themselves with calling attention to the fact that the amount of fiber consumed in 1968 was 47 percent greater than that consumed in 1961 and calling attention to the increased use of manmade fibers in U.S. textile operations.

It is not surprising, Mr. President, that U.S. textile mill consumption reflects an increased use of manmade fibers in comparison with cotton and wool. The American textile industry has pioneered, innovated, and promoted the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in conventional and new fabric constructions in an imaginative effort to gain and hold the allegiance of consumers for increased expenditures for textile articles. To a degree this effort was successful in the past, and it is this success that for a time helped cushion the blow of the rising import competition.

As the liberally administered restraints of the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement placed some limitations, however generous, on exports of cotton textiles to the United

States, the principal supplying nations shifted increasingly to the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in part to escape the restraints under the LTA, and in part to take advantage of the consumer demand which had been stimulated by the developmental and promotional programs of the U.S. textile industry.

As in the case of the other alleged indicators of phenomenal growth cited by the importers, it is not sufficient, as they do, merely to call attention to the fact that there has been an increase in the consumption of fibers. I can accept for purposes of discussion the thesis of the importers that overall fiber consumption should be considered rather than a segmented study of cotton, wool, and manmade fibers. Indeed, I am happy to see the importers take this position, as it is precisely this fact which has been the basis for the efforts of the American industry and textile State Members of Congress to persuade the executive branch of the Government to recognize that the textile industry complex is interdependent from a fiber point of view and that all-fiber regulation is required, not merely imports of cotton textiles.

The fact is, however, Mr. President, that the rate of increase in mill consumption of all fibers in the United States has lagged seriously behind the increase in consumer disposable income and of personal consumer expenditures for clothing articles in the United States. It is also significant that textile sales valued in constant dollars have grown at a rate very close to that of mill consumption, both being far off the pace of the growth in consumer disposable income and expenditures for clothing.

As will be shown in a subsequent section of my remarks, the mill consumption of fibers standing alone is an insufficient indication of the pace of activity in the textile mill products industry. The heart of this industry is represented by the establishments engaged in the production of fabric for use in apparel. A substantial part of the fiber consumed in the United States goes into floor coverings

and industrial textiles. The growth rate in these sectors, including, notably, tufted carpets and rugs, has been exceptional and the amount of fiber consumed in such manufacturing activity tends to invalidate the use of mill consumption data standing alone as an index of textile mill activity. This point is emphasized by the data in my table 6 concerning the production of broadwoven goods, where the annual average rate of change is far, far below the increase in the mill consumption of fibers.

These facts, established by my table 6, refute the suggestion contained in the importers' memorandum that in some way the change in mill consumption of fibers supports their general thesis. The facts as set forth in my table 6 show that in this area, as in the case of the other factors cited by the importers, the truth is opposite to the impression they seek to create.

manmade staple fiber, filaments, and filament yarn are textile articles, recognized as such by the United Nation's Standard International Trade Classification, the Brussels Nomenclature, the Tariff Schedules of the United States, the Tariff Commission in its January 1968 report on "Textiles and Apparel" made at the joint behest of the President and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by the textile industry itself in its testimony before congressional committees and the Tariff Commission, and in the definitions of all of the pending textile import quota bills.

This recognition leads necessarily to the inclusion of imports of manmade fibers in the data which undertake to measure in pound equivalents, imports of textile articles. Just as imports of apparel articles have an impact upon the textile mills which weave fabric by displacing the consumption of domestic fabric by domestic apparel plants, so, too, the importation of apparel, fabric, yarn,

and staple of manmade fiber have an impact upon the manmade fiber producers, part of the textile industry complex, by displacing domestically produced fiber in textile articles destined for consumption in the U.S. market.

The importers ignore this basic fact in their memorandum and, hence, their data significantly understate the true extent of import penetration of manmade fibers as measured by the ratio of imports to domestic consumption of fiber. My table 7 sets forth the data pertinent to this measurement. The importers have undertaken to measure only the ratio of imports of secondary textile articles to domestic consumption, whereas the true measure must be based upon the ratio of total imports of textile articles, including manmade fibers, to domestic consumption. Thus, the correct measurement of the import penetration of textile articles on an all-fiber basis in the year 1969 is 10.5 percent rather than the 7.7 percent claimed by the importers in their memorandum.

TABLE 6.—TEXTILE MANUFACTURING ACTIVITY AS MEASURED BY MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, BROADWOVEN GOODS PRODUCTION, AND TEXTILE SALES IN CONSTANT DOLLARS, 1961-68

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Average annual change (percent)
Mill consumption of all fibers (millions of pounds).....	6,561.0	7,042.1	7,246.1	7,782.1	8,494.4	9,007.5	8,982.0	9,781.7	+5.92
Percent of change.....		+7.33	+2.90	+7.40	+9.15	+6.03	-0.28	+8.90	
Broadwoven goods production, all fibers (millions of linear yards).....	11,863	12,301	12,104	12,766	13,431	13,304	12,753	12,968	+1.34
Percent of change.....		+3.69	-1.60	+5.47	+5.21	-0.95	-4.14	+1.69	
Textile sales, 1961 (millions of dollars).....	\$13,973	\$14,971	\$15,510	\$16,673	\$17,910	\$19,311	\$19,279	\$20,708	+5.82
Percent of change.....		+7.14	+3.60	-7.50	+7.42	+7.82	-0.17	+7.41	
Consumer disposable income (billions of dollars).....	\$364.4	\$385.3	\$404.6	\$438.1	\$473.2	\$511.6	\$546.3	\$589.0	+7.11
Percent of change.....		+5.74	+5.01	+8.28	+8.01	+8.11	+6.78	+7.82	
Personal consumption expenditures: Clothing and shoes (billions of dollars).....	\$27.9	\$29.6	\$30.6	\$33.5	\$35.9	\$39.8	\$42.1	\$45.7	+7.33
Percent of change.....		+6.09	+3.38	+9.48	+7.16	+10.86	+5.78	+8.55	

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969; Bureau of the Census; Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Seventh, the importers next contend that "imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption." They insist that data pertaining to the apparent domestic consumption of textiles and to imports be evaluated on an overall pound equivalent basis. They then point to the smaller increase in the quantity of textile imports than they assert occurred in the textile mill consumption of fibers as support for their contention that "there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports."

The importers' argument is facile: By substituting the concept of "injury to domestic production" for the more appropriate test of "injury to the domestic industry" the importers seek to avoid the implications of the retarded growth rate in employment and sales, and the marginal earnings perform-

ance of the textile mill products and apparel industries in comparison with the average of all manufacturing industries which I have previously discussed and documented.

Their stratagem should not succeed, Mr. President, because it is addressed superficially and in misleading way to a fragment of the data reflective of the industry's situation which is far less cogent in evaluating the industry's position than the systematic analysis which I have presented in these remarks.

A study of the relationship of imports to the mill consumption of fibers can be helpful, Mr. President, if it is approached with a correct understanding of the structural nature of the textile import problem and with appropriate methodology. This I shall now undertake to do.

A fair analysis of the textile import problem must begin with the recognition that

TABLE 7-A.—RATIO OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILE ARTICLES TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

	[Amounts in millions of pounds of fiber]					
	Domestic consumption	Imports			Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)	
		Primary manmade fiber products	Secondary cotton, wool, and man-made fiber products	Total	Secondary	Total
1961.....	6,564.0	60.1	339.8	399.9	5.2	6.1
1962.....	7,206.4	87.6	486.0	573.6	6.7	8.0
1963.....	7,422.2	145.2	493.0	638.2	6.6	8.6
1964.....	7,938.0	158.2	491.3	649.5	6.2	8.2
1965.....	8,758.9	159.3	595.7	755.0	6.8	8.6
1966.....	9,425.4	212.7	772.2	984.9	8.2	10.4
1967.....	9,339.0	196.3	697.8	894.1	7.5	9.6
1968.....	10,235.5	293.2	784.3	1,077.5	7.7	10.5

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969.

But these data, even when corrected as by my table 7-A, still conceal the true extent of the import penetration of textile articles in the most seriously affected area of the industry; namely, the apparel manufacturing sector with the supporting textile mill products operations which supply the yarn and fabric which ultimately become apparel articles. It is possible to determine that portion of the mill consumption of textile fibers in the United States which has apparel as its end use. Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel on a fiber pound equivalent basis can then be related to the domestic consumption of fiber for apparel use to derive a more accurate indication of the extent of import penetration in this major and most sensitive sector of the textile industry. This analysis is presented in my table 7-B, which establishes that in 1968 imports accounted for nearly 18 percent of domestic consumption of textile fiber in apparel manufacture, more than double the extent of import penetration in 1961.

TABLE 7-B.—RATIO OF THE AGGREGATE IMPORTS OF YARN, FABRIC, AND APPAREL TO THE DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF FIBER IN APPAREL END USE, 1961-68

	[Amounts in millions of pounds]		
	Domestic consumption of fiber in apparel end use	Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961.....	2,883	270.2	9.4
1962.....	3,065	408.1	13.3
1963.....	3,152	430.5	13.7
1964.....	3,342	424.5	12.7
1965.....	3,469	526.1	15.2
1966.....	3,618	680.3	18.8
1967.....	3,823	612.7	16.9
1968.....	3,971	699.6	17.6

¹1968 consumption calculated based on ratio of apparel end use to total consumption in 1967, applied to 1968 domestic fiber consumption as reported in source.

Source: Textile Organon, March issues, 1964, 1966, 1969; January 1969.

Mr. President, the use of overall statistics concerning imports and domestic consumption on an all-fiber basis not only tends to obscure the heavy impact of imports in the apparel sector of the industry and those sectors of the textile mill products and fiber industry which support apparel manufacturing; it also obscures the very grave position of the woolen and worsted industry in the United States as a result of inordinate import pressures. My table 7-C shows that the penetration of textile articles of wool has risen to the extraordinary level of 31.3 percent in the year 1968, up sharply from the already excessive level of imports which existed in 1961 of 23.8 percent.

TABLE 7-C.—RATIO OF IMPORTS TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION FOR WOOL, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds]

	Domestic consumption	Imports	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961-----	535.0	127.4	23.8
1962-----	570.3	145.6	25.5
1963-----	558.6	152.5	27.3
1964-----	490.8	141.1	28.7
1965-----	527.5	156.1	29.6
1966-----	500.4	142.9	28.6
1967-----	423.5	121.7	28.7
1968-----	466.4	146.0	31.3

Source: Textile, Organon, March 1969.

Mr. President, the issue posed by the contentions of the American Importers Association and the currency which those contentions gained as a result of their energetic distribution and exposition by that association's representatives in advance of Secretary Stans' visit to the nations whose representatives be consulted in regard to the U.S. textile import problem can be stated as follows: Does the Congress wish, as a matter of policy, to leave without remedy basic American industries whose rate of growth is retarded under the pressure of excessive and rapidly increasing import competition to a degree where such industries fall below the average rate of growth of the manufacturing sector of the American economy and below the rate of growth required if the industry is to contribute proportionately to employment of the growing labor force of the Nation?

The importers seek to obscure this fundamental issue by simplistic presentation of absolute growth figures over an 8-year period without in a single instance relating such growth to the growth of the Nation's work force, or of its economy, or of the manufacturing sector of the economy, or to the earnings performance of other industries. The essence of the importers' position is that the Congress ought not to inquire into the relative performance and growth of the textile industry in comparison with the rest of the American economy nor be concerned about a submarginal growth rate for a basic American industry.

Mr. President, I believe that the issue is clearly joined by the type of attack which the American Importers Association is making upon the U.S. textile industry and the manner in which the importers have set about to obfuscate the essential facts.

To my colleagues in this body I state that the time has come when we must cleanly and squarely face up to our responsibilities. It is we who are charged with the regulation of foreign commerce. It is we who are expected to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of foreign nations intent upon trading with the United States and benefiting by our open market, on the one hand, and the equally legitimate interests of American industries to sustain on a reasonable basis their work force and economic growth so that they may continue to contribute to the strength and well-being of our Nation.

It is not, Mr. President, a heinous act for Members of this body to respond to their constitutional responsibilities. It is not an unworthy act for a Congress which has always been keenly sensitive to our Nation's moral and legal obligations to other members of the community of nations to act now to develop a policy based upon concepts of fairness and equity which will afford our basic domestic industries at least an equal opportunity to share in the economic life and progress of our Nation.

In view of our traditions, we recognize as Americans that freedom is accompanied by responsibility. The right to freedom of our choice does not give any of us the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater, nor the right to drive at a reckless rate of speed irrespective of the right of others on a public highway. By act of Congress our free enterprise system does not give any American manufacturer the right to pay wages below the statutory minimum nor to require his employees to work in excess of the maximum hours without the payment of the prescribed overtime. Our free enterprise system must also yield to the strictures of the antitrust laws and to the prohibition contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act against the use of unfair practices in commerce.

Why is it that we in the Congress, with the full realization that no responsible member or group in society have the right to exercise their liberty in a way that does positive harm to their neighbors, refuse to recognize the true nature of excessive import competition based upon the competitive advantage of wage scales and working conditions which are outlawed in this country? Opponents of import regulation choose to state the problem in terms of simplistic alternatives, using expressions such as "shutting out imports." That type of dialog does a disservice to the difficult task which is our responsibility as Members of the Congress to recognize the problems, to study and understand them, and to have the courage to undertake their solution.

It is no longer sufficient, given the widespread exposure of our basic industries, for us to take refuge in the thought that the best solution, as implied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is for the Federal Government to subsidize the relocation of entire industries and their workers to some other line of endeavor. Mr. President, it is manifestly impossible to "relocate" the textile and apparel industries: they are spread across the face of America in literally hundreds of communities. It is difficult to retrain the workers in the textile industry for some other occupation. In many cases the textile mill represents the only source of gainful employment for miles around the community in which it is located. In Appalachia and a 50-mile belt surrounding it, employment in the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade fiber industries accounts for one out of every four jobs in manufacturing industries available to that depressed economic area.

Mr. President, for many years the United States has based its foreign trade policy on the myth that our capital-intensive industries whose technological sophistication enables them to compete in world trade will supply jobs for all of the workers who are displaced by rising import competition in the product sectors of our labor-intensive industries. The study to which I referred at the outset based on a computer analysis performed on behalf of the Trade Relations Council of the United States demonstrates conclusively that this assumption is fallacious.

I have already alluded to the fact that the labor-intensive industries included in the Trade Relations Council study suffered a net loss of 367,552 jobs as a result of the balance of trade deficit experienced in our foreign trade in products like or competitive with the output of those industries in 1966 alone. The Council's study also established that

the foreign trade surplus of the capital-intensive industries generated employment equivalent to only 201,532 jobs, leaving the U.S. economy with a net job deficit in manufacturing of 160,000 jobs. While the capital-intensive industries generated in dollars a trade surplus of \$10.4 billion, somewhat greater than the trade deficit of \$9 billion of the labor-intensive industries in 1967, the net favorable dollar balance of \$1.4 billion will not supply a surplus of jobs as a result of our foreign trade in manufactured products.

Mr. President, this Nation will always require a complete range of manufacturing industries, including the labor-intensive as well as the capital-intensive, if our responsibilities to provide employment for all of the members of our work force are to be met. The Nation's labor force does not now, nor will it ever, consist entirely of persons possessing the types of technical skills which are needed in the sophisticated capital-intensive industries; nor will those industries ever be able to employ the entire portion of the work force which must find its employment in the manufacturing sector of the economy.

What we are witnessing is a strong erosion of jobs and job opportunities in labor-intensive industries because our foreign trade policy exposes those industries to unrelieved pressure from sharply rising imports without hope for limitation. Unless we promptly undertake to create a realistic foreign trade policy that will preserve for our labor-intensive industries equal opportunity to share in the growth of the American market with foreign products, we are dooming our basic manufacturing industries to a slow death and their workers to an insecure and uncertain future.

I say to the Members of this body that the time is overdue in which we manfully face our responsibilities and undertake to act in the interests not only of the textile mill products, apparel, and man-made fiber industries, but also the other basic industries which are similarly affected by excessive imports. To this end, Mr. President, I shall shortly introduce as an amendment to an appropriate bill pending before this body a legislative solution not only to the textile import problem, but also to the problems besetting any other American industry which is being harmed in its employment of economic health by excessive import competition. I shall at an appropriate time ask the distinguished Members of this body who have displayed leadership on these problems to join with me in the sponsorship of this important new approach to the solution of these problems.

EXHIBIT I
AMERICAN IMPORTERS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,

New York, N.Y.

Attached is a revised copy of our earlier Memorandum entitled "Memorandum on the Performance of the United States Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports." The revisions include several 1968 figures which had been estimated or were preliminary. Most of them apply to sales and profits, Table 1, Figures 1 and 2.

MICHAEL P. DANIELS,
General Counsel.

MEMORANDUM ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE
U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES AND
THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS

[Figures referred to not printed in RECORD]

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the reasons of AIA-TAG for asserting the complete lack of economic justification for controls on imports of textiles and apparel products, whether by way of legislative quotas or a negotiated international agreement. A more extensive treatment is contained in the statement of AIA-TAG before the Committee on Ways and

Means on Foreign Trade and Tariff Proposals (Part 6, pages 2415, 2417, et seq. 1967).

Foreign governments, it is believed, will reject approaches to enter into an international agreement controlling world trade in textiles and apparel because of the absence of data supporting the United States industry's special pleas for such controls.

SUMMARY

The textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968. This growth was briefly interrupted by a slight recession in the general economy in 1967 resulting in a minor downturn from the record levels achieved by the industry in 1966. In 1968, the industry completely recovered from this recession and surpassed, in almost every instance, the record performance of 1966. Indications are that 1969 will be another record year for the textile industry. This depends largely upon general economic factors and the overall condition of the American economy.

Imports over the period have also grown, but such growth has been commensurate with the growth in domestic production. Imports also declined during the slight recession of 1967, but picked up in 1968. During 1968, and at the present time, imports have been stimulated by extraordinary demand conditions within the United States and inflationary price levels. Nonetheless, imports represent a very modest and stable proportion of domestic consumption of textile and apparel products.

Import growth must be seen within the context of the growth in domestic production and domestic consumption of such products. Figures showing the growth of imports in percentage terms without reference either to the absolute volume of increase or outside of the context of overall domestic consumption are misleading and considerably distort reality.

Another major distortion engaged in by the domestic industry is analyses by each fiber: cotton, man-made, and wool. Man-made fibers are substituting for both cotton and wool. This is clearly admitted by the United States textile industry. The consequence of that admission, however, is that one must look to the overall performance of all fibers in making valid comparisons.

ANALYSIS

An analysis of every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries. These indices are shown on the attached tables and charts.

SALES AND PROFITS

Sales of the textile mill products industry grew from 13.4 billion dollars in 1961 to 20.8 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of 55.6 percent. Sales for 1968 were 11.6 percent above the level for 1967.

Profits of the textile mill products industry grew from 589 million dollars in 1961 to 1,276 million dollars in 1968, an increase of 116.8 percent. The increase in profits for 1968 compared to 1967 was 29.9 percent.

Apparel industry sales grew by 67.6 percent from 1961 to 1968. Profits grew by 181.3 percent over this period from 331 million dollars to 931 million dollars. These figures are shown on Table 1 and are plotted on Figures I and II.

SHIPMENTS

Shipments from the textile mill products industry grew from 14.0 billion dollars in 1961 to 21.7 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of some 55 percent. These figures are shown on Table 2 and Figure III.

PRODUCTION

Industrial production increased rapidly over the period. For the apparel industry there was a slight decline in 1967 but a pickup in 1968 almost to the peak level of 1966. The textile mill products industry also showed a slight decrease from 1966 to 1967,

but a strong upward turn in 1968 with an increase of about 8 points in the index of industrial production. These figures are shown on Table 3 and Figures IV and V.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment has also shown an increase over the period with a gain in almost 300,000 workers from 1961 to 1968. During 1968 alone, there was a gain of 50,000 workers. These figures are shown on Table 4 and Figure VI.

MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS

Mill consumption of cotton, wool, man-made and other fibers are shown on Table 5 and Figure VII. It should first be noted that total consumption of all fibers, which is a measure of overall textile activity, increased from 6.6 billion pounds in 1961 to 9.7 billion pounds in 1968, an increase of 47 percent. What the figure illustrates so graphically is the switch from the natural fibers to the man-made fibers. Thus, the performance of wool has remained fairly static with some decline evident and there was a drop in cotton consumption. Man-made fibers, on the other hand, have increased from 2.1 billion pounds to 5.2 billion pounds, an increase of 115 percent. In 1968 for the first time, man-made fibers surpassed cotton consumption. It is this dramatic switch to the man-made fibers which has made analysis by separate fibers irrelevant.

The domestic industry can point to a declining performance of cotton and wool. This is not attributable to imports, however, but to the competition from man-made fibers. Total consumption, as shown on Figure VII, has increased.

COMPARISON OF IMPORTS AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Table 6 and Figure VIII show mill consumption, apparent domestic consumption, (mill consumption, plus imports, minus exports) imports and exports. Imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption. It is here that the "percentage game" is belied. It is true that imports have increased by 135 percent from 1961 to 1968, whereas mill consumption has increased by 47 percent. However, the absolute magnitudes are the important factor. While imports increased by 450.7 million pounds, mill consumption increased by 3.1 billion pounds. Thus, the growth in mill consumption was about seven times the growth in imports. Of the total growth in mill consumption plus imports, imports accounted for only 12.7 percent, while domestic mill consumption accounted for 87.3 percent.

Certainly as Figure VIII illustrates, there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports. The slight decline in mill consumption in 1967 was matched by a greater decline in imports (see Table 6). As Table 6 also shows, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained fairly stable, certainly since 1962. The ratio in 1968 was only one point above the 1962 ratio and in 1967 and 1968 there was an actual decline from the highest ratio reached in 1966. This overall measurement has a number of imperfections so that the ratio should not be taken as accurate in the absolute sense; however, as an index it measures the relative performance of the domestic industry compared to imports.

ANALYSIS BY FIBER

As pointed out above, analysis by separate fibers is unfair and misleading.

The situation in wool and cotton is impossible to illustrate because of the rapid substitution of man-made fibers for the natural fibers on the cotton and the woolen and worsted systems. Thus, simple minded comparisons of imports, chiefly of cotton or wool with domestic production by chiefly fiber, are completely misleading.

The domestic industry has made a large

point of the growth in imports of man-made fiber products. These figures compared with mill consumption and apparent domestic consumption are shown on Table 7 and Figure IX. Imports have grown from 23.2 million pounds in 1961 to 172.4 million pounds in 1968. Mill consumption, however, during the same period grew from 2.1 billion pounds in 1961 to 5.2 billion pounds in 1968. Thus, while imports increased by 149.2 million, mill consumption increased by 3.1 billion. As the figure also illustrates, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained at extremely low rates, at its highest, 3.3 percent in 1968.

COMPARISONS BY SEGMENT

Even in the overall figures discussed above, there are a number of distortions when all imports and domestic products are combined in terms of weight. The most valid and revealing comparisons are separate comparisons by the major categories of yarns, fabrics, and apparel. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to compute figures for 1968 because of the time lag in statistical reporting, and even in 1967, there are difficult problems. Judgments as to conversion factors and other technical matters complicate the matter. The most reliable computations available are those by the United States Tariff Commission. The Commission found that the ratio of imports to consumption in 1966 for yarns was 1.4 percent, for broad woven fabrics, 6.5 percent, and for apparel (in 1965), 5.1 percent.

Given the general relative performance of imports and domestic production for 1967 and 1968, we do not believe that these percentages would have materially changed. Indeed, the overall analysis showing a higher ratio in 1966 than in 1967 or 1968 (see Table 6), can be taken as an indication that in some areas the ratios might also have declined.

ANALYSIS BY INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTS

The domestic industry has often cited particular products, for example, white shirts, with very high ratios of imports to domestic consumption as reason for overall quotas. Such particular instances, however, affecting a minute portion of the trade, cannot be utilized to support overall controls. In many instances, even with a very high ratio of imports to consumption, imports cannot have been deemed to have caused any injury to domestic production. This depends on the particular nature of the trade and the nature of the product, where, in many instances, one is dealing with specialties traditionally imported in large proportion from overseas.

Such particular products should, in our view, be handled through the Escape Clause mechanism, first to determine whether imports have caused or threatened serious injury, and second, to determine what relief might be appropriate if injury is found.

To this end, we have endorsed the general notion of an Escape Clause amendment suggested by the report of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and by the Hon. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, as the appropriate method of dealing with the problems of particular products. Such problems, if any, will certainly not support the overall quota relief sought by the domestic industry.

TABLE 1.—SALES AND PROFITS: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

	[Dollar amounts in millions]			
	Textile mill products		Apparel and other finished products	
	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax
1961.....	\$13,398	\$589	\$12,365	\$331
1962.....	\$14,449	\$724	\$13,241	\$415
1963.....	\$15,092	\$721	\$13,696	\$414
1964.....	\$16,249	\$947	\$14,880	\$553

TABLE 1.—SALES AND PROFITS: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961-68—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Textile mill products		Apparel and other finished products	
	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax
1965	\$18,028	\$1,268	\$16,263	\$644
1966	\$19,513	\$1,272	\$18,110	\$740
1967	\$18,672	\$982	\$18,170	\$728
1968	\$20,841	\$1,276	\$20,718	\$931
Increase: 1961 to 1968 (percent)....	55.6	116.6	67.6	181.3
Increase: 1967 to 1968 (percent)....	11.6	29.9	14.6	27.9

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission.

TABLE 2.—U.S. MANUFACTURERS' SHIPMENTS: TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS, 1961-68

[Millions of dollars]

1961	13,999
1962	15,179
1963	15,734
1964	16,998
1965	18,294
1966	19,608
1967	19,241
1968	21,742

Increase: 1961-68, 55 percent.

Increase: 1967-68, 13 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—INDEX OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

	Textile mill products		Apparel products	
	1968	1967	1968	1967
Annually:				
1961	107.1	112.1	112.1	112.1
1962	115.3	118.9	118.9	118.9
1963	116.9	125.6	125.6	125.6
1964	122.9	134.1	134.1	134.1
1965	134.9	145.1	145.1	145.1
1966	142.5	150.1	150.1	150.1
1967	142.0	147.6	147.6	147.6
1968	150.3	149.9	149.9	149.9
Monthly:				
January	147.6	141.4	145.2	150.2
February	148.8	139.2	146.4	147.1
March	149.9	139.2	148.5	146.3
April	146.3	138.3	148.9	142.5
May	147.2	138.3	149.6	142.6
June	148.8	136.9	151.4	142.4
July	150.9	135.8	150.4	144.2
August	151.4	137.9	149.0	146.4
September	152.0	140.6	149.9	146.8
October	153.3	144.3	152.1	146.2
November	155.1	147.1	152.5	148.6
December	153.5	151.9	149.2	150.9

Note: Monthly figures seasonally adjusted.
Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES

[In thousands]

	Textile		Apparel		Total
	1968	1967	1968	1967	
Annually:					
1961	893	1,215	2,108	2,108	2,108
1962	902	1,264	2,166	2,166	2,166
1963	885	1,283	2,168	2,168	2,168
1964	892	1,303	2,195	2,195	2,195
1965	926	2,354	2,280	2,280	2,280
1966	964	1,402	2,366	2,366	2,366
1967	957	1,400	2,357	2,357	2,357
1968	985	1,417	2,402	2,402	2,402

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES—Continued

[In thousands]

	Textile		Apparel		Total
	1968	1967	1968	1967	
1968 monthly:					
January	972	1,399	2,371	2,371	2,371
February	981	1,403	2,384	2,384	2,384
March	979	1,408	2,387	2,387	2,387
April	979	1,417	2,396	2,396	2,396
May	982	1,422	2,404	2,404	2,404
June	990	1,433	2,423	2,423	2,423
July	987	1,416	2,403	2,403	2,403
August	990	1,412	2,402	2,402	2,402
September	987	1,422	2,409	2,409	2,409
October	988	1,426	2,414	2,414	2,414
November	992	1,419	2,411	2,411	2,411
December	994	1,425	2,419	2,419	2,419

Note: Seasonally adjusted.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 5.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, 1961-68

[In millions of pounds]

	Cotton		Wool		Man-made		Others		Total
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	
1961	4,081.5	412.1	2,057.7	12.7	6,567.0	6,567.0	6,567.0	6,567.0	6,567.0
1962	4,188.0	429.1	2,418.5	12.4	7,048.0	7,048.0	7,048.0	7,048.0	7,048.0
1963	4,040.2	411.7	2,787.8	13.1	7,252.8	7,252.8	7,252.8	7,252.8	7,252.8
1964	4,244.4	356.7	3,174.3	14.2	7,789.6	7,789.6	7,789.6	7,789.6	7,789.6
1965	4,477.5	387.0	3,624.1	13.3	8,501.9	8,501.9	8,501.9	8,501.9	8,501.9
1966	4,630.5	370.2	4,002.2	14.7	9,017.6	9,017.6	9,017.6	9,017.6	9,017.6
1967	4,423.0	312.5	4,240.4	10.4	8,986.3	8,986.3	8,986.3	8,986.3	8,986.3
1968 ¹	4,136.1	345.0	5,175.0	11.9	9,668.0	9,668.0	9,668.0	9,668.0	9,668.0

¹ Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF ALL FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF ALL SEMIMANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Mill consumption		Imports and Exports		Apparent domestic consumption		Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	
1961	6,567.0	333.6	326.0	6,574.6	5.1	5.1	5.1
1962	7,048.0	485.4	313.4	7,220.0	6.7	6.7	6.7
1963	7,252.8	492.7	307.6	7,437.9	6.6	6.6	6.6
1964	7,789.6	491.2	325.5	7,955.3	6.2	6.2	6.2
1965	8,501.9	595.7	320.2	8,777.4	6.8	6.8	6.8
1966	9,017.6	771.4	342.8	9,446.2	8.2	8.2	8.2
1967	8,986.3	697.7	333.0	9,351.0	7.5	7.5	7.5
1968 ¹	9,668.0	784.3	321.0	10,131.3	7.7	7.7	7.7

¹ Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 7.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF MANMADE FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE MANMADE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SEMIMANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Mill consumption		Imports and Exports		Apparent domestic consumption		Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	
1961	2,057.7	23.2	82.5	1,998.4	1.2	1.2	1.2
1962	2,418.5	30.0	89.0	2,359.5	1.3	1.3	1.3
1963	2,787.8	35.9	95.1	2,728.6	1.3	1.3	1.3
1964	3,174.3	49.9	105.7	3,118.5	1.6	1.6	1.6
1965	3,624.1	79.0	131.2	3,571.9	2.2	2.2	2.2
1966	4,002.2	121.5	141.0	3,982.7	3.1	3.1	3.1
1967	4,240.4	137.5	134.4	4,243.5	3.2	3.2	3.2
1968 ¹	5,175.0	172.4	124.0	5,223.4	3.3	3.3	3.3

¹ Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

CONTINUATION OF COLLOQUY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for this masterly analysis of the desperate situation which confronts the textile industry, as well as other industries in this Nation. I commend him not only for his analysis, but particularly for the concluding words of his speech, in which he justifiably states that the time has come for something more than words. It is time for action on the part of Congress.

As the distinguished Senator knows, I have been in conference with him, and shall wish to join him when he introduces the bill which he is preparing. I have two bills of my own before the Senate on this subject.

In my own State, where we have lost the bulk of our textile industry, we find we are now going down the same road with the shoe industry, which is vital to my section of the country. Eleven plants have recently closed, seven of them within the last 3 years. Nearly 3,000 jobs have been destroyed, and, in the last 6 months, the trend has speeded up to the point where we have lost over a thousand more jobs in the shoe industry alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's time be extended 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. I shall only use 2 of those minutes.

Mr. President, I shall not take the further time of the Senate, except to repeat, in a few sentences, what I said when the Senator from Georgia made his speech to the Senate on this subject the other day.

This is not in any way a reflection upon the very able speech of the Senator from South Carolina—but time after time we have had a field day in the Senate, and Senators have delivered speech after speech about this situation, but it has ended here and been limited to talk.

Now the straws in the wind indicate that the present administration is preparing or is inclined, at least, to follow the example of the administrations of President Johnson, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower, and place our foreign relations and the attitude of the State Department ahead of the preservation of American jobs.

I am a friend and admirer of the President of the United States, and I am with him 98 percent of the time, I hope. But the time has come to do something more than talk; and the opportunity will be before the Senate within a very few days to indicate our intent to do something about this situation. I think such an indication would strengthen the administration rather than hurt it, because it is time that the world should know and the country should know that Congress is prepared to perform its duty to save the jobs provided by American industry.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks. The Senator from New Hampshire has given most distinguished leadership in Congress over a period of a decade or more in an effort to present to Congress the desperate situation of textile industry employment in America.

The Senator from New Hampshire as the senior committee member on the minority side, and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), as a member of the Special Textile Committee and as the senior committee

member on the majority side, have led the fight over the years.

Rather than talk, we have given hard statistical information and gotten down to the root of the problem and told it like it is.

As the senator from Missouri stated the day before yesterday with reference to the importers' position in his brief remarks:

"Let us lay the facts on the table and then talk in adjectives and specific language."

I thought it was time to get to the facts. Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I have never heard the case stated more clearly and the problem put forth in a more practical and understandable way.

In my State, the manufacturing industry depends upon the textile industry as the eighth largest in the State. It has a payroll of \$280 million a year. It is worthy of all our consideration. The industry employs 68,000 people, of whom 50,000 people are employed in my particular area of Los Angeles.

Thea PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I point out that there are 230,000 businesses, mainly small. They form the main strength and backbone of this industrial complex that we call America. Large numbers of the members of the minority groups who need special help are employed in the industry.

I point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that as the story is told and as the bill comes up for consideration, I would like to do whatever I can to join enthusiastically with the Senator and others in this most needed concern for this particular industry.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) was a strong worker and supporter of a similar measure in the past. There is industrywide support in California. As we emphasized the need for this measure and as we see southern support for the northern textile industry, we are talking about a national industry.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the concern for the textile import problem that the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina has expressed. The textile industry is the largest manufacturing employer in the State of Tennessee, with many plants being located in rural areas. I am particularly concerned that jobs for workers in these areas may be jeopardized. I am most hopeful that the Nixon administration will be able to negotiate a fair and reasonable voluntary import quota system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished majority leader wishes me to yield briefly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without losing his rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEA BAGS AND TEMPESTS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by the Reverend A.

Craig South of the First Congregational Church in Battle Creek, Mich., to the graduating high school seniors of his congregation, so inspired my friend and constituent, Mr. Art Fettig, that he has asked me to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. I am happy to do so. The text of Reverend South's sermon, "Tea Bags and Tempests," follows:

TEA BAGS AND TEMPESTS

(By Rev. A. Craig South)

We are pleased today to recognize in a special way those graduating seniors who are a part of our church fellowship. Graduation from high school has become a significant factor in the lives of the youth of our society; and the accomplishment which graduation signifies is no small one. So we, the fellow participants in this church, seniors, take pleasure in adding our congratulations to those of your family and other friends. On occasions such as this, the speaker is supposed to say something profound, to give you one last crash lecture which will set you on the straight and narrow, just in case the past twelve years haven't quite done the job. I can make no guarantee of the profundity of this sermon, but I would like to share with you some of the concerns which we would have you think about seriously.

Being the astute observers of the human scene that you are, you are well aware, probably even more aware than some of your elders, that we are living in a time of great and rapid change—and it isn't only Mr. Jones who doesn't know what is happening, most of us don't know what is happening. We all feel the sting of the unfamiliar and we all are subjected to the pressures of these changing times. The pressures of school, work, our social rounds and the family often make us feel that we are adrift. And when we add to our personal concerns the tumult of the great upheavals of our world; the student unrest, the racial conflicts, the drug scene, the changing moral climate, the war in Vietnam, the arms race, the pollution of our natural environment and the rising cost of living, we all feel conspired against and tossed into confusion and frustration. There have been a number of responses to this confusion and frustration: some are immobilized and drop out; some turn to hate and violence, some hang on out of sheer determination and fortitude, and some survive wrapped in a rapidly diminishing cocoon of apathy.

But certainly there ought to be some better alternatives. If, as the scripture tells us, God has given to us dominion over the earth—a charge to fill the earth and subdue it—he must have provided a means by which we can handle our problems, deal with our adversaries and rejoice in the gift of life which he has given us . . . and the Christian faith claims that he has. This morning I would like to discuss three parts of a Christian alternative. Remember, these are not the answers to our predicament, but they do provide a stance, a foundation, from which we can better deal with our problems and work for their solutions.

I

The first block in the foundation of our stance is Faith; faith! Now, we need to approach the word, faith, with some care; it is one of the abused words in our vocabulary. Let's look at some things which faith is not. Faith is not believing in what you know isn't so, it's not a substitute for knowledge. Faith is not the acceptance of creed or dogma. Faith is not the performance of religious duties; faith is not being a good moral person with a pious, churchy decoration. Basically, faith is a relationship of trust. Faith is confidence. Faith is a relationship of trust in God. Now that's profound! Faith is a relationship of trust in God. Faith in God means that we trust, we have confidence, that under all of

the events of our lives, from the smallest of our personal lives and the greatest of the global, lies the sure hand of God. It means that we trust that life has a meaning and purpose; that life is not a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Faith means that our plans and actions have meanings which are not lost in the long run; it means that the whole historical process is growing toward a future that God understands even if we don't and which will come to fruition in his good time provided we have the good sense to see it through without blowing ourselves up or poisoning ourselves with pollution.

Jesus talked quite a bit about the importance of faith. He said that if we had faith the size of a small mustard seed we could move mountains. I don't know if he meant that literally or not; but I do know that the great achievements of mankind have come principally from people who felt that life was worth getting out of bed for, and who felt that the efforts of their thinking and labor were not just exercises in futility ending in rubble and oblivion. Without this faith, this relationship of trust, this confidence, every thought, every action would be tainted with tedium and the wonderful zest for life which we received from God as children, and will turn sour, leaving us shrunken lives to be lived out in quiet desperation. Faith in God and his process is essential to any stance from which we can move against our problems and adversity and it is an equally essential ingredient in any meaningful celebration of the joys of life.

II

The second block in the foundation of our stance is reason. Man, so far as we know, is the only creature endowed by God with the power of reason and rational thought. In the great commandment, we are urged to worship God with our minds, as well as with our heart, spirit and strength. But all too often today we turn our backs on reason. In our feelings of frustration and futility we lash out violently at our real and imaginary tormentors. We react rather than respond; shoot before we think; strike without any thought of consequences. And as a result we often end up in a worse situation with only an increase in our frustration as our reward.

Now these quick reflexes toward violence may have served us well in the past. But we have reached a new age. "New occasions teach new duties. Times make ancient good uncouth." Our whole disposition toward violence needs radical re-evaluation. In the world of today with our sophisticated warheads and almost faultless delivery systems violence is a deadend street. The situations which face us today cannot be solved by a shoot-out, cannot be handled with force; cannot be resolved by an international or inter-racial or inter-personal quick draw. The days of the guys in the white hats and the black hats at the corral are gone. It's going to take all of the hard thinking and creative imagination that we possess to solve our predicament. And in the end, reason, not thoughtless reaction, is going to be the major factor.

But, in order for reason to work, we have to keep our cool. And keeping our cool today demands concessions. Take for example the conflict between the young and the old. There must be concession from both sides. The young must remember that the mess in today's world was not created by their parents and grandparents—it is the creation of generations of human greed and human ignorance. To expect that the mess created over thousands of years can be cleared up in six months is ridiculous. To work it out, even to a more tolerable degree is going to take time. Reason demands of the young patience. But the old must remember that time is growing short, terribly short; that the pleas

for patience which we make—sometimes with justification, sometimes without—are often viewed as being another put-off, and our delays are seen as being tactics of reaction aimed at reinforcing a dubious status quo. A radical re-evaluation of our national and personal priorities is in order, not tomorrow but now! As John F. Kennedy said, this world cannot survive half rich and half poor, half slave, half free. This world cannot continue half affluent going its merry way and half crowded, starved, beaten and oppressed. To follow this road is to court disaster. So the day calls for people young and old to think, reason, respond.

III

The third block in the foundation of our stance is love; this is perhaps the most important. This word, like faith, needs some thought. It is in that list of abuse terms. The term as I use it today is not to be confused with all of our hang-ups on sex. It has little to do with physical intimacy or touch; it has absolutely nothing to do with the desirable and the loveable.

Now I realize that love cannot really be defined, but following Eric Fromm I would like to point out four basic elements in any love—elements which are essential to a Christian stance in today's world.

First, love involves care. Care begins with taking the existence of other people as seriously as we take our own. Care means the willingness to work (that's a four letter word, you know) for the well-being of the beloved, to see their welfare as being essential to us as our own.

Second, love involves respect—to see and see again, *re specere*. That is the power to see every man as a human being, with feelings, hope, aspirations and needs as a part of the human family. On the other hand, respect involves the power to see that each person is unique in his own right and that his uniqueness is of value. Respect means seeing each as an important part of the human family with an individual uniqueness and being able to honor both his humanity and his personal uniqueness.

Third, love involves responsibility—the ability to respond to the needs of the beloved. Responsibility involves sensitivity to human feelings; an awareness of where the other guy lives; and an understanding of what makes him happy, of what hurts him; and the ability to work for his happiness and to fight with him against that which hurts him. And all of this means that:

Fourth, love involves knowledge. We cannot care, we cannot respect, we cannot respond, unless we know! How do our adversaries feel? What are their perceptions of the human predicament? Where do they see us? Where do they hurt? Where do they rejoice? I believe very deeply that a lot of the trouble in this world would vanish if we really understood, if we really knew just how the other guy feels and lives; if we were aware of his own private warfare within, of all of his hang-ups, of all of the restrictions in which he feels he lives, if we really understood the frustrations of the situations of others. Love begins with knowledge; and knowledge begins with dialogue; and dialogue is half listening.

Part of the problem of our time is that we come at each other with our mouths open and our ears closed. The time has come for us to listen, to understand, to know, and to feel. Only then can we love; only then can we care; only then can we respect; only then can we respond. We are, as it were, tossed about in a tempest. And we are only going to get out of it if we get into it. There is no way over, no way under, no way around—you have to go through. There has to be involvement.

We are as pleased as we can be with this

group of seniors, with many of their classmates, with many of their generation. They have an idealism not gone sour; they have hopes not turned cynical; they have a strength not yet debilitated. Jump into the tempest. Like a tea bag in hot water. You're going to get into hot water; everybody gets into hot water. The question is not whether you get into hot water, but what kind of tea you make; and we could all stand some good tea. Involvement is the key.

In the scripture, God says to the church at Laodicea: I would that you were hot or cold, but you're a bunch of lukewarm fuddy-duddies! And I'm going to spit you out of my mouth! I can't stand apathetic, unconcerned, uninvolved people. Get with it! Get involved, make that cup of tea.

It's a big tempest. And some of us are going to drown in it; and some of us are going to make lousy tea. But, it will suffice to be said; they were involved, they tried, they gave their all.

My parting words—the last two minutes of this crash course to keep you straight, are: Face this tempest from this Christian stance. Faith, trust, be confident that the hand of God holds all.

Remember that reason and rational thought form our God-given crown and it must not be abdicated to irrationality and violence.

And that all we do, and all we say, and all we are must be tempered by love.

Then abide these three; faith, reason and love and the greatest of these is love. And therein lies our hope.

PRAYER AT GRADUATION

(By Rev. David L. Evans)

O Lord God, on this special day we pause before your greatness and wisdom to admit that as this phase of our education draws to its conclusion we have not learned very much about living together in peace and justice; that we do not have adequate answers to the ancient problems of hunger, poverty and prejudice.

We would pray that our learning might be the occasion of a new appreciation of those qualities in our common heritage which are of enduring worth and value to mankind; that we might come to the maturity which recognizes those things from the accumulated wisdom of the past which rightfully claim our allegiance and our support.

May our learning be such that it strengthens us in daring to be different in dreaming dreams; in thinking the unthinkable and speaking the unspeakable—not for the sake of being strange or difficult, but because those times call for vision, integrity and courage. Thus we ask that we might not be part of the problem but a source of the answer to the age-old divisions of mankind caused by fear, suspicion, greed, ignorance and pride. So may our prayers for these young men and women be not so much for their material success as for their contribution toward a better society, a more human, livable world; in these terms we hope that they achieve great success.

This we pray in the name of the Great Redeemer. Amen.

SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems we are having in

this country today is trying to squelch "instant experts." These paragons of knowledge will spout for hours on any subject—you name it.

It is particularly sad to me when some honored members of the scientific and engineering professions are those who are generating invective about many subjects—subjects in which they have little or no expertise. By lending the eminence of their names to dubious debates and dubious causes they generally end up debasing their professions.

Dr. Karl Cohen, outgoing president of the American Nuclear Society, spoke on the "Ethics of Scientists" at the society's 15th annual meeting in Seattle last month. I would like to quote briefly from his speech:

The diminishing popularity of the physical sciences and engineering among students is symptomatic of a decline in confidence in the ability of technology and technologists to solve the world's problems. Sober people have asked for a moratorium on technology generally, and as for nuclear energy, there is a spectrum of similar attitudes, ranging from opposition to the spread of nuclear technology, lest it increase the possibility of its misuse, to a desire to put the genie back in the bottle—together with those who released him in the first place—and put the cork in.

These are the dimensions of the problem of public alienation. What can we do to improve it?

Here are a few suggestions (I am sure that many others will occur to you):

Restraint and modesty will create a better public image of scientists and engineers than arrogance and conceit. Only science is amoral; scientists should have ethics.

Let us begin with a sense of respect for those who disagree with us. The purpose of technology is to serve people, and they must be satisfied that they are being served.

It is difficult to separate one's interests from one's beliefs. Achieving dispassionate objectivity is an ideal probably beyond most of us. We may, however, attain relative freedom from our own biases if we acknowledge them explicitly—at least to ourselves.

A scientist should certainly recognize and accept his social responsibilities. Only on occasion, however, will his particular expertise confer special merit to his political opinions, even on subjects with high technical content. He should avoid this implication when it is not valid. What is occasionally true for individual scientists will be very rarely true for a whole scientific society. In particular, the ANS should observe scrupulous neutrality on any technical issue with a strong political content or indeed a strong subjective content of any sort.

The correlation between the leveling off of federal R&D appropriations and deep philosophical concerns over federal R&D policy is striking. The social responsibilities of scientists should extend beyond the question of why the federal government should spend more money on science.

An invidious comparison between your nuclear project and someone's else does not prove that your project is desirable; it merely pollutes the atmosphere for all nuclear projects.

Likewise, do not make invidious comparisons between nuclear technology and other technologies. They also are trying to serve the public.

Postponing a project because we do not know everything about its effects on the ecology is equivalent to cancelling it. We

shall never know all there is to know about anything.

Above all, let us try to win better acceptance, not by belittling our critics, but by acting more responsibly ourselves. The fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves.

THE OSTEOPATHIC PROFESSION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the persistent shortage of physicians in our Nation is accompanied by another problem that merits our attention. I speak of the diminishing numbers of general practitioners—physicians who are the "family doctors" on whom our citizens rely so heavily for their health care needs.

In this regard, the osteopathic profession, represented by the New York City Society of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, is performing an invaluable role in attempting to provide solutions for these problems.

First, because osteopathic physicians put emphasis on general practice and comprehensive health, they are assuming the role of the "family doctor" in ever-increasing numbers. Indeed, in New York State, some 95 percent are general practitioners.

The society also is doing its share to stimulate a greater interest in a health career among college and high school students. Members of the society make themselves available to address undergraduate organizations on the contributions to the community which they can make by entering the osteopathic profession.

The society in advising students as to career opportunities, points out that virtually all osteopathic physicians in preparation for practice take an internship of at least 1 year in a hospital inspected and approved by the Bureau of Hospitals of the American Osteopathic Association.

Many doctors of osteopathy, it should be noted, have taken training residencies in various approved osteopathic hospitals throughout the country.

Throughout the country, osteopathic physicians are affiliated with osteopathic hospitals; and in their private practices, as in their work in the hospitals, they adhere to the highest standards of their profession.

I believe it is important to stress that osteopathy is a school of medicine whose most distinctive quality has been and is the constant development of techniques for releasing man's natural abilities to combat stress and strain which could conceivably result in disease.

Moreover, osteopathic physicians and surgeons integrate all accepted methods of treatment of disease and injury, including manipulation, drugs, surgery and physical therapy, as dictated by diagnosis of the individual patient.

Osteopathic physicians and surgeons

are performing an enormous service in behalf of the health and well-being of our citizens, and it gives me great pleasure to salute the membership of this dedicated profession.

REDUCTION OF THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in an unprecedented action the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives voted to slash the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 20 percent. I am totally and unequivocally opposed to the action, and I will work for its reversal.

This unwarranted cutting of the oil depletion allowance was motivated and inspired by individuals and groups in our country who fail to understand the economic conditions accompanying the locating and producing of oil and gas. Rather than examine the true facts and circumstances, these individuals and groups have yielded to emotions and misconception, and have erroneously attacked percentage depletion as a tax haven and a tax subsidy. In fact, it has become quite fashionable for big city Congressmen to attack the depletion allowance. They think the issue has a lot of political appeal with urbanites who forget how much of their individual well-being and material comforts depend on continued oil production, and a stable price structure for oil and gas distribution.

The fact of the matter is that the full depletion allowance is needed to maintain the vitality of the oil extractive industry, an industry in which only one out of nine drillings produce some oil, while merely one out of 45 is even profitable. As a natural consequence, net return on investment in the petroleum industry is lower than 50 percent of all the industries in the United States.

Without the full oil depletion allowance the incentive to assume the risks inherent in the oil business will be reduced and many small independent companies which help to keep the petroleum industry competitive will be forced out of business or absorbed into the giant petroleum corporations. As a result, the price of oil and gas will increase, and the final consumer will be forced to pay more for gas, oil, and other petroleum products.

In addition to the impact on the individual consumer, our national security will be impaired by the reduction in oil production. Critics of the oil depletion allowance contend that we can supply all our petroleum needs from abroad. However, I believe that the situation in the oil-rich Middle East is too uncertain and too volatile for the United States to

rely on the area as a prime source for oil supply.

I believe that the value of the full 27½-percent depletion allowance over the last four decades is clear. It has been the most effective procedure yet devised for maintaining the vitality of the petroleum industry while at the same time providing a fair and equitable industry tax base. The fairness of the tax base is evidenced by the fact that the petroleum industry pays 5.1 cents tax for each dollar of gross revenue, while mining and manufacturing corporations pay 5.4 cents, and U.S. business corporations pay 4.5 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate the true facts surrounding the oil depletion allowance to my colleagues as I believe this is a matter which is too important for partisan or regional politics; it is a matter of national security and individual well-being.

INSTANT LEASING PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, frequently, we in the Congress pass laws which we believe to have meritorious prospects and then forget about the actual operation of those laws, particularly when they operate satisfactorily.

One of those sections to which my attention has been called recently is section 23 of the U.S. Housing Act providing for low rent for public housing and private accommodations, commonly known as the Widnall amendment or the rent certificate program. This was first incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and has been particularly useful in my own community. In this regard, I am enclosing a memorandum on this so-called instant leasing program, from a member of my congressional staff, which recites the specific experience in four separate cases benefiting from this program in the Cincinnati area. I know that it will be of interest to many.

The material follows:

INSTANT LEASING PROGRAM

Housing or shelter is one of man's basic requirements. Our government recognizes this need and I would like to advise of the success of the Instant Leasing Program as experienced by my District Office in Cincinnati during the past twelve months. This program is carried out in the Cincinnati area by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority under the auspices of HUD. They currently have 237 units under lease and hopes for expanding the program by 100 more units.

Many people come to a Congressional District Office with a variety of problems, Social Security, welfare, employment, etc. However, the basic problem is frequently financial, and too large a proportion of their budget is being spent on housing. If the person is elderly or disabled, the Metropolitan Housing Authority can with the cooperation of the landlord directly lease the apartment or

house from the owner and in turn lease it to the applicant at one-fourth of their income.

To directly understand the impact of this program is to cite specific cases. Case A is a polio victim about 30 years old currently on Welfare. She originally contacted our office for job help. She then lived in a \$75 a month air-conditioned apartment right on the street with no steps, which made the use of her wheel chair feasible. The landlord was about to put the tenant out on the street when our office recommended Instant Leasing. The request went through and the tenant was able to remain in her convenient apartment and work with the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation training for suitable employment.

A widow, Case B, with an incurable disease recently lost her sister who shared the expenses of an apartment. Case B's income is a Social Security disability check of \$93 per month. She contacted us originally to see if we could help her with a Workmens Compensation claim with the State of Ohio. It was not possible to help with the Workmens Compensation claim but we did recommend the Instant Leasing program and she was able to reduce her rent payment from \$75 per month to approximately \$23 per month, which enabled her to purchase more food, cleaning supplies, and make more frequent visits to her doctor for pain shots. She was particularly pleased to be able to purchase cleaning supplies and clean her apartment.

Case C is an elderly lady, a widow of a dentist who has for the past year or so been caught trying to sleep in the restrooms of our Federal Building. Through the help of the Basen Ministry, The American Dental Society granted Mrs. C a pension of \$100 per month. Her efforts to work after the death of her husband enable her to collect a minimum Social Security benefit of \$42 per month. After the Dental Society granted her pension, she located an apartment in an acceptable area for \$85 per month. She was having difficulties with her Social Security checks due to a change of address and contacted our office to help her in this matter. Since she was a frequent visitor in our office, her financial situation eventually became clear, and we recommended again the Instant Leasing Program. She proved acceptable to the program and has \$49 more a month for necessities.

When Case D's husband died early this year, he left his widow with \$127 per month widow's pension from Railroad Retirement. She wrote to me to see if there was any possibility of obtaining any more money. She stated that she was 75 years old and unable to work. She was not eligible for any more pension, but the Instant Leasing Program was recommended and put in effect. Case D was able to remain in her apartment where she had lived for many years and pay only \$32 per month rent which was in keeping with her income.

We currently have six more recommendations before the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority of similar circumstances and hopefully they will turn out as successfully as the cases outlined above.

BOBBY WINKLES, AN OUTSTANDING BASEBALL COACH

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of America's annual All-Star

game, I should like to give special recognition to the baseball coaches throughout our land for the contributions they have made to this much loved sport, and in particular, I should like to give tribute today to an outstanding coach from my State of Arizona, Bobby Winkles.

Bobby Winkles has amassed an enviable record during his 11 years of coaching at Arizona State University. Most recently, as I am sure most sports fans will recall, his team captured the World Series college championship for the third time. It is self-evident that Bobby Winkles possesses those capabilities prerequisite to producing three championship teams in such a short span of time, for he must have had to instill a winning, enthusiastic, and competitive spirit, along with a fine balance of subordinating personal prominence to the efficiency of the whole in each member of those teams.

All Arizonans take great pride in Bobby Winkles, and I am pleased to express publicly today our appreciation, and congratulations to him.

NEWSLETTER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith my newsletter of this week which perhaps some of my colleagues may be interested in reading:

NEWSLETTER

In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness . . .

Thus it was that Frank Borman, in the chandeliered East Room of the White House on Sunday, July 20, read these three verses from the Bible's Book of Genesis.

Ahead of him and facing him were the nation's leaders, the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members, Congressmen and Senators, those of the military, and representatives of foreign governments in the Diplomatic Corps. Almost 350 were present to participate in these simple services. This service was much like the one attended by this writer a few weeks ago.

The President always says a few words, and on last Sunday he used these: "This is a historic day, the day when man will first set foot on the Moon."

There were also prayers for all of the astronauts, and these probably were the same kind of prayers that were offered by Columbus and his men near the end of their search for the New World.

Also on the minds of those who prayed were the problems with which we are faced throughout the world.

As the leader of the Senate Prayer Group said: "Even as our astronauts go to the Moon in the name of peace, our world aches

from the pain of war. We perfect the means for destroying human life, and then believe we have found security. May the nation trust not in the power of arms, but in the Prince of Peace, Thy Son."

Washington is an overly sophisticated town. It takes something truly remarkable to stir its soul. The astronauts' trip to the Moon moved the governmental community as has nothing in my time in Washington.

These astronauts to the Moon were pioneers, as was Columbus. It will be remembered that Columbus made five trips to the New World and still touched only a small part of North and South America.

Even as the astronauts flew home, people in the space world were talking about a trip to Mars by 1979. Mars is in an entirely new satellite system, and its distance at its nearest orbit is 35 million miles from the Earth. In a conference at the White House on Monday, someone asked, "And where does it all end?" And to this, even the President did not make an answer.

MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH IN THE DENTAL PROFESSION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the enormous public attention focused on the need for adequate health care programs has been accompanied in recent years by a greater awareness of the importance of dental care. Parents especially have become increasingly concerned about proper dental care for their children.

In the field of orthodontia, there has arisen a need for new prosthetic devices that have beneficial corrective qualities and at the same time enhance the wearer's appearance.

As anyone whose child has had to wear orthodontic dental braces can attest, these devices have hardly proved popular with young people. The fitting of these braces requires several uncomfortable hours in a dentist's chair, while the patient has his teeth separated and wired in heavy, unsightly metal bands.

Now, there has been a major breakthrough in the dental profession, one which virtually eliminates the fears in the minds of parents and their children concerning orthodontic braces.

An attractive lightweight plastic dental brace has been developed as a replacement for the conventional and often painful orthodontic metal teeth braces.

These new braces are being brought to the public by Dr. Francis V. Pribula, the orthodontist who heads Ortho International Services, Inc., of Wilmington, Del.

Almost 2,000 orthodontists throughout the Nation are now using this new OIS plastic dental brace with their patient's approval. The application of these braces reduces by two-thirds the time it previously took to apply metal braces. The new brace employs small tooth-colored plastic brackets which are easily affixed by a special adhesive to the front of the teeth, resulting in the same sup-

port previously provided by the heavy metal bands. A scarcely visible thread-like wire is tied to the brackets affording the required tension.

For youngsters, there are many advantages in wearing such braces. They are more comfortable than the heavy metal welded braces. They are tooth-colored for cosmetic reasons. Also, there is no need to separate teeth prior to application. They do not cause cuts or abrasions inside the mouth. The number of potential cavities are reduced because of the diminished size of the brace and the elimination entirely of braces on the back of all teeth. Tooth brushing is much easier.

Moreover, the adhesive system utilized in this new orthodontic system does not damage teeth. It is easily removed at the completion of treatment.

Metal braces give youngsters, and even adults, an embarrassed, tight-lipped appearance. The success of this new plastic brace stems from the fact that it affords people of all ages a more pleasant facial appearance.

TO ANNOUNCE AN ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1961, the United States launched its first nuclear power supply into space aboard what is now the Navy's, and the world's, oldest operating navigational satellite. On its ninth anniversary, the Snap-3A—system for nuclear auxiliary power—will have circled the earth 40,530 times and traveled more than a billion miles.

I remember that first launch well. We had quite a time getting the White House to agree that it was safe. The Secretary of State, or somebody in that conservative organization, was afraid that the small isotopic power supply device might fall on Cuba and give the Communists a propaganda advantage.

This grapefruit sized—large California sized, that is—power supply converts the heat from the decay of plutonium into about three watts of electricity. This power, plus some from solar cells, has kept the navigational beacon in operation 3 years beyond its predicted 5-year life.

This use of the atom in space has contributed to man's better understanding of the shape of the earth on which he lives, and was a forerunner of the current Navy satellite navigation system.

The United States has another nuclear power system operating in space—the 50-watt Snap-19 which helps power the Nimbus 3 weather satellite.

When man lands on the moon with the Apollo 12 moon lander which is scheduled for this fall, present plans call for him to place on the moon's surface the Apollo lunar surface experimental package, which will be powered by the 60-watt Snap-27.

I would like to place in the RECORD the press statement which the Atomic Energy Commission has prepared to commemorate the 9th year of atomic power's operation in space at the conclusion of my remarks.

OCEANOGRAPHIC USE OF NUCLEAR POWER

I am also appending to my statement a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission dated June 23, 1969, and a press release describing another potentially important test of a radioisotope power system. This test concerns the potential application of nuclear energy in the marine environment. This device designated as Snap-21 contains two 10-watt strontium 90 prototype power sources and will be implanted in the Pacific Ocean off Clemente Island. We are confident that this new power supply will make a valuable contribution in the field of marine exploration and communication. It is intended to meet an ever-increasing demand for reliable, long-lived power sources for oceanographic applications.

In closing I would like to remark that it is a shame that the detractors of the atom do not consider it worthwhile to mention these accomplishments. The detractor's only hope is to sit around, like a bunch of carrion converters, waiting to pounce on some careless atom that might stray from the field.

The press statement and letter follow:

ATOMIC BATTERY BEGINS 9TH YEAR OF OPERATION IN SPACE

A grapefruit-sized atomic battery, launched in 1961 on a navigational satellite, begins its ninth year in orbit on June 29. The compact radioisotope thermoelectric generator already has operated three years beyond its five-year design life.

The nuclear generator, developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, is supplementing the power from solar cells on the Navy's oldest operating navigational satellite in space. On its ninth anniversary, the satellite will have circled the earth 40,530 times and traveled more than a billion miles. The drum-shaped satellite is the first to carry a nuclear power supply.

Operated now on command from The Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md., the satellite still beams information "loud and clear." The satellite contributed to a better understanding of the shape of the earth, and was a forerunner of the Navy satellite navigation system, which now is used by the fleet and by scientific and commercial ships.

The first space nuclear generator, designated SNAP-3A, is about five inches in diameter and 5½ inches high. It converts the heat given off by plutonium directly into 2.7 watts of electricity. It was built by the Martin Company, Baltimore.

In all, five Snap (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) nuclear generators have been launched, and a compact reactor power system was demonstrated in space in 1965.

April 1969 saw the first civilian use of atomic energy in space with the launching of NASA's Nimbus-3 weather satellite, which carries two nuclear generators as supplementary power to solar cells. This combined power is resulting in the acquisition of data of such significance that it has been characterized as "unprecedented" by the scientific community.

When Apollo 12, the second manned lunar landing mission, reaches the moon, an atomic-fueled generator will be placed upon

the lunar surface where it will provide the power for a package of instruments—the first nuclear power on the moon.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1969.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: In the past we have advised the Joint Committee as to significant milestones in the AEC's program to develop radioisotope power systems for remote terrestrial and marine applications. Pursuant to this policy we now wish to inform you of the planned initiation of an ocean test program involving several second generation deep sea prototype devices.

During the week of June 23, 1969, two 10-watt strontium-90 prototype power sources (Snap-21) will be implanted in the Pacific Ocean for long term environmental testing. The implantation will be carried out by the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL), as part of a joint AEC-Navy program. The actual implantation site is located off the coast of San Clemente Island, which is, in turn, located some 60 miles from Long Beach, California. San Clemente Island has been selected as the test site because of its remote location, extensive test facilities and Navy controlled access.

The planned environmental test program is expected to last from one to two years. The specific purpose of these ocean tests is to establish the long-term operating characteristics of each power source in an in-situ marine environment. These highly instrumented prototype units will be monitored continuously and the data generated utilized to assess the long-term effects of ocean exposure and to conform reliability and endurance capability. Although the 10-watt system is designed for deep ocean operation at depths up to 23,000 feet, the initial tests will be conducted in relatively shallow water; e.g., approximately 100 to 200 feet. Each of the prototype units has, however, been hydrostatically tested at the design pressure of 10,000 psi. Deep ocean testing is contemplated following successful completion of this initial phase of testing.

The 10-watt power system has been developed by the 3M Company for the AEC to meet an increasing demand for reliable, long-endurance power sources for oceanographic and ocean engineering application. The absence of such power sources has been frequently cited by representatives of the oceanographic community as a critical factor limiting this nation's ability to establish a meaningful ocean engineering and marine sciences program. In this regard, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, in its January 1969 report to the President and the Congress, strongly endorsed and recommended the continued development of undersea power sources, including nuclear sources. In our judgment, the development of the Snap-21 deep sea nuclear power system will represent a major milestone towards the development of reliable power sources for multipurpose undersea use. Further research and development effort is currently under way as part of AEC's program to develop a second generation of highly reliable, long-endurance and economical radioisotope power sources for terrestrial and marine application.

The 10-watt, Snap-21 units presently being readied for ocean testing represent a significant technological improvement over the first generation, proof-of-principle Snap-7 devices developed by the AEC in the mid-1960's. A comparison of the Snap-21 unit with the first generation Snap-7E, which represents the only deep ocean radioisotope power source previously developed by the AEC, is shown as in the following summary:

	SNAP-7E	SNAP-21
Size.....	30 inches diameter by 70 inches high.....	16 inches diameter by 28 inches high.....
Weight.....	3,500 pounds.....	650 pounds.....
Power output.....	6.5 watts.....	10 watts.....
Design life.....	2 years.....	5 years.....
System efficiency.....	≈4 percent.....	≈7 percent.....
Weight/power ratio.....	540 pounds per watt.....	65 pounds per watt.....

An extensive nuclear safety review of the SNAP-21 and related ocean test operations has been conducted by specialists in the AEC, Navy, and the 3M Company. The AEC has reviewed all aspects of generator design and operation, and has concluded that the planned underwater testing activities may be conducted without undue risk to the public health and safety. It has been further concluded that no undue hazard, either to operating personnel, the general population or to marine life, will result from any credible accident or incident which could occur during unattended operation of these devices at the San Clemente Test Site.

A draft public announcement concerning the implantment of the SNAP-21 devices is attached for your information. This announcement will be released upon successful completion of these ocean operations.

We will continue to keep your Committee informed of our progress with respect to these second generation systems.

Sincerely,

R. E. HOLLINGSWORTH,
General Manager.

ADVANCED NUCLEAR GENERATORS IMPLANTED IN PACIFIC OCEAN BY AEC IN PROGRAM TO ASSIST OCEAN EXPLORATION

The Atomic Energy Commission (date) implanted in the Pacific Ocean two 10-watt nuclear power generators whose successful operation should help fill a critical need in ocean exploration.

The nuclear radioisotope power generators, designated Snap-21, were implanted for a long-term testing by the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory off the coast of San Clemente Island, California, as a part of a joint AEC-Navy program. A third unit is scheduled for implantment later this summer.

These 10-watt radioisotope powered generators have been developed by the AEC to meet an increasing need for long endurance and highly reliable energy sources for use in the ocean at depths up to 23,000 feet. They are designed to provide uninterrupted electrical power for periods of five years or longer and are intended for use as power sources for underwater navigational aids, sonar beacons, seismological stations and for general purpose oceanographic and ocean engineering application. Reliable and long endurance power sources have been frequently cited by ocean engineers and scientists as one of the most critical needs associated with ocean exploration and technology. In many remote applications where frequent maintenance, refueling or battery recharging or replacement is difficult or expensive, compact radioisotope power sources promise important operational and economic advantages over conventional power sources. Conventional power sources are generally limited to endurances of less than six months.

This phase of the test program off San Clemente Island is expected to last from one to two years. The highly instrumented prototype units will be monitored continuously to determine their long-term behavior in an ocean environment. Although the generators are capable of operation at depths of 23,000 feet, they will be tested initially in shallow water at a 200 foot depth. The purposes of the shallow water tests is to subject the nuclear devices to marine growth generally found at depths of 500 feet or less. Deep water tests are planned following successful completion of the initial phase of testing. Eventually, these units will be recovered for laboratory analysis and evaluation.

Each of the units is fueled with radioactive strontium-90. The heat energy from the decay of the fuel is converted directly into electrical energy by solid state semiconductor thermoelectric materials. The absence of moving parts contributes significantly to inherent reliability and endurance capability.

The nuclear fuel is obtained from the waste fission products generated by nuclear reactors. The waste fission products are recovered from the reactors and reprocessed to separate the long-lived strontium-90 from other radioactive material. The strontium-90 fuel used in these power sources is encapsulated in a heavy-walled, high strength, nickel alloy cylinder capable of containing the fuel under normal operating and accident conditions for hundreds of years. After this period the nuclear fuel will have decayed to an insignificant quantity. An extensive safety test program has been conducted to demonstrate complete integrity of the fuel container under all handling, transportation, implantment, operation and accident conditions.

Each power package is 16 inches in diameter, 28 inches high and weighs about 700 pounds, including shielding and pressure vessel.

Deployment of these nuclear power units represents the culmination of the initial phase of the AEC program to develop a second generation of highly reliable, long-endurance and economic radioisotope power sources for terrestrial and marine applications.

The power units were developed for the AEC by the 3M Company, Space and Defense Products Department, St. Paul, Minnesota. The Linde Division of Union Carbide Corp., Buffalo, N.Y., provided the high temperature vacuum insulation subassembly as principal subcontractor to 3M Company. The strontium-90 fuel was provided by the AEC's Oak Ridge (Tenn.) National Laboratory.

APPENDIX

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the many special tributes being paid to our Nation's astronauts for their successful voyage to moon. The full significance of this landmark in exploration will not be known for some time and pending further discoveries resulting from the space feat, we can only ponder our extraterrestrial future.

Here is a list of a few of the headlines we might be reading in the years ahead:

You See One Planet, You Seen 'Em All!
Moon Hilton Opens for Tourist Season at Tranquillity Bay.

Pentagon Calls for \$10 Billion Defense Network To Protect U.S. Military Interests on Moon.

Ralph Nader To Investigate Safety of Moonbeams Sold by NASA on Earth.

Pete Rozelle Approves NFL Franchise for Tranquillity Eagles.

Secretary of Interior Declares Pluto Water Polluted.

Joe Namath Retires After Rozelle Demands He Sell Mars Bar.

Ambassador to Saturn—Calls for U.S. Intervention To Resist Mars Aggression.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Calls for Withdrawal of U.S. Troops From Saturn. Vice President Agnew Charges That Chairman Is "Soft on Milky Way."

United Nations Censures U.S. for Dumping Trash on Mars—Approves Interplanetary Beautification Act.

Mayor Lindsay Runs for Jupiter City Council on Fusion Ticket—Proposes Busing Night School Students to Moon.

Attorney General Denies Interplanetary Wiretapping—"Moon Bugs Me," He Declares.

Beatles Call Halley's Comet G1g a Bad Trip.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY AT VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the nationwide shortage of national cemetery facilities. Statistics made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reveal that the Department of the Army now operates 54 national cemeteries that are still open and available for the interment of deceased veterans. Additionally, there are six open national cemeteries operated by the Department of the Interior. In the next 30 years, 40 of these 60 national cemeteries will be closed. On the other hand, approximately 750,000 servicemen are being separated annually from the Armed Forces. All of these veterans are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Despite these rather alarming statistics, there has been no expansion of the national cemetery system for many years.

The situation is even more acute in the State of California than it is across the Nation generally. There are more than 2,800,000 living veterans residing in the State of California, all eligible for burial in a national cemetery. The three national cemeteries located in California, Fort Rosecrans, San Diego; Golden Gate National Cemetery at San Bruno; and San Francisco National Cemetery at the Presidio in San Francisco, are all closed to future veteran burials, because of the unavailability of space. On the entire west coast of the United States there is only one national cemetery with space available for future burials. This is the Willamette National Cemetery at Portland, Oreg. In an effort to alleviate the problem as it relates to veterans in my own State of California, I have introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

The proposed site is located between San Francisco and Los Angeles and is readily accessible to both northern and southern California residents. I am informed that there are three areas of Vandenberg Air Force Base controlled land that could be utilized for this worthy purpose with no acquisition cost

to the Government. The land is unencumbered and has natural features that would eliminate the need for excessive development costs. This Government-owned land meets all the established criteria for national cemeteries as set forth by the Chief of Support Services, Department of the Army. I am hopeful that the committee will act promptly upon this legislation so that veterans in the State of California may be entitled to burial in a national cemetery within reasonable proximity of their hometown.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which authorizes the President to establish annual fees for entrance to and use of Federal recreational areas. We have often encouraged our citizens to visit, use, and enjoy their outdoor recreational facilities, but because of action in the 90th Congress, the "Golden Eagle Passport" designed to make it easier for our citizens to do just that, will expire March 31, 1970.

There is no doubt in my mind that the citizens want the Golden Eagle to live. Like some of my colleagues, I too have received letters from constituents, many of them retired and enjoying the opportunity to travel and visit our beautiful country, who have asked that the Golden Eagle program be restored.

I realize others have introduced "Golden Eagle Passport" bills which only extend the present program, but it is my opinion that a better approach would be to take this opportunity to improve on the 5-year-old program.

The bill I have introduced will add flexibility and strength to the already growing passport program. For flexibility in determining and establishing the appropriate fees, I have authorized the establishment of a "reasonable fee" for annual passports, single visits, and users fees for highly developed facilities.

The collection of fees has been streamlined to reduce the excessive cost in administering the program. Under the new plan I propose, the fees may be collected by public or private agencies, much like a fishing license. This approach to the problem should save both time and money.

A problem under the present system is that some individuals take advantage of their "passport" by remaining for excessive periods of time in one recreational area. My bill is designed to protect the facilities from the abuse of this minority by authorizing the President to establish a time limitation on visits to specific areas as he determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States, thus giving strength to the proposed program.

Mr. Speaker, the "Golden Eagle Passport" program may not produce a dollar profit, but to the extent that it encourages the fuller utilization of our na-

tional parks and other recreation areas, the lives of our citizens are richer for the experience.

This is sound legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its prompt consideration and passage.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR CELEBRATION OF OUR NATIONAL PASTIME

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Washington is honored this week by the presence of the greatest gathering of baseball players, past and present, ever assembled in one place. The centennial year celebration of the national pastime will be highlighted by the playing of the All-Star game tonight in Robert F. Kennedy Stadium.

The names of our visitors read like a "who's who" from Cooperstown, home of baseball's Hall of Fame—Joe DiMaggio, Lefty Grove, Joe Cronin, Bill Dickey, Jackie Robinson, Frankie Frisch, Willie Mays, Casey Stengel. The list goes on and on and the quality does not fall off.

But even among these illustrious heroes of yesterday and today, no star shown brighter last night at the gigantic baseball dinner at the Sheraton-Park Hotel than that of the new baseball commissioner, Bowie Kuhn.

I was honored, Mr. Speaker, to be a head-table guest at that grand affair last night. The evening sparkled, not only with the presence of so many of the real jewels of the game, but also with true warmth and spirit.

Although many stars contributed to the success of the event, including former Olympic great, Jessie Owens, it was Commissioner Kuhn's show. In his short reign, Mr. Kuhn has injected welcome leadership, vigor and excitement into the baseball world.

Shirley Povich, sports editor of the Washington Post, devoted his daily column to Mr. Kuhn Monday. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert that article in the RECORD at this time:

THIS MORNING WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

The kid who used to get a peek at the ball games by tending the scoreboard at Griffith Stadium for a dollar a day is back in town this week, now age 42. The scope of this success story must leave Horatio Alger to mourn, and ask the nearest celestial spirits where he had failed, and why his own imagination was so constricted.

The poor but honest heroes of Pluck and Luck, and Ragged Dick, climbed and prospered to mere pismire heights compared to the moon shot of Bowie Kuhn from scoreboard boy to commissioner of baseball. The man who has described his boyhood in Washington and Maryland as comfortably poor will be presiding at the All-Star Game on Tuesday night.

In RFK Stadium, he will be outranked only by the President of the United States. The annual All-Star Game, like the World Series, is the commissioner's game, and, like the World Series, it will not commence until the commissioner gives the umpire in chief a nod or other signal that all is in order.

The same boy who used to dream of some

day sitting in one of those box seats at an All-Star Game, perhaps, has pre-empted several hundred box seats for the commissioner's official party at RFK Stadium. Senators, congressmen, cabinet officers, baseball bigwigs and some old friends will be in his group. In the White House box, Commissioner Kuhn will be an official host along with President Bob Short of the Senators.

Others will be minding the scoreboard while Bowie Kuhn makes certain that all of his guests, including Richard Nixon, are comfortable. There already will have been some other official duties performed by the commissioner. For instance, on Monday night at the Sheraton-Park Hotel he has plans for a cozy gathering of 2200 fans and other people who can get up front-money of \$35 per ticket. It has been sold out.

This is only one of the imaginative things Kuhn and his chief aide-de-camp, Joe Reichler, are doing. Never were baseball's treasures so brightly exploited by any commissioner, especially in a year of need, when the game was being put down as a creeping bore by its detractors. For their \$35 the commissioner is giving the 2200 a view of 35 living members of the Cooperstown Hall of Fame, in the flesh, plus close-up introductions of the 56 All-Stars selected for this year's game.

Not as a money-making gimmick for baseball is the commissioner staging the All-Star dinner. On the contrary, the expenses are such that it could cost the commissioner's office \$100,000. Originally a television network was supposed to pick up most of the tab, but conflict with the moonshot knocked that out. Kuhn went ahead with the lavish show anyway, as an investment in good will.

The former scoreboard boy will be throwing another party a couple of hours before the game Tuesday night, for special guests, about 4000 of them. This one will be held just outside the stadium on the D.C. Army grounds under perhaps the biggest tent ever shipped into Washington for a social event. This bash could cost another hundred grand, but the commissioner is very blithe about that.

Last it be suspected that the new commissioner is off on some Bacchanalian binge with his grand-scale socializing, let some truths be known. Mr. Kuhn has utterly no ambitions to be a social lion. He is a home-and-hearth family man who would rather reach for his slippers than a white tie.

He isn't trying to make any points with the 24 major-league club owners who are, in a nominal sense, his bosses. Bowie Kuhn didn't ask for the job they gave him as a compromise commissioner in February after opposing factions could not elect Mike Burke or Charles Feeney. He didn't need their measly \$100,000-a-year sinecure as a figure-head commissioner. He was doing very well as a \$200,000-a-year New York lawyer.

Kuhn's friends suspect he hasn't even bothered to sign the one-year contract the owners tendered him, because the moment they cross him the job is theirs, not his. In office barely six months, he has knocked two club owners out of their Las Vegas hotel stock speculation, has told the gaddy Houston club owner, Roy Hofheinz, to hush his mouth, and declared Joe Namath's saloon off limits to the baseball athletes.

Never, along the 29-year route from scoreboard boy to commissioner of the game, did Kuhn's baseball interest lapse. He knew last year, before he was commissioner, who was hitting fifth for the Cubs or Minnesota or St. Louis or the Orioles. Now he knows who is leading off for Seattle, Kansas City, Montreal and San Diego.

He's been a buff all these years and now he's calling the game's most important shots, from on high. There seems to be nothing wrong with what he is doing, and the fact that he is presiding over the game when it is having its biggest year in decades suggests that the Kuhn boy was cut out for bigger things than that scoreboard job.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INFLATION?

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report features an exclusive interview with Arthur Burns, the President's counselor, who is generally considered to be one of the most authoritative White House advisers. Mr. Burns states that the greatest problem facing the United States at this time is inflation. He ranks this problem above all others: he ranks it above the problem of crime, above the problem of chronic poverty in our major cities, and above the interest-rate scandal which is at the heart of the inflationary pressures within our economy.

It is ironic that the President's chief adviser on domestic matters should say that inflation is our No. 1 problem when the Secretary of the Treasury seems willing to accept a continuing upward climb in the prime rate. Someone is clearly out of phase, or perhaps the administration generally is becoming guilty, not of a credibility gap, but of a credibility crisis. Another aspect of the same problem is to be seen in the many pronouncements coming forth on the issue of wage and price controls. Mr. Kennedy says we may need them; the President is quoted as saying "Never." Who speaks for the administration?

Basically, the theory which lies behind high-interest rates as a solution to inflation is fallacious. Profits are higher than ever, especially for the banks. What has happened as a result of high-interest rates at the Federal Reserve Board is that the banks have gone elsewhere to find funds. They have gone into the corporate markets and they have gone to Western Europe for dollars held in Swiss banks. And the high rates of interest they pay for these funds have been passed on to American consumers.

We now face the worst housing shortage in 20 years. The rise in the cost-of-living index, at 4.2 percent, is the largest in 17 years. All of this results from the tight money philosophy which dominates the thinking of the bankers at the Fed and the bankers at the Treasury Department. The high cost of capital creates the credit squeeze both on the corporations and the consumer, with resulting higher prices and higher wage demands. That is the inflation cycle. The only interests which have made money off this inflationary situation are the banks. Let us look at their profits.

It might be instructive to look at a group of representative banks on the basis of 6-month earnings for the first half of 1969. This table shows an average net operating income increase from a year ago of 23 percent. The leader is Royal National Bank of New York—up 60.5 percent. At the lower end of the group is the National City Bank of Cleveland at 13.8 percent, still a considerable profit increase over last year. My source for these figures is the Gallagher Presi-

dents' Report, a monthly economic newsletter:

6-MONTH EARNINGS OF SELECTED BANKS

Net Operating Income 1st 6 Months

(Dollars in millions)

Bank	1969	1968	Percent increase
Royal National Bank, New York	\$1.96	\$1.22	60.5
Security National Bank, New York	3.79	2.66	42.5
Marine Midland Grace Trust	7.20	5.50	30.9
Republic National Bank, Dallas	8.57	7.03	21.9
Fidelity Union Trust, Newark	5.23	4.31	21.1
Manufacturers-Hanover Trust	40.12	33.14	21.1
Northern Trust Co., Chicago	7.66	6.44	19.0
Citizens & Southern, Georgia	7.35	6.18	19.0
United California Bank	8.41	6.87	17.8
Cleveland Trust, Ohio	13.87	11.90	16.5
Security Pacific National Bank	28.11	24.27	15.8
First National Bank, Dallas	7.52	6.52	15.4
Mercantile Trust N.A., St. Louis	6.83	5.99	14.0
Wells Fargo & Co.	16.80	14.76	13.8
National City Bank, Cleveland	9.10	8.00	13.8

My advice to Mr. Burns, then, is to look within the permissive policies of his own administration for the roots of the No. 1 problem—inflation. It is indeed a curious spectacle to see the Secretary of the Treasury invite the banks in, ostensibly to discuss prime rates, and yet to issue a statement which indicates no alarm whatsoever. I hope that the fiscal and monetary experts in the administration will sit down together and come to some understanding of what is wrong with the economy and what we can do about it, rather than sending forth an endless stream of contradictory and self-defeating statements.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we embark once again on the commemoration of Captive Nations Week, I find myself experiencing simultaneously three different emotions. They are sadness, optimism, and caution. I am saddened, because as I view the world spectrum in which we live, I recognize the human bondage that 1 billion people suffer every day of their lives when they are denied the most basic of human rights; namely, that of self-determination. I am optimistic when I perceive the forces of the free world working together in an effort to crack the Iron Curtain which separates truth from fiction on our planet. I am cautious in that I fully realize that this is a vision which cannot be expected to meet with instant success. Instead we must be prepared to accept the proposition that this will be a never ending fight as long as the earth is populated with men who are determined to pursue self-serving objectives at the cost of their fellow citizens.

I am proud to join with a great many people in this country and abroad who are rededicating themselves to the great cause of liberty for all people. It is my hope that as each day passes our civilization will move one step closer to truly world freedom.

LEARNING DISABILITIES: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? WHERE ARE WE GOING?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the general Subcommittee on Education held 3 days of intensive hearings on the subject of learning disabilities and what assistance the Federal Government might provide to aid children who are capable of competing intellectually with their classmates, but who have slight neurological or physiological deficiencies which impede their ability to absorb information.

Among the many witnesses who testified before this subcommittee was Dr. Jeanne McRae McCarthy, director of special education for the Schaumburg schools in Schaumburg, Ill. Dr. McCarthy's testimony helped measurably to increase our knowledge of the special needs of children with learning disabilities.

In order that my colleagues might also benefit from her experience in this field, I am including excerpts from her paper which she presented at the 47th annual convention of the Council for Exceptional Children in Denver, Colo., on April 7 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. McCarthy's excellent presentation follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LEARNING DISABILITIES: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? WHERE ARE WE GOING?

(By Jeannie McRae McCarthy)

Seldom has a concept burst upon the educational scene with such cataclysmic force as has the concept of special learning disabilities. Although the early impetus of the published work of Strauss and Lehtinen with the brain-injured dated from the late 1940's and early 1950's and the work of Orton and the dyslexia group dated from the 1920's and 1930's, the educational scene remained quite unruffled as late as the early 1960's. With the possible exception of some isolated research and practice in childhood aphasia and related language disturbances in centers like Syracuse University, Northwestern University, Purdue, the University of Illinois, and Bellevue Hospital, activity in the area which we now call learning disabilities was largely subliminal, or limited to abortive excursions into new methods of remedial reading, or new approaches to psychiatric or child-guidance practice with children whose non-learning was seen as a hostile response to parental pressure or rejection.

State legislatures had not yet been bombarded by parental pressure groups to enact enabling legislation. The U.S. Office of Education was blissfully unaware of what was about to erupt. Universities, with rare but notable exceptions, had no courses or the books to train personnel either to diagnose a learning disability, or to teach the child who had one. Nor were there any plans afoot to initiate such training programs. Even The Council for Exceptional Children, the professional organization devoted to the education of children with special needs, at their annual convention in 1960 had not one program or paper which addressed itself to the topic under any of the various aliases which have been used to describe the child who cannot learn.

It is probably safe to say that in 1960 there were few public school classes for these chil-

dren except for remedial reading programs. In Illinois, in 1959 and 1960 we were able to bootleg service to a limited number of children by christening them "multiply handicapped"—the most common combination of handicaps was educational retardation, emotional disturbance, and brain damage. Thus labeled and documented, the public schools could legally initiate an educational program to teach them.

There were few parent groups organized to serve these children in 1960. I believe the New York Association for Brain Injured Children, the California Association for Neurologically Impaired Children, and the Illinois Fund for Perceptually Handicapped Children were the only ones in existence.

In a very few years since 1960, when all was relatively quiet on all fronts, until now, a great deal of progress has been made in all areas . . . At least 13 states now have within their educational code a term which relates to learning disabilities. Parent groups have been organized at the national level, at the state level, and at the local level. There are now over 200 local and state affiliates of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. Many universities now have a sequence of courses leading to a Masters degree or a doctorate in learning disabilities. There are many summer workshops or institutes in which a classroom teacher may enroll in order to upgrade her skills in meeting the needs of children with learning disabilities. Programs to train speech correctionists are collaborating with other disciplines to provide services for these children. Guidance counselors, particularly at the elementary level, are looking at learning, or non-learning as an essential part of their training and practice. Psychological diagnosis, as well as the training of clinical or school psychologists, has taken a decided turn away from an emphasis on the dynamics of psychosexual development to an emphasis on learning as a modifiable behavior, and on perception and cognition rather than concentrating on emotional responses to environmental pressures. The total involvement of the field of medicine, whether in a positive or negative way, is everywhere apparent, whether it be in the obvious fields of pediatrics, neurology, and psychiatry, or in the less obvious fields of endocrinology, obstetrics, ophthalmology, otology, or genetics.

What meaning does all of this activity have to you as you attempt to integrate these new concepts into your established body of knowledge, into the organizational structure of your school system—whether you direct a program in New York, Florida, Wisconsin, Utah, or California: In simplest terms, it means that your job will be infinitely easier in this year of 1969 than it would have been at any other time. This is not to suggest, however, that your job will be easy. However, you do have some models—some other programs which have been started in public schools—from which you can learn a great deal. You do have a body of research theory and practice from which you can build a sound program for children with learning disabilities. You also have a series of mistakes and blind alleys to assist you in plotting an educationally sound program . . .

. . . Each year, I have attempted to delineate trends and issues in the field of learning disabilities which seem to be evolving from year to year. By far the most important issue in the field today is that of *definition*. In some areas there is still a serious question in the minds of special educators over the very existence of learning disabilities. Are we just talking about "dumb kids" as one notable educator suggested to me last week? Is the child with special learning disabilities just the mentally retarded kids in the suburbs? Is this not just another label for the emotionally disturbed child? As we look at the trends in definitions, it becomes apparent that the early medical emphasis is being replaced with an educational emphasis. The

early emphasis on etiology is being replaced by an emphasis on remediation. The six or seven current definitions which seem acceptable to the majority of practitioners in the field, including the Task Force I and Task Force II definitions—federal studies which tried to define the learning disabled child—the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities definition. Kirk's early definition, the definition of the Northwestern Conference, or the National Advisory Committee definition, all have two concepts in common; the first is the intact clause, the second is the discrepancy clause. Most definers seem to agree that the child with special learning disabilities is basically an intact organism. This concept of intactness is expressed differently in different definitions. Some follow Dr. Gallagher's comment in St. Louis at The Council for Exceptional Children meeting, when a small group was attempting to formulate a definition acceptable to all factors, "whenever you start to define a horse, you first have to define a non-horse." Thus, the "non-horse" part of the definitions may be more specific than the definition of what a learning disability is. We seem to be quite sure that the learning disability is not "primarily due to visual, hearing or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbance or to environmental disadvantage." These are basically intact children.

However, "the discrepancy clause" seems to be somewhat less specific. The National Advisory Committee describes the children with special learning disabilities as those who "exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using spoken or written language." These may be manifested in order of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic.

This definition seems to be one upon which a sound educational program can be based. You will notice that there is no statement of possible etiology in this definition. We seem to have outgrown our need for a medical model around which we can build an educational program. We have learned from the experience of those programs which have included a medical diagnosis of organicity that the neurological examination or the electroencephalogram (EEG) provides a tenuous base upon which to build an educational program. For those of you who are saddled with legislation or program which includes some statement of physical disability before these children can be served, I highly recommend that you read, in the Fall 1967 issue of the *Journal of Special Education*, Roger Freeman's article entitled "Special Education and the Electroencephalogram: A Marriage of Convenience." After reviewing the extensive research involving the EEG, Dr. Freeman recommends that Special Education consider at least a trial separation from neurology and the EEG.

My reason for spending this much time on the evolution of a viable definition is that I am convinced that the most important decision you will make is that of the definition—because your definition will dictate for you the terminology to be used in your program, the prevalence figures, your selection, criterion, the characteristics of your population, and the appropriate remedial procedures.

I would like to point out that this emphasis on definition seems to be of more intense concern in the area of learning disabilities than in any other area of handicap. We still do not have a definition of deafness which is acceptable to people working in the field, nor of mental retardation, for that matter, but it does in the field of learning disabilities.

The question of incidence, or more correctly prevalence, is one that is causing a great deal of difficulty at the present time. "Guessimates" of how many children there are with special learning disabilities range from 1 per cent to 40 per cent of the total school popula-

tion. Prevalence is determined directly by the definition used. Dr. Myklebust, in discussing the question of "how many children are there" has said, "Tell me how many you want to find, and I'll write you a definition that will find that many." Using the National Advisory Committee definition there is some evidence to suggest that learning disabilities exist in varying degrees in children. While the milder learning disabilities may profit from the individualization of instruction in the regular classroom, the more severe problems require special remedial procedures. An extremely conservative estimate of the latter group would include 1 to 3 per cent of the total school population, according to the Report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped.

Regardless of which guesstimate you elect to use in your program, be assured that you will find that there are too many children with learning disabilities which require educational modifications to be served by special class placement, and to be individually diagnosed by trained specialists. This also suggests that speech correctionists will begin to become more directly involved in the limited disorder program. . . .

Dyslexia will be viewed as a sub-set of learning disabilities, not a distinct limited disorder. Severely disabled readers will be programmed just as severely disabled learners of any other type. It is probable that remedial reading populations are now made up of some children who have special learning disabilities and some whose failure to learn is due to causes outside of the child. Thus, care will need to be taken by administrators to avoid duplication of services, without cutting out needed services to children with corrective reading problems. It is probably safe to say that the current practice of some districts of having parallel programs serving the same child will be discontinued.

It seems well within the realm of probability that the National Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders will, in their final report due in June, help to clarify the relationship between limited disorders and dyslexia, thus providing a base for better articulation between reading specialists and limited disorder specialists at the National, State, University and Public School levels. Learning disabilities may be the bridge which will increase communication and articulation between elementary education and special education, since most children with special learning disabilities will *not* need a self-contained special class, but will remain in a regular class for part of the day.

The current furor over "an IQ of average or above" seems quite likely to dissipate rather quickly, as psychologists and educators continue their disenchantment with the IQ as a measure of functions in children. We are now aware that IQ's in many children respond to programs aimed at training intelligence, and are unstable enough to warrant careful matching to performance in and out of the classrooms. The number of hours of expensive professional time being wasted on trying to decide whether a child with an IQ of 79-81 is mentally retarded with a learning disability or merely a Limited Disorder should reduce sharply, as classes for mentally retarded children begin to individualize instruction and utilize the concepts of clinical teaching commonly found in Learning Disability classes.

In the immediate future, I predict that little or no valuable time will be wasted trying to decide whether a child is primarily emotionally disturbed or learning disabled. In the normal school population, the child with a learning disability will stick out like a sore thumb. The fact that he also has emotional problems is *given*. Psychotic, schizophrenic, and autistic children will also stick out like sore thumbs, and obviously need to be programmed differently than the child with minor adjustment problems. Between these two extremes lies a large group of

conduct problems—learning disabled children who can profit from a carefully structured, purposeful, learning-focused classroom atmosphere, regardless of the label for the condition. . . .

. . . I am indebted to Dr. Samuel Kirk, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped and Dr. Masland, Director of National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness, for confirming some of my ideas about the future of learning disabilities in the speeches they made at the recent Association for Children with Learning Disabilities Conference in Fort Worth. I am also indebted to Alice Thompson for sharing some of her ideas in a paper she presented to the California Council for Administrators of Special Education group last year. By pooling these expert opinions, I have gathered the courage to make some predictions about the future:

(1) I predict that special learning disabilities will continue to gain prestige as a respected category of special education.

As learning disabilities stabilizes, so should those areas which seem to be clouding the picture at the present time: language problems, aphasia, dyslexia, remedial reading, slow learners, and some emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded children.

It seems quite clear that the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped definition includes children with developmental aphasia.

Thus, a district with a program for children with learning disabilities would automatically include aphasic children in such a program.

You will also find that learning disabilities come in all shapes and sizes. The varying degrees of learning disabilities in children requires varying degrees of intensity of service in the schools. To describe an "exemplary program" for all children with learning disabilities, as if any one type program will serve all children, is to oversimplify an extremely complex problem.

(2) My second prediction involves a proliferation of new programs and services for children with special learning disorders. Pressure from parents will continue to keep pace with the demands of society. As administrators it is urgent that you come to grips with some of the pressure points involved in the program, and plan carefully to avoid the booby traps. By all means plan programs of varying degrees of intensity to match the varying degrees of severity of learning disabilities in the children. You will need (1) consultants to regular classroom teachers, either on an itinerant basis or on a one consultant per building basis; (2) You will need some resource room teachers, where children are bussed to the school to spend a portion of each day in the regular class and a portion in the special class; (3) You will need some self-contained classes for the most severely involved children where the major focus is on behavior management, not on the learning problem itself. The emphasis in the self-contained classroom should be on return to a resource room program in the school where the child "belongs in" since research and experience indicates that the farther a child is removed from the normal educational program, the more difficult it becomes to return him to the mainstream. Major emphasis needs to be placed on the individualization of instruction for most children with learning disorders within the regular classroom. . . .

. . . By the same token—the best prevalence figures we have suggest that most districts would have enough children to start a class in their own district, rather than as part of a joint agreement or cooperative arrangement. . . . It may be necessary to provide diagnostic services on a cooperative

basis, but major emphasis on programs needs to be placed at the local district on local building level. The ramifications for pre-service and in-service training are monumental. We need to work toward a drastic change in attitude on the part of regular classroom teachers from the current "He doesn't belong in my class" to an attitude of "What can I do to help him?"

(3) My third prediction in answer to where are we going involves early identification of these high-risk children, and a complete change in attitude toward our interest in and responsibility for pre-school children. There is no question that these children can be identified in kindergarten. Many of them could be identified and served at four. The current trend toward mandatory education at age three is one that I believe will continue to gain support at all levels. Impetus for this will come from the one hundred demonstration programs funded under Public Law 90-538, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act.

If you do not have a program, I heartily recommend that you start with early identification and programming at the kindergarten or first grade level. This is a difficult place to start, since awareness of failure on the part of the child has not yet hit his parents or his teachers. You will also be fighting a large segment of kindergarten teachers who still subscribe to the "leave them alone and they'll come home" philosophy. At the very least, begin to reexamine your entrance policies for high risk children and design a program to serve them rather than sending them home for another year in an environment which already has them behind their peers.

(4) My fourth prediction involves the relationship between learning capabilities and cultural deprivation—or between special education and compensatory education, if you will. We have already excluded culturally deprived children from the learning disability population by definition, but this does not solve the practical problems for you. I am not too hopeful that learning disability concepts are going to have a great deal of impact on the problems of the culturally deprived. I am quite convinced that the answers to these problems will need to encompass total societal involvement, of which special education is a small part. There is no question that massive changes must take place in the community, in the home, and in the school system before we begin to find answers to these learning problems. But let us not fail to provide for the smaller number of children with special learning disability of unknown etiology, while we wait for answers to the much larger problem of cultural deprivation.

(5) My fifth prediction involves our current concept of the diagnostic process. At the present time diagnosis is primitive, time-consuming, expensive, and fraught with problems of validity and reliability. Our instruments for diagnosis and prediction are at best rudimentary. Test constructors will continue in their efforts to provide valid micro-scope measures of cognition. As psychologists become more disenchanted with the traditional tools of their trade and as a new breed of psychologists replaces those left over from the Rorschach days of their Veterans Administration Training, you will begin to see more creative use of some of the good diagnostic instruments available to your school psychologists.

(6) My sixth prediction involves remedial methods. We seem to have tried all the global approaches to remediation that can be conceived. Now we are ready to begin differentiating the teaching methods so that we will see the emergence of real clinical teaching, where the goal is a precise match between the cognitive style of the learner and the cogni-

tive demands of the task. We will be seeing emphasis placed on the diagnostic role of the teacher, as well as the training of specialists who are both psychoeducators, diagnosticians, and clinical teachers.

In the foreseeable future I suspect that neuropsychologists will be able to tell us something meaningful about the chemistry of learning in human children. At the present time, they are quite knowledgeable about earthworms, or rats, or pigeons, and even chimpanzees, but not about children. I am not willing to sit around and wait for the "pill" which will prove to be the panacea that will solve all of the problems of children who do not learn. In the meantime I hope that you will be as aware as I that children who do not learn, do not do so for an infinite variety of reasons. For some of these it is because of a special learning disability. For these, we can and should provide special educational programs.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF JEANNE M'RAE M'CARNEY

Educational background

- I. Ph. D. University of Illinois, 1965.
Major area of Concentration: The Administration of Special Education Programs.
Minor Area of Concentration: Psychology.
Thesis—The Psycholinguistic Development of Mongoloid and Non-Mongoloid Severely Retarded Children.
- II. Master of Arts—Loyola University, Chicago, 1951.
Major: Clinical Psychology.
- III. Baccalaureate—Barat College, Lake Forest, Illinois, 1944.
Major: Psychology.
Minor: Education.

Professional experiences

- I. U.S. Office of Education Fellow—University of Illinois, 1960-62; U.S. Office of Education Consultant—1967, 1968.
- II. Associate Professor, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Director of the Learning Disabilities Program—1968 to present.
Visiting Instructor—Summer Sessions: West Texas State University, Texas Christian University, Georgia State College, University of Wyoming, Boston University, Iowa State University, University of Virginia, University of Kansas, University of Arizona, San Francisco State University, Ball State University.
Graduate Extension Division, University of Illinois.
- III. Public School Experience:
Niles Township Department of Special Education: School Psychologist, Director of Special Education.
Glenview, Illinois: Director of Pupils Personnel Services.
Schaumburg District 54, Hoffman Estates, Illinois: Director of Special Services.
- IV. Clinical Psychological Experience:
Loyola Center for Guidance and Psychological Services, Chicago, Illinois.
Wichita Guidance Center, Wichita, Kansas.
Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana.
Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, Illinois, Consultant in Learning Disabilities.
- V. Research:
Project Director—Research and Demonstration Project—1966 to the present; "A Public School Program of Remediation for Children with Severe Learning Disabilities"—Public Law 88-164.
- VI. Professional Organizations: APA, IPA, CEC, ICEC, AAMD, NEA, IEA.
CEC—Vice President: Division of Children with Learning Disabilities (1968-69) President Elect (1969-70).
ACLD—Advisory Board (1967-present); 1967 Conference Planning Committee, Educational Advisor; 1968 4th Annual Conference Planning Committee; 1969 5th Annual Conference Planning Committee; Recipient of President's Award (1969).

JULES VERNE'S SPACE PREDICTIONS WERE AMAZINGLY ACCURATE: WEST VIRGINIAN CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE FOR MOON TRIP

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the past week the attention of the world has been riveted on the heavens where three Americans are engaging in one of the greatest adventures of all time.

The courage, daring, and resourcefulness of the American astronauts is beyond compare. Their journey to the moon is the culmination of many years of work and study by untold thousands of talented and dedicated people. Among those who made their own contributions to the conquest of space is Col. Charles Yeager, a West Virginian who in 1947 became the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound and later broke other barriers in the knowledge of high-speed flight. Such ventures into the unknown were part of the accumulation of experience and information that made the moon landing possible.

The trip to the moon is surely a mighty technological and engineering achievement. It is also one that has captured the emotions and imagination of mankind, just as the thought of flying to the moon has for centuries been a preoccupation of dreamers and poets as well as of scientists.

Some of the most vivid speculation about space flight was provided in the 19th century by Jules Verne, whose stories remain today a model for science fiction writing. His predictions about the methods of conquering space have proved to be incredibly accurate as the dream turned into reality just 2 days ago.

Just how accurate Verne's forecasts were is shown in an article written by Associated Press writer Harry Rosenthal and published in the *Huntington, W. Va. Herald-Advertiser* of July 20, 1969. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

MOON FLIGHT: JULES VERNE HAD IT ALMOST 104 YEARS AGO

(By Harry Rosenthal)

CAPE KENNEDY, Fla.—"In America," wrote French novelist Jules Verne, "all is easy, all is simple . . . a thing with them is no sooner said than done." And then, 104 years before Apollo 11, Verne proceeded with phenomenal accuracy to describe America's trip to the moon.

"Such a journey must be made sooner or later" said a Verne character in "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865.

In the classic, Verne described how President Impey Barbicane of the Baltimore Gun Club proposed building a giant cannon—Columbiad—and sending a projectile to the "queen of night." It was to be a "cylindrical shape" of aluminum, 15 feet high and 9 feet in diameter.

(The Apollo 11 command module, nick-

named Columbiad after Verne's book, is cone-shaped, made of aluminum alloy, 10 feet 7 inches high, and 12 feet 10 inches in diameter.)

"Figures impossible to gainsay have convinced me that any projectile starting with an initial velocity of 12,000 yards a second and shot in the direction of the moon must surely and necessarily reach her," said Barbicane.

(Says the Apollo 11 press kit; "Midway through the second revolution in earth parking orbit, the S-4B third-stage engine will restart. The velocity will increase . . . to 35,533 feet per second.")

"An important question was that of choosing the ground where the great experiment was to be made," Verne wrote. A spot in Florida, near the 27th degree North latitude, called Stone Hill, was selected as the ground . . ."

(Cape Canaveral, on the East coast of Florida near 28 degrees latitude—not more than 150 miles east of "Stone Hill"—was announced Aug. 24, 1961, as the spot from which America would launch her moon men.)

The Columbiad, 900 feet long, got its crew when a Frenchman, Michael Ardan, demanded permission to be enclosed so he could be carried to the moon. He persuaded both Barbicane and a Capt. Nicholl to join him.

On Dec. 1, precisely on schedule, the cannon was fired.

"An appalling, unearthly report followed instantly, such as can be compared to nothing whatever known, not even to the roar of thunder, or the blast of volcanic explosions," Verne wrote. "An immense spout of fire shot up from the bowels of the earth as from a crater . . . with great difficulty some few spectators obtained a momentary glimpse of the projectile victoriously cleaving the air in the midst of the fiery vapors."

In Verne's vision, weightlessness was "the realm of the marvelous, they felt that their bodies were absolutely without weight, their arms fully extended, no longer sought their sides . . . their feet no longer rested on the floor. In their efforts to hold themselves straight, they looked like drunken men trying to maintain the perpendicular."

(Said astronauts Thomas Stafford after Apollo 10: "It feels good to me." "You can do everything so effortless." And fellow astronaut John Young added: "It's really an enjoyable and exhilarating experience to literally be able to do everything with your fingertips.")

After five days, the gun club's passengers whipped around the moon—because of an aiming error. "The lunar disk struck the travelers as glittering with a splendor and purity of light that they had never witnessed before."

(Cernan reported: "There are significant colors of browns in the moon, light browns, the blackest blacks that we've ever seen, the whitest whites that we've ever seen.")

"Candidly and truly speaking, never before had mortal eye revealed on such a scene of stary splendor," wrote Verne.

(Said Cernan: "It's really a very fascinating landscape. You see something new every pass you make, your eyes don't have the capability to gather in all the information that's there.")

The nearer the travelers approached the lunar surface, said Verne, "the drearier, the more inhospitable and the more unearthly everything seemed to look."

(Said Frank Borman after Apollo 8 flew around the moon last Christmas: "My own impression is that it's a vast, lonely, forbidding type existence or expanse of nothing. It looks like clouds and clouds of pumice stone and it certainly would not be a very inviting place to live or work.")

Verne's version: "Wrinkled, pitted, knotted, furrowed, scarred, the surface of the moon looked like an immense battle field."

(Said William Anders who flew with Borman: "You can see by the numerous craters that this planet has been bombarded through the eons with numerous small asteroids and meteorites pockmarking the surface every square inch.")

Verne wrote of the lunar sunrise as "gilding the summits of the mountains on the moon's rim."

(Said Anders: "These in particular bring out the stark nature of the terrain and the long shadows really bring out the relief that is here and hard to see at this very bright surface.")

Verne's crew splashed down in the Pacific Ocean, near the USS *Susquehanna*.

"Who can describe the welcome that greeted these long lost, beloved sons of earth now . . . rescued . . . and restored . . . to the wonderstricken eyes of admiring humanity," Verne wrote.

He added in an epilogue: "If we reflect a moment on the audacious goaheadiveness of the Yankee we shall easily conclude that the American people will never rest quietly until they have pushed to its last result and to every logical consequence the astounding step so daringly conceived and so wonderfully carried out."

And 97 years later, John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, stood in Rice Stadium in Houston and said:

"No man can fully grasp how far and how fast we have come. The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join it or not. It is one of the great adventures of all time and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in the race for space."

THE ROTC

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of our Reserve Officers training program on our college campuses, I am disturbed by the vocal opposition to the program from many people. Mr. K. L. Lott of Mobile, a former ROTC officer and past president of the Auburn University Alumni Association, has sent me a fine editorial on this subject which appeared in the July issue of *Nation's Business* magazine. This editorial expresses many of my own sentiments about ROTC, and I include it in the RECORD so that our colleagues may read it also:

WHO ARE THE VICTIMS?

(By Alden H. Sypher)

The easiest explanation of the campaign to drive the United States armed forces officer training programs off some of the nation's campuses is that it is part of a spontaneous revolt against war by students.

That probably is the farthest from the truth of any possible interpretation.

There's been no popular revolt against the ROTC on any campus, as far as news reports have revealed. The demand originates among a few bearded activists whose purpose is not change, but turmoil.

Although the apparent intent is to deny training facilities for the officer corps, that's hardly a likely goal. If it is, the drive is failing. As Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird points out, more schools are adding ROTC programs than are dropping them. And there's a list of schools waiting to sign up.

Among officials in Washington who study such things, some see a pattern of organization behind the campaign.

If they are right, the strategists who laid out and direct the movement must be well aware of that waiting list, and of the fact they could accomplish little in the way of diminishing training facilities available to the armed forces.

Which suggests another and more serious purpose: To bring disrepute to all of America's armed forces and defense efforts by creating such contempt for the ROTC as a foul and vile thing that it is driven from such newsworthy campuses as Harvard's.

Who's doing the driving?

The Washington officials who see organization in the campaign attribute its origin to the communists' over-all strategy for war in Viet Nam and peace negotiations in Paris.

They see it as one of the many projects being used to hack away at American power and prestige that could be used against them in Da Nang or Paris.

This interpretation is spoken off the record. Washington is concerned about the political popularity of such a position these days, and concerned about the backlash possibilities of a witch-hunt tag.

Whether they're right or wrong in their assumptions, the action on a sampling of the nation's campuses must please Ho Chi Minh much more than it could comfort President Nixon or Ambassador Lodge.

In any case, expulsion of the ROTC either by direct methods or by denying credit for its courses cannot be attributed to students. They haven't the authority necessary to abrogate a contract between the school and a branch of the armed services.

Faculties make such decisions. Even those members who don their beads and join with minority activists in screaming obscenities at the police during scheduled campus confrontations usually have full voting power on decisions that determine the policies and practices in the schools. There is the leadership supporting self-righteous young radicals who try to break down democracy by force.

This is the traditional faculty power brought to this country from Europe, along with the concept that a campus offers sanctuary from the police—an idea hardly valid on many campuses today since it stems from the times when schools were branches of the church.

Even the yards of those schools still connected with churches hardly seem proper sanctuaries for those who burn buildings and screech four-letter epithets at policemen and presidents alike.

Who are the victims of this drive against military training on college campuses?

Everyone in the country would be, if the campaigns were successful, for the effectiveness of the nation's defense forces depends on the effectiveness of the officer corps.

The service schools at Annapolis, West Point and Colorado Springs are far from big enough to produce all the officers required. The Army depends on the college training program for half its commissioned officers. A third of the Navy's officers and 30 per cent of Air Force officers come from the civilian schools.

There are no plans for expanding service schools to take over the entire training load. Armed services under civilian top command and sensitive to civilian attitudes need a large part of their leadership trained in a civilian environment.

So there will be continued dependence on colleges and universities to turn out Army, Navy and Air Force officers.

The more immediate victims of the drive are the particularly able young men who have won Navy scholarships through competitive examinations, and had chosen to go to schools that recently have terminated their ROTC agreements, or have changed

their minds about giving credit for ROTC courses.

Among the latter group is Harvard, which made an agreement with the Navy in 1926. It lasted until this year when a few Harvard students not in the program instigated demands that military training be denied the entire student body.

Thus motivated, the faculty passed a resolution recommending that credit be withheld from students in military classes, and that all such classes be considered extra-curricular. The administration acquiesced.

The direct victims are 21 outstanding high school graduates who won full Navy scholarships, and had chosen to go to Harvard. Because of the conditions imposed by Harvard, these young men were told by the Navy to choose other schools. Such Navy scholarships are among the best offered by any institution. They include full tuition, book costs, and a \$50 a month allowance. More than half the Navy's nearly 10,000 ROTC students in 54 colleges and universities are on full scholarships won in competitive examinations.

In setting up conditions the Navy decided it could not meet, Harvard was well within its rights. It is a private school. But its administration must feel a public responsibility in view of the vastness of its endowment, its magnificent plant, its stature as America's oldest institution of higher learning.

Harvard's library, for example, with more than 7.6 million volumes and an annual expenditure rate of \$7 million, is exceeded in size in this nation only by the Library of Congress and the New York City library system.

Harvard has 150,000 more books than the entire collection in the Air Force system with its 667 worldwide library locations.

Harvard's endowment is more than \$600 million, the largest of any school in the country. That's slightly more than \$40,000 for each of its 15,000 students. At 5 per cent interest it would produce more than \$2,000 a year per student.

Yet, at \$2,000, Harvard's tuition is in the top bracket among the nation's universities. All this indicates the quality of education that may be offered at Harvard, including a faculty nearly half the size of the student body—a teacher-student ratio of nearly 1 to 2.

This is a faculty denied the most promising young men the Navy could find, because the university administration broke a 43-year-old agreement by approving a faculty recommendation that followed the strident demands of a small minority of Harvard students militantly against the military.

The Brown University faculty, also nearly half the size of the student body, made a similar recommendation under like circumstances.

Brown's president, Dr. Ray Lorenzo Heffner, didn't accept his faculty's decision. He is said to have assured the Navy the existing agreement would be honored.

Faculty reaction to this is said to be one of the reasons Dr. Heffner resigned to return to teaching at the University of Iowa.

Altogether this is a small thing from the services' point of view, measured against the 260,000 students enrolled in Army, Navy and Air Force programs in colleges and universities across the nation.

But it does bring up the question:

Who's doing the driving?

Is student power so tremendous that faculties and administrators must bow to the demands of a few aggressive bigots who seek—too often successfully—to deny freedom of choice to the great majority?

Is the problem accurately analyzed by faculty and students at Amherst, who took two days off for discussion, and concluded that what's wrong on campuses can be cured only by the White House, since the problems are war, poverty and racial repression?

Or do we just need strength and resolution at the top?

S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president who met student disruptions at San Francisco State College head-on, has become so popular in California that only Gov. Reagan could beat him in an election today, according to a survey.

In a democracy there's always a chance that the people are right.

U.S. COMMITMENTS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial captioned "Our Commitments Require It," published in the Northern Virginia Daily of July 18. The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is J. J. Crawford.

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

OUR COMMITMENTS REQUIRE IT

Speaking on behalf of the military procurement bill, Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. had some wise counsel for those members of the Senate who would use the debate on the bill as another springboard for criticism of Pentagon judgment, for propagandizing opposition to the Vietnam war, and for attacking the Defense Department generally.

The outgoing Administration of President Johnson had recommended a \$23 billion authorization. President Nixon reduced the authorization to \$22 billion. After long deliberation, the Senate Committee on Armed Services recommends a further reduction of \$2 billion, which would make the total authorization for military procurement, missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tanks and research, \$20 billion.

Sen. Byrd spoke in support of the Committee's recommended reduction describing it as a fully realistic and justifiable cut which can be achieved by more efficiency, and without "jeopardizing our national security." But, here the senator would stop. He apparently regards further tampering with the Department of Defense's estimate of requirements as dangerous.

Sen. Byrd's reasons are primarily two-fold. First of all, reason dictates that the strategic advantage long held by the United States, and which is now beginning to disappear, be maintained. We cannot second guess the intentions of the Soviet Union. The senator put it this way:

"The entire strategic concept upon which the United States has been relying to avert a nuclear war is that the United States be so strong that any foreign power deploying missiles against us would know that we could retaliate by destroying him who struck the first blow."

Secondly, there is the worldwide responsibility imposed by the mutual defense agreements which the U.S. has with 44 countries. Here, again, Sen. Byrd's reasoning was sound:

"We have guaranteed the security, insofar as foreign aggression is concerned, of 21 Latin American nations; we have guaranteed the security of 15 West European nations; we have mutual defense agreements with Vietnam, and Thailand, and with Australia and New Zealand; we have guaranteed the security of Free China, and the Philippines and Japan.

"So I say the United States is in a difficult and awkward position. We have over-extended ourselves militarily and financially.

"But until major reappraisals are made in our foreign policies—and until effective arrangements for arms controls can be worked out with the Soviet Union—the United States has no recourse except to appropriate large sums of money for the national defense."

We agree with Sen. Byrd, there is no alternative.

SEQUEL

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Hamburger Hill is a familiar and poignant term to many, many Americans. Some of our very finest young men gave their lives there.

But as a specific place, it is more than a familiar term to Charles Black, of the Columbus Enquirer, for he has a personal intimacy with Vietnam, its people, its geography, and its direction, which is equaled by few people. His comments have the ring of factual authority and I commend the perspective of the within article to my colleagues:

QUESTION FOR PUBLIC: WHAT HAPPENED AFTER HAMBURGER HILL FUROR?

(By Charles Black)

Television commentators last week were wisely talking about a slowdown allegedly ordered by President Nixon in our Vietnam military efforts and saying that it came because of that horrendous "Hamburger Hill" criticism a while back.

They would have to say that, of course, or the code of controversy in news wouldn't be served properly, but let all of that go by and consider something else.

What finally happened in Ashau Valley?

No, you tell me first.

You are the one who hung on every word from Kennedy or Cronkite or the guy across the country while that was going on. You are the one who was kept on easy chair edge every evening for weeks thereafter as the big question of "another Hamburger Hill?" was filling its appointed spot in the evening news schedule.

You certainly were interested enough in what had happened, what was happening, and what was going to happen then, weren't you?

All right, you tell me what finally happened.

What have you heard about Ashau Valley lately? After all of your interest and curiosity was whetted, after you were belted by that political barrage, after Ashau Valley had served its domestic political purpose—what happened finally?

If not knowing doesn't make you feel cheated; if not knowing the final fate of our military operations in Ashau Valley doesn't demonstrate once and for all the fine relationship between Kennedy politics and a huge percentage of the purveyors of mass audience information; then you deserve just what is done to you every night in the week where this war in Vietnam is concerned.

Or is it true that you really do want to know facts?

If true, then here is what happened in Ashau Valley after the television cameras pulled out and the politicians moved on, leaving the GIs behind:

Through June 25, Operation Kentucky Jumper killed 1,324 North Vietnamese and captured 1,411 individual weapons; Operation Lamar Plain killed 294 enemies and captured 78 weapons; and on June 8, a third operation called Montgomery Rendezvous was started which by July 7 had found slight resistance but had killed 132 enemies and captured 64 weapons.

That last operation—all involved the 101st Airborne Division now commanded by Maj. Gen. John M. Wright—is still going.

The 3rd Squadron 5th Armored Cavalry, with Lt. Col. Thomas E. Carpenter III, Miami, Fla., its commander, riding in the lead armor personnel carrier, left Fire Base Blase at 7:30 a.m. June 20 and seven hours later brought the first road convoy of 80 vehicles safely into the new U.S. air strip a mile north of Ta Bat in the middle of Ashau Valley.

On that strip, built by the 326th Engineer Battalion, the first Caribou transport planes landed June 30. Supplies are coming into the place by land and air while paratroopers operate to keep it clear of enemy.

On July 4, Co. D, 1st Bn, 502nd Airborne, celebrated by painting a pole red, white and blue and mounting it across the old North Vietnamese highway from Laos with a sign on it "pay toll here." The G.I.'s call that North Vietnamese road, which all during 1967 supplied every enemy attack in I Corps, the "Yellow Brick Road."

That's what happened afterwards in Ashau Valley. We own it. Not that you're interested in such things of course, there being no argument over something like that.

THE EDUCATION OF SECRETARY ROGERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very timely editorial discussing the frustrating and objective education being acquired by Secretary of State Rogers in the realities of foreign affairs was carried in the Monday, July 21, Chicago Tribune.

In view of the fact that the Soviets are increasing their doubletalk and maneuvering and as usual find a naive audience in the West for their lures, this factual commentary merits review.

The editorial follows:

THE EDUCATION OF SECRETARY ROGERS

When William P. Rogers, a lawyer, was appointed secretary of state in President Nixon's cabinet, he had no special qualifications for the job. The generally accepted explanation was that Mr. Nixon intended to be his own secretary of state and wanted a trusted friend to serve as a front man.

Some of the new secretary's remarks on the Viet Nam war were ambiguous, and this raised doubts among the hardliners, as well as hopes among the advocates of a sellout, about the Nixon administration's intentions. In testifying before the House Foreign Affairs committee Thursday, however, Mr. Rogers demonstrated that his education in the problems of war and peace and negotiations with Communists is progressing satisfactorily.

The United States and South Viet Nam have made concession after concession to try to break the stalemate in the Paris peace talks, Rogers said. "The only reaction we get from the other side," he added, "is totally negative. They call names and use phrases

like swindle and fraud. All they've been is more intransigent, more unreasonable, more inhumane."

There was never any excuse for expecting any different reaction from the Communists. There are hundreds of captured enemy documents in which Hanoi's masters have boasted of their determination to "fight and negotiate" until the American people are so sick and tired of the war and its dreadful cost in lives and money that the United States will pull out.

The Johnson administration put the United States in this terrible dilemma when it resolved to wage a "limited war" for goals that did not include military victory. The Communists are not fighting a limited war. Their minimum objective is South Viet Nam. All military history proves, as Gen. MacArthur said, that in war there is no substitute for victory. The best recent example of ending a war by winning it was Israel's crushing defeat of the Arab states in six days in 1967. The most recent example is the cease-fire agreed to Thursday by Honduras and El Salvador after only three days of fighting. El Salvador, which has a larger army, invaded Honduras, and the Hondurans quickly agreed to a cease-fire.

The United States would have won the war in Viet Nam by destroying North Viet Nam's warmaking capacity in 1965, and more than 30,000 American lives would have been saved, if the politicians in Washington had listened to the military leaders.

BE A GOOD GUY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is too often the case nowadays that our local police forces are more remembered for what they do wrong than for the many things they do right in protecting our communities and maintaining justice in them.

In Miami, Fla., a program was recently started to promote better relations between the police department and local schoolchildren. This effort, originated by Mr. Bill Winn, a dedicated police officer of the Miami Police Department, is known as the "be a good guy" program.

Officer Winn instigated his campaign in the hopes of establishing a better rapport and respect between young children and police officers. Under the program, two officers in uniform, one black and one white, tour all the elementary schools within the city of Miami. As they tour, they issue pins to all the schoolchildren urging them to "be a good guy" and discussing with them the requirements for "good guys."

Mr. Winn, a member of the force for 14 years, was recently honored for his efforts in fostering better community relations. On May 22, he received the Good Newsmakers Award from a local television station—WTVJ. The award was presented by the station's executive vice president, Mr. Ralph Renick.

Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure, I would like to call to the attention of my honorable colleagues, the presentation of this award to Officer Winn and to commend him and his colleagues on the

Miami police force for their fine efforts. At the same time, I would hope that other police departments around the Nation take notice of this fine effort.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT DECISION ON
PUBLIC HOUSING

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently a decision affecting public housing in Chicago was rendered by U.S. District Judge Richard Austin, which I believe will create very serious problems in meeting the housing needs of America.

I can fully sympathize with efforts by the court to prevent a repetition of concentration of huge public housing projects such as we witness today along the entire route of the Dan Ryan Expressway in Chicago, commonly known as Dan Ryan Village.

I am mindful of the court's attempt to desegregate public housing in keeping with the Civil Rights Act but in so doing, well meaning as the decision may be, it will, in my opinion, seriously impede the building of public housing in this country.

While this decision is directed at the Chicago Housing Authority and affects only public housing in Chicago and Cook County, it may very well turn out to be a landmark decision which will affect all public housing throughout the United States.

In my judgment, if the provisions of this decision become applicable on a nationwide basis, two fundamental consequences will follow: First, local communities just will not get engaged in public housing development projects; and second, Congress itself will undoubtedly seriously curtail appropriations for public housing.

This decision fundamentally provides seven major points. These are as follows:

First. The next 700 dwelling units to be built by the Chicago Housing Authority must be in basically white Chicago neighborhoods.

Second. Chicago Housing Authority must design each project for no more than 120 persons, or 240 at the most if it can't build the smaller design.

Third. The Chicago Housing Authority should not begin construction on any housing unit until not less than 700 dwelling units in predominantly white Chicago neighborhoods are started.

Fourth. Three-fourths of all future public housing built after today must be located in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Fifth. No public housing dwelling units shall be built in any census tract if such Chicago Housing Authority facilities would amount to more than 15 percent of available housing.

Sixth. No dwelling units shall be provided above the third floor in any structure except for families without children.

Seventh. Not more than 50 percent of the dwelling units in all public housing projects shall be made available to eligible neighborhood residents.

On the surface, this opinion would seem to aid the underprivileged people of this country who desperately need housing. But as a practical proposition, it will actually bring to a serious halt much of the public housing now scheduled for Chicago.

I am today including in my remarks the text of Judge Austin's decision and I am also including a memorandum from the United States prepared by the Housing and Urban Development Agency which had been asked by Judge Austin to prepare its views on his proposed order.

I am also including an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News which generally supports the decision, but which also quite properly points out the problem it will create.

I believe the HUD memorandum, while basically supporting Judge Austin's motives and desires to desegregate public housing in Chicago, to some degree sustains some of the questions properly raised by the Chicago Daily News editorial.

While I can appreciate Judge Austin's interpretation of the law in requiring that hereafter three out of four public housing units must be built in white communities, I believe one cannot ignore the very cogent observation of the Daily News editorial on this subject.

The Daily News editorial states:

As a matter of fact, Judge Austin's ruling may observe the letter of the law, but it fails to accommodate the facts of human nature that the CHA and the aldermen must live with. One salient fact is that a white neighborhood subjected to forced, substantial dilution with blacks frequently reacts with a sense of panic that is next to impossible to calm with appeals to reason. Racial tensions set in, and mount. Over the long run, the neighborhood tends to become all-black as the whites grudgingly retreat and finally flee.

I believe a careful reading of the HUD memorandum will sustain my own position that well meaning as the judge's order may be, it will not serve the housing needs of our community.

The city of Chicago now has 2,000 public housing units scheduled for construction in four model cities target areas.

Under Judge Austin's order, we would have to build more than 6,000 public housing units outside the model cities target areas before we can proceed with the 2,000 units in the model cities target areas.

The judge's order further provides that no housing project can have more than 24 units. This means that for the city of Chicago to build 6,000 public housing units in white communities, the city would have to find almost 250 individual sites for public housing construction in the white areas of Chicago for these 6,000 projects. Anyone who knows anything about availability of property for multiple-housing construction in the outlying areas of Chicago or in the suburbs will readily know that it is literally impossible to find 250 sites for public housing construction. In those areas where sites might be available for this type of

construction, the cost of land is so prohibitive that HUD could never agree to pay such prices for public housing sites.

The HUD memorandum itself states:

1. The 75 Percent-25 Percent Requirement: It is impossible to evaluate the workability of the basic 75 percent-25 percent requirement of the proposed Order. It will require the location of many sites in an area where site availability is still an unknown factor. To the extent that there may be difficulties in obtaining sites and getting production in the "General" area, the formula would impose another restriction on a program which is already failing to make available sufficient public housing to families in non-white areas, or indeed to any of the poor families in Chicago. The necessity for dispersion and a balanced distribution of public housing in the City must somehow be reconciled with the need for accelerated response to the housing needs of persons in the "non-white" and buffer areas.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these documents for the RECORD today because I think it is important for Members to have the fullest opportunity to review these historic decisions.

I sincerely hope that the judge will amend his order and exclude model cities and urban renewal areas from its provisions.

There is no question in my mind that the model cities program will permit orderly development of integrated communities in large sections of our cities.

The model cities program offers the greatest hope of saving the large cities of America and for that reason it would be my hope the judge would carefully consider an amendment to his order. Fortunately, and this is a tribute to Judge Austin's sincerity and integrity, he has left the order open-ended so that amendments are in order.

Judge Austin's order, the HUD memorandum, and the editorial follows:

[U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division]

DOROTHY GAUTREAU, ODELL JONES, DOREATHA E. CRENCHEW, EVA RODGERS, JAMES RODGERS, ROBERT M. FAIRFAX AND JIMMIE JONES, PLAINTIFFS, v. THE CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY, A CORPORATION, AND C. E. HUMPHREY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEFENDANTS
(Civil action No. 66 C 1459)

JUDGMENT ORDER

This matter coming on to be heard pursuant to this Court's Memorandum Opinion of February 10, 1969, and Orders entered on such date denying defendants' motions for summary judgment, denying plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment as to Count II of the Complaint, and granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment as to Count I of the Complaint, and

The Court having conferred with counsel for the parties and having determined that the several provisions of this judgment order are necessary to prohibit the future use and to remedy the past effects of the defendant Chicago Housing Authority's unconstitutional site selection and tenant assignment procedures, to the end that plaintiffs and the class of persons represented by them, Negro tenants of and applicants for public housing in Chicago, shall have the full equitable relief to which they are entitled,

It is hereby ordered:

- I. For purposes of this judgment order,
 - A. "CHA" shall mean the defendant, Chicago Housing Authority.
 - B. "Dwelling Unit" shall mean an apartment or single family residence which is to

be initially made available to and occupied by a low-income, non-elderly family, subsequent to the date hereof, directly or indirectly by or through CHA, whether in a structure owned in whole or in part by CHA (whether or not newly constructed) or to be otherwise made available for occupancy by or through CHA to such a family. "Dwelling Units" include "Leased Dwelling Units" as hereinafter defined.

C. "Leased Dwelling Unit" shall mean a Dwelling Unit in a structure leased or partially leased by CHA from any person, firm or corporation.

D. "Limited Public Housing Area" shall mean that part of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois which lies either within census tracts of the United States Bureau of the Census having 30% or more non-white population, or within a distance of one mile from any point on the outer perimeter of any such census tract. "General Public Housing Area" shall mean the remaining part of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois. The terms "non-white" and "white" shall have the meaning given to such terms by the United States Bureau of the Census.

For purposes of this subsection D, results of the 1970 and each subsequent census taken by the United States Bureau of the Census shall presumptively determine the non-white population of census tracts until results of a subsequent such census are officially published; provided, that any party may, on motion, offer evidence as to the non-white population of any census tract for the purpose of rebutting such presumption; and provided further, that Dwelling units located or proposed to be located in any census tract subsequent to official publication of the results of the last previous such census shall be taken into account in determining the population of such census tract, and for such purpose it shall be assumed that such Dwelling Units will be occupied by non-whites at the rate of two persons per bedroom.

For the period from the date hereof until the official publication of such 1970 census results, the census tracts in the City of Chicago listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto, shall be presumed to have 30% or more non-white population; and, subject to evidence offered on motion by either party, the non-white population of census tracts in the County of Cook outside of the City of Chicago shall be presumed to be as stated in the 1960 census of the United States Bureau of the Census.

E. "Public Housing Project" shall mean any thirteen or more Dwelling Units which are located (1) in the same structure, (2) on the same lot or parcel of real estate, or (3) on two or more lots or parcels of real estate which are contiguous to one another, or are separated only by streets, alleys, bodies of water, railroad tracks or the like.

II. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall not authorize, approve or implement any plan for Dwelling Units, nor shall CHA seek any approval or request or accept any assistance from any government agency with respect thereto (including without limitation approval of the acquisition of any interest in real estate), unless such plan affirmatively requires that,

A. All Dwelling Units provided for in such plan shall be located in conformity with the provisions of Article III hereof, and

B. The activities to be performed in order to render such Dwelling Units available for occupancy (whether construction, purchase, rehabilitation, leasing or otherwise) shall take place at such times as will result in the location of such Dwelling Units in conformity with the provisions of Article III hereof.

III. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall provide Dwelling Units as follows, and not otherwise:

A. The following Dwelling Units may be made available for occupancy without restriction imposed by this order:

(1) The 1458 Dwelling Units provided for by pending CHA projects I11. 2-27, 2-28 (exclusive of Dwelling Units proposed to be located at 70th and Harper streets in the City of Chicago), 2-32, 2-33, 2-51, 2-64, 2-69 and 2-74.

(2) Leased Dwelling Units (but not more than two per structure) which have been occupied for at least six months prior to CHA's leasing the same by tenants who continue in occupancy following CHA's leasing thereof.

B. CHA shall not commence or cause to be commenced the construction of any Dwelling Units, other than said 1458 Dwelling Units referred to in Subsection A of this Article III, until CHA shall have commenced or caused to be commenced, and shall be continuing or shall have completed, the construction of not less than 700 Dwelling Units located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago.

C. Subject to the provisions of Subsection E of this Article III, CHA shall not commence or cause to be commenced the construction of any Dwelling Units in any Limited Public Housing Area, other than said 1458 Dwelling Units referred to in Subsection A of this Article III, unless within three months following such commencement of construction at least 75% of the Dwelling Units on which CHA shall have commenced or caused to have commenced construction, and shall have continued or completed construction, since the commencement of construction of the last of the 700 Dwelling Units referred to in subsection B of this Article III shall have been located (at the time of commencement of construction thereof) in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago.

D. Subject to the provisions of subsection E of this Article III, no Leased Dwelling Unit shall be made available for occupancy in the Limited Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago (in addition to Leased Dwelling Units in such Area which are already occupied) unless, immediately following such occupancy, at least 75% of the Leased Dwelling Units then occupied are located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago; provided, that such number of Leased Dwelling Units located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago may be less than such 75% to the extent Dwelling Units other than Leased Dwelling Units have been occupied, or are under construction which is continuing, in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago in excess of the 75% minimum requirement of subsection C of Article III hereof.

E. Not more than 33 1/3% of the Dwelling Units required by subsection C of this Article III to be located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago, and not more than 33 1/3% of the Leased Dwelling Units required by subsection D of this Article III to be located in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago, may, at the option of CHA, be planned for and located in the General Public Housing Area of the County of Cook in the State of Illinois, outside of the City of Chicago, provided that (whether or not constructed by CHA) the same are made available for occupancy by CHA to, and are occupied by, residents of the City of Chicago who have applied for housing to CHA, and provided further that all such Dwelling Units comply with the provisions of Article IV of this order.

IV. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall not concentrate large numbers of Dwelling Units in or near a single location. Without limiting the foregoing, unless part of a development specifically designed to assist in achieving the purposes hereof as to which the Court by order shall have given its approval,

A. No Public Housing Project shall contain Dwelling Units designed for occupancy by more than 120 persons, except that if it is

impossible for CHA to provide within such limitation Dwelling Units which it is otherwise capable of providing, and if it will assist in achieving the purposes of this judgment order, a Public Housing Project may contain Dwelling Units designed for occupancy by not more than 240 persons.

B. No Dwelling Units shall be located in any census tract if, following such location, the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences theretofore made available to low-income, nonelderly families, directly or indirectly by or through CHA, in such census tract would constitute more than fifteen percent of the total number of apartments and single family residences in such census tract; and

C. No Dwelling Units shall be provided above the third story in any structure except for families without children and except Leased Dwelling Units in a structure in which the number of Dwelling Units aggregates no more than 20% of the total number of apartments in such structure.

V. Within 30 days following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs evidence that CHA has modified its tenant assignment policy, adopted by CHA Board Resolution No. 68-CHA-232, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, and its practices thereunder, to include all Leased Dwelling Units as a single "location" for the purposes thereof. Such policy and practices, as so modified, shall be applicable until the further order of this Court.

VI. Within 60 days following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs a tenant assignment plan. Such plan shall include, but need not be limited to, provisions having the following purpose and effect:

A. Such modifications, if any, shall be made in CHA's tenant assignment policy and practices as will assist in achieving the purposes of this judgment order.

B. New registrations on CHA's list of persons desiring housing (the "waiting list") shall be temporarily ended; a determination shall be made promptly as to which registrants remain eligible for and still desire public housing; intensive publicity shall then be employed in such manner as effectively to inform low-income families throughout the City of Chicago, including present CHA tenants, that substantial numbers of Dwelling Units will be made available in the General Public Housing Area of the City of Chicago pursuant to the provisions of this judgment order; and thereafter the "waiting list" shall be reopened to new registrants, including present CHA tenants who wish to apply for Dwelling Units in the General Public Housing Area.

C. Not more than 50% of the Dwelling Units in all Public Housing Projects shall be made available to eligible neighborhood residents, the remaining Dwelling Units to be made available for occupancy in accordance with subsection A of this Article VI.

D. Vacancies in CHA's Trumbull, Lathrop, Lawndale, and Bridgeport projects shall be filled in accordance with subsection A of this Article VI, except that such tenant assignment plan may contain provisions designed to assure that such projects do not become racially segregated.

E. Suitably detailed information shall be regularly filed with the Court and served upon counsel for the plaintiffs showing CHA's compliance with the provisions of this Article VI and such tenant assignment plan.

Following the filing and service of such tenant assignment plan the Court will enter such further order as it deems appropriate.

VII. Following the date of this judgment order CHA shall file with the Court and serve upon counsel for the plaintiffs, the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice, and the Regional

Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the following:

A. A statement of the following information respecting each location for one or more Dwelling Units, such statement to be filed and served not more than 10 days after any such location is approved by the Board of Commissioners of CHA (or by the appropriate CHA officer or employee with respect to any location not required to be approved by the Board of Commissioners) and prior to the formal submission thereof to any other government agency or official for consideration or action:

(1) a map showing boundaries, placement in relation to adjacent streets, and where available, street address;

(2) the area location (whether within the Limited or General Public Housing Area);

(3) the census tract number;

(4) the white and non-white population of such census tract;

(5) the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences theretofore made available to low-income, non-elderly families, directly or indirectly by or through CHA in such census tract;

(6) the aggregate number of apartments and single family residences in such census tract as reflected by the most recent census taken by the United States Bureau of the Census, supplemented by such information with respect thereto as is available to CHA from any other government agency or official (but the statement need not include such number if the number supplied with respect to the preceding paragraph (5) is zero);

(7) the total number of Dwelling Units proposed to be provided at such location;

(8) the number of structures, and the number of Dwelling Units in each, in which such Dwelling Units are proposed to be provided; and

(9) such additional data as will show that such proposed Dwelling Units will be made available for occupancy in conformity with the provisions of Articles III and IV hereof, including without limitation, in the event such proposed Dwelling Units would result in a Public Housing Project designed for occupancy by more than 120 persons, information showing that the provisions of subsection A of Article IV hereof have been met with respect to such Public Housing Project.

B. Statements setting forth any change in the information included under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (7), (8) or (9) in a statement filed and served pursuant to subsection A of this Article VII, and covering the period up to initial occupancy of all Dwelling Units at any location, such statements to be filed and served not more than 10 days after any such change occurs.

C. Statements covering the periods from the date hereof until December 31, 1969, and from the date hereof until the end of each calendar semi-annual period thereafter, containing such data as will show that (1) all plans for Dwelling Units during the period covered by such statements have been in conformity with the provisions of Article II hereof, and (2) all Dwelling Units provided during the period covered by such statements have been in conformity with the provisions of Articles III and IV hereof, such statements to be filed and served not more than twenty days after the end of each calendar semi-annual period beginning with such period ended December 31, 1969.

VIII. CHA shall affirmatively administer its public housing system in every respect (whether or not covered by specific provision of this judgment order) to the end of disestablishing the segregated public housing system which has resulted from CHA's unconstitutional site selection and tenant assignment procedures. Without limiting the foregoing,

A. CHA shall use its best efforts to increase the supply of Dwelling Units as rapidly as possible in conformity with the pro-

visions of this judgment order and shall take all steps necessary to that end, including making applications for allocations of federal funds and carrying out all necessary planning and development; and

B. CHA is hereby permanently enjoined from invidious discrimination on the basis of race in the conduct or operation of its public housing system, including without limitation the "pre-clearance procedure" described in the Court's Memorandum Opinion of February 10, 1933.

IV. This order shall be binding upon CHA, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and their successors, and upon those persons, including the members of the City Council of the City of Chicago, in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of this order by personal service or otherwise.

X. This Court retains jurisdiction of this matter for all purposes, including enforcement and the issuance, upon proper notice and motion, of orders modifying or supplementing the terms of this order upon the presentation of relevant information with respect to proposed developments designed by CHA alone or in combination with other private or public agencies to achieve results consistent with this order, material changes in conditions existing at the time of this order, or any other matter.

XI. The costs of this action shall be taxed against CHA, subject to the further order of this Court.

Enter:

Judge, U.S. District Court.

Dated: July 1, 1969.

CENSUS TRACT NUMBERS

114 through 116	569-Z
120 through 137	574 through 610
280 through 282	613-Z
340 through 347	614 through 619
348-Z	620-Z
349-Z	621-Z
350 through 352	623 through 641
353-Z	642-A
354 through 355	642-B
357 through 362	643 through 650
363-Z	652
364 through 373	653-Z
375-Z through 378-Z	655
379 through 383	656-Z
384-Z	657
389-Z	658-Z
390-Z	659 through 662
391 through 392	664
395	666 through 667
399-Z	675 through 678
401-Z	681-Z through 683-Z
403	685 through 686
410-Z	687-Z
412 through 420	688
428 through 429	690 through 691
431-Z	695
432	697
434-Z	711
440 through 441	717-Z
442-Z	719-Z
444 through 449	720-Z
450-A	723
450-B	803 through 805
451 through 457	852
460 through 467	855
468	858 through 859
469-Z	861 through 862
470	867-Z
487	868 through 895
519-Z	897-Z
520 through 521	898 through 900
524	903
527-Z	905 through 911
532-Z	912-A through 912-D
534-Z	922
539-Z	923-A
541 through 553	923-B
554-Z	924 through 927
556 through 562	932
564-Z	934 through 935
567-Z	

EXHIBIT A

Tenant selection and assignment plan

Each applicant shall be assigned his appropriate place on a community wide basis in sequence based upon date and time his application is received, suitable type or size of unit, and factors affecting preference or priority established by the Local Authority's regulations. At a given time, the applicant first on the waiting list shall be offered a dwelling unit in accordance with the following plan:

1. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there are suitable vacancies in three or more locations, the applicant shall be offered the unit at the location that contains the largest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the first vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the location containing the next highest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the second vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the location containing the next highest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the third vacancy offered he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list. When an offer of a suitable vacancy is made to an applicant, there must be a rejection of such offer before the applicant will be offered another location. Thus, the offering of a unit at the location with the second largest number of suitable vacancies will not be made until the applicant has first rejected the unit offered at the location with the largest number of vacancies. The offering of a unit at the location with the third largest number of suitable vacancies will not be made until the applicant has rejected the unit offered at the location with the second largest number of suitable vacancies.

2. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there are suitable vacancies in only two locations, the applicant shall be offered the unit at the location that contains the largest number of vacancies. If the applicant rejects the first vacancy offered he shall be offered a suitable unit at the second location. If the applicant rejects the second vacancy offered he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list. When offers of suitable vacancies are made to applicants, there must be a rejection of the first offer before the applicant will be offered the second suitable vacancy.

3. If at the time the applicant comes to the top of the waiting list there is only one location at which a suitable vacancy exists, the applicant will be offered a unit at that location. If the applicant rejects the unit offered, he shall remain at the top of the waiting list until a second offer of a suitable vacancy can be made. Should the applicant reject the second offer of a suitable vacancy he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list.

In carrying out the above plan, should the applicant be willing to accept the unit offered but be unable to move at the time of the offer and presents clear evidence of his inability to move to the Local Authority's satisfaction, refusal of the offer shall not count as one of the number of allowable refusals permitted the applicant before placing his name at the bottom of the eligible applicant list.

In carrying out the above plan, should the applicant present to the satisfaction of the Local Authority clear evidence that acceptance of a given offer of a suitable vacancy will result in undue hardship or handicap not related to considerations of race, color, or national origin, such as inaccessibility to source of employment, children's day care and the like, refusal of such an offer shall not be counted as one of the number of allowable refusals permitted an applicant before placing his name at the bottom of the eligible list.

[U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division]

DOROTHY GAUTREUX, ODEL JONES, DORETHA R. CRENCNAS, EVA RODGERS, JAMES RODGERS, ROBERT M. FAIRFAX AND JIMMIE JONES, PLAINTIFFS, v. THE CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY, A CORPORATION, AND C. E. HUMPHREY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEFENDANTS.

(Civil action No. 66 C 1459)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

In response to the request of the Court and in light of its interest and concern in this case, the Government, and particularly the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), offered on May 16th to advise the Court of its views in regard to the proposed judgment orders in this case and the practical impact of the proposed orders on the model cities, urban renewal, leased housing programs in Chicago. In addition, we were requested by the Court to provide information as to how the various HUD programs and activities could be utilized to further the objectives of the Court.

This memorandum is presented in response to the Court's request for our views.

The United States strongly supports the objectives of the Court in this case. We are concerned that the Court Order be realistic, so as to permit the provision for badly needed housing for poor families and that it be effective, in order to accomplish the objectives previously indicated by the Court.

We have considered the alternative Judgment Orders proposed by both parties (copies of which are attached), that transmitted to the Court by Mr. Polikoff by his letter dated June 2, 1969, and that presented to the Court by Miss Kula with her letter of June 4, 1969. Our comments are addressed to the provisions of Plaintiffs' proposed Order, for two reasons: First, Plaintiffs' Order is more comprehensive in scope and raises the full range of issues which the Court and the parties have considered, and in addition has received more extended consideration by the Court; second, we accept the Court's view that a generalized Order such as that proposed by CHA, substituting for specific criteria a requirement for judicial review and approval of all project proposals, will not serve the Court's purpose of removing constraints which have heretofore inhibited both housing production and production of housing so located and administered as to serve the objectives of the Order. See, e.g., *Louisiana v. United States*, 380 U.S. 145, 154 (1965); *Local 53, Asbestos Workers v. Vogler*, 407 F. 2d 1047, 1052-53 (5th Cir., 1969). *Accord: Green v. County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 437-8 (1968); *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 295, 299, 301 (1955).

We accept the Court's intention to lay down specific requirements for dispersed and desegregated housing and base our comments on the provisions proposed by Plaintiffs. These comments deal first with factual material that we have been able to gather relating to the probable impact of the Order on provisions of new or rehabilitated public housing units; on leasing; on urban renewal; and on the model cities program. The second section of the material which follows sets forth certain comments and observations based upon the preceding information. The third section which follows deals with affirmative actions that can be taken by HUD in furtherance of the objectives of the Court.

I. Impact of proposed order

1. Impact on Provision of New or Rehabilitated Public Housing Units

From September 1958 through December 1967 CHA completed construction of 11,817 family dwelling units. However, of this number only 1,284 units were completed during the last 5 years of this period—an average of

257 units per year. Since December 1967, only six units have been completed, but 1,259 are now in various stages of construction.

On the basis of an application filed by the CHA in January 1967, the HUD regional office is currently considering the reservation of 4,000 family units and 1,000 elderly units.

The proposed Order would hereafter require placement of at least three quarters of all family public housing units (and all of the next 1,330 units built) in a "General Public Housing Area." Out of a total city area of about 200 square miles, a rough calculation indicates that an area of approximately 75 miles is available for the location of such units. The Order further requires the scattering of such units by means of limitations on the amount of public housing which may be placed in any given census tract and by project size limitations. Within this area there will, of course, be further limitations of site costs, availability and suitability.

The "Limited Public Housing Area" includes approximately 85 square miles classified non-white, to which have been added one mile buffer areas which aggregate approximately 40 square miles. Under the terms of the Order, no more than one quarter of the family public housing would be built in this area.

A measure of the change contemplated by the proposed Order may be gained from an analysis of the 8,050 units (or 10,903 units counting repeat requests) in "white" areas submitted to the city council by CHA over the past 15 years and disapproved by it. Sixty percent of those units were on sites along the boundary areas between the non-white and buffer zones. Twenty-five percent were in areas now classified non-white; and only 775 appear to have been proposed for the "General" areas as it is now delineated.

While we would support the objective of constructing housing outside the City of Chicago, in light of the probable difficulty of obtaining the required cooperation of local governments, that appears unlikely to be a major factor in the immediate future.

2. Impact on Leasing Program

The proposed Order also places the leasing program under a 3 to 1 requirement, requiring that 75 percent of units leased be in the "General" area.

There is a city-wide vacancy rate of less than 1 percent, and virtually no availability of three or more bedroom units. CHA reports that since 1965 it has leased only 180 family units, of which 44 are stated to be in white areas. Few, if any, are large units.

Currently, CHA has commenced using the leasing program for a number of purposes in the "Limited" area. It is being used to support nonprofit moderate-income housing projects where up to 20 percent of the units in such projects can be leased in order to assist sponsors in achieving financial feasibility, to reach poorer families, to accommodate larger families. The T.W.O.-Maremont Project in Woodlawn is an example of such an undertaking. The leasing program is also an element of certain rehabilitation programs, such as programs under the "Chicago Plan Agreement" and in the Department of Urban Renewal's rehabilitation programs on West Douglas Boulevard and Independence Avenue. Some leasing has already commenced and it is planned that several hundred units be leased under these three programs in the "Limited" areas.

3. Impact on Urban Renewal

The so-called "Proxmire Amendment" requires that 20 percent of the housing units provided in urban renewal projects subject to the Amendment shall be for low-income families or individuals. As stated in the Senate Report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (Report Numbered

1123), this amendment "reflects the committee's concern that the present emphasis in urban renewal on the provision of housing for persons of low or moderate income be continued and reinforced, in view of the urgent need for housing at these levels." Low-rent public housing is a major source for the provision of such units. The location of the urban renewal projects is such that probably at least four-fifths of the necessary public housing would have to be built in the "Limited Public Housing Area."

The maximum number of dwelling units permitted on land to be disposed of in projects subject to the Proxmire Amendment is 59,002 units, assuming actual construction at maximum permitted densities. Should this total be reached, 11,800 low-rent units would be needed in the project areas involved in order to meet the statutory requirement.

The statistics above must be considered in light of several other factors which reduce the impact of the order on this program. The projects involved are recent projects, in early stages of planning or development. Therefore, only a small fraction of the indicated housing will be needed in the years immediately ahead. In addition, the City proposes to rely on Section 236 of the National Housing Act for much of the low-income housing required by the statute. Projects developed under this FHA moderate-income housing program will be able to house families in the public housing income range if they are operated to utilize the maximum Federal subsidy available. Moreover, a substantial portion of the public housing programmed for these projects will undoubtedly be housing for the elderly, which is not affected by the Order.

The urban renewal program is directed at slum and blighted areas, most of which in Chicago are in the "Limited" area, and Congressional mandates increasingly require provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families in such project areas. In addition, the national goals to which the program's priorities are directed by the Department make provision for housing of these income groups the primary factor for priority of approval of projects. The Order can be reconciled with urban renewal efforts, but its effects on the present renewal program must be carefully evaluated.

Urban renewal is important not only in terms of housing production but in terms of the objectives of desegregation. Urban renewal affords one of the few possibilities for making inner city neighborhoods sufficiently attractive to partially reverse the out-migration by bringing some white families back into the center city.

The neighborhood preference aspect of the proposed Order may have an adverse impact on relocation efforts connected with urban renewal and other public programs causing displacement of families and individuals. The latest workable program submitted by the City of Chicago to HUD estimates displacement from January 1969 to December 1970 by urban renewal and other public programs as including 5,165 families, of whom 3,484 are non-white. In addition, we estimate urban renewal displacement over the life of projects now covered by contracts to involve 21,381 families and 14,435 individuals. Of these, 11,514 families and 8,556 individuals are non-white. A few thousand families and individuals have already been displaced; on the other hand, estimates do not include three large rehabilitation areas.

While neither set of figures is broken down by incomes, a sizable percentage of displacees are persons of low income. Public housing is the essential resource to provide relocation housing for such persons, and is counted on in planning and scheduling urban renewal undertakings. A 50 percent "neighborhood preference" in "white" areas where most of the dwelling units must be placed under the Order could reduce by half the number of

units available for rehousing of displaced non-white families and individuals.

4. Impact on Model Cities

Three of the four model neighborhoods in the Chicago model cities program are in the "Limited Public Housing Area." Current proposals for these four areas contemplated provision of 4,400 units of public housing over a 5-year period, but under the City's program, 2,450 are for the elderly, and would not be affected by the Order. Of the 1,950 units slated for family occupancy, 1,450 are in the "Limited" area. Some or all of these units may duplicate units required to meet the statutory urban renewal requirement.

Federal law does not require such units to be placed within model neighborhoods. Nevertheless, in view of the statutory objective of improving living conditions in such areas, an Order will certainly have substantial impact on rebuilding or restoration of the model neighborhoods.

In the three areas involved, 12,716 families out of 113,355—or slightly more than 11 percent—earn less than \$3,000 per year. Many additional families are within the initial occupancy income limits for public housing in Chicago which range from \$4,200 for a single person to \$10,000 for a family of twelve. Public housing is the only program in Chicago which has been able to reach families in the lower segment of this income range.

II. Comments

We have carefully reviewed the provisions of the plaintiffs' proposed order, and have come to the conclusion that the basic structure and direction of that order are appropriate to accomplish the Court's objectives. In light of the absence of information concerning the availability of sites in the "General" area, we are not in a position to assure the Court that these provisions are the best ones, or that the order is workable as stated. After the order has been in effect, and the results of the site survey discussed below are available, it may be necessary to make changes in the order. Accordingly, we suggest that any order of the Court expressly recognize that the specific features (e.g., 75-25 percent requirement) are subject to revision based upon experience and further information.

1. The 75 Percent-25 Percent Requirement

It is presently impossible to evaluate the workability of the basic 75 percent-25 percent requirement of the proposed Order. It will require the location of many sites in an area where site availability is still an unknown factor. To the extent that there may be difficulties in obtaining sites and getting production in the "General" area, the formula would impose another restriction on a program which is already falling to make available sufficient public housing to the families in non-white areas, or indeed to any of the poor families in Chicago. The necessity for dispersion and a balanced distribution of public housing in the City must somehow be reconciled with the need for accelerated response to the housing needs of persons in the "non-white" and buffer areas.

The 100 percent requirement for 1,330 units in the "General Public Housing Area" to balance 1,330 units now being provided will intensify the problems above. It would appear preferable and more logical to regard the latter as part of the past record on which the Court's opinion was based, and to confine the Order to one formula uniformly applicable to all future housing production.

We recognize and accept the Court's belief that specific criteria are essential to an Order. Any ratio calling for provision of housing units in "white" areas equal to or greater in number than those in "non-white" areas would require a striking change in CHA's program. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that there is little or no information as to the prospective avail-

ability of usable sites in the "General Public Housing Area" as delineated in the proposed order. We regret that we are unable at this point to advise the Court whether the particular 3 to 1 ratio proposed by the plaintiffs, or any other ratio, is in fact appropriate.

2. The Leasing Program

Application of the proposed Order to leasing may present some special problems. The primary present utility of the leasing program in Chicago is in connection with new moderate-income housing projects and rehabilitation programs in non-white areas. If units for leasing are as scarce in other areas as we understand them to be, the proposed Order would make it virtually impossible to use the leasing program for this purpose. In order not to deprive neighborhood and other nonprofit projects in the "Limited" area of the support which this program can furnish them, the effect of this provision of the Order must be carefully evaluated.

3. "Neighborhood Preferences"

There is basis for concern in regard to the proposal to give a preference to "neighborhood residents" for 50 percent of the dwelling units in a project. Such preferences can have the effect of denying admission to public housing to some non-whites who have been waiting for public housing for long periods. The proposal may be subject to misunderstanding and attack by non-whites denied admission, and it may be subject to abuse.

To the extent that the Court requires that projects be small, the location of such projects in white neighborhoods may well achieve the desegregated living pattern which is sought without regard to the precise composition of the residents of the projects. Though this is less true of larger projects, we question whether such preferences or quotas are sufficiently useful to overcome the disadvantages as well as the complications they would add to already cumbersome tenant assignment procedures.

4. Other Comments

We agree that the Court's proposal to limit project size to occupancy by 150-200 persons is preferable to a 24-dwelling unit limitation. This still does not permit judgments on size to be made in relation to neighborhood development, services, and facilities, except to a very limited extent, but it ought to be possible to make provision for exceptions in cases where somewhat larger projects would not be disadvantageous in light of the location and facilities available.

It appears that some exceptions to the limitation to 15 percent of the family living units in a census tract will be necessary if statutory and other requirements are to be met, particularly in the urban renewal program. It should not be difficult to provide for such exceptions where needed.

In our view the following clarifying revisions might improve the proposed order:

(1) To more clearly state the objectives of the Court, we would suggest deleting the second paragraph in the proposed judgment order, and substituting therefore the paragraph contained in Attachment A to this memorandum.

(2) In Paragraph V. B, the relationship between persons presently on the "waiting list" and new registrants is not clear. Consistent with the first-come, first-served policy of the HUD Title VI Regulations, 24 C. R. F. 1.4(b)(2)(ii) we believe that those people who have been on the "waiting list" prior to this time should receive credit for that period of time in determining the order in which eligibles are to be offered new units in accordance with existing priorities. Similarly, persons who are already tenants should be allowed to transfer only in accord with their place on the new "waiting list."

III. Affirmative actions

HUD has considered possible means of utilizing its various programs in support of a CHA program under a Judgment Order. There are several supporting actions which we are prepared to take.

We can promptly make funds available for a survey to locate available and suitable sites. We can also fund activities to modernize existing public housing so as to make that housing located in the "Limited" area as desirable and as well serviced as possible. Another action this Department can take, as occasions may arise, is to encourage and approve utilization of other HUD programs for improvement of neighborhoods into which housing projects are introduced pursuant to a Court Order.

In one specific respect, HUD is ready and willing to assist the Court directly. We will be happy to participate in any arrangement whereby CHA proposals are screened or reviewed by HUD in order that we may furnish technical advice as to their conformity to the dictates of the Court. We believe that some such procedure could substantially relieve the Court of a technical burden which it would otherwise be forced to assume.

In conclusion, we assure the Court that we fully support the objectives of overcoming segregated and overconcentrated patterns of low-rent public housing in Chicago. We hope that they can be achieved together with the production of a substantial volume of sorely needed housing. We will do all that we can to contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERMAN UNGER,
General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

S. LEIGH CURRY, Jr.,
Associate General Counsel.

JERRIS LEONARD,
Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

THOMAS A. FORAN,
U.S. Attorney.

JACK B. SCHMEITZER,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.

DAVID L. ROSE,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

ATTACHMENT A

The Court having determined that the defendants, Chicago Housing Authority and its Executive Director have violated their obligations under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States by following racially discriminatory tenant assignment practices and racially discriminatory site selection procedures and practices, with the purpose and effect of maintaining patterns of residential segregation in Chicago; and the Court having conferred on several occasions with counsel for the parties and having received their written and oral statements as to the provisions of this judgment order.

[From the Chicago Daily News;
July 3, 1969]

HOUSING DECISIONS DUE

U.S. District Judge Richard B. Austin's order that a massive portion of any future public housing built in Chicago must be placed in white neighborhoods unquestionably means a temporary halt in public housing here.

Before anything worse happens there is a stern obligation on the Chicago Housing Authority and the City Council to come to grips with this issue. For if public housing does grind to a halt in Chicago it will be because the aldermen, eager to mollify their constituents, have fumbled their larger task of serving the entire city and its future. There is still time to avoid that.

Judge Austin's order requires the CHA to build 75 per cent of its future public hous-

ing in neighborhoods that are predominantly white, and the reaction in those neighborhoods has been prompt and predictable. As a matter of fact, Judge Austin's ruling may observe the letter of the law, but it fails to accommodate the facts of human nature that the CHA and the aldermen must live with. One salient fact is that a white neighborhood subjected to forced, substantial dilution with blacks frequently reacts with a sense of panic that is next to impossible to calm with appeals to reason. Racial tensions set in, and mount. Over the long run, the neighborhood tends to become all-black as the whites grudgingly retreat and finally flee.

Another salient truth, however, is that suitable housing accompanied by individual freedom of residence is one of the imperatives on the way to acceding blacks the social justice that must finally resolve the race problem.

Are these two points hopelessly irreconcilable?

We refuse to believe it.

Certainly at this stage the CHA and its chairman, Charles R. Swibel, must buckle down to a serious, exhaustive and imaginative study of the alternatives open under the law.

Legal appeals are likely, and it may well be that some of the strictures imposed by Austin will be removed by a higher court.

But it is doubtful if a higher court will reverse the main thrust of Austin's ruling, which is that, one way or another, white neighborhoods are going to have to yield a measure of their adamant resistance to any form of integration.

One serviceable device might be the quota system in which percentage figures are established for whites and blacks in the same projects. Elsewhere this system has had some success in bringing whites and blacks together as amicable neighbors, and in allaying fears of a massive population "invasion."

Whatever plans are produced should be brought before the City Council, and that body should react with something more responsible than grandstand politics. For one thing that Judge Austin has done is to put Chicago face to face with its most crucial issue—whether it is to be a city united or a city divided. The Council, under the leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, must act in the full knowledge that if the decision is for a divided city, that can only be a stopgap on the way to a city in social and economic ruin.

RAISE THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today I join with hundreds of my colleagues in introducing legislation which will raise the personal income tax exemption from its present meager \$600. I have chosen to cosponsor Mrs. MINK's bill, which will double the present exemption.

I voted against the income tax surcharge, Mr. Speaker, because I felt it would hinder efforts to secure meaningful tax reforms this session of Congress. Whether such a hindrance indeed exists will soon be seen as the bill wanders its way through the legislative quagmire. For this bill—which aids the already

overburdened average American taxpayer—is the first step toward any true tax reform. If it is defeated, my prediction will have come true.

The average, middle-class American taxpayer is carrying much more than his fair share of taxes. With rising inflation and the increasing cost of money, he can ill afford this burden. Many of these persons are moving from the cities to the suburbs, not so much because they love the often sterile suburban life, but simply because they cannot afford to live in the cities. Thus, as the tax base moves out of the city, the city begins to decay. And as the cities rot, our whole Nation begins to fall apart at the seams. Something must be done, and it must be done soon.

Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy has already told us that the time is too late, that we are facing a taxpayers' revolt. The only way we can quell this revolt is to bring overdue justice to the taxpayer. I ask all my colleagues to join with me in this fight for tax reform.

APOLLO 11

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, mankind has awakened from a dream of a million years. And through the miracle of earthly technology and a prodigious accomplishment by the television industry, an incredulous world watched in breathless wonder as man took the first step into his own dreams.

Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin—with their "guardian angel" Michael Collins hovering above—have actually walked on the face of the moon.

These bold men have traversed the untrodden sanctity of space. They have soared like the eagle on an unparalleled, unprecedented journey into the sunshine and shadows of man's future.

They have captured the rays of the solar wind, raised the Stars and Stripes over the Sea of Tranquility, have gathered "purple rocks" and moon dust, and have left the footprints of mortal men to endure for 500,000 years.

And in taking this "giant leap" on that dead satellite a quarter of a million miles away, they have perhaps discovered the secret of life.

Wilbur Wright, who with his brother Orville made man's first flight into the air 65 years ago in my home State of North Carolina, once said:

It is not really necessary to look too far into the future; we see enough already to be certain that it will be magnificent. Only let us hurry and open the roads.

The Eagle has landed. The roads to the future are opened.

Now the exultant crew of Apollo 11 is earthward bound—and mankind will never again be bound by earth.

SPEECH OF MAURICE BLOND

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in a stirring speech in New York City, Maurice Blond, whose credits are listed below, delivered a message of hope to the Mended Hearts International Convention.

This organization is composed of people from all over the world who have undergone heart surgery.

Mr. Blond is to be congratulated for this fine speech which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and to the people of the country.

I have known Mr. Blond for over 40 years and I am proud to recall that he was born and grew up on the Lower East Side, which I have represented in the New York State Legislature and in the House of Representatives.

As a young lad, he was active in the Clark House, a settlement house, where he served as president of its Junior Athletic Association, president of its Alumni Association, elected to its Hall of Fame, and continues to serve the people of my neighborhood as a member of the board of directors of the Grand Street Settlement.

He was one of the founders of the Henry Street Settlement Federal Credit Union and for many years was its educational director.

As a young adult he was the organization secretary of the Lower East Side Public Housing Conference which was responsible for the passage of early legislation making possible the many low-rent housing projects that stand today all over America as a shining monument to their activities.

Mr. Blond, a successful general agent of the Travelers, specializes in the counseling of pension and profit-sharing plans. He is the insurance consultant to the Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc., with a membership of over 110,000.

It is Mr. Blond's interest in the handicapped that I am particularly pleased with and share his philosophy that a man should be judged as an individual whether it be in search of employment or insurance.

I rejoice in the national recognition he has received by being asked to serve on the National Advisory Committee of the National Diabetes Foundation and with the new honor tendered him with his election to the Advisory Council of the Mended Hearts, where I know he will serve with distinction among such world-renowned members as Mr. David Baird, Mr. Rome A. Betts, Mrs. John W. Chapman, Mr. Morris Chartkoff, Dr. Harold A. Collins, Dr. Denton A. Cooley, Dr. Michael A. DeBakey, Dr. Arthur DeBoer, Dr. Lewis Dexter, Mr. Donald Farmer, Sister Mary Frances, S.A.C., Dr. David G. Greene, Dr. Robert E. Gross, Dr. Dwight E. Harken, Dr. James A.

Helmworth, Dr. Ormond C. Julien, Dr. Harold D. Levine, Dr. Benedict F. Massell, Dr. F. Lloyd Mussells, Mrs. Walter A. Oates, Dr. Walter L. Phillips, Mrs. Abraham E. Pinanski, Dr. Willis J. Potts, Col. Louis J. Rosenfield, Dr. George Schimfrt, Miss Mary E. Switzer, and Dr. Luis Soltero Harrington.

The address referred to follows:

WHY HEART SURGERY PATIENTS ARE INSURABLE
(Address by Maurice Blond)

Madam President Mrs. Cleston Ray, President-Elect Fred Howard, and officials of The American Heart Association—I am honored to appear before so rare and distinguished an audience of ladies and gentlemen from all the world who have undergone heart surgery, wearing proudly the insignia of The Mended Hearts.

As a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, I bring you warm greetings from our Chairman, Harold Russell, who agrees with me that the work you are doing—calling attention to the activities of people who have undergone heart surgery—is vitally important. The entire world needs to know about your message of hope. It is an optimistic battle cry and a credo all humanity should live by: "It's great to be alive—and to help others."

I recall quite well my initial reaction when first invited by your Convention Chairmen, Herman Brown and Paul Raskin, to speak on the availability of insurance for the heart surgery patient. It brought to mind some terrifying moments in a jet in the Far East when the voice of the pilot came over the loudspeaker: "Will the passengers please fasten their seat belts. I have two items of important information—one good and one bad. I will tell you the bad news first. We have strayed off course. We may land suddenly and we don't know where. And now for the good news. We are well ahead of schedule."

As a navigator guiding the financial destiny of many a former uninsurable, let me assure you that the insurance industry is right on course. We know our destination and are way ahead of schedule.

We are especially grateful to the magnificent skills of the medical profession who, in no small measure, are responsible for the excellent shape you are in. It was Cicero who brilliantly saluted these miracle men when he said, "In nothing do men more nearly approach the Gods than in giving health to men."

Not too long ago, in 1883 to be exact, a Dr. Billroth said "The Surgeon who should attempt to suture a wound of the heart would lose the respect of his colleagues." He has long since been proven wrong. The research I have done uncovered the fact that actually the year before that a Dr. Block had already shown the feasibility of suture in animals and proposed it for man. Within 13 years, 3 attempts were made to close wounds in human hearts. Of these, two were technically successful though only one patient survived. In 1896 a Dr. Farina closed a stab wound in one of the ventricles. The heart's muscles healed perfectly—though the patient died of broncho-pneumonia. Napoleon's great surgeon-in-chief, Dr. Larrey, saved a life by inserting a catheter into the pericardial sac to draw off an excess of fluid following a wound of the pericardium. In 1902 Dr. Brauer operated on cardiomyosis to relieve a crippled heart. Sir Thomas Lauder Brynton recommended the use of amyl nitrite for angina pectoris stating "The good results which have been obtained by a surgical treatment of wounds in the heart emboldens one to hope that before very long similar good results may be obtained in cases of mitral stenosis." This proposal awakened a storm of criticism but revived attempts dating

back many years to create and study valvular lesions in experimental animals.

Consonant with the dismal prognostic views which prevailed clinically until recent years, the Insurance Companies avoided insuring persons with known heart problems. However, a sizeable and valuable mortality experience has accumulated by virtue of the disability features of the insurance contracts. Disability claims following attacks of myocardial infarction have provided abundant material for follow-up mortality studies. In addition, reflecting a more optimistic clinical climate, experimental underwriting of persons with known coronary disease has been increasingly undertaken. Early experience has begun to emerge from these studies as well. Although adequate long term mortality data is still lacking, an interesting number of clinical as well as actuarial studies suggest that life expectancy on selected groups with heart problems is so far better than was formerly supposed that insurance contracts may now be offered on a sound basis without prohibitive expense.

Up until recently the Insurance Underwriter rejected all diabetics. Today the climate is such that Companies compete for this business. I am proud that I have in some small way contributed to the prevailing attitude in the insuring and hiring of diabetics which is that the applicant should be judged as an individual and not as a class.

Another group of persons, who have at times been denied insurance, and who most certainly are insurable, often as standard risks, are those who have had episodes of acute pericarditis. Very often, both clinically and electro cardio graphically, an erroneous diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction has been made. I am happy to state that where curative surgery has been carried out, and there are no residual structural or functional abnormalities, a normal or near normal life expectancy may be anticipated, and such persons are freely insurable after a short time has elapsed. This is the situation following repair of patent ductus arteriosus, and perhaps with somewhat greater reservation, coarctation of the aorta and interatrial septal defect of the predominant secundum type. In instances, as yet uncommon but increasing rapidly, cure has been accomplished with lesions such as interventricular septal defect, primum atrial defects, pulmonic and aortic stenosis and other anomalies using a direct open heart approach employing a by-pass procedure. With the relatively recent advent of such techniques as cardiac catheterization and angio cardiography, a new day is dawning for The Mended Hearts. You are no longer the "Untouchables"—you are becoming the "Desirables". These are sophisticated procedures and well worth the effort and it has been my experience that they have paid off. The heretofore uninsurables are now being covered.

Too often, the examining doctors report is long on diagnosis but short on description. It is more important that the attending physician be consulted to counteract and contradict findings detrimental to the applicant. We know that heart murmurs are among the most common impairments detected on insurance examinations. What does this mean? A functional murmur is a physiological murmur that should be called a "romantic murmur", because although it may sound impressive, its message may be one of sweet nothings. In order to help make up the mind of the Underwriter affirmatively, I insist on a complete workup, EKG and X-ray and interpretation of same by a cardiologist or an internist, with special knowledge in the field of cardiovascular medicine.

There is still not very much usable material from an insurance standpoint on the insurability of people like yourselves, who have had heart surgery. It is by far the most important problem in the field of insurance

as it is, too, in clinical medicine. The Association of Life Insurance Medical Directors has had two conferences with the Committee on Congenital Cardiac Defects of the Council on Rheumatic Fever and Congenital Heart Disease, American Heart Association. From this type of meeting, with free interchange of ideas, cardiologists and medical directors of insurance companies have a much better understanding of each other's problems.

The fact is that not enough time has elapsed as yet from the time this kind of surgery was first performed to draw any accurate conclusions. There is so much individual variation of such factors as the severity and complexity of the heart lesion, the extent of irreversible or only partly reversible secondary changes in the lungs, heart, kidneys and the probably long term deterioration of synthetic prosthetic materials, such as teflon patches, valves and vascular graft implants. Surgically corrected septal defects one year after surgery have been written with a small rating, along with pulmonary and aortic stenosis cases. Coarctation of the aorta and surgically corrected patent ductus arteriosus have been accepted in a like manner with all of the above-mentioned procedures issued on a standard basis with the passage of 3 to 5 years. As of this moment heart transplants are not insurable. I am certain that with improvements in techniques and materials we will eventually be able to insure these cases, too.

The scarcity of reliable statistical reports to assist medical underwriters in the assessment of proper extra premiums is the big stumbling block. While remarkable post-operative improvements are being achieved day by day, the insuring of people like yourselves must necessarily be on a highly individualized and personalized basis.

You should know that Insurance Companies vary in the action they will take on such cases. Most Companies will not accept a case where a heart valve has been replaced. It has been my gratifying experience to have placed several of these cases with the helpful assistance of Dr. Michael A. DeBakey, Dr. Denton A. Cooley, Dr. Adrian Kantrowitz and Dr. Benjamin Stein who have convinced the underwriters in their Attending Physician Statements that what they have done is indeed truly life giving—Life Insurance in the best sense of the word.

I am also grateful and would like to express my appreciation to such eminent medical directors as Dr. Albert L. Larson, The Travelers, Dr. Richard A. Nelson, Prudential, Dr. Paul S. Entmacher, Metropolitan and Dr. Harry E. Ungerleider, North American Reassurance Co. for their valuable assistance in the preparation of this address. It is to their everlasting credit that they hopefully look to the future to see whether their predictions on longevity will be realized. The difference between treating the individual patient, which is your Doctor's responsibility and the medical director's concern for relating dollar values to human lives, is not so far apart as it may seem. Financial stability will remain as long as insurance is based on the probabilities within large groups. There must continue to be close cooperation. Only in this way can we prevent the physical problems from becoming economic tragedies. This must be appreciated by you who have first-hand experience and are making history. The very fact of your being here today is gratifying not only to your family who depend on you, but to the Supreme Underwriter in the Heavens who has seen fit to protect you and keep you alive.

Several years ago Calvin Coolidge made the following statement: "Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent. Genius will not; unrewarded genius is almost a proverb. Education will not; the world is full of educated

derelicts. Persistence and determination are omnipotent."

This Convention must persist in its determination in establishing a program of assistance to surgeons, physicians and hospitals in their work with heart patients. We already have the know-how to cure many heart defects through surgery, but 100,000 people a year still die, which points up the fact that further research is vitally needed.

I came to bring a message of hope and was in turn exhilarated. I came to console—and leave with spirits soaring. I came to talk insurance and am assured.

It is heart warming to know that you put into practice what you preach—"It's great to be alive—and to help others."

CORNING GLASS HELPS NATION TO SEE MOON LANDING

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday night, two Americans set foot on the moon marking what certainly must be the most extraordinary venture in all mankind.

This historic achievement which took men from this world through 260,000 miles of space to that incredible landing defies description and makes what was once exciting science fiction a fantastic reality. Every American can puff out his chest proudly in seeing this oldest of man's dreams come true.

The epic accomplishment is the result of courage, skill, faith, and dedicated work. And a lesson which I think can be learned from this lunar landing is that the same kind of courage, skill, faith, and dedication can result in epic achievements here on earth as we strive to solve social and economic problems.

Eight years of work, involving at one time almost a half million people, went into the development of the Apollo program, which reached that dramatic climax Sunday night when millions of Americans watching on television saw man land on the moon. As unbelievable as the landing itself were those magnificent pictures permitting nearly one-quarter of the world to witness this event.

I am happy to say that one reason why we here on earth were able to visually share the landing was the research and development by a company located in my 38th Congressional District. I speak of the Corning Glass Works in Corning, N.Y. A piece of glass, about the size of a half dollar and containing 31 million glass strands, helped make the pictures beamed from the moon's surface by the Apollo TV camera brighter and clearer.

The company also developed other glass products for use in the Apollo program, and its men and women are typical of the thousands of technicians, engineers, and laborers who teamed up to make the moon landing a reality. They deserve the highest praise.

I submit for the RECORD a story in the Corning, N.Y., Leader which tells in detail of the role played by the Corning Glass Works in the Apollo program:

LOCAL PRODUCTS TO HELP BEAM BACK FIRST PICTURES FROM MOON'S SURFACE

When the first television pictures come back from the moon's surface next week, the world will see them through a piece of remarkable glass—a glass that didn't exist 10 years ago.

It's a chunk of glass about the size of a half-dollar (but somewhat thicker), developed by Corning Glass Works.

"If you could look inside, you would find 31 million separate strands of glass, each one only one-twelfth the thickness of a human hair, each one fused to its neighbor in a precise pattern," a CGW spokesman said.

These minute glass strands act as light "pipes," picking up light from the moon's surface and transferring it inside the camera. With the strands fused together in a solid piece, it's called a fiber optic faceplate, it was explained.

In the Apollo TV camera, this unusual glass helps to intensify the image—that is, it helps make the image brighter, hence easier to see. The tube for the television camera was made by Westinghouse Electric Corp. at Horseheads.

From its beginning to its end, Apollo 11 will depend upon some highly unusual glass products that came from the Corning research laboratories. They include:

Giant glass resistors (as big around as telephone poles and four feet long), located at every ground tracking station around the globe, will help clarify, or sharpen, the tracking signals. These massive resistors use glass because it doesn't conduct electricity. A thin metallic film on the glass provides the resistance.

When the Apollo astronauts look out into space, they'll be looking through perhaps the strongest, most perfect windows ever made—10 times stronger than the windows in your home. During their manufacture, Corning subjects them to numerous exhaustive tests, including one in which the glass panels are heated to 1,200 degrees F. and then plunged into cold water. Every American spacecraft has carried Corning windows.

When Apollo 11 re-enters the atmosphere, its radio antenna will be protected from searing heat by another extraordinary Corning glass—fused silica. These rod-shaped antenna shields are small—only two inches in diameter and five inches long—but they provide a vital service that virtually no other material could do. Four of them will be aboard.

Aboard the Saturn rocket that boosts Apollo 11 into orbit will be an IBM computer, and in the computer will be glass delay lines—thin, five-sided slabs of still another rugged glass. They're called delay lines because they delay electrical impulses, perhaps for only 80 millionths of a second, before feeding them to the computer.

TAX REFORM * * * RELIEF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very direct, timely, and effective commentary on the need for tax reform and relief from the oppressive tax load was carried in the Thursday, July 17, Harvey Tribune which, I believe, reflects the basic thinking across the country.

The editorial follows:

TAX REFORM . . . RELIEF

A higher interest rate on United States savings bonds is in the works as inflation

finally catches up with this aspect of federal government. The treasury requested an increase, from 4¼ per cent to five per cent, in an effort to be on an equal footing in the competition for the attention of savers.

Perhaps with the passing of time and a return of the government's bank roll to robust health, another move might be made in the direction of keeping step with the times. This is the amount of personal exemptions permitting in the filing of income tax returns.

Year after year, despite annual moves upward in the cost of living, the exemption for federal tax purposes has held steady at \$600 per person. But the ranks of those who can remember when a dependent could be supported in any kind of style at that figure are rapidly being depleted. Reports of persons who, paradoxically, pay income taxes while receiving public assistance are not hard to believe.

For the time being, of course, not only the regular tax payments but an extension of the surcharge are needed. The next subject will be tax reform, and it will be approached from many angles as attempts are made to close loopholes and otherwise make the federal levy more equitable, particularly at the upper levels.

But it is not unreasonable to hope that real tax reform will be considered to include more realistic treatment of dependents and perhaps a little extra consideration for those who are buying a college education.

ONE GIANT LEAP

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, America's three astronauts are on their way home, having accomplished one of humanity's greatest feats. The success of the astronauts in their quest has been an inspiration to all of us and should serve as a guide to what this Nation is capable of doing when it puts its mind to it. I am hopeful that the determination evidenced in the space program can now be directed toward attacking the problems of poverty, racial prejudice, and urban decay here at home.

Today the Christian Science Monitor carried an editorial on the moon landing and what it should mean to us. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

ONE GIANT LEAP

Mankind has again been taught one of history's still most needed lessons: humanity's greatest triumphs are those that come through peace, through intelligence, through inspiration, not through war. The worldwide outpouring of support, of joy, of prayer for man's monumental achievement on the moon is proof of how deeply all men share the desire for peaceful, orderly progress. And President Nixon, in speaking with the astronauts on the moon, voiced a profound truth when he said that the event had momentarily made all men truly one.

Few events in man's long struggle upward and forward have given a greater uplift to man's thought and spirit. In seeing what men could do, all persons felt new hope and confidence in humanity's further conquests. Helping lift men still further out of ignorance, fear, discouragement, and small-thinking, the moon-landing gave promise of ever

more magnificent conquests in a multitude of fields. Feeling no longer confined to his immemorial home, man today can take a broader and less selfish view of the great problems still besetting him on this dear but crowded earth.

One may feel that Astronaut Neil Armstrong was modestly underestimating the achievement when he termed it "one small step for man," but all would agree that he spoke a profound truth when he also called it "one giant leap for mankind." The widening of horizons which will flow from it are beyond humanity's farthest ken. Although it is clearly one of the climaxes of human progress, it is also but one step upon the ladder of man's mastery of the universe. It helps provide insight into the promise which lies behind that great question to be found in Psalms: "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? . . . Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou has put all things under his feet."

Although in the deepest sense, the landing on the moon was an overall, worldwide accomplishment, it was also a peculiarly American one. For it demonstrated—powerfully and unmistakably—all that is right in what, for want of a better word, is called the American system. While free politically and economically, the United States proved itself able to outdo, with the whole world watching, the tightly bound Soviet Union in a venture which required the highest degree of collective organization. This is a lesson which must surely make a deep impression on men everywhere as they ponder the best system for their own material advance.

America and the world can rightfully be proud of the three astronauts. They demonstrate so much that is good and hopeful in the present day. Their calmness and efficiency, their lack of conceit, the broad and inspired view they take of their accomplishments are the qualities so urgently needed as the world's attention turns back from the moon to the earth.

THE USE OF U.S. PORTS BY FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a commonsense proposal regarding the use of U.S. ports by foreign fishing vessels. This bill provides for the closing of U.S. ports to fish or fish products from vessels of any foreign nation which closes its ports to U.S. fishing vessels.

This proposal is not a vindictive response to the policies of another nation, and it does not blindly lash out at all who are in some way inhospitable. The bill is simply an appropriate means of protecting Americans involved in the fishing industry.

At the present time, vessels far away from home sometimes use foreign ports to repair their ships and to process their catch. When two nations share such port facilities, fishermen from each country may stay out of home port longer. Both take full advantage of profitable fishing grounds.

But when one nation severs its services by closing its ports, an unearned advantage is established for the inhospitable nation's citizens. They alone reap

the benefits of cooperation while undercutting the ability of rivals to compete.

When a nation bars American vessels, it places an unjust and unnecessary burden on American fishermen. By closing our ports to that nation's fish products we can reestablish the balance necessary for fair competition.

STATEMENT ON THE VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years the Southern Regional Council has been sponsoring a voter education project designed to research the causes of low political participation, particularly among blacks, in the South. A major component of this research effort has been the funding of voter registration drives by the voter education project.

The first voter education project was initiated in March of 1962 and ended in the fall of 1964. As a result of the activities carried out under this project, nearly 700,000 Negroes were registered in 11 Southern States during this 2½-year period.

The second voter education project was put into effect in early 1966, following the adoption of the Voting Rights Act by Congress in 1965. This project is ongoing and now includes nonpartisan education and leadership training programs as well as voter registration and voter participation research.

The importance of the voter education project is perhaps best judged by the extensive use which a recent report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Political Participation, has made of it. The project has been a valuable source of statistics and information as well as an important reason why the Voting Rights Act has achieved the significant gains it has during the 4½ years it has been in operation. If progress is to continue to be made in bringing blacks into full political participation in the South, it is imperative that programs like the voter education project be continued.

Unfortunately, the work of the voter education project is now threatened by changes in existing tax law presently being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. One of the provisions of the committee's "Tentative Decisions for Drafting Purposes," which was released on May 27, would "prohibit foundations from directly or indirectly engaging in activities intended to influence the outcome of any election—including voter registration drives—or to influence the decisions of any governmental body—whether or not such activity is substantial." Since the voter education project from its inception has relied almost exclusively on contributions from foundations, the proposed prohibition imperils the continued viability and usefulness of the voter education project.

I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to redraft the language so that voter registration drives such as the voter education project will be able to continue to receive foundation support. Tremendous work remains to be done before political equality becomes a reality in the South. In view of the commitment made by Congress in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress has a responsibility to see that every effort is made to eliminate the last remaining barriers to full political participation by all our citizens in all political processes and institutions.

I include at this point in the RECORD a statement made on June 14 by the executive committee of the Southern Regional Council, Inc., on this subject, and urge my colleagues to give it their closest study:

A STATEMENT ON THE VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL, INC., ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, JUNE 14, 1969

The Southern Regional Council launched the first Voter Education Project in 1962. A major purpose of the new undertaking was to be research into the causes of low political participation, particularly among blacks, in the South. And a major method of this research was to be the direct funding of voter registration drives in the South as a means of determining the types of difficulties encountered.

While the SRC Executive Committee felt this project to be of the first importance, it stipulated that the Council could not sponsor this effort without review and assurance from the Internal Revenue Service that this program would be in accordance with tax-exempt activity as interpreted by IRS. The Council received that assurance from IRS on March 22, 1962. In addition, of course, the Southern Regional Council has filed annual reports with IRS on this as well as all of its programs and expenditures.

SRC's first Voter Education Project began in March of 1962 and ended in the fall of 1964. As a result of these efforts, an increase in Negro registration of nearly 700,000 was recorded in 11 Southern states.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, suspending literacy tests in six states and otherwise providing new protection for prospective black voters, substantially changed the circumstances of civic participation in the South. Accordingly, the Southern Regional Council decided to launch a second Voter Education Project.

This second VEP began work in early 1966 and remains in operation today. Research into the causes of low political participation remains a major function. Support of voter registration activities continues to be a method of determining the causes of low political participation. However, the second Voter Education Project has placed an increasing amount of emphasis on non-partisan citizenship education and leadership training programs, particularly the latter.

As Congress recognized in the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the recent history of the South is darkly stained by the systematic exclusion of Negroes from the political process. A summary of the repressive statutes and practices which enforced this exclusion can be found in "Political Participation," published in May of 1968 by the Civil Rights Commission, and in "Climbing Jacob's Ladder," by Pat Watters and Reese Cleghorn, published by Harcourt, Brace and World in November of 1967. The latter book is largely a description of the work of the Voter Education Project. A feeling for the importance of the research activ-

ities of VEP may be gained by noting the number of citations of VEP material in the Civil Rights Commission's report.

The activities of the Voter Education Project have unquestionably brought more Negroes into the political process in the South. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act as a contributing factor, the second Voter Education Project—like the first—estimates that its programs have added 700,000 blacks to the registration rolls in the South. Year-by-year progress can be seen in the following table:

INCREASES IN BLACK REGISTRATION—11 STATES

Year	Black registration	White registration
1960	1,463,333	12,276,127
1962	1,480,720	12,109,680
1964	2,164,200	12,263,820
1966	2,689,000	14,309,704
1968 (summer)	3,112,000	15,702,000

It should be noted that although black registration has risen to 62 per cent of the black voting-age population in the region, white registration stands at 78 per cent of white voting-age population. Much remains to be done before it can be said that Negroes in the South are full partners in the regional and national political process.

The amount of money allocated for each project hardly can be described as large (although it must seem large to an organization with no other source of support). An average grant for voter registration runs between \$1,000 and \$2,000. The allocation generally covers a period running from one to two months.

A grant letter is sent to the local organization which sets out in unequivocal terms that the money is to be used only for non-partisan voter education and voter registration and may not be put to any partisan or other use, and specifically not to serve any political campaign. The grant letter is followed by a research letter which sets our reporting requirements. Organizations receiving funds are required to submit both financial and status reports weekly. These reports are reviewed in the VEP office in Atlanta. All money spent must be accounted for precisely.

Money is supplied on a cash-draw basis. No lump-sum grants are given. This furnishes VEP with a means of cutting off support instantly when a report indicates partisan activities or any other irregularity.

In addition to all this, VEP employs a full-time field director. The field director makes both announced and unannounced visits to all projects receiving VEP support. The field director also visits projects prior to funding to determine that they qualify for support. Non-partisanship is a major item checked by the field director in these on-the-spot inspections.

It should be pointed out that VEP does not endeavor to pay the entire cost of voter registration activities in the South. Local organizations, to the extent possible, are expected to raise funds of their own, particularly in urban areas. Candidates and others directly connected with political campaigns are not permitted to hold positions of responsibility in VEP-supported registration activities or in any way utilize VEP-supported projects, funds or facilities in aid of their own campaigns. While VEP has never found instances of partisan activity to warrant terminating a grant, several grants have been discontinued on other grounds.

Registration activities are not limited to blacks. Several projects have involved registration of Indians and Mexican-Americans. A few projects have reported registering some white Southerners. Relevant to the last point, however, is the fact that white regis-

tration in most of the South already is quite high.

The weekly reports are the backbone of VEP research. It is through these reports that VEP learns of difficulties Negroes continue to encounter in their attempts to register and vote in the South. Directors of voter registration projects supply the research department with a wide variety of facts and figures relating to Negro political participation in the South. VEP is the central point of such information by government, the press, scholars and universities, publications, research organizations, authors, and foreign visitors.

As already mentioned, the registration drives provide tremendous amounts of information and knowledge that otherwise would not be available. For many years, the Southern Regional Council has been the main source of information about black registration and voting in the South. Because several states have discontinued publication of registration figures by race, these local registration drives have become increasingly important in arriving at registration figures by race. The Voter Education Project continues to be the main source of this information.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

During the last three years, VEP has held a number of seminars, workshops and conferences for candidates and officeholders.

We have felt that black candidates and black officeholders, like black voters, have been so long denied a part in the political process that these special educational programs were warranted and, indeed, necessary.

The seminars and conferences are restricted to discussions of the duties and responsibilities of candidates and/or officeholders. Discussion of campaign techniques and strategy, of how to get elected, etc. is not permitted. Incidentally, VEP has consistently rejected requests for funds for get-out-the-vote activities and has cautioned grant recipients against using VEP funds for this purpose. Similarly, we have felt that the new voters should be informed about the government they now are helping elect, and that is the basis for the programs in the field of citizenship education.

As the number of black elected officeholders in the South climbed rapidly toward 400 last year, VEP scheduled the first Southwide Conference of Black Elected Officials. The conference was held in Atlanta last December with approximately 200 black elected officials attending. With the total number of black elected officials now standing at about 460, VEP has set up service centers for elected officials at five predominantly black colleges in the South. Although these centers now serve mostly black officials, we look forward to the day when they will be serving officials of any race who need technical and research advice. The centers may be compared, in terms of techniques and approach to the problems of government, with the Institutes of Government of the Universities of North Carolina and Georgia.

FINANCES

The Voter Education Project is but one of the many programs conducted by the Southern Regional Council, but it is the largest. Although VEP continues to receive small gifts from individuals, the bulk of funds comes from foundations.

Between 1966 and 1968 VEP received \$1,163,446. Foundations which gave \$2,500 or more each during this period include Aaron Norman, Abelard Field, Ford, Irwin-Sweeney-Miller, Mary Reynolds Babeock, New World, New York, Rockefeller Brothers, Robert E. Moton Memorial and Taconic.

Grants for 403 programs, most of which involved voter registration totaled \$736,956.70, for an average of approximately \$1,830 per grant. The rest of the expenditures went

for publications research and consultants, scholarships, student interns, meetings and seminars (including the Southwide Conference), and salaries and administration.

The first Voter Education Project (1962-64) received \$870,371. Principal supporters were Taconic Foundation, Field Foundation, and the Edgar Stern Family Fund.

CONCLUSION

The Voter Education Project was formed as a result of widespread urgings from many concerned persons and groups, including high government officials, particularly in the Justice Department, that the energies of the sit-ins and freedom rides of the early '60s be channeled also into voter registration and citizenship education. It should be noted that there was some resistance within youthful civil rights circles to this development, the objection being that the idea sounded like an "Establishment" effort to blunt the thrust of activists undertakings.

It is true that the voter registration, citizenship education and leadership training programs have sought to bring black Southerners into the political process as a means of correcting the injustices that black people have historically suffered. The registration of thousands and the election of scores of black people have given many blacks in the South some hope of improving their lives through the existing political structure.

The Voter Education Project is the only organization conducting such programs on a region-wide basis. VEP could not have undertaken its task without foundation support. Without foundation support, VEP could not have existed. And without VEP, the black registration in the South would be substantially less than it is today.

Yet, as already pointed out, much remains to be done. Some two million voting-age Negroes in the South have not been registered to vote. Gradually, there are signs that white officeholders are responding to the needs of black voters. There are encouraging signs, here and there across the South, that blacks and whites can work together in the councils of government.

In large part these gains were made possible through voter registration, which in turn was made possible in large part through foundation support. To continue and sustain these gains will require a continuing effort, which in turn hinges upon continued foundation support. Gradually white Southerners are becoming accustomed to Negroes as a part of the political process. To roll back that trend now would be tragic. Discontinuance of foundation funds for voter registration, coupled with the prospective expiration of the Voting Rights Act, would surely halt and reverse the trend toward full political participation in the South.

Sustained registration campaigns are needed to test the willingness of Southern registrars to follow non-discriminatory procedures (especially if the Voting Rights Act is not extended). However, most black people in the South are poor and can scarcely meet their daily needs. A few communities would be able to raise local funds to finance a voter registration campaign, but most would not. For all practical purposes, voter registration in the South would grind to a halt without foundation support.

In the years after Reconstruction came a dark period called Redemption. During this period, white Southerners turned back the clock and reasserted their control over the lives of black people. Tragic and bloody years followed, and the nation is still undoing the damage. Total exclusion of blacks from the political process was a major factor in that Redemption period.

A second Redemption is unthinkable if the region—and the nation—is to survive as a multi-racial society.

POLLUTION AND HEALTH

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of discussion concerning biological warfare and as is too often the case in matters of this sort, the argument tends to become so emotional that we lose sight of pertinent information that should be of interest.

One of the installations involved in this discussion is Fort Detrick located in Frederick, Md., and I think it should be pointed out that people at this location are playing a vital role in the field of public health. For instance, Fort Detrick scientists were involved in research on the bacterium believed responsible for the massive Chesapeake Bay fish kill in 1963. There is probably no other laboratory in the United States with the equipment and experience necessary to study live fish experimentally infected with dangerous human-disease organisms. Furthermore, as a result of this experience Fort Detrick scientists were requested by the Lunar Sample Receiving Laboratory at Houston to develop methods for detecting diseased producing agents in the lunar sample which might effect commercially important fish. The knowledge, experience, and equipment resulting from work at Fort Detrick is of great value to society directly and it is highly unlikely that any other American research establishment could do some of the work required at this installation. As an evidence of the kind of work going on at Fort Detrick and of the quality of the personnel, I would like to include in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Werner A. Janssen who is medical microbiologist at Fort Detrick. These remarks were made at the Pollution and Health Conference of the American Public Health Association held on July 2 in the Washington area.

ADDRESS BY WERNER A. JANSSEN

Fish and shellfish are not yet a major food source in the United States, but as our growing population rapidly encroaches on farm lands for living room, we will have to turn more and more to our water resources for food. Unfortunately, this will occur at the same time that our water resources will be used increasingly for waste disposal and recreation if present trends continue. I think that the time is rapidly approaching when fish and shellfish may become carriers of human infectious disease of equal importance with domestic animals and poultry. I say this even though it is generally believed that few human disease organisms infect fish and even fewer fish disease organisms infect man. This conclusion is based on very little experimental evidence, and may be quite incorrect.

The fact that fish and shellfish serve as mechanical carriers of human disease organisms associated with sewage is well known, but how long and how far the animals carry the organisms is not known with any degree of accuracy. If it is simply a matter of contamination of the animals' surface or gut, then perhaps they may become decontaminated by swimming in uncontaminated water, as some authorities claim. But if the ani-

mals become actively infected by the human disease organisms they may spread these organisms over great distances and for long periods in areas thought to be safe according to the usual public health department methods of assay. For example, a graduate student at Kansas State University found that a variety of fish caught within one and one-half miles below the sewage treatment plants of 2 towns on a river in Kansas contained many different kind of bacteria capable of causing serious human diseases. He was also able to isolate many of these bacteria from the polluted water itself. In addition, he found that catfish experimentally fed several kinds of disease-producing bacteria associated with sewage continued to excrete these organisms for at least 30 days later.

Other workers have shown that fish become actively infected with the bacteria that cause cholera and para-typhoid fever, and they excreted these organisms for days.

In Japan, the chief cause of food poisoning is the eating of raw fish infected with a certain marine bacterium. This organism is probably indigenous to the marine environment, but it is also spread via the feces of human carriers. The organism has recently been isolated from diseased striped bass, crabs and oysters in Chesapeake Bay. No doubt our western habit of cooking fish and shellfish has avoided a great deal of trouble with infected and contaminated aquatic animals.

A few years ago I was involved in investigating a massive fish kill in Chesapeake Bay, which probably originated in the Potomac River. About half of the white perch in the upper bay region were believed to have been killed by a bacterium which closely resembled the organisms which cause human plague and pseudotuberculosis. I might point out in retrospect that it was because of the resemblance of this organism to the extremely deadly plague bacillus that our unique facilities and experience at Fort Detrick were called upon. Fortunately, we found the organism to be noninfectious for mammals. But we also found that some white perch caught in rivers of the western shore of the bay which flow through highly populated areas had definite evidence of having been infected with either the organism believed responsible for the fish kill, or any one of a number of human disease-producing bacteria associated with pollution. In contrast, white perch caught in rivers of the eastern shore of the bay, which flowed through areas of low population, had no evidence of infection with the organisms tested for.

Contaminated or infected fish can, of course, infect anyone handling the fish directly through wounds or abrasions, but I think the biggest danger from fish exposed to contaminated water is the possibility that they may become actively infected with the human disease-producing organisms associated with sewage and spread them to areas thought to be safe which are far removed from the polluted area. The role of fish as potential carriers of human disease, especially as related to pollution, needs much more research, and I hope you will all do what you can to see that it gets done in time.

FIRST STEP IN SPACE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reality at last, man's first step onto another body in the universe was so much like what we had expected that it

seemed like just another science fiction movie except for the anticipation, pride, and exhilaration of the moment.

Neil Armstrong and his companions on Apollo 11, and all of his fellow astronauts, the NASA team, the scientific and industrial personnel, and American taxpayers who made this moment in history possible, are to be congratulated for their daring and their faith and their willingness to face the future.

The exploration of space demonstrates the tremendous teamwork which has always made this Nation great. There should be no doubt in anyone's minds today that we are reaching to the heavens openly and freely for the benefit of all mankind. But this accomplishment today is uniquely American. It was conducted openly for all to see and hear, as have all our space triumphs and failures. And we are a richer country for it.

Man's faith in his own scientific and personal achievement is based on his faith in God, as evidenced by the strong commitment of our astronauts. "In the beginning, God," as Col. Frank Borman quoted from Genesis. This Nation, which itself is based on its belief and faith in our Creator, can truly thank God today for the blessing of this successful mission into God's universe.

The new voice of our people can be heard through Neil Armstrong and all his associates and the young men and women who have been inspired by their accomplishments and who will lead us even farther. And perhaps there is even hope for those of us of an older generation who, when confronted by talk of the "generation gap," can point with some pride to the fact that it was our generation which provided the knowledge, the money and the willingness to take this historic first step into the universe.

OUR MEN ON THE MOON

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in expressing congratulations to the members of the Apollo 11 crew following the successful landing of the lunar module "Eagle" on the moon. The courage and abilities of these men are part of that spirit which continues to make America the leader of the free world.

When man first stepped on the moon, one fact was paramount: when America sets a goal, that goal is accomplished.

Of course, we must achieve a balance among our national commitments. Improvements need to be made in housing, education, nutrition, civil rights, urban and rural improvement, and social order. We must develop a program appropriate to the total problem, and we must meet that program with a total commitment.

Our country realizes we can accomplish what we intend to do. As we develop our priorities in a balanced program, our space achievements assure us our domestic goals will be accomplished, also.

AN OPEN LETTER

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a distinguished fellow Texan, Mr. F. T. Wilson, president of KLRN, Inc., of Ralls, Tex., whom I have known and esteemed as a great citizen of our State of Texas and who has always been responsive to human need. For many years he has labored in the field of the radio media, in fact, I had the honor of knowing him when he operated radio station KGNB at New Braunfels, Tex.

Mr. Wilson has sent with his letter a most touching message written by a grieved father of an American hero who died patriotically in the defense of our country, in fact, in the defense and in behalf of every one of us, even those who are today reviling the United States for answering the cause of human freedom.

This letter was printed in the Crosbyton Review of June 26, written by Mr. and Mrs. Andres V. Minor, whose son, as I said, died heroically in Vietnam. I place this great, though simple, and inspiring message into the RECORD at this point:

AN OPEN LETTER

(The following is the message delivered in Crosbyton Wednesday by Andres V. Minor, father of the late Arman Minor, for whom funeral rites were held Wednesday afternoon:)

MY DEAR FRIENDS OF CROSBYTON: I come to you to express my feelings. I have lost a son in Vietnam, a son who belonged to me and also to this town, where he was educated and grew up. My heart aches and suffers, but at the same time, I am very proud of this son, Arman Minor, who served his country well, even unto death. Perhaps some people in Vietnam thank him also, for he fought for their freedom.

I am talking in his place, and I want to thank the town and the people of Crosbyton, for the opportunities given to him to educate himself and to serve this great Country to the best of his ability.

Everyone, under the blue beautiful skies of this Country, has a duty to perform. My son, Armando Minor did perform his duty. I always taught him to respect his elders and all authority, and though my heart aches, I am proud of him, for he is honor for the family, Crosbyton and the United States.

I am a simple man, had very little schooling, all told about Thirty days with a teacher by the name of Benito Jimenez of Floresville, Texas.

I am also a man of peace. I love peace and have taught all my children to do so. As strange as it might sound, my son died fighting for peace, fighting for the peace of unfortunate people, who have not known peace for a very long time.

In the name of my son, and in the name of my whole family and my own, I would like to thank God and this Country of the United States for the opportunity to serve them both, first God and then the United States, as my son has done.

This is our ideal for me and my whole family

Andres V. Minor and Ines A. Minor and my sons: John C. Minor, Marcelina M. Cruz, Juanita M. Candanoza, Andres C. Minor, Jr., Ignacio C. Minor, Adolpho C. Minor, Jose Guadalupe C. Minor, Consuelo A. Minor, Pfc. Romualdo A. Minor.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minor, is far more representative of that great body of people of Mexican descent, sometimes very condescendingly, and in my opinion, mistakenly, referred to in hyphenated form as "Mexican Americans." This great conglomeration has proven in two great world wars and sequela their loyalty, patriotism, and bravery. Mr. Minor's simple but fervent expression is most typical of these Americans. In time they will establish their great national contribution, as Walt Whitman prophesied last century. Indeed, I believe they have already—except they are not by tradition given to tumultuous and rebellious presentations, despite and notwithstanding some present day "leaders," or "spokesmen," or "redeemers," except in circumstances of justifiable and unbearable causes. Rather, despite prejudice and antipathy it is forging forward in the traditional American manner, within the law and framework of American social ideals.

I am proud and grateful and also humbled before such great Americans as Mr. Minor and his wonderful family. I feel sure you, Mr. Speaker, and every Member will share this sentiment with me.

TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE MITCHELL

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—recently was justly praised in a syndicated column by Whitney M. Young which appeared in the July 21, 1969, issue of the Washington, D.C., Daily News. Mr. Mitchell is one of the ablest legislative lobbyists I have encountered during my 21 years in the House of Representatives. The achievements of Clarence Mitchell demonstrate that injustices can be ultimately corrected in this country. Furthermore, Clarence Mitchell is a true militant. For years, probably in quiet desperation, he has patiently but determinedly prodded, pressured and pleaded the cause of justice in America. No setback sent him yelling in frustration into the streets and no achievement caused him to pause in self-satisfaction. I insert the column at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1969]

CLARENCE MITCHELL

(By Whitney M. Young)

Some time in the future, when historians look back at the civil rights movement, they'll pay a lot of attention to a man most Americans never heard of—Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr.

They'll write about demonstrations, the March on Washington, and a lot of dramatic events that captured headlines. But they'll also write about the major legislation that was passed, laws that gave Negroes the legal rights denied them for so long.

And the story of how those laws came to be passed is also the story of Clarence Mit-

ell's tireless efforts as a one-man civil rights lobby in Washington. He's been so effective that he has been called the 101st Senator.

He recently was awarded the coveted Spingarn Medal for his outstanding contributions in the fight against racism. As director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP since 1950, there hasn't been a bill of importance to black people before the Congress that didn't find Clarence Mitchell working to make it better, to pass it, or to kill it if it was bad.

You may not recognize his face when you see it on television, but there isn't a Senator or Representative who doesn't know Clarence Mitchell.

Clarence Mitchell is a lobbyist for America's poor and he has served them well. He helped to get the first civil rights bill in over 80 years passed in 1957. In 1964, he worked long and hard to get the great Civil Rights Act on the books.

Last year saw perhaps his greatest triumph. After one fair-housing law had been defeated, everyone agreed that another could not be passed. But Clarence Mitchell rolled up his sleeves and went to work. He told wavering Congressmen how important such a bill was. He met argument with argument; encouraged the bill's supporters, counted votes, and kept after Congressmen and administration officials alike. Finally, in April, 1968, the fair-housing bill no one thought possible was enacted.

Too many people think equality is going to come about by shouting and thru rhetoric. But open expressions of anger have to be backed up with sound legislative savvy.

Laws are made in Congress, and the civil rights movement needs shrewd men who can get those laws passed. We've been fortunate in having just such a man—Clarence Mitchell.

His success is also a lesson to those who are so impatient with the NAACP as an organization. It may not do or say things some people consider to be dramatic or exciting enough, but it has made, and is making, a vital contribution to securing equality for black people.

The Urban League often gets the same kind of criticism. So do other organizations. Even CORE is attacked as being too moderate, by some whose definition of "militancy" is total irresponsibility.

What is too little understood is the need for a division of labor among the various civil rights groups. Each has its thing that it does best. But they all work together.

MISS KANSAS 1969 IS MARGO SCHROEDER OF HILLSBORO

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas, the land of two Miss Americas, has crowned Miss Margo Schroeder of Hillsboro as Miss Kansas of 1969. She will represent her State, her county, and her hometown in an outstanding fashion during her reign the coming year. Margo follows in the proud and beautiful tradition of Debbie Bryant and Debra Barnes who reigned as Miss America.

I am especially proud that this talented young lady resides in my congressional district in Kansas. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Schroeder of Hillsboro and attends Wichita State University where she is preparing for a teaching career. Prior to winning

the title of Miss Kansas, Margo reigned as Miss Marion County.

The citizens of Hillsboro and Marion County honored Miss Kansas at a homecoming celebration Monday, July 21. I regret I could not be in Kansas on that occasion because of legislative responsibilities. However, I join in congratulating Miss Kansas of 1969 and wish her happiness and success in the future.

THE 20TH OF JULY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July 20, 1969, marked the 25th anniversary of a memorable event which testifies to man's unquenchable desire for freedom from tyranny even in the darkest hour.

I refer to the attempt by German Col. Count von Stauffenberg and his resistance group to overthrow the Hitler regime on the 20th of July 1944.

Throughout the 12 years of the "Third Reich," there were many groups of men and women who protested the regime's laws and actions. But they were isolated by the state-party machine, and when detected they were mercilessly hunted down. They could not prevent the war. Gen. Ludwig Beck, the German Chief of Staff, who was one of their number, resigned his command rather than accept Hitler's dictates.

Notwithstanding the Gestapo's efficient machinery, the spark of freedom lived on. A group of men of high ideals, known as the "Kreisau Circle," planned again and again to overthrow Hitler. Many had religious scruples against taking the life of the "Führer," but in the end they decided there was no other alternative. They also knew well that failure would cost them their lives.

Against all odds, Count von Stauffenberg, a young, highly decorated battlefront officer, planted a bomb in Hitler's staff briefing room at the Prussian headquarters "Wolfsschanze." Then he rushed to Berlin to help wrest control from the regime. But Hitler survived the explosion to wreak his vengeance upon all his opponents. Count von Stauffenberg was immediately executed by a firing squad. Many thousand others were less fortunate. Anyone with the slightest connection to the resistance group was arrested and literally slaughtered. Field Marshall Rommel, a soldier respected by friend and foe alike, was forced into secret suicide to protect his family from Hitler's wrath.

Although this attempt failed, even in failure it stands out as a monument to the belief in freedom and to the sacrifices which freedom is worth.

At the entrance to the auditorium of the German Embassy here in Washington, there is a small bronze plaque for a former diplomat serving in this country. It reads: "20 July 1944—Otto Kiep—He gave his life for the honor of the German people."

In remembering him and his countrymen who died in the aftermath of the 20th of July 1944, we honor all those who have given their lives to fight oppression. We accept also their vindication of their country's honor.

FREIGHT TRAIN DERAILMENTS INCREASE 20 PERCENT A YEAR IN NEW YORK STATE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling the attention of the House to the ever-increasing number of train accidents and derailments.

Obviously, the railroad industry is making no effort to police its own operations and it is, therefore, necessary that we "throw the book" at them with some tough laws enacted by the Congress; laws that have teeth which the executive agencies can use to bring about safety precautions that are effective.

Previously I have been using national figures in citing the need for tough legislation.

Now, I have some State figures for New York. They are appalling. Imagine, derailments in the State are increasing at the rate of 20 percent a year. This is just one State.

The need for legislative action is clear.

Following is an article detailing the New York statistics as detailed in the July 16 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express:

TRAIN DERAILMENT DISASTERS MOUNT

(By Modesto Argenio)

Freight train derailments in New York State have increased by more than 20 percent a year contributing to concern over disasters triggered by such derailments, a Courier-Express survey indicated Tuesday.

The most recent derailment-collision in Western New York occurred Monday when four Erie-Lackawanna Railroad crewmen were injured after their freight train struck a road paving machine near the Wyoming County community of Castile. Three diesel engine units and 16 cars were derailed in the wreck.

FIGURES COMPILED

The most recent figures compiled by the state Public Service Commission (PSC) show statewide increases in freight train derailments and grade crossing accidents.

PSC figures, compiled for July-through-June periods, show a 23 per cent jump in freight train derailments from the 1966-67 period to the 1967-68 period. There were 178 freight train derailments reported for 1966-76 and 231 for 1967-68.

Grade crossing accidents increased from 183 in 1966-67 to 201 in 1967-68.

Concern over derailments was voiced by the National Transportation Safety Board recently because of the increased shipment of volatile, hazardous commodities by rail.

About 2 billion pounds of industrial explosives alone are transported throughout the country annually, according to the U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission. This is besides increased shipment of military explosives, rocket fuel and radioactive material.

There were no reported hazardous mate-

rials on the Erie-Lackawanna freight train involved in Monday's collision.

MOTOR VEHICLES

The PCS reported that the total number of railroad accidents increased slightly from the 1966-67 period to the 1967-68 period. There were 1,585 accidents in 1966-67 and 10 more during the following period.

The total number of passenger trains derailed decreased from 19 in 1966-67 to 12 in 1967-68. Seven passengers were killed and 57 injured during the 1966-67 period. Three passengers were killed and 253 injured during the 1967-68 period.

However, the total number of grade crossing collisions involving motor vehicles striking moving trains increased from 66 in 1966-67 to 72 in 1967-68.

WARNING ISSUED

The number of persons killed in grade crossing accidents dropped from 40 in 1966-67 to 27 in 1967-68. Eighty-eight persons were injured in grade crossing accidents during each of the reporting periods.

The National Transportation Safety Board has warned that there appears to be a need for a general re-examination of existing railroad and maintenance and operating procedures.

NIXON'S PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 6 months have elapsed since Richard M. Nixon was inaugurated as President of the United States. White House watchers have spent the first half of 1969 scrutinizing the apparent successes and failures of the new administration. For the most part, these evaluations have been couched in prophetic and noncommittal language. With the administration still unpacking, most political analysts preferred to suspend judgment until more time had elapsed. But after half a year, comprehensive critiques of the Nixon administration are beginning to appear.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful critique, which was published in the June issue of Commentary, by Robert Lekachman, professor of economics at the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

In brief, Professor Lekachman's analysis suggests that the administration is pursuing a course which offers little hope that the necessary concerted and aggressive attack against the problems confronting our cities and the Nation's poor will be launched during the next 4 years. In area after area requiring a change in policy—in housing, education, extravagant military expenditures, and tax reform—the administration has evidenced a desire to stand pat, rather than redirect national resources toward solving the multitude of problems comprising our domestic crisis. As Professor Lekachman says:

The President is disinclined to support urban problems not because there is no money available for them, for, of course, there is money available.

Tax reform, higher taxation of corporate profits, and even a modest reduction in Pentagon spending could easily gen-

erate the funds necessary. As Professor Lekachman emphasizes:

We could . . . control inflation and at one and the same time finance social reform at decent levels.

However—

President Nixon's actual tax and expenditure policies have decidedly different aims from these.

Professor Lekachman's analysis points out the need for Congress to undertake a reordering of budgetary priorities. For, if the administration will not lead the way toward social and economic progress, Congress must. I urge my colleagues to carefully study this article. If Congress is to provide effective leadership during the current session of Congress, it is essential that we understand the inadequacy of the Nixon administration's approach to our growing unresolved domestic needs.

The critique follows:

[From Commentary, June 1969]

NIXON'S PROGRAM

(By Robert Lekachman)

Superficially the initial months of the Nixon administration can be interpreted as something of a relief from the exaggerated fears and dismal visions of the President's more devoted enemies. The New Frontier has not been surrendered to the Indians. Ramshackle as ever, the Great Society stands. The gloomiest forecasts centered upon the programs administered by Health, Education, and Welfare, but thus far at any rate Secretary Robert Finch has averted massive financial bloodletting. Moreover, in spite of Strom Thurmond, the fabled Southern strategy of the Nixon campaign, and the ambiguities of the President's own utterances on the subject, the guidelines governing Title VI funding of local school districts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been only bent here and there, not discarded. The appointment of Dr. James Allen as Commissioner of Education certainly suggests some inclination not to reverse the outcome of the Civil War.

Elsewhere the omens are equally cheerful or at worst ambiguous. Congressman Donald Rumsfeld's surrender of a safe House seat in order to become head of the Office of Economic Opportunity implies the continuation of that agency. Even the Job Corps camps which Mr. Nixon the candidate condemned as flat failures are promised a continued life on a more modest standard of living under the aegis of the Department of Labor. Head Start, though it is presently the target of a somewhat dubious evaluation, is for the coming year promised as much money as it got last year.

A resolute viewer of the bright side of life can find a little more that is pleasing. The Model Cities program has been adopted by Secretary Romney as his own. Mr. Finch has actually asked for more money with which to enlarge the studies now underway in New Jersey into the effects of negative income taxes. There is manifest a Presidential disposition to proceed against at least two of the many tax inequities which make the American system of so-called progressive taxation something of an international laughing stock. These are: the tax assessment of individuals and families whose incomes put them below the poverty line and, at the other end of the scale, the total escape from tax liabilities of fat cats whose incomes each year run in excess of \$200,000.

The much touted budget reassessment, received with yawns when it was finally released on April 15, has not proved to be any occasion for alarm, either. "The President's objectives," it proclaimed, were "threefold:

. . . to make the expenditure cuts that are a necessary part of efforts to combat inflation; to bring federal outlays under control; and to begin redirecting ongoing federal programs toward his administration's goals." Fair enough, at least if it were possible to identify the goals in question. But all that the fanfare announced was a small stage army of some fifty minor alterations in the last Johnson budget. The two largest cuts were the least likely to stick. Of the \$4 billion in announced savings, \$1.1 billion comes from the Pentagon, but more than half of that figure represents a problematical reduction of B-52 bombing raids in South Vietnam. The other large saving amounts to \$1 billion to be derived from smaller and postponed increases in Social Security benefits. Here again the outcome is uncertain. Congress, which has recently awarded itself a 40 per cent pay rise, may feel obliged to give the old folks a bit more than the 7 per cent improvement in their monthly checks which the administration has recommended.

Not very many of his constituents have ever expected a great deal from Mr. Nixon and it might plausibly be argued that in his initial months in office the President has fulfilled expectations. He never promised much action and he has delivered. Mr. Nixon is not a thorough-going reactionary, but on the other hand his public record has never betrayed much trace of original thought about domestic needs. Instead, as a prudent conservative, he publicly seeks better administration of programs invented by more imaginative men, patient sorting of the successful from the unsuccessful in job training, urban renewal, welfare administration, and so on, and careful balancing of the interests of blacks and whites, Northerners and Southerners, and urban and suburban dwellers.

Before I complete this penance of fair-mindedness, I must note another respect in which the administration has been unexpectedly temperate. This is control of inflation. In the demonology of American politics Republican administrations traditionally consort with depressions and recessions and Democratic regimes with wars and riots. But possibly because Mr. Nixon is aware of this association, having himself suffered through three Eisenhower recessions (he reportedly is convinced that he lost the 1960 election because unemployment rose in the summer and early autumn of election year), he has studiously refrained from an abrupt braking of the economy, which would be certain to cause substantial unemployment. His economic counselor, Arthur F. Burns, and his Council of Economic Advisers, though noticeably more conservative than their Democratic predecessors, are responsible economists who, in a time of racial discord and high black unemployment, know better than to advocate the trading-off of very much unemployment in favor of a reduced rate of price inflation.

Last year the country chose to elect a conservative, non-charismatic politician who promised them a quieter life, an end to the Vietnam war, a firm hand on inflation, and an improvement in the management of the federal bureaucracy. In Washington, if no place else, life is quieter. Mr. Nixon, keener of vision than most, perceives progress toward peace in Southeast Asia. Although the pace of inflation is notably unchecked, the administration is making the right noises and probably even some of the right moves to bring results pretty soon. As for the federal establishment, nobody in his right mind could expect even gifted Republican businessmen to produce instant results. It is possible, then, that in contrast to the activist types who enter the White House equipped with unfulfillable challenges to greatness and commitments to get the country moving again, Mr. Nixon merits a

modest quantum of praise—administered naturally in the lowered tones favored in Republican Washington—for restraint, caution, temperance, and conciliation.

Unfortunately this quasi-quietism simply won't do as a recipe for social harmony in a racially and politically torn country. The reasons the Nixon strategy is unlikely to give even the appearance of success for very long derive partly from the character of national needs and partly from the direction of national policy at the end of eight years of Democratic administration. The Kennedy-Johnson years ended in a whimper as far as domestic policy goes; even their most successfully executed programs were demonstrated to be inadequate responses to the problems which they were designed to solve. Possibly the least flawed achievement was the attainment of something like full employment. By historical standards (though not by post-World War II European and Japanese criteria) an unemployment rate below 3.5 percent probably represents the best American performance we are likely to get until we succeed in integrating into our labor force blacks, Puerto Ricans, and rural whites. Although the Vietnam war has had something to do with high employment, there is no need to deny the Keynesians their fiscal policy success. The 1964 tax cut was that truly rare event, a public policy which worked according to plan and prediction. Walter Heller and the Council of Economic Advisers said that a major tax cut would, through its multiplied impact, expand the 1964 Gross National Product to produce nearly full employment, and, *mirabile dictu*, they were quite correct. One cannot say as much for some of the later forecasts made by the economists.

The more important of the other legislative innovations of the Kennedy-Johnson era include Medicare (proposed in a more generous form fifteen years earlier by Harry Truman), aid to public education, and the War on Poverty. Of the three, the last may yet deliver some unexpected results. Despite the botching or sabotage of many programs sponsored by OEO, it may turn out that the community action and neighborhood legal services programs of the War on Poverty will produce more lasting consequences than some of its better-funded, more conventional programs. The Supreme Court decision in April of this year which outlawed residency requirements as a condition of welfare eligibility, for example, was the result of a case fought through the courts by poverty lawyers. Another of their cases, to be heard at a later date by the Supreme Court, claims the right of welfare recipients to a hearing before their assistance can be cut off.

This is not the occasion for detailed discussion of programs which are in any event so familiar. What I want to make clear is a judgment of the significance of the limited changes which they wrought. In the case of the 1964-65 series of welfare measures, the program was limited, conservative (with the partial exception of some OEO experiments), and always underfinanced. Nevertheless, this was the first successful movement for social change of even a moderate, melliorative variety since the first Roosevelt administration.

It is plain, however, that the Great Society had stalled by the end of 1965, and if we are to understand where a new President is starting from and why we should not rejoice unduly at his restraint in tampering with Democratic programs, we should not forget that the original Kennedy-Johnson programs existed on lean rations at a time when price inflation and rising population would by themselves have required substantially larger appropriations just to maintain them at their original levels. Appropriations for the schools under the Secondary and Elementary Education Act have never risen above 50 per

cent of Congressional authorization. The War on Poverty has done well to get as much money each year as it got the one before. The propaganda for Model Cities has been a great deal more generous than the appropriations recommended by the President or approved by Congress. Rent supplements and public housing have been the annual victims of Congressional budget cutters. For some time the Congressional disposition has been to trim welfare support, impose more onerous conditions upon mothers who receive Aid to Dependent Children allotments, and restrict the scope of Medicare coverage. The Great Society was a starved social experiment years before the Nixon administration began to reevaluate it.

The Republicans' mean-spirited reaction might be taken more calmly as part of an inevitable period of national digestion of legislative novelties if only one could be confident that all of the novelties would survive an extended period of financial malnutrition. Of course this would be to suppose in turn that eight years of liberal Democratic administration had modified significantly the structure of American plutocracy, either by redistributing income in the direction of equality or by diffusing power among some constituencies not used to its exercise. But neither of these alterations in our economic arrangements has been either attained or sought for.

Today income is distributed very much as it was in 1961. Now as then the lucky 5 per cent at the top of the income pyramid collect 20 per cent while the unhappy 20 per cent of the population at the base of the pyramid struggle along with a symmetrical 5 per cent of the national income. This pattern is not the mere consequence of blind chance, much less the play of free markets, for much in the policy of two Democratic Presidents was calculated to promote inequality. The first two tax initiatives of the Kennedy administration liberalized depreciation guidelines and granted 7 per cent investment allowances to the business community—exceedingly valuable privileges for the prosperous folk who run and own large corporations. Fiscal success: that it was, the tax cut of 1964 was no victory for egalitarianism. With a few minor exceptions the tax reform provisions of the original measure failed to survive, and what remained was a measure which reduced corporate taxes and cut the top personal income tax rate from 91 to 70 per cent. The effect was to reduce burdens on prosperous taxpayers and thus to make the tax system less progressive.

Moreover, many of the new social benefits, notably Medicare, were financed largely through the Social Security mechanism which in itself contains a highly regressive tax feature. Because Congress maintains low ceilings on the maximum amount of income subject to Social Security levy, those with lower incomes are the exclusive source of periodic increases of the levy. This is an important reason why working-class and lower-middle-class taxpayers have been screaming for relief. And their plight has been aggravated by the sharp rise in real-estate and sales taxes upon which states and localities must depend to finance schools and other services. By comparison with the inhabitants of other advanced industrial states, Americans are lightly taxed. But the system produces so many inequities that many Americans feel, and some actually are, harshly dealt by.

The Democrats did nothing to bring the tax system into some less whimsical relationship with one's ability to pay. As the system now operates, individuals of quite modest incomes pay larger percentages of those incomes than do their more affluent fellow citizens. And the number and the value of the loopholes increase as incomes rise. Overall, for example, taxpayers who earn more than \$100,000 annually pay lower ef-

fective rates than those in the \$50,000-\$100,000 bracket. Up to this moment, Congress has been far more disposed to widen than to close or narrow the tax hatches that make this possible.

There is one further comment to be made about income distribution. Any inflationary period favors the recipients of the more volatile forms of income. Thus it was that in the fourth quarter of 1968, in spite of tax surcharges and the expenses arising from credit shortages, American manufacturing corporations earned \$8.7 billion after taxes. This was a pleasant 5.2 per cent of sales, higher than the preceding quarter's 4.9 per cent or the 5.1 per cent record for all of 1968. As the *Wall Street Journal* approvingly noted, this level of profit has been matched or exceeded only five times since 1950.

Profit, it can more or less plausibly be argued, is the reward of efficient enterprise. But inflation often rewards most richly those whose claims to efficiency are the most tenuous. The tax laws in an inflationary period grant stock speculators, real estate promoters, and conglomerate organizers something very like the right to print their own money (although that last bubble appears to have burst). This too is part of the reason why so many people are feeling no richer or are actually feeling even poorer at a time when the GNP bounds forward each quarter, industrial output rises, and the familiar roll call of statistical indicators seems to prove that Americans never had it so good. In fact, as the Teamsters' Nicholas Kisburg recently demonstrated in a study of real earnings in the New York metropolitan area, higher taxes and price inflation often leave even tightly organized workers no better off than they had been when wages, prices, and taxes were each rising less steeply.

As for any potential redistribution of economic power, what seems to have been going on instead is another movement toward further concentration of assets and corporate control. Recent Federal Trade Commission data reveal continued acceleration in the pace of corporate mergers. In 1966 there were 1,746 company acquisitions, in the next year 2,384, and last year no fewer than 4,003.¹ All this was of course in addition to the normal growth of the established goliaths of American manufacturing and finance. One recent dodge, the bank holding company, allows banks to acquire unrelated manufacturing and distributing enterprises in a fashion which reminds a good many observers unpleasantly of the operations of the Japanese Zaibatsu or the German industrial banks which have traditionally merged financial and industrial power.

It is no exaggeration to say that when the Johnson administration passed into history, it left the Republicans a country operating at full economic blast, equipped with an inadequate but marginally improved set of social services (by comparison with 1960), and handicapped by a distribution of income and wealth possibly still less equitable than in 1960 and a concentration of economic and military power far more menacing than the military-industrial complex which had aroused Mr. Eisenhower's apprehensions.

What I have been describing is close to the policies of classic English conservatism: inegalitarian as to power, income, and wealth, and disposed to pay most of us off with high employment and modest social benefits. There have been occasions when that policy was, if not appropriate, at least successful in both England and the United

¹ Large companies acquired small ones. Often large companies acquired other large companies. In 1966 the 200 largest corporations bought 33 other companies with total assets of \$2.4 billion. The score for 1967 was 67 companies endowed with assets of \$5.4 billion. Last year the giant 200 picked up 74 companies and assets of \$6.9 billion.

States. This is not one of those occasions. I do not intend to rehearse the familiar catalogue of social needs which a new administration, saddled with an expensive war and harassed by a serious inflation, must nevertheless cope with. Two concluding statements will suffice. Massive new funding is required for federal programs now on the statute books, among them aid to schools, Medicare, public housing, model cities, welfare, and manpower training. In addition, federal assistance is urgently required to bail out the states and localities in their attempts to finance the growing burden of public services out of taxes which offer little financial and less political scope for increase.

Race and the cities: we cannot avoid as a nation the confrontation which they impose upon us. As a people we have faltered before the choice of a full integrationist strategy designed to open white suburbs and white schools to black families and, in the inner-city ghettos, a strategy calculated to make life humanly tolerable and financially viable. Both approaches require very large quantities of resources for any hope of success, and although we all know by now that money alone does not resolve racial tensions deeply rooted in human prejudice and American history, we should be equally aware that these problems are highly unlikely to be ameliorated in the absence of a very large national commitment of public funds.

There then is President Nixon's dilemma. A conservative by temperament, Affiliation, and political choice, elected by rural and suburban seekers after lower taxes and improved public order, he is faced with menacing maladies of race and urban life whose treatment will surely require that large wads of cash be diverted from the thrifty white voters who installed him in the White House to the blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans who preferred Mr. Humphrey. And yet there appears to be no money available. When the war in Vietnam subsides, the generals and admirals will have grasping hands extended for the funds to buy new and more expensive toys. And if the President resists the military, he will face a clamor (which he himself has encouraged) for tax reduction.

Within this grim context, the unfolding Nixon domestic program seems a good deal less reassuring than I was earlier suggesting. The President is disinclined to support urban programs not because there is no money available for them, for, of course, there is money available, financially if not politically. Repeal of the investment tax credit (unvitalized by a promise to reduce other taxes) would supply the Treasury with over \$3 billion each year for domestic spending. Or, as Andrew Brimmer, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board, has recently urged, the tax surcharge on corporate profits might be raised from 10 to 15 percent. It is, after all, the business sector which is the major source of inflationary pressure. Accordingly it is the business sector, not the unhappy consumer, that ought, on economic grounds as well as on grounds of equity, to be squeezed. A real effort to close such enormous loopholes as the tax treatment of real estate and capital gains, building depreciation, charitable and foundation allowances, and the mineral depletion scandal could readily generate anywhere from \$5 to \$15 billion in additional tax receipts. A modest slice from the Pentagon establishment could easily grab another \$5-\$10 billion. We could—but of course we will not—control inflation and at one and the same time finance social reform at decent levels.

President Nixon's actual tax and expenditure policies have decidedly different aims from these. The administration tax program, sent to Congress on April 21, is a carefully carpentered piece of merchandise. It commences with a major surprise, the repeal of the 7 per cent investment tax credit and the companion 3 per cent allowance now granted

to utilities. Mr. Nixon adroitly couples with this proposal, presumably highly unpalatable to his business supporters, a promise to reduce the tax surcharge from 10 to 5 per cent, come January 1, 1970. As far as the Treasury is concerned, the two changes offset each other and the net revenue effect will approximate zero. This is not the way to generate additional funds for urban programs, although on January 18, 1970 the tax system will be a trifle less unfair than it now is.

The remainder of the program is equally astute politically. The President puts a liberal face upon mild changes which will no doubt be used as arguments against more substantial tax reforms. The new "low-income allowance" will, according to Treasury estimates, "remove more than 2 million of our low-income families from the federal tax rolls and assure that persons or families in poverty pay no federal income taxes." At present a family of four with income in excess of \$3,000 is subject to some tax. After the Nixon reform only families that earn over \$3,500 will be assessed. Today a married couple whose total income is \$2,300 still pays a \$100 federal income tax. The Nixon plan would relieve such a couple of all liability. And so on. As far as it goes, the changes are commendable and long overdue.

The revenue lost by this how to equity is to be replaced by imposing tax liabilities upon some affluent citizens who legally have been able to avoid such liability under existing tax regulations. The key innovation is the "minimum income tax" which, says the President, will impose a "50 per cent limitation on the use of the principal tax preferences"—notably not including tax-exempt securities and capital gains. In the absence of specific legislation, it is difficult to say just how much importance should be attached to this device. Even Congressman Mills and the New York Times have reacted by stating a preference for a direct assault upon the loopholes themselves, surely a more fundamental approach to the problem.

As on so many other occasions, one is led almost irresistibly to say of a Nixon action: it could have been worse. Small changes in the right direction are better than none at all, unless of course they spoil the chances to make more substantial improvements later on. But it would take a real optimist to think that there ever existed an opportunity to be spoiled in this administration to do away with oil depletion allowances, inheritance tax escape hatches, capital gains avoidance devices, and the rest of a list which costs the Treasury up to \$50 billion a year in uncollected revenue. My guess is that if Congress enacts this package, it will be about as much tax reform as we can sensibly anticipate in the next four years.

Nixon's expenditure policy should be divided into its current and, one hopes a post-Vietnam phase. The current Nixon budget, as I have said, is the last Johnson budget modified by a very small number of changes. As far as social policy goes, the most significant of them may turn out to be the slight reduction in the funds sought for Model Cities. Romney intends to spread out what is left after the cut over a much larger number of communities. The effect almost inevitably will be the conversion of a scheme designed to operate powerfully upon a limited number of slum areas into a conventional federal subsidy spread thinly on the usual political assumptions over so many claimants as to eliminate the possibility of substantial success anywhere. The most disastrous current failure of course is the President's refusal to take on the Pentagon, which is the major consumer of federal tax receipts and, one would have thought, the likeliest candidate for budgetary curtailment.

After Vietnam what is promised in the way of new federal spending is revenue-sharing with the states and tax credits for business

firms that invest in poverty areas or hire and train the hard-core unemployed. The strategy is faithful to the Nixon themes of decentralization and reliance upon the energies and ingenuity of private business. Both of these devices are potentially retrogressive in their effects, although revenue-sharing had liberal origins and carries some continuing liberal sponsorship. Walter Heller, while still Chairman of the Johnson Council of Economic Advisers, proposed distribution to the states of a portion of annual federal income tax receipts, with few strings attached. As he saw it there were three practical merits to the device; the states would be relieved of some of the dreadful financial poverty in which they now conduct their affairs; revenue-sharing might strike many Congressmen as a preferable alternative to tax reduction in a time of fiscal surplus; and finally, state government itself would be appreciably strengthened. Heller thought of revenue-sharing as supplementary to the wide variety of categorical grants to states and localities which had been federal practice since the early days of the New Deal.

The idea was quickly adopted by such astute Congressional conservatives as Melvin Laird and Charles Goodell who saw in revenue-sharing a potential substitute for federal social programs. It would appear that Laird and Goodell were rather more astute than Heller in their perception of the political potentialities of revenue-sharing. In fact, there is rather more wrong with the scheme from a liberal perspective than there is right with it. It is no accident that the governors have to a man favored and the mayors with equal unanimity opposed revenue-sharing, for there is no way of assuring that the states will treat the large cities any more equitably with federal funds than they do under the various state-aid formulas now in use. There is a racial count against the device as well. It is exceedingly difficult even under existing categorical grants to control the ways in which states spend federal money. Funds given to the states without strings or standards are certain to be disbursed in the South and elsewhere with scant attention to racial equity. The last and possibly the most powerful argument against revenue-sharing is embedded in the history of social innovation in the United States. In our conservative land, social change has come with extreme rarity from the states. Where progress has been made, it has usually been at the federal level. An occasional activist President is from time to time able to push Congress in progressive directions. To diminish the political importance of the federal government and increase that of the states is still further to shift the balance of power in a conservative direction.

Nixon's favorite scheme, granting tax incentives to business for applied social work, is subject to both technical and social reservation. Technically there is great difficulty in writing a statute which would genuinely reward the extra efforts at ghetto investment and job training engaged in by corporations without giving subsidies to corporations that in the absence of the reward would have followed the same policies anyway.

The larger, social issue is one that I have earlier alluded to. Are we going to encourage the drift of two separate societies, one black and the other white? Or are we going to strive still against the odds to achieve an intergrationist resolution of the American dilemma? There is no doubt that tax incentives for ghetto investment support a separationist strategy. Is it this perception which explains the odd alliance of the Nixonites and such Black Power advocates as Roy Innis.

I thus come to a brief but unhappy conclusion. The Nixon domestic program is drastically inadequate to meet the social needs with which only the federal government can

cope. This is bad enough, especially since the President shows no sense of urgency in somehow scraping together more resources for urban programs. But what is worse is the direction in which the signposts point. The danger is real that the more innovative policies of recent years will be whittled away or blurred in their impact, that revenue-sharing with the states will strengthen conservative political elements throughout the country, and that tax incentives will encourage the drift to white and black separatism which now menaces us. The voices of the new administration are low and courteous, but their message is not one of joy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—PEOPLE IN CHAINS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those in our midst who understand the true value of freedom are those who have been deprived of their freedom.

No more vivid reminder of the tyrannies and constant threat from international communism exists than the presence of those friends among us who are exiles of the 27 captive nations enslaved by the Red terror.

One such articulate advocate of individual freedom is Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky—a Ukraine American who lives in my State at Abbeville.

Dr. Sas is one of the millions who have voted with their feet. He uses his free speech to warn his fellow Americans.

I have had the privilege of hearing Dr. Sas speak. I know him personally and have had the opportunity to discuss his persecution and experiences firsthand. I wish that every Member of this body could also have this opportunity—that every American could hear his story. They would learn that freedom is more than a word.

If more of our people could hear the unpopular truth from someone who has been there and known the human tragedies that always accompany Red conquest, we would have found a way to do something for the captive nations people over the past 10 years.

I include Dr. Sas-Jaworsky's letter as follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS: AMERICA'S SHAME

In the history of mankind there was never a period when a great nation urgently needed friends as the United States at the present time. Our country which was conceived of the intense hope for afflicted humanity reached its peak of power, glory and respect throughout the world at the end of the second world war. The United States fought World War II not for glory, territorial gains, or other ambitious reasons, but for one purpose—to establish throughout the world peace built on the principle of God and the Declaration of Independence.

Did the people in responsible government positions who handled foreign affairs and especially East European affairs in the last 35 years succeed in their jobs? Every impartial historian must answer No. For after many sacrifices in lives and material goods, the United States is on the brink of losing its physical existence.

Now the average American would ask what happened? The answer is simple and one. During World War II we chose a "friend" who supposedly stood by our side. In reality this "friend" (and to be specific we are talking about the Russian communists) never were our "friend", are not our "friend", and never will be our "friend", for they have a definite goal—to overthrow our legitimate government and establish a Soviet United States.

And what is our reaction? Instead of being faithful to the principles of our Declaration of Independence and giving all moral support to the 27 countries enslaved by the Russian communists, we are continuing stubbornly to court the Russian imperialistic conquerors and do everything possible not to hurt them. While we are prepared to meet their military attack, we are doing absolutely nothing as far as psychological warfare, which is equally important, especially in the atomic age, for the solution will not be on the battlefield. The United States does not intend to attack the Soviet Union and the Russian communists do not want to take over our country devastated by the hydrogen bomb. They want to take us over intact with all our beautiful developments. The three per cent of their followers have succeeded up to now and 97 per cent of the complacent Americans are doing nothing.

The purpose of this communication is to request support for House Resolution 102-103 for the creation of a special House Committee to study Captive Nations and the establishment of a Freedom Academy.

Twenty-seven nations enslaved by the Russians are waiting for a word of moral support from the American people. Those 27 captive nations are our genuine friends.

Ask your Senators and Congressmen what was done concerning this matter after they voted unanimously 10 years ago to proclaim "Captive Nations Week". Americans, ask your Senators and Congressmen when will there be an end to our suicidal foreign policy. Ask your Senators and Congressmen in letters why after devastating proof that we are following this deadly wrong direction in dealing with Russians, we still continue to perpetuate our mistakes.

After all, you have full moral right to do so, for you are the one who pays the heavy price for our leaders' mistakes.

ALEXANDER SASJAWORSKY.

ABBEVILLE, LA.

**COMMENDING MR. LOWENSTEIN
FOR HIS CONSTRUCTIVE WORK
WITH YOUNG PEOPLE**

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, 22 Republican House Members made an unannounced tour of some 50 university campuses across America to try to understand the problem of campus unrest. We later met with the President and submitted a report which outlined our findings and recommendations.

Today, I wish to commend another Congressman, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, of New York, who also has been visiting the college campuses in an effort to help develop constructive answers for dealing with campus unrest and violence. Having personally visited campuses where Mr. LOWENSTEIN has appeared, I have found his efforts to have been highly successful in isolating campus revolu-

tionaries and others promoting violence, while encouraging the moderate students to seek constructive change in a proper manner.

I salute AL LOWENSTEIN for his individual efforts and for the significant contribution he is making in encouraging the use of reason, in place of revolution, on our troubled campuses. He is one of a very few people in our society who is convincing our young people, by word and action, that violence is wrong and has no place in our universities or in society.

The Christian Science Monitor, in a very thoughtful article, discussed the excellent work Mr. LOWENSTEIN is doing with young people. I insert the full text of this article which appeared on May 20, 1969:

LOWENSTEIN TAKES FIGHT TO THE CAMPUSES

(By Lucia Mouat)

WASHINGTON.—"All I want to do is shake his hand—this guy's my hero you know."

Soon the University of Maryland student with the sideburns got his wish as freshman Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein (D) of New York came zipping out of his office in a last-minute dash to the airport. With one handshake and a brief greeting later, he was off for a speaking engagement at Notre Dame University.

As leader of the "Dump Johnson" movement and a longtime articulate critic of the Vietnam war, Mr. Lowenstein is an over-30 liberal with considerable under-30 appeal. But what he says as he speaks to college campuses this spring is not always what students expect.

He assures them that change is possible without violence and disruption. And he puts the message strongly. He refers to burning buildings and spitting at university presidents as "pointless nonsense" which will not bring the war to a close or solve the nation's domestic problems "one second sooner."

"There is something between Melvin Laird and the SDS," he tells his young audiences. (The Secretary of Defense and the Students for a Democratic Society are considered at opposite poles in their view on Vietnam.)

STANDING OVATIONS

As a politician Mr. Lowenstein admits it would be easier and more natural for him to denounce violence before civic groups or on the floor of the House. Instead, he decided to "take the fight where it's at" by going straight to the campuses.

While on-campus radicals predictably try to disrupt the speeches or at least make noisy exits, Mr. Lowenstein is often given a standing ovation at the close of his remarks and often takes part in late-evening "bull sessions."

As a liberal, he carefully links his indictment of violent tactics with an impatient plea for social change. He charges that members of Congress are wasting vital time and energy by simply congratulating themselves on how virtuous they are because they are against violence and rioting.

If Congress is really eager to stamp out the disruption, he suggests, it would not allow itself to become preoccupied with cutting off scholarship aid to campus rebels but would hasten to solve some of the nation's most pressing problems.

"It's now more fashionable to denounce than approve," he says, "but if we don't get out of the current lockstep, present violence is going to get worse."

"ONLY SHOW IN TOWN"

The Congressman from Nassau County, who has taught variously at Stanford, North Carolina State University, and the City Col-

lege of New York, sees his mission in campus speaking as reminding the "great majority" that they are not alone.

"There's great toleration for violence mainly because it's the only show in town," he remarked in the course of the hectic ride to the airport. "On no campus that I've visited does disruption by the Left have the support of any substantial number. But you've got to prove there are plenty of alternatives or it becomes the prevailing wind and the majority acquiesces."

He argues that the student majority, like the bulk of the American people, needs to be convinced that there is an effective choice between violence and parliamentary procedure.

"We can pull together the vast majority of Americans or we can split among ourselves and fight as to what's the acceptable way to bring change," he adds.

In this congressman's view—though he does not consider ending the war a cure-all—students around the country would do well to emulate Yale University's senior class this year in petitioning the administration to dedicate commencement activities around the goal of ending the war in Vietnam.

EDWIN A. LAHEY

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know that we were all distressed last week to learn of the passing of one of the greatest reporters of our times, Edwin A. Lahey, of the Knight Newspapers.

It was my privilege to have known Ed Lahey for the entire 20 years of my political career. Having served with him on charitable enterprises, I know of the deep sense of compassion that he felt for the underprivileged.

Ed Lahey was a crusader for all of us in these United States of America. He spoke the words of truth and fairness in every line that he wrote.

He had little patience for the deluder and dissembler. He tore the masks from the faces of the hypocrites and revealed their machinations.

I hasten to say that Ed Lahey was not one who used his columns to destroy those with whom he was in disagreement. He had a full understanding of the frailties of man. He was a gentle man.

Though he achieved the position of chief of the Washington Bureau for the Knight newspapers, his principal interest remained that of a reporter. His articles were often carried nationally.

I know of no man in his field who so well gained and held the respect of his fellow worker. Many of the great reporters of today received the guidance of this great reporter.

Ed Lahey has been called an irreverent man but he was never irreverent for the sake of irreverence. He simply believed in the true equality of man.

No one knew this great reporter better than his employer, John S. Knight. The following remarks on Ed Lahey's passing are taken from a column by Mr. Knight:

ED LAHEY

During my time as editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, the only man of

whom I stood in awe was Ed Lahey, the best newspaper reporter in my profession.

Admittedly, my feeling about Ed was touched with more than a tinge of envy. For what other writer could turn out a story on any subject and make it sing with Lahey's flair for facts and fluency? As an associate once remarked: "Ed was born with a silver phrase in his typewriter."

In time, my reverence of an respect for Ed Lahey deepened into a warm and understanding friendship. Though Ed held strong convictions on a variety of subjects, his reporting was a model of accuracy. He sought to report the world, not to reform it.

As chief of our Washington Bureau, Ed Lahey sought no favors from management. As he enjoyed saying, "I demand nothing of my publisher except that he be solvent."

Ed Lahey had no peers in the reporting field. He could spot a phony or a saint with equal celerity. Ed walked with the great and loved the lowly.

His professional code was such that during the 1960 Democratic Convention he rejected one of my stories because he did not believe it to be true. Not many men would do that to their boss.

Ed Lahey was no ordinary man, as his record in journalism will attest. Nor was any Washington correspondent more admired by his colleagues for the quality of his work.

He died as he lived, with indomitable courage, and in later years serene acceptance of the inevitable.

We shall miss Ed, and in all probability never see his like again.

The New York Times carried the following story about this great American:

EDWIN A. LAHEY IS DEAD AT 67; KNIGHT'S CHIEF CORRESPONDENT; FORMER HEAD OF WASHINGTON BUREAU WAS AMONG THE FIRST NIEMAN FELLOWS

WASHINGTON, July 17.—Edwin A. Lahey, chief correspondent and former chief of the Washington Bureau of the Knight newspapers, died today of complications of emphysema at the Washington Hospital Center. Mr. Lahey was 67 years old.

NEWSPAPERMAN 42 YEARS

Small, tough, sentimental and irreverent, Edwin Aloysius Lahey earned in his 42 years as a newspaperman a reputation as one of the nation's outstanding reporters. His affection for his job was unmistakable, yet it was typical of his hardbitten attitude toward his profession to pronounce it "better than working in a steam laundry."

Although he was the friend and confidant of Supreme Court Justices, Senators, labor leaders and other luminaries of Washington, where he was based for the last 28 years, he adopted as his motto five words attributed to Thomas a Kempis: "Fawn not upon the great."

"I have advised my associates," he once wrote, "to reserve one paragraph in my obituary to point out that in my long career as a Washington correspondent, five Presidents have ignored me at press conferences."

Mr. Lahey sensed danger in too great a desire for acceptance by reporters in the capital. "After some 27 years in Washington, where the importance of being accepted is so overemphasized," he said in his address as Elijah Parish Lovejoy Fellow of 1967 at Colby College in Waterville, Me., "I am convinced that the 'inner ring' mentality, the inordinate desire for acceptance, can produce more spiritual corruption than any combination of things put together by the world, the flesh and the devil."

Having established a reputation as a superb crime reporter during the early 30's, Mr. Lahey became in 1938 a member of the first class of Nieman Fellows at Harvard, where he studied economics, history and political science.

"COLLEGE COMPLEX" CURED

The Nieman Fellowship, he said, cured "the worst damn inferiority complex about college you ever saw." It was clear that Mr. Lahey had been a school dropout, but there was always some doubt about the exact extent of his formal education.

At Harvard he reportedly filled a blank space on a form requesting information on prior schooling by writing "fourth grade Chicago public schools." But on another occasion, he left the impression that he had dropped out at the age of 13 or 14. "None of that Abe Lincoln stuff," he said, "everybody did it—not to build character, but to bring in five dollars."

But the academic atmosphere of Harvard failed to smother the irreverence of a man who was well-known then and later for his terse and trenchant summations of people and events.

One day when a notoriously verbose instructor was concluding his lecture, Mr. Lahey asked: "Would you mind summarizing that last point in 10,000 words?"

To another speaker who appeared to be dealing with him as a nitwit, Mr. Lahey said, "Ah, Shakespeare! I'm nuts about him. I read everything he writes, as fast as it comes out."

At Harvard he became a friend of Felix Frankfurter, the professor of law who later became a Supreme Court Justice. Mr. Frankfurter once gave him a collection of essays inscribed:

"To Ed Lahey, to whom I owe so much of my education."

It was characteristic of Mr. Lahey that exposure to Harvard's intellectual community did not prompt him to turn his back on his gangland connections. One day he took a hoodlum to the Harvard Club for a chat, commenting afterwards, "I figured nobody there would recognize a couple of crumb bums like us."

Mr. Lahey had turned to labor reporting in 1936, and the following year added to his reputation with coverage of sit-down strikes in the automobile and steel industries. In 1941, The Chicago Daily News sent him to Washington, where his reputation continued to grow.

"Anyone who goes out on a labor story and doesn't fall flat on his face," he declared, "becomes, quote a labor expert, unquote."

In the capital, he continued to maintain a stubborn resistance against taking himself seriously.

"I don't know anything duller than an expert," he remarked. "I have constantly striven for superficiality. The best stories are written by guys who don't know anything about the subject. A kid who goes in cold to cover a labor convention may make it sing."

During World War II, he traveled extensively, in the China-Burma-India theater of operations and later his byline appeared over reports from Europe, Africa and Latin America, the last being an area for which he developed special concern.

Mr. Lahey was named chief of the Daily News Bureau in Washington in 1956, and remained with the Knight newspapers after the Chicago paper was sold in 1959 to Marshall Field. Two years ago, he retired as bureau chief but remained a chief correspondent.

RECONCILIATION REALIZED

Among his best remembered articles were a beat on the resignation of Martin Durkin, a former labor leader, who was President Eisenhower's first Secretary of Labor; and an interview with Senator Robert A. Taft that led to a reconciliation between Mr. Taft and General Eisenhower after General Eisenhower had defeated Mr. Taft for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1952.

To the late Meyer Berger of The New York Times, who was often described as the best reporter in the country, Mr. Lahey was "the best reporter in America."

He was born in Chicago, on Jan. 11, 1902, the son of the former Alice Burns and James F. Lahey, a machinist. After leaving school, he worked as an office boy, shipping clerk, railroad yard clerk and dishwasher on an excursion steamer before beginning his career in journalism with The Glen Ellyn, Ill., Beacon in 1927.

Leaving the weekly, which is now defunct, he worked for The East St. Louis Journal and The Associated Press until 1929, when he joined "the only paper I ever wanted to work for," The Chicago Daily News.

LEAD CONCERNING STABBING

One of his famous leads concerned the fatal stabbing in prison of Richard Loeb, whose trial with Nathan Leopold for the murder of a small boy had been one of the century's most sensational. When Loeb was killed by a man to whom he had made a homosexual overture, Mr. Lahey drafted a lead that read: "Dickie Loeb, despite his erudition, today ended his sentence with a proposition."

Once he characterized an ex-Communist employed by a garment union to fight Communism as "half cloak and suiter, half cloak and dagger."

Mr. Lahey was a heavy drinker early in his career, but gave it up and joined Alcoholics Anonymous in 1940. He helped others to solve their drinking problems.

He was a member of the National Press Club, the Harvard Club and the Gridiron Club, and his friends were legion.

"He reminds you," J. A. C. Dunn of The Charlotte Observer once wrote, "of an elf who grew too big for the burrow and had to go live with people."

Mr. Lahey is survived by his widow, the former Grace Seidcheck; two daughters, Mrs. Allen Kobliska and Mrs. Bernard Nigro; two brothers, James and Joseph; a sister, Mrs. Gertrude Meyers, and five grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held in Washington tomorrow at 11 A.M. at Blessed Sacrament Roman Catholic Church. Burial will be at Gate of Heaven Cemetery in Wheaton, Md.

We deeply sympathize with his widow, Mrs. Grace Lahey, her children and grandchildren, over their great loss.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, both Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird have appealed to the authorities of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front in recent weeks to make known the names of men who are held as prisoners of war.

This disclosure is part of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners, a pact to which we subscribe and with which we make every effort to comply. North Vietnam has endorsed this convention but so far has refused to adhere to its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that Secretary Rogers, Secretary Laird, and other high officials in our Government will continue to press this point. Only an aroused world opinion is likely to convince the North Vietnamese that compliance with the Geneva Convention and the humane treatment of prisoners is the best course.

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO HON.
ROBERT A. EVERETT

HON. EDWARD JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the eulogies to my fine predecessor, Representative Robert A. Everett, have just been printed and have paid due respect to a fine public servant.

There is one further tribute that I feel should be brought to the attention of Mr. Everett's friends here in the Congress. This is the personal tribute written by his former professor and close personal friend, Dr. Forrest C. Pogue, who is also the author of the historical volumes about the life of Gen. George C. Marshall.

Dr. Pogue's tribute was published in the Murray State University Alumnus magazine of March 1969, and reads as follows:

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO FATS: HIS DESIRE TO
HELP AND PASSION TO SERVE

(By Forrest C. Pogue)

Regularly over the past eleven years, my telephone would ring, and I would find one of my oldest friends—Representative Robert A. "Fats" Everett of Tennessee, whom I first met in 1933 when he was a sophomore in my class at Murray—was on the wire.

Almost invariably, his opening words were, "Hello, Pogue, what you knowing?" It was a ritual he followed with many friends—in Tennessee, Kentucky, Washington—as he canvassed his sources, hungry for reports on friends or the most recent events of the day. He also looked at a score of papers daily, tearing our clippings to send on to friends.

His calls were short—he knew how to husband his time. He said what he had to say, got what I had to report, passed on a funny story or remark, and then went on to another call or to his daily grist of correspondence—sometimes running to 100 letters a day, expressing his thanks, congratulations, condolences, or best wishes.

HE LIVED FOR HIS FRIENDS

His network of callers represented a source of strength, nourishing him by contacts with new acquaintances and old friends. The telephone and mail helped him to re-charge his energies as much as they furnished information for his work.

Fats lived for his friends and his constituents. From his early days in high school and college he had made friends, blunting their efforts to tease him about his size by winning their affection, turning the name "Fats" from a possible epithet of ridicule into a badge of honor.

"Call me Fats" was the slogan he put at the top of his letterhead when he went to his first responsible post, and he never ceased to use it after he entered Congress.

Restless people are supposed to be nervous and thin—Fats was a living denial of that theory. He sat quietly with difficulty. Quiescence robbed him of time to be performing a service for those he represented or prevented him from renewing his drive from the springs of friendship.

LIKE A FLOWING TIDE

He walked through a public meeting like a procession and through a Homecoming gathering like a flowing tide—grasping hands, booming out greetings, gathering to himself the assurance that he was prized for his openness of heart.

He was a prodigal of his friendship as he was of his personal fortune. His great body

seemed almost too small to house his tremendous interest in others, his desire to help them, his passion to serve. He enjoyed sitting with friends over a meal, conscious that their happy talk and easy laughter were basic parts of his existence.

His insistence, so often, on picking up the check was a sign in part that he felt he had gained most from their common meeting. It was not true, as his many friends who gained much from knowing him can attest, for perhaps his greatest legacy was the wealth of friendship he amassed and then passed on to others.

New acquaintances were overwhelmed with the knowledge he was making them part of a great relationship that embraced all those he had known. He wanted his new friends to know and value his other friends. No matter how many newcomers he met—and he constantly reached out for new hands to clasp—he held on tightly to those he knew. And he cultivated their friendship as if the whole country were his electoral domain.

He served, first of all, the people of his district—for that was his duty; and then the people of his state, for that was his cherished inheritance; and last, all those he had met and their friends, for that was his great pleasure.

NEVER NARROW IN INTERESTS

Although he was deepful grateful to those who elected him and faithful in performing his congressional duties, he was never narrow in his interests. Having served in various positions which brought him into contact with people throughout Tennessee, he knew no strangers from his state. To all these he added the people of West Kentucky, particularly those who had gone to Murray, and anyone else who passed his way.

Near the end of 1964, friends in West Tennessee decided to hold an appreciation day for him at Tiptonville. Some 2,000 contributed to a fund to buy him a station wagon, and they came, overflowing two halls, to do him honor.

He had asked me to give the address and I attempted to catch some of the essence of my friend's nature—a hard job to do when nearly everyone in the audience knew Fats of old.

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS

So I spoke simply of the things they already knew—of his sense of humor as shown in quips already finding their way into the columns of the nation's press, of his hearty commonsense, of his joy of living, his hard work, his direct approach, his loyalty to his friends, his great interest in encouraging the young, his work for veterans, his support of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the waterways that concerned his state, his love of people, and his expert knowledge of how to win friends and influence people—a process which he had perfected before Dale Carnegie decided to write a book.

He never forgot to come back to his friends (he probably visited his district more regularly in the last year of his life than at any time during his membership in Congress), and he nearly always managed to stop for a moment in Murray. And they never forgot him.

As a member of Congress, he mirrored faithfully the beliefs and wishes of his constituents. No representative ever spent his days and nights performing more personal services for those who elected him.

He was the kind of friend who anticipated when you might want a favor or looked for some means by which he might recognize suitably some tribute to a friend he wanted other friends to know about. A column by Bill Powell of the *Sun-Democrat* on Dr. Lowry, Dr. Wells, Dr. Hortin, or "Daddy" Trail was almost certain to appear in the *Congressional Record*. Every favorable notice of an old acquaintance which he read or heard about drew a personal word of con-

gratulation, for he delighted in the success of others.

FAITHFUL IN HIS DUTIES

He was not an initiator of legislation, but he was keenly aware of the interest of his constituents in pending legislation and he made tremendous efforts to be on hand for every key roll call and to be present for all sessions of the committees of which he was a member.

To me the tip-off that the end of his life was near came from the fact that despite almost superhuman exertion, at a time when his energies were fast ebbing, he could not remain for all the roll calls in the first weeks of the present session of Congress.

As a fellow-graduate of Murray, one of his former professors, and a close friend for a third of a century, I shall remember him as the graduate of Murray who best qualified for the title of "No. 1 Alumnus" and all-time booster.

There were some whose duties as members of the Murray staff included almost constant attention to the college's development. But no graduate took as much time from his other duties to spend time and thought and money in pressing Murray's cause. Every Murray graduate could assume that he possessed an extra congressman in Fats.

HE EXTENDED FRIENDSHIP TO ALL

Naturally, he was most closely attached to the schoolmates he had known in college. But he extended that friendship to all those he met at Homecomings, tournaments, and season games.

When a classmate came to Washington, Fats tried to think of other Murray people who would like to see or talk with him, and he often arranged a luncheon meeting at the House Restaurant or, if time did not permit, set up a three-way conversation from his office.

A few weeks before his serious illness in October, he told me he was going to Murray for Homecoming, and he talked of the many friends he expected to see.

When that day came, he was in the Veterans Hospital at Nashville, but his old friends remembered him and hundreds signed a telegram to him which he treasured.

My last memory of him, when my wife—who was one of his classmates—and I went to the hospital to visit him on Nov. 12, is of his pleasure in telling of this tribute. As we went out the door, he returned to the pleasant task we had interrupted—reading get-well cards which a friend was opening and handing to him.

In recent months, he had worried over the loss of tolerance for the views of others that was being shown on many college campuses and he was pleased that Murray had escaped the great turbulence experienced elsewhere, not that he opposed disagreement nor decried change.

BACKER OF STUDENT ORGANIZATION

As a student, he had been a staunch backer of the movement which gave Murray its first Student Organization, and he had worked diligently to see that it was made effective.

He was delighted at every Murray athletic victory and its successes in every field of endeavor. He favored instinctively any measure that would aid the college. And yet his championing of Murray did not lessen his enthusiasm for the progress of other schools in Tennessee and Kentucky. His friends at the other institutions knew their programs had a friend in Fats. He was a strong supporter of education.

Like many of us, Fats was a child of the depression. He knew the problem of finding money for tuition and expenses. He set high value on the part that Murray, and many schools like it, with low costs and special understanding for the student with little money, had played in the bleak years of the 1930s.

MURRAY ONLY SOLUTION

For many students in that area, Murray had offered the only possible solution. He was convinced that the opportunity for a college education had meant the way up for him and his contemporaries. He liked to tell of newspaper editors, successful doctors and lawyers, devoted teachers, and flourishing businessmen, all of whom had started with nothing but next week's meal ticket and had made their way with Murray's help and the encouragement. He wanted that help to continue.

One of his first acts as president of the Alumni Association, an office to which he was elected not long after he graduated, was to propose the first alumni scholarship offered at the college. It meant an act by which graduates could help to pass on to others an opportunity which they had enjoyed at college.

Later, on the death of Dr. Rainey T. Wells, founder of Murray, Fats joined loyally in the move by the alumni and friends of the former president to establish a memorial in his honor. I recall the day he met with Marvin Wrather and me to plan a special appeal for funds. Although Dr. Wells had left Murray not long after Fats went there, his true home was Murray, and he was back often enough for Fats to know how much he had meant to the college.

As we went through a list of former students, Fats selected the names of those he knew best. During most of that day, he would pick up a card, recall an incident or two about the individual, and then in the warm glow of reminiscence would dictate the special letter which made clear to the recipient exactly what he, as well as the rest of us, owed Murray. It was a tremendous performance.

WRATHER PRAISED FATS

All of this was in Marvin Wrather's mind in 1967 after a meeting of the alumni in the Washington area. Fats was as friendly as ever, but he seemed to lack some of the drive and ebullience he normally showed. Marvin was worried about Fats' health, and he said to me, "Before it might become too late, I want him to know from me what he has meant to Murray."

In a splendid letter, Marvin wrote to Fats of what he had given Murray even in his student days, of his great work as alumni president, of his key role in raising funds for the Wells Memorial, and of the constant encouragement he had given to Murray and its graduates.

"I know of no one," wrote Wrather, "who has constantly rendered greater service than you to our university. . . . You have generously given of your time and ability to help."

Fats appreciated praise. Like all of us, he wanted the good opinion of his fellows. But in his reply to Marvin, he minimized his contribution. He stressed instead the extent to which he valued the opportunity to serve. His key paragraph said it all:

"I know that Murray State College did a lot for me, and I feel that what little effort I put forth is to try to show in a small way my appreciation for the great opportunity it afforded me so that I might get a college education."

FATS EVERETT SCHOLARSHIP

What he had to say should have a special meaning for each alumnus.

I feel the greatest tribute those of us who knew Fats and valued his friendship could pay would be to contribute generously to a scholarship fund providing a large enough endowment to permit a Fats Everett Scholarship to be offered annually.

If this is to truly honor him, it should be a gift in addition to the scholarship contribution made by many alumni each year. Otherwise the contribution to the Fats Everett

Scholarship would be at the expense of others awarded annually.

This one, being continuous, would keep alive the fine spirit, the warm friendship and the loyal support to Murray that was exemplified by Fats Everett.

NOT THE RIGHT MAN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has completed his first 6 months in office and has been given a resounding expression of approval by most Americans.

To be sure, some people who are to the left in the political spectrum are not ecstatic about the tenor of this administration. The objects of their ire include: the nomination of Warren E. Burger as Chief Justice of the United States, the conviction of the administration that Safeguard is essential to the national security, the action to couple fiscal and monetary policy to control ruinous inflation, the extension of tax reform proposals to include political activities of tax-exempt foundations, the allowance of greater flexibility in guidelines to bring about a meaningful and realistic program of desegregation, the declared war against crime and the proposals to furnish protection against obscenity in the mails.

In large measure, Mr. Speaker, these persons were not among those who supported President Nixon in November and would understandably be opposed to his present policies. The people who voted for President Nixon did so because they were fed up with left-leaning politicians whose pseudosolutions to national problems fared so dismally in recent years. They opted for a change in the direction of responsible conservatism promised to them in the campaign and, true to those promises, this accurately describes the quality of leadership which President Nixon has so ably provided in his first half year in office.

Along these lines, an editorial in the Arizona Republic of July 14, 1969, might be of interest to my colleagues, as follows:

NOT THE RIGHT MAN

Our reaction to the entire controversy involving Dr. John H. Knowles, the hospital director who was rejected as the U.S. government's chief health officer, was one of studied indifference.

We felt Knowles probably would have been a good health officer, as we are sure Dr. Roger Egeberg—who finally received the nomination—will be.

And although we dislike seeing partisan politics brought into such important appointments, for the life of us we can't understand the feigned cries of outrage—particularly from critics who regarded it as sacred duty that Democratic administrations clear appointments not only with Sidney Hillman, the CIO bigwig who greatly influenced FDR, but with a succession of labor union officials and professional liberal organizations.

Now, on the basis of Dr. Knowles' embittered

remarks the other day, we are pleased that he was denied the nomination. For he obviously has neither the temperament nor perception needed for that important post.

Knowles charged that President Nixon "is in the grip of the archconservatives," and he claimed that the archconservative bandwagon is running the White House.

Conservatives, yes; archconservatives, no. And only a man suffering from political myopia could make such a charge—in view of the fact that liberals Daniel Moynihan, James Farmer, and HEW's liberal Robert Finch, all occupy prominent positions in the administration.

The Nixon administration is basically apolitical. That is, ideology is relegated to the back seat in the formulation of most political, economic, and social programs. But where ideology does play a part, conservative ideology usually prevails.

This is hardly surprising, however, considering that Mr. Nixon was elected precisely because he promised to reverse the nation's leftward drift—the direction in which it had been pushed by the liberals. Why should the administration be other than conservative, considering the mess liberal administrations have made of public affairs during the last several decades—a mess cogently detailed by liberal columnist Joseph Alsop during the last several weeks?

Knowles himself said that Medicaid "is the louisiest waste of taxpayers' money and the most ill-conceived program that ever came down the chute." Yet that program was conceived by the very liberals who appear to be affronted that the conservative Mr. Nixon is fulfilling his campaign promises to slow or reverse the tide of ritualistic liberalism.

The Nixon administration is responsibly conservative. It values the individual, society, and economic thrift. That is why Richard Nixon was elected. And that is why, according to the most recent Gallup Poll, the President is highly popular in every section of the United States.

WERNHER VON BRAUN: "SPACE—AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our brave astronauts, Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin, are well on their way returning from the moon. As they continue successfully to complete this remarkable flight, it seems important to reflect on the importance and significance of our national space program.

Dr. Wernher von Braun in August 1969 Pace magazine offers a thoughtful commentary. Dr. von Braun points to the value of our space program as an alternative to war.

When Congress considers the authorization and appropriation of funds, this is certainly a significant aspect in the determination of congressional support. I commend this thoughtful discussion to your reading:

WERNHER VON BRAUN

Suddenly the eyes of the powerful man across the table lose their humor. "How sad," he reflects, "that scientific progress has been fastest when nations were fighting. Now the space program is doing what war used to do.

For the first time in history a nonmilitary program is making enough demands on human ingenuity."

The authoritative, guttural voice is that of Dr. Wernher von Braun, master of both war and space. His V-2 weapons of World War II came close to changing history, and he masterminded the giant Saturn V rocket which thrusts man to the moon.

"At last man has an outlet for his aggressive nature," he explains. "Unless you give a small boy an outlet to vent his energy and his sense of contest he'll come home with black eyes. Then you can either chew him out or make a sissy of him or channel his energy into sport or skills. That's the way it is with space."

Wernher von Braun was eight years old when he first dreamed of playing with stardust. He was practicing the violin in the nursery of Wirsitz Castle in Prussia when his mother, the Baroness Emmy von Quistorp, an amateur astronomer, returned from the market with a small telescope. The boy ran outside into the frosy night and looked at the moon. "How near it is!" he shouted. "One day I'm going up there."

Two decades and a world war later Dr. von Braun arrived in America as the world's first expert on rocketry. Today his castle is a steel-and-glass one rising above the cotton crops and dairy herds on verdant hills near Huntsville, Ala. Here he conceived and developed Saturn V.

Since his first telescopic look at the moon, von Braun has kept telling himself, "How near it is—how near!" Now he reflects, "When you wheel out one of the rockets to the launch pad I find myself thinking of all those thousands of parts—and all built by the lowest bidder—and I pray that everyone has done his homework."

At 56, Von Braun is athletically fit. It has been said that when he sucks in a breath he creates a vacuum around him—one of many legends about a man who is a pilot, skier, skin diver, mountaineer, pianist, philosopher, writer and theologian.

"The most fateful question of our time? I would say that it is simply how people are going to use their knowledge."

The blue eyes moved to the ceiling, "Let's understand that science itself has no ethical standards. Take drugs. They are neither good nor bad. It's the same with nuclear power—it can blast cities into cosmic dust or create a new Renaissance. Space technology can bring the best out of men or hold terror over their lives and homes."

Von Braun compares the exploration of space and NASA's role with the Renaissance "which was also a time when the mental and spiritual blocks of mankind were blasted away. As old concepts came under scrutiny and as the spiderwebs were pulled away, the church had its problems. But in the end the church and the spirit of man benefited. The same thing is happening now."

"What I'm saying is that the space program is the cutting edge for science and technology. Man needs a cutting edge as he hunts for truth."

He is convinced that space will bring nations closer together. "Space people have a tremendous respect for each other," he says. "The world knows we're not going to the moon to put up a sign, 'Uncle Sam was here.' Nor is it just to bring back samples of moon sand. Our purpose is to extend human knowledge."

After the moon Von Braun and his technicians will be looking at Mars "and probably going there in 15 years. We must evaluate the options available to us in the continued exploration of the universe. We need a timetable."

This is the year of the moon—the year dreamed about by a small boy, who lived in a faraway castle, who looked through a telescope and said, "One day I'm going up there."

His Parthian shot: "I still plan to."

THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION BUDGET GUILLOTINES OUR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as you are no doubt aware, I and other Members of Congress are appalled at the shortsighted attitude of the administration with respect to its appropriations requests for funding of our education programs.

The cuts which the administration is proposing for our education programs will be disastrous not only for elementary and secondary schools but also for our colleges and universities. If all education programs were fully funded at the levels which the Congress has authorized, this Nation would still only be spending 2.5 percent of its total Federal budget and a half percent of the total gross national product. I do not believe that such an expenditure is too great an investment to make in the future of this Nation and of our children. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to carefully study the administration's education budget requests and keep in mind the thoughts expressed in an excellent article which appeared in the Washington Star last Sunday, "School Projects Are Guillotined." The author of the article was Sylvia Porter. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert that article in the RECORD and encourage my colleagues to heed the warning it contains:

SCHOOL PROJECTS ARE GUILLOTINED

(By Sylvia Porter)

A House Appropriations subcommittee is about to complete a bill to provide cash for the national education budget during the 12 months ending July 1970. In the form prepared by the Nixon administration, this bill would downgrade education to a very low place on the list of national priorities. It would, in fact, erase several education advances achieved under the three previous administrations of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. Specifically, in its Nixon administration form, this bill would:

Reduce the total Office of Education budget from \$4.1 billion in fiscal 1968 to \$3.2 billion in fiscal 1970, a reduction of 25 percent at a time when more and better education is a must;

Reduce to zero funds for school library materials under the Elementary & Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Reduce to zero matching funds for materials and equipment for elementary and secondary schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

Reduce to zero funds for guidance and counseling services, also under the NEA, passed during Eisenhower's administration;

Cut in half funds for college library materials, under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Cut in half matching funds for public library programs and materials under the Library Services & Construction Act of 1956, another Eisenhower education law.

In summary, eliminate entirely three education-library programs and emasculate another two and shrink to less than 1½ percent of the federal budget the total for education-libraries.

The fact that this is a very real threat and may well happen is just starting to penetrate education circles; until now, educators

could not believe that the Nixon administration would adopt such policies of retreat on education in a period of explosive social unrest.

They are fighting back. A National Citizens Committee to Save Education & Library Funds (SELF) under the chairmanship of Detlev W. Bronk, president emeritus of the Rockefeller University, is publicizing the crisis.

On July 9, 150 trustees of libraries from 33 states marched on Washington to obtain pledges of votes for registration of the funds from 100 lawmakers.

A fight on the House floor seems a certainty.

No one denies the need for curbing federal spending now; this is imperative to dampen inflationary psychology and control the price-wage spiral. But what is swelling the federal budget are such items as military spending in general, the Vietnam war in particular, skyrocketing interest on the national debt. As one comparison, Texas Democratic Senator Yarborough cites the fact that we are spending \$21,666 per American for ammunition to fight the Vietnam war—against 25¢ per American for libraries and teaching materials. As another, while our national education budget is threatened with mutilation to the \$3 billion a year range, interest going to owners of the U.S. debt is soaring above an annual \$17 billion.

These cutbacks would wipe out libraries in areas where the need is greatest; for instance, many bookmobiles would disappear in regions of New Mexico where the Indian pueblos and Spanish-American migrants live. Thousands of children would suffer; the key cause of failure in school is inability to read.

In the words of New York GOP Senator Javits: "Guillotining the education budget is not responsible fiscal belt tightening." Or even more to the point, as Yarborough asks in obvious disgust:

"What kind of priorities do we have in this country?"

A DIALOG ON FUTURE OF U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as we await the safe and triumphant return of the men of Apollo 11 a national dialog has started on the future priorities of the space program. This is a healthy and timely dialog. I recently received an enlightening and constructive letter from a 16-year-old constituent, Lyndon Gamelson II of Wichita, Kans. Speaking as an intelligent representative of our younger generation, he makes a strong case for continued progress in the space program.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to bring Lyn Gamelson's views to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Excerpts from his letter to me follow:

DEAR SIR: As you are now reading this letter, three Americans are on the greatest voyage of our time. This voyage represents billions of dollars and many millions of hours of hard, strenuous labour. It has also cost lives. But it is well worth it. If life is to continue for mankind, we must reach out for what beckons us. The space exploration program of this country, or even this world, cannot stop. What would become of us if humans were not inquisitive? The wonders and fascination of everyday life would mean nothing. But since mankind is naturally

curious, I hope that he has the courage and strength to continue our space program. If we, as humans, cannot find answers to our problems, then we must reach out and grasp those answers. I believe that space exploration is the answer. Cures for diseases; new, stronger elements; life . . . on other planets is out there. We know not what, but if we stop now, all will be lost. We can do it. We can. We can go where no man has gone before. If we do not have the wisdom to stop fighting, then maybe a superior intelligence does. Who knows?

I ask you now, since our goal is almost reached, to speak out, and convince your fellow men, that space exploration is necessary. It offers the wonder and splendor that we do not know. Only God knows what wonder, challenge, fascination lies beyond the stars. But if we discontinue our priceless space exploration program, we would be taking a step backward. I hope you can see my point. I know that it will cost billions more, but look at the profit. Look at the profit!

Sincerely yours,

LYN GAMELSON II.

JOIN THE CONSPIRACY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, little by little the extreme and anarchistic nature of the Students for a Democratic Society is being brought to public attention. Through press stories, congressional committee hearings and the recent annual appropriations statement by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the message is getting around that SDS goals are synonymous with revolution and the destruction of our way of life. As pointed out previously, the 1968 national convention of SDS included a workshop on sabotage and explosives to disrupt selective service and police facilities during riots, the use of letters dipped in combustible materials, the use of "bird bombs" in toilets to destroy plumbing, employing "thermite bombs" in manholes to destroy communications, to name a few of the devices considered.

In a workshop on self-defense and internal security a proposed pamphlet included suggestions on starting rifle and karate clubs, infiltrating right-wing organizations, starting roguish galleries of police officers and spotting plainclothesmen by observing them as they testify in court.

The SDS national convention for this year was held in June in Chicago, with the nonunderground press being barred from the proceedings. Much more respectable than the press in the eyes of SDS leaders were representatives from various groups hewing to one form of communism or other. Several members of the Illinois Communist Party were observed by local and Federal investigators attending the convention sessions, in addition to members of the Socialist Workers Party and, of course, the Progressive Labor Party, some of whose members are also members of SDS.

We can form some idea of the type of thinking which pervaded the convention by examining a sampling of the resolu-

tions, leaflets, tracts, and news releases which circulated during the sessions. Similarly, resolutions presented at the convention convey at least a glimpse of the extremist trend so characteristic recently of this group. The July 21, 1969, issue of Barron's, a weekly of financial and business news, ran excerpts from a recent article by Alice Widener, the nationally syndicated columnist and long-established authority on the so-called Left, Old and New. The following excerpts appeared in the July 11 issue of Miss Widener's biweekly publication, U.S.A., which, incidentally, lists among its subscribers an impressive list of readers from business, Federal agencies, the field of journalism, and other areas.

The list of responsible organizations subscribing to U.S.A. are not at all surprising when one reviews the information provided by Miss Widener in past years. In late 1965 one could have read of the history of SDS which for years was the student arm of the League for Industrial Democracy under the title, "Student League for Industrial Democracy"—SLID. Other reports included the three conferences of the socialist scholars where the sophisticated left met to fret; the National Conference on New Politics, that calamity in Chicago in August 1967, in which the black militants steamrolled the white militants into militant acquiescence; another SDS operation, the radical education project conference, and other studies too numerous to mention.

A collection of the above-mentioned articles and others are now available under one cover entitled "Student Subversion," which is available from U.S.A. at 530 East 72d Street, New York City. Studies of this type are extremely valuable at this time when one considers Director Hoover's recent statement that—

Never before in our history has there been such a strong revolutionary Marxist movement of young people so eager to tear down established authority.

The Widener articles provide a veritable scorecard by which one can identify the player in their various roles of revolution and upheaval.

At this point I wish to insert the article mentioned above as it appeared in Barron's of July 21 and which was extracted from the July 11 issue of U.S.A. by Alice Widener:

JOIN THE CONSPIRACY—A SUMMARY OF THE LATEST SDS BLUEPRINT FOR REVOLT

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), self-described as "communist, with a small 'c,'" held a national convention in Chicago last month from which the press was barred. From the outside, a New York newspaperman observed that as the delegates streamed into the hall, there was "an overwhelming sense" that last spring's college campus confrontations had proven SDS to be an organization with considerable power. One SDS delegate, on the way into the convention, reportedly said: "We showed them we mean business and can put action behind words." Another boasted: "In the past six months, we have proven to be a maturing revolutionary organization. And we will be 10 times as strong next year."

Will they be? Nobody knows. Most of the press reported that the delegates split irrevocably into two separate groups. "Two rival factions calling themselves the SDS

have so far emerged from the national convention in Chicago," stated National Review Bulletin. "One group, the 'Revolutionary Youth Movement,' retains control of SDS offices, files and funds. The other is dominated by the Maoist Progressive Labor Party."

In fact, Students for a Democratic Society has never been a monolithic organization. By and large, such a political set-up is very rare in human affairs, since factionalism is endemic to politics. It is often said that in political unity there is strength; what is not said nearly after enough is that in minority political activism, even on the part of one person or a small group, can lie real power. Soon after the Bolsheviks seized the reins in Russia during the First World War, one of them said to another: "And to think that a short while ago we were only a handful of propagandists!"

As 20th Century history has clearly shown, it is a great mistake for the majority to dismiss as mere words the propaganda of the minority. In the U.S. today, for example, the Socialist Scholars are a minority among university faculty members, but serve as the brilliant Marxist brain trust of the so-called New Left, in which Students for a Democratic Society wield power great enough to convulse such universities as Columbia, Harvard, Stanford and Cornell.

"We can put action behind words," exults an SDS delegate. So they can, regardless of the faction to which members belong. Unfortunately, though the press paid close attention to the mechanics of the SDS National Convention, scant notice was given the ideas circulated there in the form of resolutions, leaflets, tracts and news releases. Yet SDS words always precede SDS actions. That is why study of the following excerpts from documents presented at the SDS National Convention, June 1969, is imperative for Americans who hope to prevent the disruption of U.S. communities and the breakdown of duly constituted government:

"RADICAL DECENTRALIZATION PROJECT, RESOLUTION NO. 1: TOWARD A POST-SCARCITY SOCIETY

"The period in which we live closely resembles the revolutionary Enlightenment that swept over France in the 18th Century—a period that completely reworked French consciousness and prepared the conditions for the Great Revolution of 1789. In both cases, the old institutions are slowly undermined by molecular action from below. This molecular movements creates an atmosphere of general lawlessness: a growing personal, day-to-day disobedience, a tendency not to 'go along' with the existing system, a seemingly 'petty' but nevertheless critical attempt to circumvent restriction in every facet of daily life. The society, in effect, becomes disorderly, undisciplined, Dionysian—a condition that reveals itself most dramatically in an increasing rate of official crimes. A vast critique develops of the system—the actual Enlightenment itself, two centuries ago, and the sweeping critique that exists today—which seeps downward and accelerates the molecular movement at the base. Be it an angry gesture, a 'riot' or a conscious change in life style, an ever-increasing number of people—who have no more of a commitment to an organized revolutionary movement than they have to the society itself—begin to spontaneously engage in their own defiant propaganda of the deed. . . . The revolution that ushers us into a post-scarcity society must be a complete revolution or it will be no revolution at all. . . ."

Proposal by Bruce Allen, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS; Carol Schik, University of Illinois Circle SDS; Henry Illian, University of Illinois Circle SDS:

"SDS, as a movement based on campus, cannot win struggles for the workers, but can aid this process in many ways, e.g., strike support, community leafletting, and particularly through Work-In. We should

carry on the Work-In year round and attempt to draw in many of the thousands of students who already work part-time in factories, as well as winning SDSers to getting jobs during the year. For instance, many universities are associated with hospitals which hire students and workers. . . . Students could be very effective in building a militant worker-student alliance in such hospitals on a long-term basis. . . ."

Radical Science Conference News: Science Students Union (SSU). On a recent visit to Madison, Fred Gordon, National Education Secretary of SDS, met with members of the SSU to discuss science organizing. . . . There are SSU people in many parts of the country whom you can contact for additional information. . . ."

"We're in contact with the Technology and Society Committee, a science group from the San Francisco area, many of whose members work at Stanford Research Institute, Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Stanford University, and many other smaller institutions on the peninsula. They plan to send us their film, But What Do We Do?, a documentary about a young defense engineer who gradually becomes aware of the actual destructive consequences of his research work. . . ."

Radical Science: A Working Paper by John Neko; Duane Peres; Howie Halpern; Chuck Lowry—"We Are Part of a New Front."

"Capitalist society and an over mechanized civilization are being attacked from many sides, e.g., by the militant labor movements, by anti-militaristic organizations, by anti-authoritarian students.

"In close cooperation with these attacks, a new front is opening, that of specific action by radical scientists against vital parts of the post industrial capitalist state: against its technological machinery and the cynical, pseudo-scientific methods it uses to develop the consumer economy.

"The most direct way open to us is to sabotage and ultimately to stop altogether our contribution to the functioning of the industrial complex. . . . One of the aims of this conference is to discuss how to build such an organization and how to connect its strategy with the existing revolutionary currents. . . . We probably shall have to join forces with the powerful pacifist and non-violent traditions among the American intelligentsia. Although this alliance implies a departure from our radical position, the pacifists, on their part, will go part of the way to meet us. . . ."

"The radical scientists should undo what the short-sighted, or soldout scientists have done. We must insure that this role will be taken over by the coming generation of scientists. . . . On a personal level, the development of a radical strategy implies a fundamental change of attitude toward life and research. Fortunately the young generation of scientists, under the influence of the world-wide radical youth movement, are breaking loose from their elders' traditions. This has a dual consequence.

"Firstly, when the science students and the young research workers choose to be radicals, they find a political background through which creative change can be made. . . . Secondly, association with the radical movement at large will affect the internal dynamics of our movement—in particular the personal evolution of its members, their regard for the place of science in society. . . ."

TARGET CHICAGO

"SDS in Chicago cordially invites every person in the movement to come to Chicago and participate in a project to turn Daley's pig police state into the greatest movement city in the country. We invite you to move here, live here, and bring the revolution to the factories, the schools, the communities and onto the streets.

"Why Chicago? Chicago is the heartland to America, the worst elements of provincialism, racism, police fascism, exploitation,

and general lack of class consciousness among the proletariat are to be found here. . . ."

"In Chicago there is a tremendous opportunity for movement people to contribute to the future of radicalism. . . . Organizing and radicalizing the youth of Chicago's street gangs, bringing the socialist struggle to thousands of workers in hundreds of unorganized plants, working with newly emerging community organizations to bring the power of the people to bear, and of course, challenging the pigs and their corporate masters in their greatest stronghold—this and more awaits those who will come and help us in the biggest and most comprehensive work-in ever attempted in American history.

"Right now, SDS members in Chicago are setting up the machinery to set movement people up in Chicago, and to coordinate their activities. We will help people get into apartments, schools, services and job opportunities of every kind in every part of the city. . . . Women are particularly welcome; women's liberation is sorely needed in factories that exploit working mothers. All we ask is that you come to Chicago and contact our office. . . ."

Eight-Point Program of the American Servicemen's Union:

"We demand an end to saluting and sirring of officers.

"We demand the election of officers by the vote of the men.

"We demand rank-and-file control over court-martial boards.

"We demand an end to racism in the Armed Forces.

"We demand federal minimum wages.

"We demand the right to collective bargaining.

"We demand the right of free political association.

"We demand the right to disobey illegal orders, like orders to fight in Vietnam."

CLASS WAR

"We must win white students and workers to seeing why it is necessary to use revolutionary violence to defeat imperialism. We must win them to supporting the violence of Black workers. But that isn't enough. We must defeat pacifism, especially among students, and engage in revolutionary violence. This does not mean we stand for individual terrorism. We must learn from and advance the example of S.F. State and Berkeley on the question of using mass violence. No social class ever surrendered. . . ."

Jared Israel, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS, PLP Mike Schwartz, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS

"If the government intends to use phony charges as a new instrument of legalized oppression, we must turn such charges into a rallying cry for liberation, winning millions to militant and open conspiracy against the forces that brought us Vietnam, racism, counter-insurgency programs at home and abroad, a capitalist system which exalts private profit and the prerogatives of property over people's needs.

"On September 24 (1969), eight political activists go on trial for 'conspiring' to bring people to Chicago's Democratic Convention. The eight—Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger, John Froines, Tom Hayden, Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Bobby Seale, and Lee Weiner—face sentences of 10 years each in the first tests of the new 'antiriot' law. Attorney General Mitchell has announced that the antiriot law will be the main weapon in the government's arsenal of repression to 'get the student disrupters.'

"Join the Conspiracy. Here are things you can do:

1) "Support the United Front against Fascism. National action around the first week of the Chicago Conspiracy trial (September 24-27).

2) "Organize Conspiracy rallies locally. Defendants will speak, if desired. Contact Conspiracy offices.

3) "Publicize the 'Conspiracy Institute,' an intensive training program for movement lawyers, law students, and potential political prisoners on strategies for fighting the courts, law and order, police and fascism. Institute to run during the Conspiracy trial. For more information, contact a Conspiracy office.

4) "Join in putting the actual conspiracy of racism, imperialism and capitalism on trial. In November, the Conspiracy will put the real criminals on trial in a People's Tribunal, involving international revolutionaries. Fight to get campus administrators to pay for closed circuit radio and TV hook-up direct to classrooms on the tribunal topic: America, the outlaw nation.

5) "Raise funds and publicize the Conspiracy. Literature, buttons and posters are available from Chicago and New York Conspiracy offices.

"Chicago Conspiracy Office: 28 E. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Ill. 60604 (312) 427-7773.

New York Conspiracy Office: 339 Lafayette St. New York, N.Y. (212) 228-1231."

The foregoing documents, presented at the SDS National Convention in Chicago last month, are self-explanatory evidence of why the non-underground press was barred from the hall. Regardless of which radical faction issued them—SDS or SDS-PLP—the contents make a mockery of the widely held view that the members of the Old and New radical Left are mostly well-intentioned idealists. The only uses SDS makes of idealism are as bait to lure prospective members, and as a cover to mask cynical plans for the destruction of U.S. society.

THE POLICE AND THE COMMUNITY

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the dedicated efforts of one man to promote the safety of his fellow citizens. Deputy Inspector Richard DiRoma of the New York City Police Department, who commands the 24th Precinct in the 20th Congressional District on Manhattan's West Side, has made it his business to understand the community in which he works. Thus he is able to communicate and cooperate with the citizens of our community.

The causes of crime in our cities are many, and the solutions are complex. The attempts to reduce crime are not aided by the demagoguery of some, but rather by the efforts of men like Richard DiRoma to promote understanding between the police and the city's residents. Respect for law comes in part from respect for those responsible for upholding the law. By responding to the community's needs, Inspector DiRoma inspires such respect.

The rapport between Inspector DiRoma and the people of the 24th Precinct is evidenced by the clamor which arose recently from the community at the time of his promotion from captain to deputy inspector when it appeared that he might be transferred to another assignment. Fortunately, Police Commissioner Leary responded to the community and continued Inspector DiRoma in command of the 24th Precinct.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article about Richard DiRoma written by Don Pride for the Manhattan Tribune of July 5, 1969:

CHECKER PLAYERS VERSUS MUGGERS, SNEAK THIEVES, AND BURGLARS

(By Don Pride)

The deadly serious game that cops play with robbers in this city of eight million mostly frightened citizens was described not long ago by Deputy Inspector Richard DiRoma at one of his Community Council meetings in the 24th Precinct.

"We must play checkers," he said. "Where crime becomes acute, we try to contain it."

Inspector DiRoma's precinct, bounded by the Hudson River and Central Park between 86th and 110th Streets, has one of the highest crime rates in New York. There is evidence, though, that the recently-promoted DiRoma is one of the best police checker players in the city.

When he was elevated by Commissioner Howard Leary last month from the rank of captain, for example, Inspector DiRoma wasn't transferred to a desk at Central Headquarters.

Commissioner Leary broke with the usual pattern of putting deputy inspectors in division administrative jobs, because the people of the 24th Precinct want Inspector DiRoma to stay there.

In 27 years on the force, Inspector DiRoma has become something of a model of the modern officer who tries to balance tough law enforcement with community imagery.

It's a tough balance to obtain.

"What do we do about strange men in our building?" asked a pretty brunette, wearing a red sweater and splashy red and blue bell bottoms, as she sat with her husband in Inspector DiRoma's office one night.

"In the last two weeks we had two armed robberies with knives in the elevator," said her husband, a young man in horn rim glasses, gray suit, striped tie.

The couple live on Central Park West and they came into Inspector DiRoma's office, in the front of the West 100th Street stationhouse, at 7:40 that evening representing 80 residents who were alarmed at muggings and other violent crimes in the neighborhood. The residents hired a private guard for their apartment building but it did not stop the robberies. The couple came to seek police help, they said, to avert a wider confrontation between the irate residents and the police.

They told how three young black men had gotten into the elevator the night before, a knife was stuck in the ribs of a resident as the car went up and one of the three said, "This is a holdup." One woman handed over some money; another, petrified, screamed. A neighbor called 911, the police emergency number at Central Headquarters, and said, "Somebody is screaming for help in the hall."

When the police clerk insisting on more information, the caller expressed fear that the robbers would get away. The man at headquarters, according to the couple, snapped, "So what?"

It took five minutes for the police to respond to the call. The young man in the gray suit said he thought that was too long.

"Absolutely!" agreed DiRoma. He leaned forward in his chair as the couple talked. His dark eyes, very prominent in an angular face, never left the two visitors. He kept a pen in his right hand and made notes on what they said.

Then, suddenly, Inspector DiRoma turned defensive. The primary election had taken part of his patrol force on the night of the Central Park West robbery, the police do need certain information before responding to a call, the police cannot patrol inside a building, and they need the cooperation of resi-

dents who should report suspicious people in their buildings.

"I need a description," he said. "We don't want to go around just stopping any male Negroes . . . we can't violate the Constitution or their civil rights."

"All right, what are we supposed to do?" the woman asked at one point.

"Cooperate with us by calling us," he said. The woman pressed further and the Deputy Inspector loudly declared, "Beyond that, I cannot help you!"

Before the couple left, however, Inspector DiRoma assured them he would check crime reports to determine what, if any, police action is needed. He also promised to meet with the residents and furnish a new set of guidelines on how New Yorkers can protect themselves in their apartment buildings. "I think we can lick this problem," he said, "but we can't police inside the building."

Apparently satisfied, the couple promised cooperation from the building residents.

It was now past 8:00 and Inspector DiRoma was late for the monthly Community Council meeting in an adjoining squad room. But another delegation was at his door.

About forty persons had marched to the station from a sidewalk rally on 107th Street, between Broadway and Amsterdam Avenue, where nearly one hundred residents agreed to demand more police protection. Inspector DiRoma arranged to have most of the delegation join the Community Council meeting underway in the next room. Then he sat down in his office with three leaders of the group, Stephen Halpern, Theodore Greenblatt, and Estelle Katz, all of 262 West 107th Street.

"We've had eight incidents in the last two and a half weeks," said Mr. Halpern, a slender man in a pin-striped suit who teaches at Manhattan Community College. "One 80-year-old woman was beaten with a chain."

"When these things start up they come in a rush," said Mr. Greenblatt, a heavyset man with a mustache who wore an open shirt and smoked a pipe.

Inspector DiRoma knew the block. "That's the one where the florist is on the corner," he said. But when he started talking quickly about what he could do, Mrs. Katz interrupted. "You talk as fast as your patrol cars go past," she protested.

They asked for a foot patrolman on 107th Street.

"We will give you one," Inspector DiRoma declared.

A man would be assigned to patrol 107th between Broadway and Columbus Avenue, he told the three visitors. He also promised to attend a meeting in their building and furnish the new guidelines he was drawing up for apartment dwellers. "When you know what to do, you don't panic," Mrs. Katz agreed. Then she told how she and her neighbors carry whistles to summon help in an emergency. "Is there any objection to this?" Mr. Greenblatt asked the Deputy Inspector.

"Absolutely not . . . providing that you call us in addition," he replied. "We don't want someone to blow a whistle and not call us."

The three got up to leave and Mr. Halpern commented on how reassuring it would be "to see a man in blue" on the block. Inspector DiRoma followed them into the squad room where the Community Council, a group of citizens concerned about the precinct's problems, was meeting. The Deputy Inspector was greeted by warm applause and, as he welcomed the group to the stationhouse, he noted, "The squeaking wheel, the responsive community, is the one that gets the best service."

Then he announced, "We're going to give you people of 107th Street a patrolman, 16 hours a day."

The people from 107th cheered.

Then Inspector DiRoma cautioned that putting a man there means pulling him off another beat. "The robberies and muggings and purse snatchings are not happening only on 107th," he said.

The police can't patrol every street, he said; they can only play checkers.

When he finished, the forty people from 107th Street left the meeting. It quickly became apparent that the other residents who stayed, and who regularly attend the police-community sessions, were not as pleased by the Deputy Inspector's announcement.

"We have a robbery a week on 110th and we don't seem to have a foot patrolman at all," complained a blonde in the back of the room.

"I will not give you a foot patrolman," Inspector DiRoma declared in the midst of the ensuing exchange. "But I will give you a scooter patrolman."

The woman sat down, shaking her head.

Another woman, in the front, got up and wondered why she saw so many foot patrolmen on Broadway and none on the side streets.

"That is not true," Inspector DiRoma retorted sharply. "I'll show you my records this evening . . . my records are open to your inspection at any time."

A balding man in a sports jacket rose and, with a Swedish accent, said, "You always can see on Broadway one or two policemen standing around . . . but never on 96th Street."

"Maybe they are there," he added, "but I don't see them."

Two members of the Community Council, sharing the head table with Inspector DiRoma, were openly distressed about the quick decision to patrol 107th Street. One of them said such actions amounted to "decentralization—all the way to the block level."

He warned that the muggers will watch to see where the police deploy their men in response to the latest block demand and then they will go hit an unprotected block. "We need long-range answers," he insisted.

The other man noted that the 107th Street delegation left after its demands were met. "We satisfy some people too quickly," he said. "We need their badgering, but we need their help too."

Both men seemed, though, to be taking pains to aim the brunt of their criticism at the 107th Street delegation rather than at the man who made the decision. They led the applause earlier when Inspector DiRoma entered the meeting and it was announced that his promotion didn't mean that he would be leaving the precinct.

Despite the conflicting demands reflected by stationhouse meetings, Richard DiRoma apparently couldn't be happier about remaining in the West Side precinct. At night's end, before boarding a subway for his home in the Bronx, the new Deputy Inspector summed up his feelings: "To be close to the people, to have personal contact with them—that's the greatest reward of police work."

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—ALICE IN WONDERLAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the present administration seems determined to aid and abet the Communist dictator Mao Tse-tung by opening trade and travel with Red China, we may expect North Vietnam, North Korea, and

Cuba to be made our next allies. This will then leave the courageous anti-Communist people of Rhodesia as the only "threat to international peace" feared by our present administration and the United Nations organization. Americans will be free to travel and spend U.S. dollars all over the Communist world but forbidden to do business or visit Rhodesia.

It is amazing to see our State Department sending up such a trial balloon—coying up to Red China—at the same time the administration wages a touch-and-go battle for the ABM system announced to be our defense against nuclear attack from that same Red China. It is even more amazing to see a civilized, peace loving nation like Rhodesia, our ally in fighting Red China in Korea, get the back of our hand as a highly theoretical threat to world peace because the packed U.N. organization dislikes its internal policies. The strange result is that strategic chrome—vital to our defense and previously imported from friendly Rhodesia, must now be procured from the Soviet Union.

The United States, under the U.N. organization flag, is still at war with Red China in Korea. We are still taking casualties when it suits the enemy to ignore the "cease fire" there.

It is almost psychotic for the United States to seek relations with Red China while we deliberately impair our national security by a boycott of Rhodesia, a friend and ally in the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that our negrophile State Department considers our ally, Rhodesia, a greater threat to the American people than our enemy, Red China, only because no race problem exists in Peiping?

News reports on Red China and the U.S. State Department follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 22, 1969]

UNITED STATES EASES CURBS ON CHINA TRADE
(By George Sherman)

On the eve of the President's first trip to Asia, the Nixon administration has made a symbolic gesture to ease tensions with Communist China.

Yesterday the State Department announced a modest revision of the travel and trade bans against the Chinese mainland to go into effect tomorrow. Officials immediately admitted the changes have far more symbolic political than practical importance.

On the trade side, Americans abroad—mainly tourists—will now be able to bring \$100 worth of Communist Chinese goods home without special clearance. But all Chinese goods over \$100 will still have to have a "certificate of origin" to prove they are not Communist-produced, and special clearance for entrance, if they are. Many of these goods are sold in Hong Kong and Singapore.

On the travel side, six categories of Americans will now have their passports automatically validated for travel to Communist China without application.

The six groups are members of Congress, journalists, professional teachers, scholars with post-graduate degrees and college students, scientists and physicians, and representatives of the American Red Cross.

Most of these people previously could get permission easily to visit Communist China, but they had to make application to have the passport restriction removed. Now valida-

tion will be automatic. For others, people such as tourists and businessmen, the old procedure will still apply.

"CLOSED DOOR" POLICY

Furthermore, Peking has not permitted an American to travel to China for more than three years, and precious few before that. Officials note that the changes in both travel and trade restrictions mean little until there is a change in this "closed door" policy on the mainland.

The chief benefactors are tourist spots like Hong Kong and Singapore, where both Communist Chinese goods and fake "certificates of origin" to bypass the American embargo, abound.

Officials in both places, as well as in Japan and on Nationalist Chinese Formosa, were informed of the changes in advance.

The timing of the State Department move, just before President Nixon and Secretary of State William P. Rogers depart tonight for the Pacific, has aroused most curiosity here.

Officials admit that this token of the Nixon desire to ease the U.S. isolation of Communist China is in line with policy lines increasingly backed in several of the countries he will visit—the Philippines, Thailand, India, Pakistan and Romania.

IN LINE WITH POLICY

But the State Department emphatically denies any direct connection between the trade and travel moves and the President's journey. They underline the "modesty" of the moves and insist that they are in line with the "gradualism" of ending the isolation of Communist China followed by the United States at least since 1961.

"Both measures, in addition to their modest benefits to American citizens," said State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey, "are consistent with the administration's desire to relax tensions and facilitate the development of peaceful contacts between the people of the United States and Communist China."

McCloskey held out little hope that Peking would respond in like fashion.

"We've made clear many times," he said, "that we have no hostile intentions toward Communist China. We hope Peking comes to realize that. But on the basis of past performance we would not be surprised if these decisions were dismissed out of hand."

Officials maintain that Peking was given no advance inkling of the move. No direct contact with Communist China has been made, they said, since Feb. 18 when Peking called off the scheduled Feb. 20 meeting in Warsaw with representatives of the Nixon administration. It was to have been the 135th meeting, the first in 13 months, between the Chinese and American governments.

Since February, U.S. officials say, the administration repeatedly has impressed upon third parties the sincerity of Rogers' announcement, after the Chinese cancellation, the United States stands ready to meet with the Communist government any time, anywhere. So far, these officials add, Peking has given no direct or indirect hint of willingness to take up the dialogue.

The Chinese press has unleashed bitter personal attacks on Nixon, claiming that he and his policy are identical with former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The modesty of the new Nixon move is underlined by the difficulty the State Department already had in enforcing the general travel ban in American passports. Four countries are involved—Communist China, North Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba.

A court decision in Washington during the last administration made this travel restriction virtually unenforceable legally. The court held that, while the government has the right to put the ban in the passport, it has no right to deny a person a passport

as a penalty for abusing it. The right to travel is absolute, the court held.

For the reason, Rogers gave serious consideration last March to dropping the restrictions entirely. But political pressure, plus the "moral effect" of dissuading travel to Cuba, carried the day. He extended the restrictions six months until September.

The predominant feeling among policy advisers today is that the small step announced yesterday points toward dropping the ban entirely in the Fall. In the meantime, they say, it is now up to the Communist Chinese to show a willingness to begin coexistence with the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 16, 1969]

CHIANG'S RAID CRITICIZED

The United States has expressed displeasure to Nationalist China about a raid in which several Formosan small craft sank mainland Chinese supply ships. State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey avoided saying the July 2 raid in the Formosa Straits near the Min River estuary was in violation of a formal understanding between the United States and Nationalist China, but he said the United States "would regret any action which increased tensions in the straits."

NEED FOR NEW GLOBAL POLICIES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is time for serious consideration of the road ahead of us as a nation seeking peace. Worldwide there is no peace. Within recent days war has broken out in Central America, a war fought with U.S. weapons and a war that could not have been fought without those weapons. In the Middle East another war simmers, a war that could spread to involve the United States in that ultimate confrontation which we all recognize would end in a nuclear exchange and an end to civilization.

Man has been able to walk on the moon, but he is unable to bring peace to his native planet. Man now has the power to destroy himself and all life on earth, but he seems nearer to bringing peace through death to this planet than peace through law and cooperation.

It is in this frame of reference that I suggest the wise words of Herbert Brucker, a distinguished American journalist, as published in the Palo Alto Times on May 9, 1969, be studied. Mr. Brucker, a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, is now associated with Stanford University in its excellent program of journalistic training. In his recent article he outlines the stresses we now live under and proposes some solutions. I include his article in the RECORD at this point:

REMEMBER THE "PUEBLO"—BREAKING OUT OF THE PATTERN

(By Herbert Brucker)

The Pueblo flurry has now been disposed of, a year and a quarter after it began, neatly and effectively. Everybody has won.

The Navy, demanding a court martial for

Commander Bucher and others, has kept flying high the motto, Don't Give Up the Ship—even one armed only with pea-shooters. But the admirals were overruled by Secretary of the Navy Chafee, so that "the charges against all the officers will be dismissed." And the public, which might have raised an unholy howl had there been courts-martial, can now rest content in the conviction that, indeed, "They have suffered enough."

So no one raises the cry, "Remember the Pueblo!" Yet the Pueblo is a reminder that basic questions about American strategic policies need to be asked, and answered. So too that EC121 spy plane, lately shot down with 31 lives lost, to the renewed humiliation of the United States, is also a reminder. The need is to rethink the global policies we have inherited from a different day, so that we may catch up with the world we actually live in.

WE AND THEY

We and our potential enemies alike act as though we were mentally paralyzed, incapable of recognizing the plain truth that the armed sovereign nation-state, living in anarchy with its armed fellows, is as outmoded as the bow and arrow in this day of nuclear ICBMs.

The nation-state was a natural development when it took shape in the time of Napoleon. It became impractical with the development of modern weapons, by the time of our Civil War. And it was made obsolete by the cataclysm of World War I.

Because that shattering experience didn't teach man his lesson, the world had to suffer the six-year hell of World War II. Then came Hiroshima. Yet here we still are, acting as though the new world of teeming, restless, multiplying peoples, elbow to elbow in a polluted world of instant communication and instant destruction, did not exist.

It is written in all history that the only way to end war is to establish a rule of law over potential enemies. So it was when individual man gave way before the tribe, the tribe before the larger language group and the city-state, and the city-state and principality before the nation-state.

It remains only to go one step further. But that way lies world government, or rather a long chain of way stations to it. Just mention world government and you get either a shrug of helplessness, or else goose pimples from the notion that it is some kind of Communist plot. If you want to know better, read the Federalist Papers, especially Nos. 15 and 16. These explain why the 13 coterwauling states of the original confederation adopted the Constitution, as a single law over them all.

IF . . .

If we do not have the wit and the drive to continue on that long and difficult path into the future, does that mean that we are stuck where we are until someone makes that final mistake, and we all blow up? Must we have ever new ABMs, which are billed as defense but can have no other effect but to force an increase in the other side's offense?

This is no security. It is the height of insecurity, as is the temporary expedient of the nuclear deterrent. It is time some statesman had the vision and the courage to break out of the paralysis of carrying forward ancient ways in a world that makes those ways fatal.

Since Glassboro, Presidents Johnson and Nixon have flirted with the idea of breaking out of the pattern. The test-ban treaty, the prospective anti-proliferation treaty, are signs that progress can be made. So is Europe's fresh stirring of interest in union, now that the Big Bad General is once again in seclusion in Colombey.

All this points the way ahead. Compared

to that way ahead agitation over the ROTC, or napalm, or chemical-biological warfare, are peripheral to the point of being irrelevant. But because the only way out is long and hard nobody, from campus to White House, even bothers to talk about it.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, Mr. Robert S. Small, president of Dan River Mills, addressed the textile section of the New York Board of Trade regarding the textile industry. His topic was "Tell It Like It Is."

Mr. Small knows the textile industry. He knows the threat it faces. He knows the indifference his Government has shown to its plight. He knows what the textile industry means to the rank and file American and to the economy of America. He knows that the American textile industry is the wonder of the free world. Mr. Small has spent most of his adult life since leaving college learning every facet of textiles—one of the most basic elements of our free enterprise system; and he has risen to the top as president of the Dan River Mills, one of the largest in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, day in and day out our system is challenged by cheap labor and a different way of life from the American standard. No nation in the history of the world pays to its employees the benefits which American industry guarantees to those who compose its make-up. Almost every store and shop in America—large and small—sells some commodity which competes with our free enterprise system. Mr. Small understands the real threat to our way of life. He understands the indifference men in high places continue to hold for the future of our system. He understands the irresponsibility of many segments of the press to the daily danger of this competition.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we looked after our own. I commend to this body Mr. Small's remarks:

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

(By Robert S. Small to Textile Section, New York Board of Trade, June 19, 1969)

I had two reasons for choosing as my topic: "Tell It Like It Is". One, it's the "in" thing to do, and if you don't believe me, visit any college campus (providing you have proper escort, of course), or ask your teenage child. Second, when you have the facts as the foundation for your story, why not "Tell It Like It Is?"

Charlie Myers, president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, reminded a recent audience of an interesting editorial. The editorial said in part: "With its mature economy the United States has out-grown textile manufacturing as an appropriate livelihood . . . the point to remember is that no amount of protectionism can help the textile industry". Continuing, the writer observed: "Efforts by the President to provide relief for the textile industry are temporary

protection against the inevitable day when textiles as a major American industry will not exist."

This editorial appeared in the Washington Post in May 1961, just after the late President Kennedy announced his seven-point program for the textile industry. But short-sighted and ludicrous as the writer's observations were, they brought into focus the pat assumption that textile manufacturing is an easy-entry business, produces commodities so basic, relatively, that a technologically sophisticated and affluent society need not waste its resources, its talents, and energies on producing these things.

This contention is pure hogwash, of course. I'll tell you clearly that if this industry earned its livelihood from producing just basic necessities, the editor of the Washington Post would probably have seen his prediction come true. What he . . . and many others . . . fail to comprehend is this: Namely, as a society's affluence and technological capabilities grow, it's interpretation of needs undergoes evolution, too. Fulfilling a basic obligation to clothe society is almost incidental to our role today. Sure, we do this, but much more besides, and in the process, we not only compete with other textile firms here and abroad, we compete with boat builders, leisure time industries and a host of others. We, like most other industries, are competing for the attention of the rising discretionary purchasing power of the consumer. And in so doing, we have to produce the fabrics and products which suit the life style of a sophisticated, affluent people.

When you come right down to it, there is only one thing basic about the American textile industry—and that is its contribution to the American economic system. Textiles are the mainstream of industrial America! Textiles have a good case to sell to the American public—as mentioned earlier, you members of the Board of Trade have been our spokesmen in this important market since 1927—let's take a look at our case, both pro and con.

During the past 10 years, sales rose from 14 to 21.5 billion dollars; production increased over 38 percent; and the industry invested almost eight billion dollars in new plants and equipment—which incidentally is 50% of total textile plants and equipment—this is a modern industry!

The textile-apparel industries have 36,000 plants in all 50 States. Today, by any yardstick, the industry is large (\$21½ billion annual sales volume), important to the economy (2.5% of gnp), and a significant employer of the Nation's labor force (.03% of the gainfully employed).

However, the full significance of the industry is far greater than these numbers suggest. The chemical industry, for example, depends upon the textile industry for over 50% of its sales volume. The cotton growers depend on the industry to consume most of their output. Moreover, numerous jobbers and middlemen are dependent upon distribution of the industry's products to durable, nondurable, and service industries across the Nation. The products of the industry supply two of the most basic needs of every individual—clothing and shelter. The Nation must have the capability of fulfilling both of these needs by domestic manufacturers in time of war and peace.

In the industrial skill ladder textiles are not at the top, but they certainly are not at the bottom. It would be wonderful if all of our industrial workers were all well-educated and had the potential for the most sophisticated skilled jobs. Clearly, this is not the case—and unlikely to be the case in the foreseeable future. The fact is—and let's tell it like it is—the United States needs gainful employment for all degrees of unskilled and

skilled employees rather than welfare extension! It needs self-supporting jobs for all, especially in our under-developed areas and in our urban ghettos. Consider Appalachia for a moment which is a case in point. In the Appalachian region, embracing 373 counties in several major textile producing States, there are some 453,000 people employed in the textile industry alone. In many of these counties, textiles account for almost all manufacturing employment.

Another case in point is right here in New York City where over 325,000 persons are employed in the textile and/or garment trades.

The fact is we are providing steady, gainful employment in many of our most needy areas. Our theoretical economist would do well to recognize this.

Although textile wages are somewhat below the national average for all manufacturing, with the most recent wage increase just announced, textile wages will have been increased eight times since 1961 and payroll costs, including fringe benefits, upped more than 60 percent.

At the same time the wholesale price index for textile mill products shows an increase of only .06 percent over 1957-59. Many important textile items such as carpeting show a reduction in price. The wholesale price index for textile mill products throughout 1968 averaged 100.6 compared to the all-industrial commodity index in 1968 of (109 percent). Certainly, textiles are not contributing to the inflationary price spiral affecting almost all other consumer products.

How do you account for this tremendous performance? Maybe this way! For the past 23 years, the textile industry has increased its productivity at an average rate of 4.5 percent per year (which is absolute and does not include inflation) while American manufacturing as a whole has averaged only 2.8 percent. Somehow this impressive performance by our industry doesn't get the headlines which are accorded to more sensational subjects.

Closely associated with these facts, is the question of equal employment opportunity. The industry has made dramatic progress in recent years, newspaper accounts notwithstanding. It is ironic, indeed, that one of the newspapers which has pontificated regularly about the alleged sins of the textile industry in this regard found its own house was not in order, and that its performance in equal employment opportunity was something less than impressive. It will come as no surprise to you that this publication did not use its own pages to publicize its own shortcomings.

Negro employment in the textile industry has advanced four times faster than the national average for all manufacturing since 1960. While employment ratios vary from company to company and State to State, the textile industry offers unusual opportunities for unskilled Negro employees to become productive and skilled members of the manufacturing segment of our economy.

Since 1960, for example, the number of nonwhite employees in the industry has tripled, from only 3.3 percent to over 9.5 percent in 1968. It is undoubtedly higher today. In my own company, this figure currently is nearly double that—or more than 17 percent. And in some mills, as many as 50 percent of all new hirings in 1968 were Negroes.

The improving role of the Negro in the textile industry is reflected in both opportunities for initial employment and opportunities for advancement. U.S. Department of Labor statistics show that of the 984,000 production workers employed in primary textiles in 1968, approximately 94,000 were Negroes. This was an increase of 10,000 over 1967.

And I predict that over the next decade the employment and promotion of Negroes and other minority groups by the textile industry will be the most important single

economic factor effecting our total economy during this period. We will provide this opportunity as no other industry can.

Against this background of achievement, progress, and economic contribution to our Nation's welfare, the future contribution of this vast industrial complex is being besieged by a steadily growing flow of low wage imports.

Let's take a realistic look at this import picture—

In 1968, textile imports exceeded 3¼ billion square yards. This left us with a textile trade deficit last year of \$1.1 billion and the gap grows wider every year.

Worship at the altar of free trade has become one of the rituals of our age. Prominent among the worshippers—to mix metaphors—are those whose ox has not been gored by imports. But free trade simply does not exist. There is nothing free about trade unless the rules are the same for everyone. And this clearly is not the case. In this imperfect world, it is not likely to be in the future.

It is high time that some responsible economist or government official addressed himself—honestly—to the subject of so-called free trade.

There has never been free trade among independent nations—there is none now. Cordell Hull at least addressed it for what it was intended to be when he fathered our present trade policy with the "Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934." Reciprocal was the word then and the intent then. It should be now!

Somehow over the intervening years, we have lost the drive for reciprocity and have allowed our trade policy to be dubbed "free trade," by certain elements of the press and the professional economic fraternity. "Free trade" has become an unimpeachable clarification call, such as the Bible, the Bill of Rights, or motherhood. No man can question it, much less condemn it—except to risk castigation as an irresponsible profligate advocating the utter ruin of the world—not just the United States. But let's face it, there are circumstances when even motherhood is not the most desirable condition.

President Nixon has also seen fit to describe his trade policy as free trade. And, I hasten to add, I for one, believe there is no credibility gap in the White House. But why doesn't someone say it like it is and affirm a policy of organized trade!

Organized trade is flourishing in the world today and our trading partners recognize it as such. Our trade negotiators were astonished to learn last year that all of the members of the E.E.C. had secret import quota agreements with the Far Eastern countries, including Japan—and had had them for several years.

Before the so-called Kennedy round of tariff reduction agreements of 1967-68 were even begun to be implemented, our trading partners in Europe were increasing border taxes, custom duties and other trade impediments, in some cases by more than the tariff reduction.

Here are just a few of the hidden trade restrictions which exist among the so-called developed trading nations which to this date have been non-negotiable: Border taxes, custom duties, transportation tax, added value tax, import licenses, trading associations, Government subsidies, downright embargoes. I'm sure there are many more.

Now, let's speak specifically about Japan—

The arrogance of Japan in refusing to discuss quota restrictions on wool and man-made fabrics with the Stans' mission last month is incomprehensible. If the facts were known, Japan, the free world's second most advanced country economically, is probably exporting directly or indirectly to the United States well over 35% of all imported goods, and possibly as much as 50% of manmade blends.

Do you realize that Japan is running a surplus trade balance with the U.S. of over \$1 billion annually?

Do you realize that while Japan ships into this country over a billion yards of cloth annually, yet Japan effectively embargoes U.S. cloth from her market? What kind of reciprocity is that!!

Do you realize that Japan, a mature economic nation, pays her textile workers less than 40c per hour? And, in addition, frequently subsidizes her exports—by our standards both illegal—yet, our textile workers lose their jobs while our government tolerates an ever increasing percentage of these imports.

Do you realize that Japanese have 100% owned textile plants in this country, yet U.S. textile firms are forbidden ownership in Japanese textiles?

Do you realize that Japanese manmade fiber producers are constructing or have constructed plants in Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Indonesia, and are looking at the Philippines—in some cases aided and assisted by the Japanese government?

Secretary Stans went to Japan, pointed out the fact that the U.S. was the only free market in the world for textiles, that imports of textile products had increased 300% in six years, and that Japan had gotten more than her share of this increase. He indicated Japan would not be asked to reduce its exports to the U.S. but in addition would be allowed to participate in the annual anticipated growth of the U.S. market. All he asked was that Japan join with the U.S. and work out some orderly organization of this textile trade—he didn't even suggest that Japan lower her barriers to the U.S. textiles.

What did he get? An insulting rebuff. Responsible textile officials refused even to meet with him. No high American official in recent years has been treated so discourteously by Japan—a country, as I said, enjoying a fat trade balance over one billion dollars and whose budget for defense in effect is paid for by the American taxpayer.

There is a question of equity and fairness involved in the textile situation. What we are talking about is simply this. Must the U.S. carry almost the entire burden of reciprocity when it comes to the textile industry?

Less developed countries have been singled out as being readily adapted to the production of textiles. Consider the situation of 19 less developed countries in Latin America and Asia. In 1967 these countries had a favorable balance of trade in textiles with the U.S. of \$318 million dollars. On the other hand, the E.E.C. countries with an aggregate population equal to the U.S., sold \$50 million more in textile products to these 19 less developed countries than they bought from them. In the case of Japan again, that country had a favorable textile trade balance of \$211 million with these same less developed countries.

In other words—and putting it bluntly—the U.S. is on the short shaft of both the developed and underdeveloped countries—and the shaft is sharp, not blunt.

In spite of these problems, whatever an American does or wants to do—go to work, drink cocktails, ski at Aspen, cruise the Bahamas, take a bath, camp at Jackson Hole, dance at a discotheque—we provide him with a selection of products and a selection of prices.

The choice of textile products today is literally unlimited. When one considers what technology and fashion have accomplished with just three basic weaves of textiles, it's truly amazing.

The Bureau of Census publishes periodic production figures on more than 350 different variations of the basic weaves. When you count the blend possibilities of at least 14 generically different fibers, including cot-

ton, manmades, wool and silk, we already have a near-infinite number of basic fabric possibilities.

Now add to this the more than 100 chemical and mechanical finishes—consider the fact that there are somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 different printed fabrics in retail stores at any one time—bear in mind that the Bureau of Standards lists five million conceivable color possibilities for textile products—then consider that clothing design by itself offers virtually unlimited possibilities to the consumer.

All told, it's not difficult to conclude that every man, woman and child in the United States could easily be provided with a complete wardrobe—and no two garments would be exactly alike—we are going to continue to offer to the American consumer exciting new products to stimulate the imagination and satisfy the demands of the world of tomorrow—we have every intention of meeting the obligations imposed on us by a changing economy and a viable social structure. We have done so in the past; we can do better in the years ahead, it is our purpose to do so.

We refuse to be tolerated or written off by the Washington Post or any other simplistic theorists who have deluded themselves into believing that textiles is a simple, elemental industry.

This industry is an integral factor in the Nation's complex economic system. We are an important and vital contributor to all facets of our national life. We will strain our talents and resources to assure this continues to be true. We insist we be recognized for what we are and what we do, and are ready to do combat with those who would cast us in a lesser role.

Gentlemen, that's telling it like it is and like it has to be!

EX-POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI ACCENTS THE POSITIVE: POSTAL REFORM IS VITAL, BUT DO NOT OVERLOOK AMAZING SERVICE YOU HAVE NOW

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been holding hearings now for the past 3 months on the matter of postal reform.

No one argues with the need for postal reform; the Department must have the tools and the authority to do the job of handling the ever-increasing volume of mail.

Our first witness this morning was a former Postmaster General, John A. Gronouski, who served from 1963 to 1965 when he took an ambassadorial assignment from then President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, in all of our hearings to date we have not had a more objective witness in his discussion of the Post Office Department as it exists today.

The situation is not nearly so chaotic as some people would contend. He puts the much-cited Chicago breakdown of 1966 in its proper perspective: It did happen, but there has not been another, so the Department must be doing something right in its management of postal affairs.

As I told Mr. Gronouski when he completed his testimony, it "will be most helpful to the committee in its deliberations as to the best way to achieve meaningful postal reform."

Mr. Gronouski and I are in agreement upon the need for postal reform, although we disagree on the form. He favors the public corporation approach, while I feel we can do the job—and better—within the present Government Department.

But in laying his case before the committee, he does an outstanding job of providing the basic background we need as we near the close of the public hearings. His testimony warrants wider circulation and I am including it with my remarks:

REMARKS OF FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1969

I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before this Committee for the purpose of discussing post office reorganization. For the record, I am John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General in the Cabinets of President Kennedy and President Johnson from September, 1963 until November, 1965. Subsequently I served as Ambassador to Poland until June, 1968. I am at present engaged in private pursuits which are in no way connected with any group or organization which has a vested interest in the operations of the postal establishment.

I should also note for the record that on April 4, 1967 and again on May 21, 1967 I expressed support for then Postmaster General O'Brien's postal corporation idea. I also testified in favor of the general thrust of the Kappel Commission recommendations before the Platform Committee of the Democratic Party in August, 1968.

The first observation I wish to make is that much of the current criticism of postal service is both petty and unwarranted. It is my judgment that postal employees at all levels—department and regional administrators, postmasters and postal workers—have succeeded in providing the American people a remarkable postal service at moderate cost. When I can have a mailman pick up a letter at my door and another mailman hand-deliver it to the door of a friend in California, often the next day, at a cost of six cents, I am receiving a service very hard to duplicate this day and age. Admittedly a letter occasionally goes astray, but considering the fact that our post office is handling almost a quarter billion pieces of mail each day, the number of pieces temporarily misdirected is remarkably small. I suggest that critics of the service provided by this government enterprise compare its performance over the past year with that of the private brokerage industry's handling of Wall Street security transactions during the same period.

I cannot refrain from relating an experience with my favorite morning newspaper, a newspaper which, incidentally, has not been reluctant to call the post office to task. During the past six months my newspaper was not delivered on five occasions—five days out of 180, or almost three percent of the time. Now this is not a bad record, and I am not complaining, but I simply note that were the Post Office to experience a three percent rate of non-delivery, at least the Postmaster General, and perhaps the President, would be impeached!

Now the morning newspaper to which I refer is conscious of its responsibilities and has provided a phone number which, they say, will insure delivery of a substitute paper

if one calls before 8:30 A.M. This I have done three times to no avail. A pleasant enough voice at the other end of the line takes down my name, address, telephone number and other data, but a substitute paper is yet to appear.

What I am suggesting, really, is not only that the postal service is not as bad as some charge, but that it is often better than that of private enterprisers who are often its greatest critics. The fact is that we expect more from the post office and while we usually get it, the fact that we don't always get it makes us indignant. Remember the roar that went up in 1949 when mail delivery was cut from twice to once a day. I will recall the spate of angry editorials when it was my lot to respond to budgetary exigencies by reducing post office window service about an hour a day.

But where was the angry roar when drug stores dispensed with clerks and required the shopper to find what he wanted and wait in line to pay for it? Or when grocery stores (with rare exception) eliminated the delivery service that my mother received in the depth of the depression of the 1930's? There wasn't any, for with private enterprise these decisions are regarded as being in the province of management choice. But the fact remains, these services are gone in the drug and grocery stores—and for good reason, for if they continued to supply them, the proprietors would probably go broke. Yet with the post office we demand such services and then bitterly complain when it costs six cents rather than a nickel to deliver a letter from one door to another three thousand miles apart.

I should also like to take note of another line of criticism which some approach with almost religious fervor. I refer, of course, to the role of politics in the appointment of postmasters and rural letter carriers. Lest I be misunderstood, I want it known that I hold no particular brief for the political advisor selection system. In fact, when I was Postmaster General I often lamented the fact that under the prevailing system the Democratic Congressmen treated their selection of the postmasters and rural carriers in their district as a matter of right. Thus, when I made the appointments of their choice I was deprived of any credit for doing a favor, for you cannot get credit for giving a Congressman something he already has. However, during my tenure as Postmaster General I never was adroit enough to get Presidential backing for a shift of postmaster and rural carrier appointing power from the Congress into my hands, and thus I was deprived of the kind of real effective power that administrators dream of having.

So I do not object on principle to removing the selection of postmasters and rural carriers from Congressional politics. What does bother me is the strong implication that the postmasters and rural carriers that have been selected by the Congressional advisor process are really a bunch of incompetent political hacks. This I say from personal knowledge is a lot of nonsense. I have met at their national and state conventions, in their post offices and in their homes a good cross section of our politically appointed postmasters and rural carriers. I say categorically that these are highly competent professionals who have a deep dedication to the postal service, and I think it is incumbent on those of us who know this to say so.

The case for reorganization of the Post Office along corporation lines as suggested by the Kappel Commission cannot be made, therefore, by pointing to an intolerable quality of service or the incompetence of management personnel, for in neither case does the charge hold water. Nor do I have much patience with those who point to the 1966 service breakdown in Chicago as evidence that

our postal system is on the verge of total collapse; the fact that this three-year old exhibit A has not been supplemented by an exhibit B—that the Chicago experience has not occurred subsequently in Chicago or Los Angeles or New York or Philadelphia or Washington or anywhere else—suggests to me that the “Chicago Catastrophe” was just that and that it does not provide a measure of the viability of our postal establishment.

Finally, I cannot accept the implication that nothing has happened to improve the capability of the Post Office to handle the ever-expanding mail volume over the past several years. Without dwelling on the point, I will simply state that in my judgment the implementation of the ZIP Code and the introduction of sophisticated mechanization into our newly constructed major facilities has provided in less than ten years the basis for a major technological revolution in mail processing and distribution.

What I am saying, in effect, is that supporters of a basic structural change in postal management and organization along lines originally proposed by former Postmaster General O'Brien, seconded by the Kappel Commission and supported by the present Administration, do not strengthen their case when they paint a picture of gross mismanagement by political hacks yesterday, crisis today and catastrophe tomorrow. There are fundamental and persuasive reasons for supporting the basic postal corporation proposal; to argue successfully for it does not in my judgment require ill-founded and unsupported charges of past incompetence and impending doom.

As I noted earlier, I have supported the postal corporation idea ever since it was advanced by Larry O'Brien early in 1967. I have supported it, not because of a lack of confidence in the managerial competence of our postmasters and other postal management personnel, but because I believe these managers can perform much more effectively if they are given the greater authority and responsibility implicit in the postal corporation idea. Those charged with administering the postal service are placed under a severe handicap when they are deprived of a relevant role with respect to major elements of the decision making process, particularly those involving wages and prices.

I support the postal corporation idea, also, because of my conviction that postal workers generally, and particularly those in larger cities, have been ill-treated by the prevailing wage determination systems. I would look for a substantial improvement in postal worker wages and fringe benefits under conditions where both management and workers are equipped with and are prepared to implement effective tools of collective bargaining.

I have said that I do not find the Post Office in a state of crisis or facing imminent catastrophe. But I also do not disagree with the general consensus I find in reading the testimony of those who have appeared before this Committee—that reforms in the structure of the postal establishment are needed, and that there is room for significant improvement in both the efficiency of operation and the quality of service provided by the Post Office. I also believe there is a need for a healthier and more responsive labor management relationship, and that the postal rate-making procedure is badly in need of major overhaul.

I do not believe that an acceptable rate of progress can be made in these areas under conditions of divided management responsibility that characterizes the postal establishment. This is because management decisions do not stand alone; for any one decision to have a chance of achieving its purpose it must be compatible with and supported by a host of related decisions. Decisions with respect to post office modernization and mechanization, for example, are directly related to the impact of ZIP Code on patterns

of mail transportation and distribution, and both have an impact on and are critically affected by policies adopted in the field of employee relations.

Postal management, in the interest of efficient and effective postal service, has the responsibility for making technological and operational changes which affect the lives and well-being of thousands of postal workers. To successfully implement these changes, therefore, it should also have the responsibility and authority to negotiate with employee representatives a wage contract which gives postal workers a share in the increased productivity stemming from these changes, and a pattern of fringe benefits which insures that the workers directly involved are relieved of whatever financial burdens the transition would otherwise impose upon them. As long as Congress retains jurisdiction over wages and fringe benefits, managers of the Post Office will lack a vital tool needed to make technological and operational changes tolerable and acceptable to postal workers and their union leaders.

But if management is to have genuine authority to negotiate wage and benefit agreements, it must also have control over the other half of the financial equation—the prices charged for postal service. It would be meaningless to suggest that postal management had authority to negotiate wage and benefit agreements if the validity of any agreement was dependent upon the willingness of Congress to appropriate money or raise postal rates to pay for it.

Congress should, of course, retain an ultimate veto power over the final rate determination of the agency charged with this function, but I am convinced it would be a mistake to retain more authority than the right to vote yes or no on the entire package. In my judgment the policy of Congress should be clearly one of establishing broad guidelines with respect to the principles of rate-making, and charging an administrative agency with responsibility for allocating postal costs among users in accordance with these principles.

I do not mean to suggest that once a postal corporation becomes established as a going concern the need or desirability of “public service” appropriations by Congress will be eliminated. The primary function of the Post Office is public service, and this should be no less true of the postal corporation than it is of the Post Office Department. A persuasive case can be made for general fund appropriations to underwrite special costs incurred by the postal service in performing its basic function of providing a communications network tying together all sections of the country. For example, in some rural areas where volume is low, pricing of mail service at a level that covers cost would result in rates prohibitively expensive. The same is true where distances are great and providing tolerable service requires use of expensive modes of transportation, e.g., Alaska and Hawaii. I would argue that it is in the national interest that those living in such areas of the United States not be disadvantaged in basic communications with other parts of the country. This is essentially a consideration of national integration and unity the cost of which is properly allocated against the general revenue.

While I would argue that the postal corporation should establish a level of rates adequate to cover its operating costs, therefore, I am not proposing the elimination of public service appropriations. I am simply saying that the effect of such appropriations should be on the price of service paid by those affected by the subsidy which Congress determines, not on the total revenue available to the postal corporation. Thus, the rate schedule submitted to Congress by the rate-making agency should provide sufficient revenue to cover the cost of postal operations, and such rates should be reduced only

in the amount and for the purposes that subsidy funds are voted by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding my remarks I would like to address myself to a particularly important aspect of postal reform, that which directly affects the well-being of some 700,000 postal workers. While in many important respects my views are in accord with those expressed in the Administration's H.R. 11750, I want it known that I take exception to those sections dealing with labor-management relations.

In this connection I should observe that I distinguish the postal service from most other functions of government on two grounds: first, the Congress has historically given emphasis to the proprietary nature of the post office, charging the user a fee for services rendered; and, second, unlike most services of government—police and fire protection, defense, welfare—the service provided by the Post Office is “postponable.”

It is primarily because of this latter characteristic that I am not nearly as disturbed by the thought of postal workers gaining the right to strike under a postal corporation form of organization as are many of my friends. Now I am not suggesting that a postal strike would be a good idea, and I am well aware that such a strike would be both costly and inconvenient. But so is a steel, automobile or transportation strike. The point I am making is that the postal service is clearly distinguishable from such “non-postponable” governmental services as police and fire protection where a strike would be intolerable.

Whatever the merits and disadvantages of incorporating the right to strike as a part of postal corporation legislation, however, as a practical matter the question appears to be academic. While there has been some flirting with the proposition, I have seen no ground swell in favor of a right to strike provision—not among postal workers, nor among leaders of postal employee organizations, and certainly not from within the administration, the Congress or the general public.

The practical problem, therefore, is to establish a procedure for genuine collective bargaining and, in the event of an unresolved disagreement between management and labor, to provide for use of a tool that will serve as a refuge of last resort for labor, management or both. Under terms of H.R. 11750 the so-called refuge of last resort would be a nine-man “Postal Disputes Panel” which would, at its discretion, determine whether either party in the dispute could take its case to binding arbitration and, in the event it so decided, define the issue or issues to be arbitrated. The Disputes Panel could also make a binding decision in favor of the status quo by simply refusing to accept jurisdiction in the dispute.

Mr. Chairman, much as I favor the postal corporation approach to postal reorganization, were this provision to remain an integral part of H.R. 11750, I could not in conscience support it. I say this for the simple reason that however impartially the Disputes Panel is chosen, the postal workers and their leaders will properly regard it as part of management. Furthermore, the procedure established through the Disputes Panel clearly denies the postal worker and his union representative the right to demand binding arbitration as a matter of right. In short, the worker is denied an ultimate weapon in those cases where collective bargaining, mediation and fact finding fail to provide an answer to a dispute.

Fortunately, this serious flaw can be corrected by simply eliminating the Disputes Panel, and establishing in its place procedures for fact finding, mediation and conciliation, provisions for a cooling-off period and, ultimately, the right of either party to demand that the issue in dispute be taken to binding arbitration. A change along these lines would correct the major flaw in H.R. 11750.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the law must change with the times. Examination of legislation which has just become law and legislation now pending before the Congress provides us with an excellent example of this need.

My colleague, LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York, and myself have introduced legislation which would regulate the billion-dollar-a-year trading stamp industry. The main thrust of the legislation would be to provide the consumer with cash options on redemption.

However, the Truth in Trading Stamps Act also would require protections for the consumer against a "run" on a redemption center. The bills drafted by Mr. WOLFF and myself would require that companies in interstate commerce provide sufficient cash reserve to insure that their redemption centers could handle a "run."

On the face of it, there is a scintilla of the absurd in all this. Some may ask with bemused scorn, "A run on a trading stamp redemption center? Really, now." Well that is just what is happening in New York.

Trading stamp companies have issued what in the American marketplace certainly must be considered currency of exchange. Just as certainly, those persons who have been issued this script have every right to demand that their Government provide them with certain protections.

On behalf of the American consumer, I urge the distinguished chairmen of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Banking and Currency Committees to schedule early hearings on the legislation which I and Mr. WOLFF have introduced.

And for those who greet in disbelief the notion of a "run" on a trading stamp center, I enter, with unanimous consent, the following account, published in the New York Times of July 18:

STATE WILL ASK FOR SECURITY FROM KING KORN ON STAMPS

(By Isadore Barmash)

Louis J. Lefkowitz, the state's Attorney General, announced yesterday that because of many complaints he had received, he would ask the King Korn Stamp Company to deposit a security with his office as good faith that all outstanding books of King Korn stamps will be redeemed.

A spokesman for the Attorney General said the complaints had been received from housewives who had been saving the stamps but who had been unable to redeem them for merchandise.

For about two weeks, thousands of savers of the trading stamps have been streaming into the company's five redemption centers in Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan.

The runs on the centers began over fears that the company was going out of the stamp business since the H. C. Bohack supermarket chain stopped distributing them last month, Mr. Lefkowitz's office said.

In Chicago, a King Korn executive, speaking for the company's president, Ira Kaplan,

denied the reports that the company was leaving the stamp business and said that all stamps would be redeemed.

CONSUMERS WAIT IN VAIN

According to the Attorney General's office, as many as 1,000 people a day have been waiting in vain at the redemption centers here to get merchandise. At one center, some housewives have waited on line up to eight hours without success, the Attorney General's office said.

Asked in Chicago why the merchandise was not available, the King Korn executive said that stocks at the local redemption centers were maintained for from one to two weeks' demand.

"But the redemption rate in New York has been exceedingly heavy—about two to three times the normal rate," he said.

"We are replenishing the stocks at our redemption centers," he said.

The company, which said that the Bohack stores had represented a major account, reported that it still had about 500 clients in the New York area and one million King Korn stamp savers here.

No exact sum has been fixed as yet for the security, the Attorney General's office said. Mr. Kaplan is expected to meet with Mr. Lefkowitz here early next week.

Trading stamps have long been a subject of debate in merchandising circles. The tiny, bright pieces of paper bearing the name of the stamp company are estimated to have a cash value of about a 10th of a cent and are redeemable for a wide variety of merchandise.

Advocates call the stamps a valuable promotional tool, but detractors say they result in higher prices because they add to the business expense of retailers who distribute them.

A spokesman for the Trading Stamp Institute, a trade organization of stamp companies, commenting on the King Korn situation yesterday, said:

Some six years ago, a similar incident occurred here in New York City when the Gold Bond Stamp Company of Minneapolis was dropped by the First National Stores.

"There was a disturbingly similar occurrence when near-mobs made a run on Gold Bond's Manhattan redemption center, resulting in the calling out of mounted police guards. But all Gold Bond stamp holders had their books honored, and a redemption center was maintained in Manhattan for many months after the cutoff date to effect just this."

On July 1, the Truth-in-Lending Act became law. A decade in the making, the advocates of this law also had to overcome the disbelief of "Doubting Thomases."

The Nation and its economy ran on credit, but all too frequently the consumer has little idea of how usurious this credit can be. Hopefully, the consumer will now not need a course in credit financing before he understands the cost of a loan on a car, a house, an appliance.

Ten years ago many thought this legislation was not necessary, just as many today doubt the need for Federal regulation of the script-issuing trading stamp industry.

It is my hope, that a decade is not needed to make the Truth-in-Trading Stamps Act public law.

For any law to be truly effective, its terms must receive wide public dissemination and I applaud WCAU-TV, Philadelphia's CBS affiliate, for its editorial broadcast July 11. "Seller Beware" is more primer than editorial and with

unanimous consent, I enter it in the RECORD:

SELLER BEWARE

(Presented by Peter W. Duncan, WCAU-TV editorial director)

It used to be "caveat emptor"—buyer beware. Now the roles are getting reversed. Now, it's becoming more a matter of seller beware. Legislative reins are tightening on many merchants who need to have the reins tightened.

Truth In Lending legislation became the law of the land last week and what it's done is this: it's uncovered the hidden figures and undercover carrying charges. For years, smooth talking salesmen have cooed to prospective buyers: "It's only 'X' dollars a month." Too many people didn't realize that when all the months were added up, and all those payments of 'X' dollars were totalled, they were buying themselves a bucketful of interest for a pocketful of product.

As of last week, those days are over. The salesman can continue to coo at the prospective buyer, but while he's cooing, he has to show you in writing exactly what you'll be paying—to the penny—for what you're buying. In other words, he has to come up with a grand total. Maybe then, if you realize you're paying (let's say) \$160 for an \$89 item, you'll change your mind about buying it.

Even so, some salesmen can win over almost any customer explaining that even with the extra costs, you shouldn't pass up the deal.

On many large credit transactions, the consumer's house is put up as a security. Let's say then, that you're convinced that a deal is a good deal and you sign your name on the contract and put your house on the line. When you leave the place of business, you begin to reconsider. By the time you get to that home that you put on the line, you wish you could change your mind. And after going over the family books and discussing it with your wife, you're certain you shouldn't have signed the contract. Well, when a consumer's house is written in to the contract as security, Truth In Lending gives the consumer three business days to think about the deal. If within the three-day period he decides he made a mistake, he can back out of the deal.

There are other aspects of Truth In Lending which benefit the consumer but the basic meaning of the legislation is to make it mandatory for merchants and businesses to spell out clearly and uniformly what the interest charges are in dollars and cents. This also makes it easier for the consumer who wants to shop around to get the best credit deal.

Truth In Lending legislation was almost a decade in the making. WCAU-TV has supported it along a rather rocky legislative route. Now that it is the law of the land, WCAU-TV hails the Truth In Lending legislation as a victory for consumers. Now, because of it, it's substantially easier for you to be a wiser user of credit and a better shopper for credit.

THE MENTAL HOSPITAL CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, my subject is failure. It is the failure of the State of California, specifically the Governor of California, to live up to its responsibility in the care of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill.

Since the beginning of his term as Governor, Ronald Reagan has wielded a meat ax on California's program for caring for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. He has turned a nationally recognized system of excellence into a national disgrace, a national scandal. In doing so he has embittered thousands of people in California, Republican and Democrat alike.

The meat ax he has used on the budgets of the State hospitals, has not produced economies, instead it has inflicted wounds on the helpless patients.

A recent report, made public only over the protests of Governor Reagan's administration, points out these conditions. It is the report of the Human Relations Agency on conditions in the 12 State hospitals.

The Fremont News Register in my district recently outlined the conditions of the State hospitals and the Governor's responsibility for them. I include this excellent editorial in the RECORD:

WHO'S RETARDED?

Within days of the date of release of an official report on California's State institutions providing hospital care for the mentally retarded. Governor Ronald Reagan showed his non-concern for the care of the retarded by blue-penciling \$500,000 from the state budget for expanding facilities and staffing these institutions.

He had barely started warming the gubernatorial chair when, through Hatcherman Spencer Williams, one-time able assistant county manager of Santa Clara County, the governor started pennypinching mental health service and facilities.

There have been numerous public-relations-oriented official statements and press handouts doubletalking how more service would be provided for less money—efforts designed to allay public anxiety over the slashes in budget and personnel—but conditions at the institutions—which is the only accurate means of measuring service—are abominable for a state as wealthy and presumably civilized as California.

The Human Relations Agency in Sacramento of which Williams is secretary has just made public findings of studies on 12 hospitals. It was like pulling teeth to get the nitty-gritty of the report—much of it was unpublished except for 12 copies—but enterprising reporters have smoked out the full report.

The report on Sonoma State Hospital became public property only after interested citizens obtained a court order for its release. It described Sonoma as a huge, decaying plant; patients herded into barn-like wards with the dignity of the individual wholly violated; a shortage of personnel resulting in minimal custodial care for patients.

And indeed, Sonoma is back in the news with the resignation from the hospital's board of trustees of Thomas J. Farrell, Santa Rosa insurance man, a Republican, whose daughter has been a patient there 15 years.

In his letter of resignation to the governor, Farrell said that since the Reagan-appointed Dr. James V. Lowry assumed directorship of the State Department of Mental Hygiene, "he has seen fit to abolish the annual trustees' meeting; has never consulted with the duly-elected president of the State Hospital Trustees' Association, and has not had any meaningful dialogue with hospital trustees and parents of children in the hospital."

He charged that in the eight years he has been close to the scene, the average IQ of patients has dropped from 50 to 25.

Bitterly, he continued, "It is too bad our retarded children were not born fish, because if they were, they would have the lobbying support of the Izaak Walton League. If they were born animals that lived in the woods, they would have the support of the National Rifle Association. However, they are not fish and they are not animals. They are human beings who cannot speak for themselves, and therefore, because they do not have the support of their fellow human beings, they are placed in hospitals where society does not have to look at them . . ."

If the legislature would take the time to personally look into conditions, interview parents and personnel, it would "come up with an adequate program that could be handled at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer, and would contribute greatly to the welfare of patients," he believes.

The Human Relations Commission's task force found one hospital—DeWitt, near Auburn—so intolerable the Commission recommends phasing it out of existence as soon as its 900 patients can be relocated.

"The physical plant is highly unsuitable. The continued use of punishment and isolation rooms, some without a bed, providing only a mattress and blanket on the floor, implies a major weakness in programming, probably related to more than merely staff shortages."

Napa looks with apprehension at the prospect of absorbing the overflow of retarded patients from Sonoma, the task force found, adding that Napa has achieved "better custodial care in a more humanitarian manner," which has evoked a favorable patient response.

Although it found Porterville State Hospital "poorly designed," with bare day rooms, too few chairs, inadequate toilet facilities and limited living space," the investigators found "excellent" diagnostic and evaluation services there. Overcrowding exists, and rehabilitation at Porterville "may be a misnomer" with only two physical and two occupational therapists.

Agnews it found to be in need of renovation, but the staff possesses "excellent morale," is energetic, flexible and enjoys a sense of achievement.

While Stockton Hospital is in excellent repair, it already is functioning above capacity—this despite the fact the state intends to send 300 more mentally retarded patients there.

Summing, Dr. Irving Phillips, clinical professor of psychiatry at Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute in San Francisco and a member of the task force, has stated that all the state hospitals treating the retarded are "totally inadequate according to modern standards of care."

"We've simply got to break them up. If we cannot normalize the retarded themselves, we can normalize their environment. We can get many more of our retarded doing more if we follow the example of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and even England."

This, it would seem, should be the concern and the goal of Ronald Reagan, rather than trying to make a name for himself as the penny-saver.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Vietnam drags on, the urgent needs of

our cities continue to be unmet. While \$30 billion a year is spent on military operations in Southeast Asia, only about \$2 billion is being spent in the current fiscal year on housing needs, and the war on poverty—which raised the hopes of so many of our poor and disadvantaged citizens—continues to limp along on less than \$2 billion per year.

A letter by W. Stanley Rycroft, chairman of People for Peace, which appeared in the June 11 Yonkers, N.Y., Herald Statesman, points out the concern with which the American population is viewing this imbalance in priorities and underlines the need for Congress to take immediate action to end the war in Vietnam and to reallocate the bulk of our national resources toward solving our growing urban crisis. Mr. Rycroft's call for an end to wasteful and unnecessary Pentagon spending and for greater allocations to the domestic sector is a call which Congress should heed.

The letter follows:

PEOPLE FOR PEACE CHAIRMAN BLASTS WASTE OF VIET WAR

TO THE HERALD STATESMAN:

It now seems abundantly clear that government at every level in this country—federal, state and city—is facing unprecedented financial stringencies, and a disturbing inability to meet urgent urban needs.

The Budget Director of the City of Yonkers now warns us that certain vital services may have to be curtailed next January unless additional income can be found, and he mentions a city income tax and a county sales tax as possibilities.

The constant increase in taxes—sales, property and income—places an intolerable burden on all citizens, while inflation hits them from all directions. In the meantime, our elected representatives never seem to forget to put up their own salaries.

As the head of a delegation from People For Peace, the writer made a statement before the City Council on May 27, requesting it to urge Congress to scrutinize carefully all proposals for military appropriations, and to make sure that savings from any curtailment of military operations in Vietnam—or from the ending of that unspeakable war—be allocated to the cities instead of being given to the Pentagon to replenish its already bulging arsenal.

In our statement before the Council, we mentioned two aspects of military spending which are causing great concern in the nation, (1) the enormous size of the current defense budget of 80 billion dollars (to which, according to Senator Eugene McCarthy, should be added billions for international programs, research, interest on past wars, and veterans' benefits, and (2) the incredibly extravagant waste of our money on planes and missiles which are never used. On May 12, WCBS-TV showed its viewers one after another of the planes and missiles which had been cancelled, either because they were obsolete, or due to malfunction. Some of these items cost up to two billion dollars each.

How long will the American people tolerate this fantastic waste of their resources, while urgent domestic problems are neglected? In addition to the shocking loss of American lives (over 35,000), the war in Vietnam has already cost the nation over 100 billion dollars. In the decade from 1959 to 1968, U.S. defense outlays amounted to 551 billion dollars. When will this madness stop?

W. STANLEY RYCROFT,
Chairman, People For Peace.

NEW PLAN OF NASA FOR SPACE WORKSHOP WITH APOLLO TELESCOPE MOUNT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced plans today to launch its first orbital workshop in 1972 using the first two stages of the Saturn V as the launch vehicle.

Use of the first two stages of the Saturn V will permit full outfitting of the workshop on the ground and will permit the launching of the workshop with Apollo Telescope Mount attached into a 220-nautical-mile circular orbit.

At an earlier date, NASA announced its intent to use a second stage of the Saturn IB as its first orbital workshop in 1971. After its initial use as a propulsion system to reach earth orbit, the spent stage was to have been prepared by the astronauts while in orbit for the conduct of scientific and biomedical experiments. The Apollo telescope mount was to be launched by another Saturn IB, with automatic rendezvous and docking to the workshop after arrival in orbit.

NASA now plans to use the launch capability of the larger Saturn V to launch the workshop and the ATM together. The workshop will be outfitted on the ground, and will arrive in orbit equipped for immediate occupancy by the astronauts.

Basic program objectives remain the same as those originally announced. The purpose of the workshop is to provide an environment in which man can live and work under controlled conditions for extended periods of time in space beyond that provided by Gemini and Apollo.

The experiments will study man's physiological and psychological responses in the space environment and provide more detailed information on his capabilities for extended manned flight.

The Apollo telescope mount will permit man to conduct astronomical observations under conditions free from optical interference of the earth's atmosphere, and will provide a platform to demonstrate man's ability to perform scientific experiments in space by operating high-resolution astronomical telescopes.

The Saturn V workshop will be launched unmanned from Complex 39 at NASA's John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla. About a day later a three-man crew will be launched in an Apollo spacecraft atop the smaller Saturn IB vehicle from Complex 34 at Kennedy Space Center. The spacecraft will rendezvous and dock with the workshop and occupy it for up to 28 days during which time Apollo telescope mount experiments will be conducted. Later revisits of up to 56 days' duration will be made using the Saturn IB/Apollo combination.

The Saturn V workshop is a modified SIVB stage which will have its 10,000-cubic-foot hydrogen tank equipped to offer living and working areas for three

astronauts for periods of up to 56 days. The Apollo telescope mount will be attached at the forward end of the workshop and launched integrally with the workshop thus making it available for use throughout the workshop operation.

The change in plans will permit simplification of the previously announced 1971 mission as well as augment the capability of that mission to perform space and earth-oriented research. Saturn V hardware from the Apollo program is available to support the revised plan.

CONSERVING THE COUNTRYSIDE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in Roll Call entitled "Conserving the Countryside."

The article follows:

CONSERVING THE COUNTRYSIDE

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

During the past week this writer visited in Northeastern Maine, near the town of Machias. Notable in the past for its rugged rocky coast, for its lobsters and clams, and for the tranquility which city dwellers always seek in the countryside, the face of Machias is now somewhat different.

A mounting crisis has reached the area as plans have been developed for making Machiasport into an international tax-free oil zone. The prospect of an oil refinery in Machias, of huge ships entering a waterway now filled only with lobstermen going about the business of setting their traps, have divided the town.

As with most towns, there are those who seek to keep it the way it has been, and there are those who look forward to the expansion and economic advance which such a change would produce. A payroll adding hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Machias market is certainly a pleasing prospect to local businessmen. The fishermen, however, fear that the possibility of pollution will destroy the waters, and that the entrance and exit of ships will eliminate all possibility of fishing.

Whatever the merits of the issue, whether the Department of Commerce finally decides to permit the plan for an international oil zone or not, the question which faces the citizens of Machias, Maine is also a question which faces the rest of us.

In the San Francisco Bay area, for example, a quietly maneuvered land transaction that preserves 330 acres of marshland indicates a new approach in the effort to save Bay area shorelands from the commercial development that now threatens them.

The Nature Conservancy, a national non-profit organization in the land-saving business, is purchasing Lower Tubbs Island, a privately owned area amid 2,500 acres of state-owned tidelands at the north end of San Francisco Bay. These 330 acres constitute only a fraction of the 57,000 acres of privately owned bay lands. But Huey D. Johnson, western regional director of the Nature Conservancy, sees the acquisition of Lower Tubbs Island as the first part of a plan to acquire key natural and recreational lands in the bay and on the shore. In as many cases as possible, the conservancy hopes to locate purchases so the effect of preservation will exceed by many times the

actual area acquired by the Nature Conservancy.

"By checkerboarding, we can with \$10 million worth of acquisitions save \$100 million worth of land," says Mr. Johnson. Because almost 70 percent of the water of San Francisco Bay is less than 18 feet deep, the baylands afford a target of opportunity for commercial development. Much of the 276-mile shoreline around the bay already has been purchased by industry and commercial real estate developers.

Another bay-saving activity of a different type has been launched just south of San Francisco. It is an all-out effort to produce citizen political pressure on California state legislators now considering legislation to protect the bay area. The Save Our Bay Action Committee (SOBAC) has been started in Menlo Park by some conservation minded residents. SOBAC has taken out full page two-color ads in Bay Area peninsula newspapers featured by bold, two-inch type stating: "Demand a halt to 122 years of destruction of San Francisco Bay." The ad urges readers to write or wire their "public servants" in Sacramento to support bay conservation.

Whether the problem of conservation is faced in the northern reaches of Maine, or in sunny California, or in any other part of the country, the question is the same. Should we sacrifice what natural beauty which remains for the quick profits brought about by commercial development? Do we not have a responsibility to preserve not only our natural resources, but our natural beauty? Can't a campaign against ugliness be as important to the good health of the nation as a campaign against cigarette smoking?

Americans, by and large, have not thought so in the past. Too busy moving westward and constantly building, we have ignored things which we should not have ignored. The vision which John D. Rockefeller had when he restored Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia was very much a response to this fact. He saw that America, in its rapid movement from coast to coast, had built few memorials, and maintained little of what was old. When a building aged, we tore it down. We felt that there was little value in preserving what was past; there was a desire to break the ties which bind generations together, and not to create new ties. Yet, as Edmund Burke has said, "People will not look forward to posterity who never looked backward to their ancestors." It was this dilemma which Rockefeller attempted to deal with.

Williamsburg is symbolic of gracious living, of deliberation, of conviviality, but not of luxury in our gilded twentieth century way. If Americans were not interested in recapturing the spirit of that age which they held in some reverence, they would have ignored Williamsburg. Instead, it has been made a kind of national shrine.

It is dignified as a shrine not only by the thousands who visit it but by the fact that the government itself has chosen Williamsburg as an initial starting point for the visits in this country of foreign dignitaries. Winston Churchill has visited Williamsburg, as has King Hussein, Queen Elizabeth, and Marshal Tito. We have chosen Williamsburg as a starting point for the exploration of America by such foreign visitors for a reason we may not always understand.

Within the fibre of our being, although not necessarily intellectually, we know somehow that Williamsburg represents something important about the American tradition which Chicago, and St. Louis, and Seattle do not. Perhaps we feel that by returning to our very beginning we can capture the important spiritual values we seem to have abandoned along the way to what Aldus Huxley has called the "Brave New World," and George Orwell called "1984," and other critics and seers still insist upon calling progress.

Driving into most American towns, the visitor is initially impressed by the ugliness of the hamburger stands, the neon signs, the glaring lights. Beauty seems less and less important, commercial advertising appears to be our ultimate life purpose. And now we see the countryside vanishing. Who was it who said, "If you have seen one Redwood tree you have seen them all"?

But it is not only because of beauty in the abstract that it is important for us to take immediate steps to conserve the natural environment of our country. Men cannot function as man solely in huge, impersonal cities. It is his uprooting from the countryside which has left him alienated and alone in our huge metropolitan areas, and it is essential that a countryside remain to which he may return for the sustenance and perspective it provides.

As Lord Byron reminds us in "Child Harold," man, through his communion with nature, is better able to commune with his fellow men: "There is a pleasure in the pathless woods, There is rapture on the lonely shore, There is society where none intrudes, By the deep sea, and music in its roar; I love not Man the less, but Nature more, From these our interviews."

If we succeed in destroying nature, in preserving only buildings and machines and other evidences of our industrial and technological era, we will have destroyed an essential element in man's nature. "One touch of nature," Shakespeare wrote, "makes the whole world kin." It is that kinship which is in serious danger.

Conservation must become a national priority, for anyone who has traveled this country widely realizes the danger we face. What if all of our Machiases become oil refineries, where then can we go to look at ourselves and see something other than the reflection of the world from which we seek some distance? The modern world has its virtues, but man has his own imperatives, and man divided totally from nature remains only a part of himself. It is to this subject that more of those who express concern for the future of our society should return.

KERNER COMMISSION—COLORS BEGIN TO SHOW

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, running the thoroughly discredited Warren Commission a close second is the fantastic Kerner Commission, which concluded that the bloody race riots in the North were not the fault of the rioters but were only because the aspirations of the lawless element in our society were not understood by law-abiding citizens.

Gov. Otto Kerner was promptly rewarded by a lifetime appointment as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—just in time to avoid the defeat at the polls which befell his successor as the people of Illinois expressed their opinion on law and order.

The police representative on the Kerner Commission is the liberal Atlanta police chief, Herbert Jenkins. Police officers, through their association, the Fraternal Order of Police, made a blistering attack on Chief Jenkins calling his department "the worst example of police administration we have ever seen."

Georgia's Governor, Lester Maddox, indicated that he might send 180 State officers into Atlanta to fight crime.

Meanwhile, back in Chicago, Otto Kerner, now wearing his judicial robes, reversed a ruling of U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman in order to permit one of the Chicago convention riot leaders to make a trip to Hanoi. Judge Hoffman had refused to permit Rennie Davis to leave the jurisdiction of the court pending trial for his part in the Chicago disturbances called, of all things "a police riot," because he did not feel that the court should intrude in political activities or enter the field of foreign relations.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Presidential Commissions, with fancy titles, and for the purpose of publicizing preconceived conclusions is a ruse without any further value. The American people have caught on. The colors are showing.

I include two news clippings at this point:

[From the Atlanta Constitution,
July 18, 1969]

JENKINS BLASTED BY FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE (By Bob Hurt)

Leaders of a national policemen's association launched a bitter attack on Atlanta Police Chief Herbert Jenkins Thursday and charged that the Atlanta department is the most poorly administered police force in the nation.

Jenkins was also the target of blistering criticism from local leaders of the association—the Fraternal Order of Police—and came under fire indirectly when Gov. Lester Maddox warned in a speech to the F.O.P. that he may send in a 180-man team of state officers to fight crime in Atlanta.

Only 15 of Atlanta's approximately 800-man police force attended the first day of the two-day seminar that has attracted about 150 policemen from Georgia and 15 other states.

The F.O.P. said more Atlanta officers would have attended, but stayed away because of "intimidation" and warnings from superior officers that membership in the F.O.P. would be the "kiss of death" so far as promotions within the department are concerned.

The seminar, which has as one of its goals the bolstering of Atlanta's struggling F.O.P. chapter of 242 policemen, also attracted three top contenders in the Atlanta mayor's race—Vice Mayor Sam Massell, Aldermen Rodney Cook and G. Everett Millican.

Cook and Massell spoke to the F.O.P. group and used the opportunity to bear down on their support of "law and order" as they define the team, and Massell applied for membership in the F.O.P. Both he and Cook are eligible because as aldermen they have arrest powers.

Millican, who could not speak to the group because he was at the opening ceremonies of his campaign headquarters, said later that he took strong exception with the F.O.P.'s attack on Chief Jenkins.

The F.O.P. denunciation of Jenkins, which dominated all of their comments about the Atlanta Police Department, is only the latest blast in an old feud between the chief and men within his department who want an F.O.P. chapter.

Jenkins has declined to comment on any F.O.P. charges.

Jenkins, who has been chief for 22 years, has said many times that an F.O.P. chapter would lead to a "police union" and the threat of strikes. Despite his opposition, the Atlanta chapter was formally organized last December.

John Harrington, a police sergeant in Phil-

adelphia and national president of the F.O.P., led the attacks on Jenkins during an afternoon press conference.

Of the Atlanta department, he said. "This is a dictatorship. The chief is a czar, and it has ruined morale. Where low morale exists, a high crime rate exists."

He said that since January, 102 Atlanta policemen have resigned from the department, giving it the highest resignation rate of any city police force in the nation.

"This is the worst example of police administration we have ever seen," Harrington said. Asked if he meant that Atlanta has the worst police department in the nation, Harrington said yes.

"You've got a beautiful city here, but it must be as unsafe as hell to walk the streets," the F.O.P. president said.

Harrington and Jenkins have been frequent opponents in the past concerning the issue of policemen belonging to fraternal and professional police organizations, and once debated each other on a television program.

Asked why Jenkins would not want to press for higher pay and better benefits for his department, as the F.O.P. has charged, Harrington said the chief was interested in "not rocking the boat."

Asked how Jenkins had been able to move into top national law enforcement organizations, including being a past president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Harrington said, "It ain't what you know, it's who you know."

The F.O.P. members voted earlier to send a telegram to President Richard M. Nixon asking that Jenkins be removed from the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders because he "does not represent the policeman's interests." The telegram was to be drafted and sent Thursday night.

However, the 11-man commission referred to by the F.O.P. was dissolved when it completed its report in March 1968. Chief Jenkins was the only policeman on the commission, appointed by former President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967 and headed by Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner.

Local F.O.P. members charged that Jenkins has "run off" many former policemen because of their F.O.P. affiliation.

Vice Mayor Massell said that the F.O.P. is "making the wrong person the scapegoat" by attacking Jenkins. He said that the mayor and board of aldermen, including himself, are responsible for the police department operations. He pledged to strengthen the department by both higher salaries and better equipment.

Alderman Cook said he "thinks we have a good department, but I have some questions to ask about it. I will examine this and every other department when I become mayor."

Earlier, Gov. Lester Maddox unloaded with a major attack on city officials in Atlanta for what he called their shortcomings in fighting crime.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

PEACE GROUP LEAVES TO AID FLIERS' RELEASE

NEW YORK.—Rennard C. (Rennie) Davis, 28, flew to Paris last night with a delegation of peace activists, en route to Hanoi to obtain the release of three American fliers held by North Vietnam.

Davis, one of eight protesters indicted for actions during last summer's disturbances at the Democratic national convention, was permitted to make the trip by Judge Otto Kerner of the 7th U.S. District Court of Appeals. Kerner had reversed a ruling of U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman, who had refused to allow Davis to make the trip. Hoffman had expressed "great misgivings about the court entering into the field of foreign relations" and said he "did not want to intrude on political activities."

Kerner, a Democrat and Illinois governor from 1961 to 1968, acted on an emergency motion filed on behalf of Davis.

Davis' attorneys had asked Hoffman's permission for Davis to go to Hanoi as head of a four-member delegation as part of an agreement worked out with the North Vietnamese delegation to the Paris peace talks for the release of three American fliers.

Davis left Chicago immediately after Kerner's decision was announced. He flew first to New York and then to Paris.

Davis identified the other members of this delegation to Hanoi as James Johnson, New York, a Negro who refused to serve in Vietnam while an army private at Ft. Hood, Tex.; Grace Taley, New York writer and anti-Vietnam activist; and Linda Evans, Detroit, a national officer of Students for a Democratic Society.

AMERICANS UNITED IN OUTRAGE AT DENIALS OF PERSONAL AND NATIONAL LIBERTY IN EASTERN EUROPE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans have observed Captive Nations Week to pay special tribute to the gallant and suffering people of Eastern Europe, so many of whom still find themselves kept forcibly under the domination of the Soviet Union.

This year the renewed and extended agony of Czechoslovakia has added poignancy to this commemoration, and has given new currency to our indignation. We had hoped things might be getting better, however gradually, in Eastern Europe. Now that hope rests with so many others in a kind of vast international graveyard of things that ought to be.

What a peculiar tragedy it is that almost a quarter century after the end of World War II the Soviet Union continues its oppression of whole nations in Eastern Europe. No longer can the Soviet leaders even conjure up a conceivable aggressor to provide some a faint pretext excuse for their misbehavior toward their neighbors. The offense, always grave, grows worse with time.

Let there be no mistake about this: there are many and profound disagreements among Americans these days, but we stand together in our outrage over the denial of national and personal liberty to so many peoples—peoples who have made such great contributions to Western civilization and to our own national development, and who have such great histories and cultural traditions of their own. We join in prayer for the well-being of these valiant men and women who have kept alive their aspirations for freedom and justice through the long night of foreign occupation and intimidation. Their courage and constancy should inspire Americans to meet our own discouragements and difficulties with less self-pity and greater effort.

A large number of us in the House were privileged and fortunate to be able to begin Captive Nations Week at a luncheon with the Honorable Zbigniew

Stypulkowski, representative of the Polish government-in-exile in this country.

Mr. Stypulkowski has been one of the great leaders of his people over three decades, in war and peace, in independence and captivity. He was one of the heroes of the underground during the war, and was captured by both the Russians and the Germans. He endured the horrors of Lubyanka Prison, and emerged as one of the few men to confess nothing to the brainwashers. How much we can learn from such a man. His example of courage, wisdom and sacrifice, and his capacity to retain balance and humor under conditions of extreme adversity, have challenged and inspired those who have known him all over the world through the years of his exile.

What an honor it is to meet with Mr. Stypulkowski as he carries on, undaunted, enlightened, still struggling for freedom for his and all people. We join in saluting him as a personification of the capacity of the free human spirit to survive untold difficulties in pursuit of high purpose, and as an especially valuable representative of the people of Eastern Europe.

Perhaps the example of millions of Americans working to change the policies of their Government could inspire millions of Soviet citizens to do likewise.

Would it hurt the leaders of the Soviet Union, in this period of vastly increased national stability to listen to questioning voices among their own people? Is it really too much to hope that the Soviet Union, in the strength of its military security, could reassess its conduct in Eastern Europe—especially the recent performance in Czechoslovakia—and perhaps could even reassess its policy toward dissent at home? Such a reassessment, if it were to lead to less archaic and more humane attitudes toward its conscience and its neighbors, could only help the Soviet leaders in their desire to influence people around the world.

Such an increase in Soviet influence would be a small price for the world to pay for the easing of the light of those whom we salute during Captive Nations Week. And it would be a great contribution to the possibility of a genuine detente, a detente that could lead to broadened negotiations, and thus perhaps could lead on to peace at last for much of this scarred and tired planet.

HUNGER IN DETROIT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press, Mary Ann Weston wrote an article entitled, "Thousands Know: What It's Like To Go Hungry in Detroit." She described the plight of numerous citizens of our city both young and old as they fight the forces of hunger, malnutrition and disease. This problem, of course, is not

confined to Detroit alone. It is of national concern.

We are aware that there are many people for one reason or another who are improperly nourished but who do have enough money to eat the right foods. In this article, Miss Weston discusses the plight of another group—no one knows how large—of people who just do not have enough to eat. Into this group are born children who must be given equal opportunity to take their place and to grow in our society without the constant fear of not knowing when they will have another meal. I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and once again I urge a review of our entire welfare system, which to a large degree has permitted these conditions to exist and flourish in our country.

The article follows:

THOUSANDS KNOW: WHAT IT'S LIKE TO GO HUNGRY IN DETROIT

(By Mary Ann Weston)

There are people in Detroit who go to bed at night with empty stomachs, who eat only once a day, who get fat on too much starch and lethargic on too little protein.

There are children who stay home from school because they've had nothing to eat and can't afford 35 cents for a school lunch, old folks who regularly run out of food days before their Social Security checks come, pregnant women who give birth to undernourished—and sometimes retarded—children because the mothers were poorly nourished in pregnancy.

No one knows how many hungry people there are—nor, for that matter, just what constitutes hunger. There are many people—rich and poor—who are improperly nourished but who have enough money to eat the right foods.

But there is another group—no one knows how large—of people who just don't have enough to eat.

Dr. George Pickett, Wayne County health director, said there are 325,000 "medically indigent" children in the county. But no one knows how many of them are hungry. No one really knows how many families are hungry.

Rainwater trickled into four metal pots dotting the linoleum floor of the mouldering old house near the Fisher Building where the Smith family lives.

The rain splatted on the red linoleum in the dining room because there were more holes than Mrs. Smith had pots. The older Smith children (there are 11) yanked the younger ones out of the puddles.

"It's kind of hard not to be hungry," sighed Mrs. Smith, a large, slow-moving woman who has not completely recovered from heart surgery last winter.

The children, who seemed quiet and polite, stayed home from school that day because they were hungry. They hadn't had anything to eat for 24 hours.

Mrs. Smith said there wouldn't be anything to eat until her husband got home from work at 2:30 with his paycheck. Then she'd go shopping.

When the seven school-aged children do go to school, they come home for lunch. Mrs. Smith said she can't afford the \$2.45 a day to buy a 35-cent hot lunch for each child.

Lunch at home is usually sandwiches of bologna or salami or peanut butter and jelly—until there isn't any bologna or peanut butter or bread left for lunch. "We run out of food practically every week," she said.

At their last meal, Mrs. Smith said, "they had some neck bones and white potatoes and rice." And no breakfast.

The last time the children—except for the baby—had milk was two days earlier.

The last time there were any greens or vegetables or fruit in the house was the previous weekend—five days before.

And, things have been that way for the Smiths for quite a while. "We came from down South, and it was still worse there," Mrs. Smith said.

Smith works at an auto plant. The family used food stamps—Mrs. Smith pays \$58 for \$82 worth every two weeks.

Smith takes-home about \$120 a week. This has to cover rent, utilities, clothes, transportation, medical expenses, incidents, everything for 13 people.

Mrs. Smith prefers to do her grocery shopping alone. She doesn't like to take the children with her, "because they be wanting things." Things like hot dogs and candy and hamburger, and breakfast food in bright packages and cookies and pop-tarts and potato chips.

What is hunger for the children?
"It's feeling empty inside," says the 10-year-old boy.

"It feels like you don't got no food," said his 14-year-old brother.

Mrs. Smith worries about the children. She says they often complain of stomach aches, of being hungry. On paycheck day they say, over and over, "I'll sure be glad when Dad gets here."

"It worries me so bad I think that is the reason I have heart trouble," Mrs. Smith said. "I don't see no way things'll get better, but I guess they will—I hope so."

For many of Wayne County's more than 127,000 public welfare recipients, hunger is always near.

Paul Conlan, director of the Wayne County Department of Social Services, knows the food allowance of 83 cents a day isn't enough.

"We have tried for some years to get increases in the allowances," he said.

The efforts have met with some success. Conlan said there were plans to raise the grants \$2 to \$3 per person per month on July 1—"depending on how our budget gets through the legislature."

Welfare recipients have been allotted 83 cents a day for food since 1960. Food prices have risen about 20 percent in the same time.

Two years ago a nutritionist with Project PRESCAD (a federally-funded children and adolescent health program) set-up a nutritious diet on a welfare allowance.

"She came within five percent of the allowance," said Dr. Louis Heideman, associate director for pediatric services for PRESCAD. "It could be done, but it requires tremendous skill and know-how."

Skill and know-how that the average ADC mother doesn't have.

There's a bowl of plastic fruit on the coffee table in the living room of Mrs. Violet Jones' little house on the East Side.

Mrs. Jones and her three teenage sons are on ADC. She can't remember the last time they had fruit to eat.

"There's no such thing as three meals a day. We just don't have it," said an 18-year-old son who is about to go into the Navy. "Usually there is no breakfast, just supper at about 3 p.m. When we do have breakfast, it's last night's beans."

"Most of what I eat I get from my friends."

A 17-year-old son was laid off his job when his boss found out he is an epileptic. He is supposed to take medicine three times a day after meals.

When the food runs out before her check comes, Mrs. Jones gets credit at a small neighborhood grocery to tide them over. Then it takes most of the check to cover it.

"After I take it up, I have to pay it back," Mrs. Jones said. "I could take up (charge) more than I could pay back any time."

Food is cheaper at a supermarket, but she can't get credit there. And she would have to pay a jitney—a man who transports shoppers to their homes—a dollar or two to get the food home.

One day last week the Joneses' only meal was blackeyed peas. The day before they had some leftover cooked cabbage and three chicken backs.

"When I don't have any money I try to get by as cheap as I can," she said.

That means a diet of mainly potatoes, beans, bread, cornmeal, hamburger and chicken. "I'm so tired of chicken I don't know what to do, but it's cheapest," said Mrs. Jones.

She gets greens—or cabbage occasionally—when the store has them. "I love vegetables, we all do. But I'm hardly ever able to buy them," she said.

"We don't ever have just what we want to eat. We're just eating to live off it—just something to keep living."

Mrs. Jones, who can't work because of arthritis, daydreams about pork chops and steak. "If I could buy something like that I know it would change my taste a little. I ate so many beans when I was young that I hate beans. They don't kill my hunger no way. It's just like I never ate anything."

Often, the "experts" say hunger is a result of poor money management. Mrs. Gloria Brown, an organizer for the Detroit Metropolitan Welfare Rights Organization (WRO), says that, given their miniscule budgets, recipients do quite well.

Food is usually the item that comes last in a poor family's budget. Bills for rent, utilities, payments on car or furniture usually get paid first. What's left over goes for groceries.

Though food stamps are a help to some, many welfare families can't scrape together the lump sum to buy them.

Sister Annette Marie Byrne, a nurse at St. Joseph Mercy Clinic, told of one family.

"They'd need about \$34 for the initial stamps and they can't save that up," she said. "They live from day to day. They're too poor to get enough money ahead to buy stamps."

When Sister Annette first heard of this family—mother, daughter, and the daughter's five children—they had been subsisting on grits, day-old bread, dried beans or peas. They got an ADC check of \$170 every two weeks. "The children were not getting milk. The little meat they got was usually frozen TV dinners because the family had no refrigerator to keep meat," Sister Annette said.

The mother came to the clinic when she was expecting her fifth child. She was underweight and anemic. Iron deficiency anemia is frequent among people who do not get enough iron and protein.

The children were not getting enough protein.

The family is doing better now because Sister Annette helped them with food from the Capuchin Monastery supplemented by things bought from her own budget.

According to Mrs. Brown of the Welfare Rights Organization, families on welfare are "constantly in a bind" to make their budgets stretch.

In an attempt to help things a little, the WRO gave the Department of Social Services forms for several hundred women and children, requesting special diets to alleviate malnutrition. The forms were all signed by doctors.

The special diets would have raised the daily food allowances from 83 cents to 96 cents.

The requests were turned down by the department.

Paul Conlan, head of the department, said there was not an adequate diagnosis and that the doctors had not actually examined the women and children whose forms they signed.

Anyway, Conlan said, "malnutrition is not a diagnosis." He said there was a provision in welfare regulations for a malnutrition diet, "but it would have to be associated with a medical problem."

The trouble is, Mrs. Brown said, malnutrition often goes undiagnosed, even when patients have other medical problems.

Mrs. Forester of Crittenton Clinic added, "Often it is hard to discover who is hungry and who is not. Some patients are willing to tell you. Others try to hide it." Some, she indicated, are too proud to admit they don't have enough to eat.

Federal surplus food now can be "prescribed" for undernourished patients at the obstetrics clinics at Crittenton, Detroit Memorial, Hutzel and Mt. Carmel Mercy hospitals. At Crittenton alone, about 80 orders a month have been written since February.

Dr. Crockett said: "Starvation? Yes, we see it."

She told of one elderly woman who confessed she ate scraps scrounged from Eastern Market. Her son was sent home from school because he was hungry to learn.

Teachers in Detroit schools learn to spot the symptoms of hunger: Children who are unusually quiet, listless, sleepy, who seem frail or pale, whose skin seems dry.

"A child who comes to school hungry is not apt to have much energy to divert to learning," said Dr. Elsie Jinks, divisional director of the Detroit Schools' department of evaluative services.

Children at schools that serve breakfast "are more alert because they are freed from the basic drive to satisfy their hunger."

The Detroit Public Schools do provide free lunches. Just who gets them is officially at the discretion of the principal.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has recommended that welfare children automatically get a free lunch.

But the board of education can't afford to do that. Last year it cost the schools \$461,000 to give free lunches. The year before, it was \$300,000, in addition to a partial federal subsidy.

In March, an average of 8,967 free lunches a day were served. But there are about 50,000 ADC recipients' children in the Detroit schools, and no one knows how many other hungry children there are whose families don't receive welfare.

Regulations say the principal can grant or deny free lunches based on whether the child can go home for lunch, or bring a lunch from home, and the family's economic situation.

Each free lunch grant is to be "reinvested" at least every semester.

The financially hard-pressed schools are serving more free lunches and so far no principals' requests have been turned down.

But, in 70 "poverty schools" there are no lunches at all—free or otherwise.

One of the schools that has a large number is Burton, at Cass and Peterboro, where the principal, Miss Monica Mullally, said: "We're pretty liberal with free lunches here. It's very hard to deprive a child of lunch when the parent, through no fault of the child, didn't budget for it."

Often when a family has run out of food and can't get more, the Salvation Army steps in to help. According to Mrs. Ada Fraser, 20 to 35 people a day come to the lodge at 78 Peterboro seeking help—about half of them seeking food.

Many of them are elderly, on Social Security or other small, fixed incomes.

According to Mrs. Fraser, it's not unusual for old folks to come in for food orders after they have been mugged and their money or groceries taken.

"That happens quite often," Mrs. Fraser said. "It is a common situation in the inner city."

A plump, efficient-looking woman who sees the city's hungry daily, Mrs. Fraser manages a quiet kind of anger when she talks about it.

"In this city there is hunger," she said, "Because so many have missed the mainstream, especially the older people. And everyone is so busy making a living, they forget this exists."

THE PEOPLE ARE SPEAKING—
ARE WE LISTENING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I appeared before the Democratic National Party Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection at New Orleans, La.

Because I remain convinced that the will of the American people should not be denied and cannot be denied—that people punish political parties and politicians—not vice versa, I include the text of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF Mr. RARICK

Mr. Chairman, I am John Rarick from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and I am a Louisiana Democrat, serving as the Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana.

Before going to Congress, I served five years as an elected District Judge. As a young man, before coming to Louisiana, I was a member of the Democratic Party of Indiana where I had the pleasure of serving as City Chairman of the Indiana Democratic Party at Goshen, Indiana. I have never been a member of any other political party than the Democratic Party of the state in which I resided.

Upon learning that your Commission was entering my state to hear witnesses on party structure, delegate selection, and grassroots participation—not having been invited, I have taken the initiative to ask that I might be permitted to appear and give testimony that I feel is representative of my people.

I think that I should add that I have contacted Mr. Arthur Watson, the State Chairman of our Party, and Mr. J. W. Ellis, elected Sixth District Democratic Chairman of my District and was astonished to learn that neither had received notice from this Committee or been invited to appear.

If such is the case, I can but advise you that I feel such lack of courtesy seems to have been our consistent experience with some of the National Party Representatives and may well explain why the Party was fatally divided last November and why it remains fragmented today.

If it is the intent of this Committee truly to move forward into the traditional strength of the Democratic Party, by opening the umbrella for the admission not only of all minority and pressure groups but for the great majority of the American people, then I think that your hearings can serve a useful purpose.

On the other hand, if the purpose for your hearings is merely to enter into our Democratic state—one of only two all Democratic delegations in Congress, the other one being Mississippi—under some subterfuge to usurp or by-pass the existing state party structure—elected by the Louisiana Democrats, then I most strenuously object to your action and ask that my objection to your proceedings on any such scheme or plan be reserved in the record of these hearings.

We Democrats of Louisiana are proud of our record of political independence and determination. As true Democrats feeling that our duty is to our people and our state, we have stood steadfastly against unrelenting pressures to oppose ideas and philosophies that we consider not only detrimental to the best interests of our people but likewise the United States.

It is no secret that the elected state Democratic Central Committee of Louisiana by democratic action voted not to permit the candidate of the national party to run under our emblem in last November's election—the Louisiana party's right to do so was upheld by the Supreme Court of our state. It is no secret that an Alabama Democrat, George C. Wallace, running as an independent was the overwhelming choice of Louisiana Democrats last November.

Likewise the election returns show that the ticket nominated in Chicago—on incumbent Vice President—backed by all the prestige of the federal government, the United States Treasury and political patronage could not interest 40% of the American people in the candidates or the Chicago platform.

This is past history—I don't think party discipline or revenge will accomplish anything unless the representatives of states outside Louisiana wish to deliberately destroy the Democratic Party of Louisiana. And I remind the Commission of the wisdom of the American Democratic voters, for at this very moment Mr. Humphrey, the former Vice President and national party candidate is behind the Iron Curtain fraternizing with the Communists in Soviet Russia.

The problem that faces you is not that Mr. Humphrey was defeated, nor that Mr. Wallace carried the state, but rather—if your interest is broadening the appeal of the party to the voters—the question is "why?"

Any observer of the mood of the American people and of "grass-roots" political action can readily see that from Los Angeles to Minneapolis to New York City, the American people are repudiating the failures of national socialism. Louisiana and other southern Democrats have been in the forefront of this inevitable wave of the future. There is no need to create appearances of grassroots interest and activity when it already exists in mounting proportions.

In fact, the majority of the American people—the decent, hard-working taxpayers—have become fed up with 30 years of flowery promise and abject failure to produce. If the party does not go back to the people—the people will abandon the party in ever-increasing numbers.

At present, the extremist views of a handful of men, who are self-appointed spokesmen of the national party, have become so offensive and objectionable to the American people, they bring the party—the very name "Democrat"—into public contempt.

I feel that any astute observer of politics in the United States must realize that if there is any gap in our country, it is a responsibility gap—a gap between the political specialists, the government leaders and the people. And it does no good for the promoted leadership to talk among themselves and figure out how to fool the people by talking of party purges, party discipline, and party loyalty oaths.

You can not deny the American people their vote and their preferences, and if we do not offer them a choice within the party, they will leave and seek out a candidate of their own. If the heralded right to vote means anything, it means more than a captive vote for a minority-controlled candidate—a right to vote only for the lesser of two evils. It must mean the right of the people to vote proudly for a candidate who best expresses their beliefs, wants, and aspirations.

If the party expects loyalty from the peo-

ple, it must first demonstrate its loyalty to the people. So long as it is loyal only to minorities, it will receive support only from minorities.

If the party leadership proposes to recruit mindless and unqualified members who can be manipulated to vote as a bloc—who will take orders—and accept party discipline without a struggle—those leaders should candidly admit their intentions and form a Fourth party as a vehicle for their ideology rather than masquerade under the name and banner of the Democratic Party.

If we trust the democratic system we must trust the will of the people. There should be no room in our party for hand-selected delegates or other representatives who are not responsible to the people of the state.

The weaknesses of the existing national Democratic Party will continue so long as it remains without an honest and substantial base. It can have no strength from the top down if it is not based on a firm foundation, meeting the goals—not of the party—but of the people themselves. True improvement for the national party would be to realize that the greatest political strengths in our country are at the state level and therefore every effort must be made to return confidence and recognition to the state parties—rather than the seemingly increased tendency to concentrate more and more control in a handful of opportunists who seem more bent on promoting their own political future than in entering into dialogue with the real reservoir of political savvy and the closest liaison with the voter—the state Democratic committees.

We must stop playing headline politics and start putting the good of our country and people ahead of party control. To represent the majority of the American people should be our goal. Their views are clear. They have been unmistakably expressed at the polls—in November 1968, in Los Angeles, in Minneapolis, and in New York.

We should get our party in line with the American people and not waste time trying to whip the American people into line with our party. The majority of the American people are Democrats—Let them come home.

GOOD STATESMANSHIP AND UNDERSTANDING OF TOM PAINE, NASA ADMINISTRATOR

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
July 18, 1969.

DEAR JIM: This record of my talk with Rev. Abernathy at the Cape may interest you.

We're working on your suggestion to speed up our legislation, but its extremely difficult now.

Delighted you were with us at the launch of Apollo 11, and that—so far—everything has gone well.

TOM PAINE.

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1969.

On Tuesday morning, July 15, while Dr. Debus and I were driving from the Apollo Executives meeting at KSC to Patrick Air Force Base to meet former President and Mrs. Johnson, we discussed the Rev. Aber-

nath's SCLC group and security measures which were being taken to avoid possible disruption of the launch activities. He expressed some concern that demonstrations might block access to the Kennedy Space Center which, with expected traffic conditions, might prevent technicians reaching their work stations during the final countdown. I told him that if it would help avoid potential difficulties, I would be glad to meet with the Rev. Abernathy, listen to his statements, and respond as appropriate. Dr. Debus immediately telephoned his security people from the car to contact the Rev. Abernathy and offer him a meeting in the afternoon. The message came back somewhat later that the Rev. Abernathy would indeed welcome such an opportunity, so we made an appointment to visit his camp just outside the Kennedy Space Center gate at 3 p.m. I designated Julian Scheer as the only person to accompany me, but asked that the press not be invited, although they could be told about it in response to queries.

Julian and I drove out to the site, arriving at 3:00, and directed that the Florida police present there not accompany us to the meeting. The Rev. Abernathy sent word via the NASA security man that he would like us to stand in the north end of the roped-off field so that he could assemble his people at the south end and march over to us. Julian Scheer and I walked over to the appropriate position in the field. It was a somewhat dramatic picture. We were coatless, standing under a cloudy sky, with distant thunder rumbling, and very light mist of rain occasionally falling. After a good deal of chanting, oratory and lining up, the group marched slowly toward us, singing "We Shall Overcome." In the lead were several mules being led by the Rev. Abernathy, Hosea Williams and other leading members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The leaders came up to us and halted, facing Julian and myself, while the remainder of the group walked around and surrounded us. A microphone and loudspeaker were produced, and several press photographers snapped photos. The Rev. Abernathy gave a short speech in which he deplored the conditions of the nation's poor, stating that although he had no specific quarrel with the space program, it represented an inhuman priority at a time when so much suffering exists in the nation. One fifth of the population lacks adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care, he said. The money for the space program, he stated, should be spent to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, tend the sick, and house the shelterless. He pointed out that his people were Americans too, with no homeland but America, and wanted to improve their lot in this country. He developed this theme at some length. He had three requests to make of me:

#1 in his scale of priorities was that ten families from his group be given passes to enter KSC and join the VIP's viewing the launch the next day.

#2 was that I support the movement to combat the nation's poverty, hunger and other social problems, and

#3 was that the scientists, engineers, and experts of NASA find new ways to use their skills to tackle the problem of hunger. He understood that we had developed new sources of nutrition in our program, for example. He then passed the microphone to me.

I stated that with respect to his first request, I would be delighted to invite the ten families which he requested to join us and the many other Americans who would be viewing the launch to the moon. (Julian Scheer later extended this to include one busload of the Rev. Abernathy's people; with breakfast and a candy bar placed on each seat of the bus.) I then said that I wished it were as easy to meet his other two requests. I stated that if we could solve the

problems of poverty in the United States by not pushing the button to launch men to the moon tomorrow, then we would not push that button. I said that the great technological advances of NASA were child's play compared to the tremendously difficult human problems with which he and his people were concerned. I said that he should regard the space program, however, as an encouraging demonstration of what the American people could accomplish when they had vision, leadership, and adequate resources of competent people and money to overcome obstacles. I said I hoped that he would hitch his wagons to our rocket, using the space program as a spur to the nation to tackle problems boldly in other areas, and using NASA's space successes as a yardstick by which progress in other areas should be measured. I said that although I could not promise early results, I would certainly do everything in my own personal power to help him in his fight for better conditions for all Americans, and that his request that science and engineering assist in this task was a sound one which, in the long run, would indeed help.

He thanked me for my remarks and for coming to meet them. I said that I was there because they had invited me and because I wanted to be there. I said that I had one request to make of his people: that in the prayer meeting he had scheduled for that evening they would pray for the safety of our astronauts. He responded with emotion that they would certainly pray for the safety and success of the astronauts, and that as Americans they were as proud of our space achievements as anybody in the country. We shook hands all around and Julian and I returned to the Kennedy Space Center.

T. O. PAINE,
Administrator.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, two topics most talked about by Americans today are taxes and inflation. Higher taxes and rising prices are gouging deeply into the taxpayers' hard-earned income. He is demanding relief, and rightfully so, from his Government. These two problems and proposals for overcoming them were analyzed this week in a superb speech by California's distinguished senior Senator, GEORGE MURPHY, before the Comstock Club, in Sacramento. So that our colleagues in the House can have the benefit of Senator MURPHY's assessment of these two problems, I insert the text of his speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen: I know that every speaker who addresses this distinguished body begins with telling all of you how pleased he was to get the invitation. I would like to go beyond that and congratulate you on your excellent timing. This meeting today will serve as a sort of belated birthday celebration for me. And, of course, as always, it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to come back to Sacramento to the seat of government of the Great State which I represent in Washington.

I might say that I am happy to be here at the end of July rather than at the early part of the month. My good and longtime

friend, Governor Reagan, observed the Fourth of July in Sacramento with the Legislature and the celebration went off just a few days ahead of time. That fireworks display, you will be glad to know, was bright enough to be seen in the press in Washington, D.C. as well as clear across the country. And I would like to congratulate him on making possible a safe and sane Fourth for the rest of us, particularly those who were wondering whether they were going to get paid or not.

You know, it occurred to me that day that I must be getting much stronger because on my birthday a year ago my dear wife sent me to the market and a box boy had to help me carry ten dollars worth of groceries to the car. And this year he put the whole thing in one small brown sack and I could have carried it in my mouth.

On the way home I picked up the afternoon paper. In addition to the report of the Governor's budget problems, there were a number of other disturbing items. There was the continuing story of the general complexities and problems of our civilization all over the world, and particular focus on the tale of the agony of the Los Angeles School District. You are all aware, of course, that the Los Angeles Board of Education, for the first time in its history, has been forced to adopt a deficit budget. There is just not enough money to pay the bills. Superintendent Jack Crowther has been forced to recommend drastic cuts in various essential educational services. His problems are repeated not only throughout the State of California but also in most of the 35 large cities in our nation. In June, for example, voters in Oakland, San Jose, Marin County, and Livermore all turned down tax increases for education for one reason or another. The net result was the same.

There was also a report in the financial section of this same paper telling of the effect on businesses of spiraling interest rates, a serious concern of the manufacturers and industrialists, the building industry over the cost of money, labor and materials. You all must have read, as I did, of the demands of the plumbers union in Southern California for a four-day work week with a raise from \$5.79 to \$9.30 in pay and dramatic increases in wages and fringe benefits; the strikes of the nurses in the hospitals in Los Angeles; the problems of the teachers; the longshoremen; grape boycotts; and all of the other disconcerting and disturbing problems of our great complex society.

In yet another article, welfare recipients were complaining that increases in the cost of living and in the general cost of food were destroying the value of the checks they were receiving, making it impossible for them to get along on the small subsistence provided for them.

There are accounts of similar problems all across the country. In Chicago, Governor Ogilvie had warned that his state is teetering "on the brink of bankruptcy." Wisconsin had to deal with a \$416 million revenue gap. And in North Carolina, Governor Scott did an unheard of thing in that famous old tobacco growing state, where tobacco was considered sacrosanct. He was so desperate he even proposed a tax on cigarettes. And at the same time, in Washington, D.C., the Department of Labor announced yet another increase in the cost of living—six percent for the first six months for the year 1969.

I am pleased to say, however, that all the news is not bad, and there are some very hopeful signs appearing on the horizon. Under the new Administration of Richard Nixon, our Federal Government is, for the first time in a decade, facing up to the realities of our national fiscal crisis and advocating policies which will return our economy to a safe and sound basis. Politics has been, at long last, replaced by practicality. Obviously, this return to fiscal sanity and health cannot be accomplished immediately or without some major irritation. You cannot effect a

cure resulting from twelve years of injective fiscal malignancy with one trip to the doctor's office. And may I say the medicine will not always be pleasant to take. But I think we all agree that we must do whatever is necessary to cure the disease of inflation which eats away at all the permanent values of our system, destroys the increases in wages and salaries, stock values, and which, worst of all, punishes the old and the thrifty by devouring their hard-earned savings. And this problem must be cured now. We can put it off no longer.

I am happy to report to you that the one concern of all economists with regard to inflation is the necessity for a balanced budget, and I can report that after six months of the Nixon Administration, it would seem that we most certainly will have a balanced budget. And better than that, you can imagine how we in Congress, who have long pleaded for fiscal responsibility, welcome the sight of a surplus in the first budget presented by the new Administration. And, may I say this is the first surplus that has been achieved in the Federal Government in nine years, since President Eisenhower ended his administration with a \$1.2 billion surplus. And, just as important, we welcome the return of an attitude of painstaking care in the spending and use of taxpayers' hard earned dollars, of an attitude that free spending does not necessarily cure all of our problems. That, in fact, free spending may be responsible for many of our problems, that practical planning is necessary, that we should know what we are going to do before we rush into operation and waste time, effort and money. Unfortunately, one theory that I have found rampant in Washington is that if you have a program that is not working right, just pour some more taxpayers' dollars into it and it will pick up speed and just work fine. Now, you and I know that that isn't exactly always the truth. Sometimes these programs are wrong; and often they overlap; sometimes the thinking that went into them was improper, and sometimes a lot of these programs never should have started in the first place.

With a sound economic basis, our government, without question, can help the individual citizens in private enterprise in this country to grow as it has in the past and to continue to provide for all of our people the highest standard of living that man has ever achieved.

As stated briefly, may I say that I believe that there are more efficient ways of using the tax dollars collected from our already overburdened citizens than are presently in effect. And the plans that I have proposed, and will be proposing, will be designed to make the same amount of tax dollars return more benefits to our people. I think this is a good place in which to start.

The problems this country faces at home and abroad are at a crisis level. They range from the war in Vietnam, where our President is leading the way, hopefully, toward an honorable, peaceful solution to the difficulties in our cities and suburbs and our slums at home. These problems are real, and they have been with us for a long time. Those who chose to ignore them or do nothing about them have not only neglected their obligation to fund the cures which in the beginning might have been simple, but they have provided more time for the complications to multiply, and thereby have increased the necessity for drastic measures.

Two of the issues presently before us in Washington, about which I know you are reading and hearing a lot, are the ABM and the extension of the surtax. I think that before going on to my principal subject for today I should report to you briefly on where these two matters stand.

With respect to the President's proposal to construct the Safeguard ABM System, I be-

lieve the opponents have spread much unfortunate confusion. The first question raised is whether or not we need such a defensive system. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have listened to much expert testimony by members of the military and I have heard the request of the President who is, in the final analysis, responsible for this nation's security. And I might add that in the current fiscal crisis he is as anxious to cut corners and save money as is anyone—if not more so. Based upon the evidence, I am sure that we need this system to help keep the peace by depriving any other nation of the temptation of feeling it has the power to knock us out.

Next it is argued by some members of the scientific community that the system will not work. Others, of course, have established that the components of the system do work and that the only real way we will know about the effectiveness of the system is to construct one—and they feel it is worth doing. I have noticed that those scientists who argue against the system have a long record of opposing the establishment of effective military systems over the past years.

And then there is the argument that we dare not construct a military system which might offend the Russians—even though they of course have done the same thing already. I would point out that the Russians have not stated this would offend them and that certainly President Nixon is anxious to go as far as safety will permit in working with them toward a lasting peace. In the final analysis, of course, the decision must be based upon the needs of our national security, and I believe that this criterion leaves us no choice in this decision. That is why every poll shows that the American people overwhelmingly endorse the President's proposal and it is why I believe the Senate will support the President when the vote finally comes.

With respect to the tax bill, the Senate Finance Committee presently has before it the Administration-sponsored bill to extend the surtax which was passed by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately some members of the Democratic leadership are attempting to withhold action on the surtax, asserting that such action should not be taken without comprehensive tax reform. I would point out that the Democratic Party, now crying so for tax reform, has controlled Congress since 1954 without passing such proposals and that their leaders were in the White House since 1961 without fabricating such measures. You can understand why I am suspicious of the argument now being advanced.

I am not only suspicious, I am upset because I believe that everyone who has studied the matter recognizes that fast action on the surtax extension is necessary to provide the cornerstone to the admirable program of the Administration to combat inflation. This should not wait for the deliberation required in putting together a comprehensive tax reform bill. Nor is it necessary to use the surtax as a sweetener to force tax reform, because President Nixon, the leadership of both political parties, and members of both Houses of Congress, most certainly including myself, and certainly the American public, are strongly for tax reform. Furthermore, the House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering such a tax reform bill, and it would seem sensible that the Senate wait for that bill, which Chairman Mills has promised to report before our August recess, so that we can benefit from all the study and resources which will have gone into constructing it. This is the logical way to do it.

It is all too obvious that politics has crept into both the opposition to the ABM and the immediate extension of the surtax, but I believe the people know what is right in these matters and that their will in the end will prevail.

In the months ahead, from time to time, I hope I will have a chance to be discussing with you many of these problems, the steps which have already been taken toward their solution and proposals which will be made in the future. In the limited time available today, however, I want to share with you my thinking in one of these areas.

We all know that two-thirds of all taxes collected in the United States today find their way to the Federal Government in Washington. State and local governments are left with only one-third, and today, my friends, this is just not enough to meet the needs at the local level. The portions that dribble back from Washington to the state and local governments in the form of grants or matching funds, and all the rest of the ways in which it is handled, is subject to a handling charge by a series of bureaucratic middlemen each step of the way, very often supervised by inexperienced enthusiasts who are uncertain in their design and sometimes faulty in their desires. I have tried to get reliable figures on what this handling charge amounts to and I have arrived at all sorts of figures from 20 percent to 45 percent. That's just for brokerage. Remember this, my friends. Our citizens don't live in Washington. That's where the Federal Government lives. Citizens of the United States live in the fifty states, and they live in the counties and the cities and on the farms. And I think all the expertise in finding the solutions to these problems may not be concentrated in the Federal Government, or in the federal bureaucracy. I know there are many people at the local level with a great deal of talent, knowledge and experience and determination to find answers to some of these problems.

Most of the states, I find, and I think this includes California, have exhausted all proper potential sources of revenue. As a result, local and state governments are becoming less able to meet public demands for better schools, law enforcement, highways, mass transit facilities, health care, parks, recreation facilities, and for the basic protection of the subsistence level of those who are otherwise unable to help themselves. We find endless numbers of people spending endless hours looking for new ways to take more and more tax dollars away from the defenseless, and I believe already overtaxed, citizens.

But the Federal Government—that great colossus on the polluted Potomac—already seems to have drained off all the available resources, and it has expanded its size and scope and its endless need for more funds, as the years have gone by. Centralize the control has been the watchword. Well, I hope those days have come to the end. Federal assistance to states and municipalities has risen from one billion dollars in 1946 to 15 billion dollars last year, and is expected to reach an overwhelming figure of 60 billion dollars by 1975. We find there are about 200 separate federal aid programs now on the books, financed by more than 400 separate appropriations and administered by 21 federal departments and agencies. There are more than 100 federal aid programs just for education. This massive bureaucracy has developed a substructure of 150 Washington bureaus and 400 regional offices. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has 386 separate advisory committees made up of 5,308 employees at a cost of \$7 million yearly. Of every tax dollar paid in by Californians, as near as one can calculate, at least 65 cents goes to the Federal Government. And this leaves just 35 cents to finance those services closer to home, closest to you. And I think that this is way out of balance. And I believe that we should now start to make this division more equitable.

Add to that the fact that our state enjoys such great national blessings that we have about 30,000 people a month unable to withstand the temptation to come here and live

permanently, is it any wonder that the State of California and the local school districts have crucial budget problems today?

That is why the concept called tax sharing was advocated some time ago by colleagues of my political persuasion—the lead taken by the Republican Governors in the 1960's. I am happy to say that last year, as a member of the leadership in the Republican Policy Committee, I helped in writing the tax sharing proposal which was adopted at that time. And the plan was relatively simple. It will allow the Federal Government to remit to each state a portion of the taxes collected in that state. This would have an obvious advantage for us in California. It would return actually more money to California than any other state for the simple reason that our taxpayers pour more money into the federal coffers than any other state.

Not long ago, those of us in the California delegation in Congress received a request from Governor Reagan in which he suggested a form of federal tax sharing to meet California's acute educational crisis. I have given it long and careful consideration because I believe as does the Governor, that the focus on education is probably the right place to begin. We hear and read a lot about the one percent of our youth who are trouble-makers and, because he has defended the 99 percent who want to get an education, sometimes our Governor has been subjected to abusive attack. But I am glad, at long last, that not only in the State of California but clear across the Nation he is beginning to command the complete high regard and respect of so many thoughtful citizens for the courageous and determined stand which he has taken in the defense of our free system of education. I have been trying, as your Senator, to help the children of this nation stay in school. I authored a Dropout Prevention Program which was incorporated in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967. Every year one million students drop out of school. One million of our youngsters drop by the wayside to face a life that could possibly put them on the welfare dole, in prison, or, at best, on a hard, uphill treadmill that will not allow them to achieve their full potential.

I know from my experience that education and job training are needed today as never before, and so I have worked successfully for the model vocational school and the skill center program, and I have pushed hard for the Cooperative Vocational Educational Program which has proved to be so successful over the years and to stimulate the development of work-study programs at the secondary school level. I co-authored the Bilingual Education Act which would give our Spanish-speaking children a chance to get an even start in the primary schools. Last week I introduced a bill, the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969, which I believe will aid the cities and impoverished rural districts and rescue them from growing fiscal crises and enable them to compensate for the educational deficiencies of disadvantaged students.

I have been told by several of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, that they believe this to be the most significant education legislation before Congress this year.

We have an intolerable situation today in the United States where large numbers of students with significant education handicaps are found in school districts with resources unequal to the challenge of educating them. This challenge, I feel, is more difficult and as exciting as the moon race. Earlier in our history, the city's wealth was tapped to equalize educational opportunities in less affluent areas. Now that situation is reversed and our major cities are in desperate need of financial help in this critical field. Time is running out.

I have similarly been involved in support of the Teacher Corps, funding for school aid

to disadvantaged youngsters, handicapped children's early education assistance, Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1968. These experiences I guess help to account for my receptiveness to the Governor's suggestion for tax-sharing as a direct aid to education. And I believe that the time has come not just for Congress to begin sharing its taxing ability with the states but to actually share the taxes. In my judgment I consider the field of education one of our most critical and so I have directed my original proposal to that area for a start. I think it's a good place to begin.

And so I announce to you today that I will introduce in the Senate shortly a resolution in support of a complete in-depth study for the concept of tax-sharing with specific emphasis on the availability of such share funds to be used to meet local educational needs. I know there are some questions that will be raised and that must be settled about the proposal, but I am quite confident they can be resolved. Such Senate resolutions are not, of course, legislation in the formal sense. But they are a means of summoning the support of members of the Senate to the concept itself and to create an atmosphere of dedication and determination, to get at the job of finding the proper programs to take care of these particular needs.

As you may know I introduced in April, as a co-author with Senator Baker of Tennessee, a broad base tax-sharing proposal which is presently before the Senate Finance Committee. This bill would result initially in a rebate to the State of California of approximately \$95 million, about \$5.00 for every man, woman, and child in the state, and the best available estimates for protected increase in the rebate over the next three years to about \$400 million.

As we have discovered, however, there is a danger in waiting for funds to come back from Washington. And a critical time lag takes place. Then there's the handling charge and the bureaucrats to toss in some special conditions to make certain that the states will hew to the line made by the bureaucrats and that all at the state level would be at least partially dependent upon Washington for the use of the money, which, strangely enough, came from the citizens within the states.

These self-evident facts emerge for any realistic discussion of this general issue.

(1) Some form of federal tax, state tax sharing is necessary to meet the present urgent needs.

(2) The greatest of these needs, and the one which legislative bodies must be most sensitive of, is in the field of education, and

(3) The maximum amount of dollars may be made available for local use if they are paid directly to the local government rather than being paid first to Washington and then sent back.

For these reasons, I will soon introduce legislation which will allow a direct credit of up to one percent of the taxpayers' federal income for money that he pays to the state to be used for education.

This is direct sharing of tax revenues, I believe, in the most efficient manner. It is also, I think, the most readily attainable type of tax sharing and will help to meet the most pressing need, in the shortest period of time.

This type of tax credit—not a return from Washington but a natural direct credit before it ever gets to Washington—will enable local government to meet its obligations without imposing further unneeded, unbearable burdens on its taxpayers. By eliminating the federal middleman, it will increase the available potential use of the tax dollars by possibly thirty percent or maybe even more. And, in the long run, it may have the effect of making a tax reduction possible. I firmly believe this to be a practical, partial answer to our immediate problem of legislation and its cost. There is no doubt that Californians

consider education their most important single investment.

In the last fiscal year, the state spent more than \$2 billion for education—over thirty-six percent of the total budget. Our citizens are determined that their children must get the benefit of the best schools possible, and they must be given this right whatever their race—black, brown, yellow or white. And I believe that this proposal will help bring this to reality and by the next Fourth of July make it possible for Governor Reagan, the school districts of the State of California, and all of the families of children up and down the state to have a new and extremely important reason for a very, very gala celebration.

I also believe it will help to set a pattern which may form a basis for a complete tax reform which certainly we have needed in this country so very desperately for many, many years.

I hope that it will not be too long before I will be able to announce to you that my plan has been accepted and is under way.

And in the meantime, may I give you my sincere thanks for the pleasure of your company and your patience today.

PROSTITUTION IN DETROIT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 22, the Detroit Free Press carried an article in a Detroit magazine entitled, "Prostitution in Detroit," in which the author, Ronald L. Phillips, related the tragic story of girls who become trapped in the world of prostitution, the majority of whom come from homes where the parents were divorced or never were married. I urgently request my colleagues to read this article which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the warning that it is a story with an unhappy beginning and a perfectly dismal ending. Every effort should be made to rescue these girls.

The article follows:

PROSTITUTION IN DETROIT: OUT ON THE STREETS, WHERE THE GIRLS ARE; THIS, TERRIBLY AND REALLY, IS THE WAY IT IS

(By Ronald L. Phillips)

Tami walks briskly up Third St. She feels a little better now. The bleeding's stopped at least. And so far her dinner has stayed with her.

Tami knows exactly where she's going, and she marches eyes front. A little while later, she'll retrace this route and take her time. Then she'll let her eyes meet the eyes of the johns cruising the area in their cars.

Tami looks down at her new outfit. Suede—all suede. Suede pants. Suede top. It's like the clothes Davy Crockett wore on that TV show she used to watch when she ditched school. Course, there was no leather fringe hanging off Davy's sleeves. And her pants are bell bottom.

She rubs her right hand up and down her left arm. Feels like skin. Then she remembers, it IS skin. Zara told her that last night. Suede's the inside of leather.

And leather is skin. Cow skin.

Tami feels more sure of herself. Because of that new outfit. If . . . if she could only have a new outfit every day. Tami remembers: New clothes—that was all she really ever wanted. But her mother never gave her any. Her mom always had money for booze.

But all Tami ever got was hand-me-downs. Dirty, stinking old lady dresses from the Goodwill. Then Tami saw the nighttime face again. Horrendous devil's face. Piercing eyes. Dripping lips. Before she can stop it, the memories break through. Of those nights when her mother was gone or blind-drunk. Of ugly awful nights when Tami pretended she was asleep and wished she was dead.

Tami walks into the bar for the tenthousandth time. And stops. The stench is oppressive. But Tami's immune to it.

She smiles at Lonnie behind the bar and starts to pan the room.

There's Dirty Gertie, a coarse, ugly, lardy hag who looks 50, yet is only barely 30. She's wearing a motley squirrel coat and hustling two drunk white punks. They're mean. But Gertie's beyond hurt now. There is no perversion, no degradation she hadn't suffered. Her hair is Tiny Tim's hair. Her face, a dime store cosmetic counter.

Then she sees George. Over to the right by the wall. George John is back. George John with the four little ones. George John with the new ranch home in the suburbs. George John with the \$1,500 raise. George John with the greenest lawn on the block. George John with the wife he can't sleep with.

He smiles at Tami.

"This. This is Dodge City." Detroit Patrolman Louis Penick announces matter-of-factly. "Go into one of those bars, and you've got as good a chance of getting shot or beat up as you'd have had in Dodge City."

It's night.

We leave main Police Headquarters at 1300 Beaubien, and drive up Woodward. We stop for a light at Charlotte. Sergeant Joe (Jake) Jakubczak and Patrolman Louis Penick of the Detroit Police Vice Bureau are giving me a prostitute's tour of Detroit.

Lou Penick has been in the Vice Bureau for 22 years. That's years longer than anybody else. He explains it this way: "I guess I look like the perfect John."

If Lou is right, the perfect John is short, grey-haired, pencil-mustached and handsome—in a rakish kind of way. Lou wears an inexpensive—but flashy zircon ring and a fake Rollex watch. He feels they make him look like a big spender.

The only way a cop can arrest a girl is when she stops him. She's got to make it abundantly clear that she's suggesting a sexual act. That's called, "Accosting." Finally, she's got to put a price on it. That's called "Soliciting."

Put them all together and you've got "Accosting and Soliciting." The law under which prostitutes are arrested.

No prostitute will accost, let alone solicit a man, if she has the slightest inkling he's a cop. Most vice men become as well known as Ed Sullivan after a couple of years. And they have to move on to another bureau or precinct.

Sergeant Jake has only been on the squad a couple of years. And he spends most of his time at Police Headquarters booking the girls when they're brought in. Still, the pros know him already. In fact, they knew him within a couple of months after he was transferred to the squad.

Jake explains it this way: "I guess I look like the perfect cop."

If Jake is right, the perfect cop looks just like a movie cop. Tall. Quiet. Raincoat and porkpie hat. Serious.

"There. There's a couple." Jake nods.

Two girls across the street stand in front of a bar. You don't need a degree in sociology to tell they're prostitutes. Micro skirts. Tall black boots. High, sexy hairdos.

They certainly aren't the girl next door.

"And there's the pimp." Lou points to a '68 Cadillac Eldorado parked in front of us with the motor running. At the wheel is a young dandy (wearing toothpick and shades) peering over his shoulder at the girls.

"Why is he keeping his motor running? For a fast getaway?" I ask.

"Now. Lou shrugs. "He's just cold. He's got his heat on. We can't touch him. He lets his girls do all the dirty work. And he stays safely off to the side. So the only time the louse can be arrested is when a girl testifies against him. Or when he tries to solicit a john. Which very seldom happens. Only a Murphy boy does that."

Now we're at Columbia and Brush. Jake's driving his own car. A '66 Plymouth. White. Straight shift.

I spot them this time. There are five girls on both sides of the street. They're obviously available. When they see us, they know we're cops. But they simply turn away with indifference. Their eyes glaze over. Zero.

We turn the corner and stop. Out of sight. I get out of the car and walk back toward the corner.

One of the girls—stocky and blond-wigged—motions to a slowing-cruising car. The car stops. She leans over to talk with the driver, keeping a yard or so from the door. After about 30 seconds, she opens the door and gets in.

"How can you let them get by with that?" I ask, self-righteously. "She hailing guys. Curb Service."

"Nothing we can do about it." Lou answers dryly.

"Used to have the 'Yoo-hoo' ordinance. Then they'd run when they saw us. Not anymore." Jake adds.

"What happened to the ordinance?"

"The courts threw it out." Jake tells me with disgust. "Judge said the girls could've been waving at their grandma."

Tami and George walk up the street to the "Hotel." That's what the sign says. It looks like another one of the decaying apartment houses just off Third. The front door is locked. Tami rings the bell. George is quiet. He's always quiet until they get to the room.

There's a buzz and the door opens a crack. Inside, George walks over to a dutch door. The top half is open. A man in a sport shirt and nicotine-stained fingers and teeth is behind the door. Behind him is a room. A TV is playing. There is a program about police on the screen.

"Sign here, please," he says politely.

George writes "George Jones" on a dirty ledger turned open to a ruled page that looks like a petition. On the lines and pages before his are hundreds of "Jones" and "Lincolns" and "L. B. Johnsons."

The man tells Tami, "Room 7." He looks at George for the first time. "Two-sixty—including tax."

George pays him the exact change. He's a frequent guest. No bellhop is needed. No key. They climb two flights of stairs and enter a small room. About 12 by 10.

Inside is a double bed and little else. The bed is 1930-cheap-hotel-type. Complete with metal-spoiled headboard and no bedspread. There are sheets, though. Stained and marked with a dozen different stamps of hotels and institutions that have owned them previously.

George and Tami are in a crib. A hotel maintained for the express purpose of renting rooms to prostitutes and johns. Two-sixty is pretty cheap rent for a room.

Cribs are strictly volume operations. A crib may have as few as three rooms. But those three lonely rooms can be rented as much as 20 times each a night.

There's a sink in the room. And a couple of towels. A single, bare 150-watt lamp is screwed into a shipwheel fixture on the ceiling.

George crushes out a new cigaret nervously and puts a \$20 bill on a beat-up dresser. Tami starts undressing. It's as mechanical as taking clothes out of a dryer. She sets her things over a chair. Puts the \$20 in her purse.

She smiles. It's hard to smile. The pain in her belly is back. A ballooning, rolling lead weight.

"Last year the United Community Services did a study. And figured there were 5,000 known prostitutes in Detroit. That's conservative." Lou is talking over a 7-Up in a bar. This is not a place where hustlers usually work. That might be one reason why it's empty except for the owner and his bartender.

Lou talks to me. "There isn't just one kind of prostitute. There are all kinds. Take the streetwalkers we just saw. They—they and the girls that turn tricks in a whorehouse—the lowest rung. Simply because their kind of hustling is the most dangerous. Soliciting on the street is the easiest way to get arrested. And the girls get the worst kind of johns. They don't know who the guys are. And lots of them are maniacs and weirdos."

"There are hundreds of prostitutes we call bar cruisers, too. They work everywhere in town. Especially the downtown spots where there's good trade in traveling execs. Or the nice spots on Eight Mile or Telegraph where there's lots of young guys with expense accounts."

"These gals are careful. They usually make a deal with the bartender. And they won't go with a john unless the bartender knows the guy and says he's safe."

"There's no flat rate. Price is pretty much negotiated. Streetwalkers will try to get \$15 or \$20. But they might settle for \$10—plus the cost of the room."

"The next rung up is the hotel girl. She makes her contact with a bellhop or hotel clerk. These girls work everywhere. The best hotels to the fleabags."

"A telephone girl works out of her own apartment." Lou continues. "She has bartenders and friends who set up johns for her. And she gives them gifts for the help. This is a shrewd con. If she gave the guys cash, they could be arrested. Gifts are okay, though. There are grifters who make a fine living out of selling cuff links and other stuff to prostitutes. The prostitutes give them to a bartender who in turn sells them back to the grifter. Some of this jewelry is bought and sold 20 times a night."

"Some girls even have answering services. One girl's telephone bill was \$275 a month."

"Then there's the party girl. Many of these girls get \$500 a night. They're pretty, intelligent and well-endowed. For the most part, businessmen hire them to entertain big customers. The gals will go out to dinner with the customers. And be their escorts for the entire evening."

Lou suddenly turned to me seriously. Almost menacingly. "You know, there's one thing that really bugs me. Really. And it's the way most guys write about prostitution. Or show it in the movies. You know. The girl always has a heart of gold. Loves everybody. And she has a hell of an easy going life. Well, that's all a dumb john's dream. The truth is, a prostitute is pitiful. A poor, sick creature. She's little more than a slave. Ultimately she'll die from disease. Or dope, or murder. Psychiatrists say they're often suicidal."

"I talk to almost every girl we arrest now. And it's like having the same bad dream over and over."

"She usually comes from a home where the parents are divorced—or never were married. In her home there was absolutely no love for her or anybody else. So she runs away. She gravitates to what we call Boulevard Circle—the area Grand Boulevard arcs as it runs from Jefferson to Jefferson."

"Then—since she doesn't have much schooling and no business training to speak of—she probably gets a job as a waitress. She may be only 13 or 14. But with makeup and hairstyles today, she gets by for 18 or 20 with no sweat."

"Well, pretty soon a guy shows an interest in her. He's a sharp dresser. And really hip

acting. He's nice and hits at her loneliness. He brings her little gifts. And pretty soon he talks about getting her a big apartment. Fancy clothes. Nice cars and jewelry.

"All she's got to do is 'have a party' with some guys. The pimp feeds her with how she'll make a lot of money in a hurry. And he promises that once they get some bread, they'll go off and set up a legitimate business. 'What the heck,' he says. 'Most people give it away. Why not get paid for it?'"

"Well, before long she says okay. Not just for the money—but because she loves the louse. Or because she's trying to get back at her dad for not loving her. Or some other reason nobody seems to want to take the time to fathom."

Tami gets into a new Buick and hands the \$20 bill to Ted. It's a dark, foggy night but he still wears shades. He reeks of Jade East. He's poured into a shiny sharkskin Petrocelli suit with an electric blue shirt and matching tie.

"I . . . I don't feel so good. I'm bleeding. I better go home."

"No." That's all he says. All he has to say. Tami couldn't bear another beating. So she nods.

Ted takes Cocaine. It's expensive. So he can't afford to have Tami quit early tonight. Or any night.

"Prostitution is a misdemeanor by state law. At least the first offense."

We have driven by a bevy of street corner hustlers on Mack Avenue in East Detroit. We turn around. And now we're heading for Third Avenue. Jake is filling me in on the penalties for hustling.

"On a first offense, we book girls on 'Ac-costing and Soliciting.' A 448. This is a misdemeanor. And if the judge finds a girl guilty, he can give her 90 days and/or a hundred buck fine. If a girl's been arrested five or six times—and we see a clear pattern of prostitution—we can book her under a 451. This is a high misdemeanor. And the penalty can be a year in DeHoCo—the Detroit House of Correction—and/or a \$500 fine.

"The third offense is a felony. That can be as much as two years in DeHoCo and/or a 500 buck fine."

"We talk to every girl that's booked." Lou tells me. "We do our best to show the kid the one-way-sewer she's sinking into. But, sadly, we don't have anything much better to offer her. There's a real need here. Psychotherapy. Counseling. Job training. A lecture don't mean a hell of a lot to a lonely, sick kid."

We're on Third. We walk into the most notorious bar in town. It is one big room. A rectangle at least three times as long as it is wide.

An old oak bar runs the whole length of one long side of the rectangle. Stools line the front of the bar. And they're all filled. People are crowded next to the stools. The rest of the bar is filled with chairs around 2 by 2 tables. They're full too.

A pretty girl with a short impish haircut looks at us sharply. She's sitting at a table by the front door. A man, thin, 40ish, well-dressed and wearing a black raincoat is sitting at the same table. She gets up and walks past us and out the door. I admire her outfit. Very mod. Bell bottom slacks and a groovy matching vest. All natural-color suede.

Her friend gets up and follows her out.

We walk to the far end of the room and stand by the edge of the bar. There's a public phone hanging on the wall about 10 feet from us. It rings incessantly. For Joan. Or Trudy. Or any of the dozens of girls in the bar, or temporarily out on business.

Sue, a voluptuous ersatz blonde (probably in her late 20's), walks over and greets Lou heartily. She knows Lou well. And, by her action, everyone in the bar now knows we're cops.

Sue is the spokeswoman for the sisterhood. And it's her job to see what's up when the cops come calling. She's a pleasant person. Her white flannel dress is just a bit tight on her ample figure (prostitutes don't wear girdles; an occupational encumbrance). And her peroxide-blond hair is a little too yellow. She is attractive.

A jocular, ribald banter follows. I'm struck by the kinship between the hunter and the hunted. There seems to be sympathy, understanding and honest concern. Yet Lou has arrested Sue twice. And Jake has booked her any number of times.

A skinny man in a ball cap and corduroy coat with a fleece collar is talking to a heavy-set, middle-aged man across the room. The older man is self-conscious. He's patently here for the first time.

Jake follows my eyes. "The skinny guy. He's probably a Murphy boy."

"What's that?" I ask.

"A Murphy boy is worse than a pimp," Lou explains distastefully.

Jake picks up. "A Murphy boy sees a green john like that one over there. He asks the john if he wants a girl. Then, he tells the john he's got a cross between Sophia Loren and Marilyn Monroe just dying to go to bed with him. All the john has to do is give him five or ten bucks to show his 'good faith' and he'll give the john the gal's address."

Lou shakes his head. "And when the john goes to the address, it's usually a church or funeral parlor or someplace like that.

"Or it's a dark spot where the Murphy boy can mug him." Jake adds.

I see the nervous john being steered outside by the Murphy boy. There's nothing that can be legally done to stop it. I turn away, sensing the same draining, helpless feeling I once got watching a bull fight.

In a few minutes we leave too. I save the question that's been nagging me until we get outside.

"Okay, a place like this couldn't exist unless the cops let it. How come?"

"It's not the cops." Lou speaks up. "We used to have a law where a known prostitute couldn't frequent a bar where 448's had been made. Whenever we saw a girl we had a laundry list on in a pickup joint like that, we'd warn the owner. And boy, he couldn't get her out of there fast enough. His liquor license was at stake."

Jake interrupts. "To a guy who owns a bar, his liquor license is golden. Without it, he's dead. So bar owners don't pimp. They don't even get a cut from the prostitutes. It would jeopardize their licenses. But they do go along with pimp bartenders and prostitutes because it brings in a lot of business."

"Getting back to what I was saying," Lou says, "the judge threw it out. He said it didn't allow for a human being's redemption. Just because a girl was a hustler once, didn't mean she would be one forever."

"That sounds fair," I say.

"Sure, it's fine in theory. Absolutely fair. But," and he motions to the bar we just left.

Tami is a zombie, as she walks down Selden. She feels all wrapped-up. Like that mummy in the movie she saw one Halloween. Funny. Her head is clear enough. The "speed" makes everything come in loud and clear. But the rest of her body is on strike. It wants to stop. Lay down. Rest.

But Tami's head won't let it. Tami's head keeps her moving.

Tami wants to go home. When she was with the last john she noticed a big ugly black and blue welt had swelled up on her right side. That's where Ted kicked her last night. Worse, she's started coughing up blood. Gawd. Gawd. Tami knows she should quit. But Ted would get mad. And besides, there's a new GTO cruising beside her with a straight-looking john at the wheel.

The john stops. He edges over to the passenger side of his GTO and rolls down the window.

Tami asks: "Looking for a party?"

"Yeah, my girl stood me up."

"Well, what're you looking for?"

"Oh . . . just a good time, I guess. How much?"

"What've you got to spend?"

"I dunno. . . ."

"Have you got twenty?"

"God, no. How about ten?"

"Ok." Tami gets into the car. Suddenly a bolt of pain shoots through her belly. It even knifes through to her head—in spite of the "speed."

Tami doubles over to try to ease the pain. The john looks concerned.

"Is . . . is something wrong?"

"No . . . no, I'm ok." She answers after a minute. But she knows she has to quit right now no matter what Ted says. Or does. She reaches for the door. "Sorry. But I got to go."

"No!" Instantly the john's right hand shoots over and grabs her arm. He pulls out a leather case with his left hand and flicks it open. Inside is a police badge. "You're under arrest," he says with a trace of sadness.

Tami's eyes register shock. Then terror. But then—just before they fold back into her head and she passes out—the officer sees an unmistakable glimmer of relief in them.

We're in the Vice Bureau at 1300 Beaubien. It's a big, open room about 25 by 30. Just as you enter, there's a short counter about five feet long and three feet high in front of you. The duty sergeant sits behind it.

When a girl is arrested, she's brought here and booked. Then one of the officers interviews her in a spare, monk-cell to the right of the counter.

It's now past 2 a.m. Jake and Lou show me the forms they fill out everytime a girl is booked. They tell me a girl is seldom, picked up just once. Some girls have been arrested 60 times. Most prostitutes are picked up at least five times a year.

There's a small photo area in the room where they take mug shots of the girls. A file cabinet chock full of these photos. Thousands of them.

Just then a young officer comes in. He's obviously shook. And bitter. He tells us about a girl he just picked up. He picked her up near Third. He thought she was drunk or something the way she was walking down the street. But when he slowed down, she propositioned him.

Then, just as he identified himself, she completely passed out. He tried to bring her around, but he couldn't. Blood started pouring out of her mouth.

He rushed her right over to the hospital then.

And they're doing their best to help her. But she's in bad shape. Very bad shape. Her insides are bleeding like crazy. Probably from a violent beating. And on top of everything else, she has an advanced case of syphilis.

The officer guesses her pimp beat her up. And that he's now through with her.

She finally woke up. And when the officer asked who he could notify, she gave him a phone number and told him to ask for Ted. She said her name was Tami.

The officer called the number. And Ted answered. But when the officer told Ted who he was, and that Tami was in the hospital, Ted said he didn't know anybody named Tami. The officer described the girl and asked Ted if he knew anybody like that by another name. Ted insisted he didn't. There must be some mistake. Then he hung up.

The officer shakes his head sadly. "The poor dumb kid. She was bleeding all over the place. And half out of her mind. But, she kept begging. 'Please, please. Don't let me bleed on my clothes. They're skin. Cow skin. Blood will soak in and never come out!'"

FIRST STATE SCIENCE POLICY CENTER ESTABLISHED IN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania will become the site of the Nation's first research center devoted to helping the States use science and technology to solve the problems of the cities, of pollution and other environmental dilemmas of modern man, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer said July 19, 1969.

Shafer said his administration, through the new Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation, has agreed to help fund a Center for the Study of State Science Policy with the Federal Government and Penn State University. The National Science Foundation will contribute \$61,000; the Science and Engineering Foundation, \$25,000; and Penn State, \$12,595. The center will be established at the State College campus. Shafer said:

This center will be established to help our Commonwealth and other states use the enormous potential and resources of science in their efforts to improve the standard and comfort of living for all citizens.

For years, we have been using science in industry to produce more and better goods, and in government to produce sophisticated machinery for defense and space conquest.

But we have not demanded that the full attention of our scientists be given to solving the problems of water, air and land pollution. We have not asked them to devote full time to producing better and cheaper low income housing with new metals and other modern materials. We have not involved the scientists enough in finding ways to provide better and less expensive health care facilities.

This fact has greatly concerned my Science Advisory Committee, which is now at work on ways we Pennsylvanians can develop a "Science for Society" program. Establishment of the new center is part of that plan.

The first assignment of the center's staff will be to examine what Pennsylvania and other states have done to develop policies for the involvement of science in public matters.

Too often states establish long range programs in urban aid, conservation, environmental health, and transportation without being fully aware of the scientific implications or without using the expertise of the scientific community.

Pennsylvania has attempted to correct this problem by the establishment of the Governor's Science Advisory Committee. The committee has been helpful in conservation and transportation policy-making and, most recently, suggested guidelines for the establishment of a policy for developing "new towns" within the Commonwealth.

The new center will be very helpful in the exchange of information between the states. For example, other states with the problems of acid-mine water pollution will benefit from Pennsylvania's new experience with treatment plants. The center will be able to communicate that experience fully and intelligently to those states that are establishing programs to combat pollution from mining operations.

I am proud that Pennsylvania has the foresight to develop this center at a time when the world is observing the most historic

event of our time—the landing of men on the moon. This is being done because the people of the Nation had the spirit and willingness to meet the challenge and the faith that their scientists could produce the result.

ATOM IN THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the June 16, 1969, Washington Evening Star concerning the civilian applications of atomic energy is worthy of the attention of all of us. The editorial does an excellent job of putting in proper perspective the society's need for electrical energy and the need to limit pollution. The editorial is based upon remarks made by Atomic Energy Commissioner James T. Ramey. We have had Commissioner Ramey and many other knowledgeable people testify before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy numerous times on the impact of the atom on our environment. Based upon the many hearings we have had, the editorial interprets and reports the factors involved concerning the atom and the environment in an accurate way. The committee in this year's report on the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1970 authorization, House Report No. 91-315, of June 17 1969, addressed itself at length to the attempts to maintain the purity of the environment and still meet our energy needs. I would like to commend all who are interested in this matter to read pages 16 through 21 of our report. It is most unfortunate that the need for a balanced view on the matter of environment and energy does not exist in many quarters. As explained in our report, the task confronting the responsible and informed is to harmonize the contending goals of a pristine environment and the supply of an abundant amount of economical and reliable electrical power.

The Star editorial follows:

ATOM AND ENVIRONMENT

Atomic Energy Commissioner James T. Ramey, in his remarks to newsmen the other day, said some timely things about the misconceptions, oversimplifications and scary distortions that occasionally creep into print or get on the air regarding the need for and the development of nuclear power.

The need, of course, is clear beyond doubt. The nation's electric power requirements are doubling every decade, and generating facilities must double with them. Since most falling-water sites are already developed, the new facilities will have to be almost entirely steam-driven. Over the next 20 years, according to authoritative estimates, it will be imperative to build no fewer than 255 huge new plants across the country, and it is expected that 91 of these will be fossil-fueled (oil or coal) and 164 atom-powered.

This prospect has caused understandable concern in many quarters. The worry is that the advent of such facilities may create serious environmental problems in terms of scenic values, harmful discharges of heat into streams, and new dimensions of air pollution. Indeed, there still are bitter arguments in some communities over proposed sites for nuclear plants. What the opponents

say, among other things, is that nuclear plants, which now release more heat than fossil plants, threaten to be highly damaging to rivers and bays. But the fear is exaggerated. As soon as the "breeder" reactor becomes operable, the thermal effects of the nuclear facility will be no greater than that of a conventional plant. Meanwhile, it can be said that those effects are already manageable to a significant degree.

In Ramey's words, there is every reason to believe that "these waste heat discharges can be controlled or, better yet, perhaps put to good use." Instead of being released into streams, for example, they could be put into cooling towers or man-made lakes around the plant site. The thermal problem thus seems to lend itself to effective abatement through coordinated planning and action between the private utilities and governmental agencies, particularly the AEC. And the same may be said of constructing facilities that will harmonize with the landscape.

As for air pollution, the quiet nuclear plant is in a class by itself. Apart from its many other superior qualities as an energy source, it has the "strong and unique" advantage of being able to produce power without sending contamination skyward. In contrast, the fossil plant, like so many other industrial facilities, releases a disturbing amount of sulfur dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere.

In sum, as Ramey has emphasized, our country, with properly sited and carefully controlled facilities, can safely and cleanly produce all the nuclear power it must have—without environmental damage and in a way that will benefit all Americans.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING SPEAKS OUT ON THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during his years of distinguished service in the U.S. Senate, former Senator Ernest Gruening was a keen critic of many aspects of U.S. foreign policy. His early understanding of the tragic consequences of American policy in Vietnam helped to focus attention on the ill-advisedness of our military involvement in that country and to bring the underlying assumptions of America's role in Southeast Asia into question. Senator Gruening opposed the Vietnam war from the beginning. Along with former Senator Wayne Morse, he was a constant and constructive critic of the conduct of American foreign policy in Southeast Asia.

I deeply regret that Senator Gruening is no longer a Member of the other body; however, I am pleased to see that he is nonetheless continuing, with his customary insight and vision, to speak out on vital national issues. I am inserting in the RECORD today the text of a letter from Senator Gruening which appeared in the July 21 New York Times.

In that letter, Senator Gruening points out the failure of President Nixon's draft reform proposals to deal with the substantive issues surrounding the growing opposition to the Selective Service System. Senator Gruening makes clear, reform of the methods of selecting draftees will not in itself eliminate the most obnoxious feature of the present system; namely, the drafting of young men

to fight in a war which many of them believe to be immoral and unjustified. The only way in which the dilemma facing thousands of draft eligible young men can be resolved is to eliminate the Selective Service System.

A few months ago, over 250 student body presidents and college newspaper editors issued a statement in which they stated their intention to refuse induction into the Armed Forces so long as the war in Vietnam continues. The dilemma which they face is shared by thousands of other young men.

I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278, which would express the sense of Congress that the President should suspend the draft calls for 6 months. This would prevent the drafting of any more young men to fight in Vietnam and would provide Congress with a period of time in which to devise alternatives to the existing draft system.

This bill, and those introduced by other Members, which would eliminate the Selective Service System, must receive the immediate attention of Congress if the crisis of conscience which confronts thousands of draft eligible young men is to be alleviated. I urge my colleagues to

support action on this legislation and to give careful attention to Senator Gruening's thoughtful and persuasive letter.

The letter follows:

DRAFT AS SERVITUDE

To the Editor:

Your July 11 editorial "A Moral Obligation" which chides the Congress for not holding hearings on President Nixon's draft reform proposals in my view misses the vital point. There is no moral obligation to implement either Nixon's proposals or the other so-called draft reforms which were urged in the last Congress by Senator Kennedy and other Senators, on which hearings were held but did not result in any legislation.

These reforms, merely altering the method of selecting draftees, do not go to the heart of the issue which is that the draft itself for this war is the inequity, the injustice, the immorality. What difference does it make whether our young men are selected by a lot or any other way to become cannon fodder in a war which many consider totally unjustified and immoral?

What this means is that they are compelled in violation of their consciences to kill people against whom they feel no grievance, perhaps get killed or maimed in the process, with the alternative, if they refuse, of imprisonment for five years at hard labor with probable ruin of their future career in civilian life.

This is an infamous dilemma, and no American citizen—indeed no member of a society that calls itself free—should be subjected to it. But so far as the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government are concerned, neither has had the vision or understanding to face this issue. Neither (with the exception of Justice William Douglas) has the Supreme Court, which has repeatedly refused to overrule the draft convictions.

It is difficult for a layman—and for this layman—to understand why the 13th Amendment of the Constitution which the Warren Court has done so much to interpret and implement is not applicable to the draft.

The draft is involuntary servitude and it is a betrayal of our finest traditions and of everything America should stand for. The moral obligation on the Congress should be not to reform its procedure but to abolish it for the rest of this war, particularly as we continue to exact the wanton sacrifice of our young men in a war that we can't win, shouldn't want to win, and which President Nixon has declared we have no purpose to win militarily.

No wonder there is unrest, bitterness and rebelliousness among our young people.

Why should we keep on sending our boys to die or be crippled in vain?

ERNEST GRUENING,
Former U.S. Senator.

WASHINGTON, July 11, 1969.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 23, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the truth, deliver us from all that is false. We pray Thee to teach us step by step what we do not know, to preserve in us what we do know, to correct us in our mistakes, to strengthen us when we fail, and enable us to grow in grace and wisdom. May we and the people of all nations learn to trust not in the power of their arms, but in the power of love. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C. July 23, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 22, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 19, 1969:

S. 1647. An act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

On July 22, 1969:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS AND SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and without infringing on his time, I ask unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) has completed his statement, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes; and that following his remarks, which would be a little after 1 p.m., which is the time the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) desires, the distinguished Senator from New York

(Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO, AND SENATOR HART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be recognized as the first speaker, for a period not to exceed 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be recognized for a purpose which he will elucidate at that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees