

of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 13061. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 13062. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for changes in the method of payment of referees for the National Railway Adjustment and Special Adjustment Boards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. HUNGATE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, and Mr. DONOHUE):

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DENT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 13064. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13065. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAFFORD (for himself, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. ROBISON):

H.R. 13066. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13068. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 13069. A bill authorizing the President to proclaim the week including the Fourth of July as "God Bless America Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 13070. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 13072. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 13073. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13074. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Drug Commission between the United States, Mexico, and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY (for himself and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known

as Cape Kennedy as "Cape Canaveral"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr.

BIAGGI, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H. Res. 490. Resolution urging the President to resubmit for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 13075. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. D-170,115; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13076. A bill for the relief of Peter Heinrich Joehnnssen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13077. A bill for the relief of Dr. John D. Fissekis and his wife, Jennifer Ann McPhee Fissekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13078. A bill for the relief of Herman Frederick Erben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

186. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vick Gould, Bellevue, Wash., and others, relative to amending the Constitution to limit taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

187. Also, petition of Karl H. Stell, Hyattsville, Md., relative to redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GROWTH OF INDIA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 9, 1969]

INDIA SHOWS SOLID SIGNS OF GROWTH—NEW ECONOMICS GIVES FREEDOM FROM SUPER-POWERS

(By Dale D. Morsch)

NEW DELHI.—India at last is showing solid signs of economic growth.

It follows an era of preoccupation with the super-powers, a grappling with the illusive policy of nonalignment and serious internal economic problems.

India has certainly not turned into an economic giant. Serious problems of food and finance still plague its development.

But the country is close to achieving self-sufficiency in food. Improved seed and agricultural techniques are bringing in bumper harvests and may enable India to export grain within a few years.

Industry is developing slowly but steadily after a serious recession following devaluation of the rupee in 1966. India now has technical know-how in many industries including steel, heavy engineering, fertilizer, oil exploration, chemicals, antibiotics, textile machinery, aviation, railways and shipbuilding.

India is diversifying its exports from tradi-

tional agricultural commodities and raw materials to finished industrial and chemical goods, including military hardware.

NEW REGIONS

As a result, New Delhi is in the process of gearing its foreign policy to this new economic policy, exploring new regions of the world and improving relations with others.

This wind of change was reflected in two conferences held for Indian envoys who were summoned to New Delhi this year—one for the southeast Asia envoys in January and another for representatives in the Mideast and North Africa held in May.

At both meetings the emphasis was on increasing trade and economic relations with the nations in these regions. The envoys were asked to concentrate on finding markets for Indian goods and striking collaboration agreements in which India will supply the know-how, plant and machinery.

Since the greatest scope for achieving these aims lies in the developing countries, India is looking mainly towards Asia, Africa and South America.

TRADE INCREASE

Trade already has increased with several countries in these regions and India has contracted bilateral collaboration agreements with some of them. New trade and cultural agreements with nations as far off as South America are being negotiated.

Prime Minister Mme. Indira Gandhi's visit to six Latin American countries last year was the first for an Indian prime minister.

India's more flexible foreign policy also is apparent in New Delhi's gradually changing attitude toward the United States and the Soviet Union.

By and large, India has been dependent on the United States for foodgrains and on the Soviet Union for arms. Both situations are changing with India slowly gaining self-sufficiency in both.

A new independence from the super-powers is taking shape, though India still has heavy economic commitments to them.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT ON THE 51ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 17, 1969, the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion opened its 51st annual convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel in the city of Washington.

As a member of the Joseph G. Weeda Post No. 66, Department of the District of Columbia, it was my privilege to attend, as a delegate, the formal opening ceremonies on Thursday evening.

Mr. Speaker, the opening ceremonies were most impressive. The performance of the National Guard of Honor of the American Legion, the Navy Band, and the memorial services emphasized the gratitude that we should all have for the opportunity to be American citizens.

Our very distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT, of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, who is also a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, presented a most inspiring and informative address as the principal speaker.

Because our principal speaker, Congressman SCOTT, made such an excellent speech, I feel that his outstanding remarks should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all of us to share. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have requested unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the inspiring words spoken by our principal speaker to the 181 delegates, 181 alternate delegates, and guests of this historic occasion:

Mr. Commander, comrades, ladies and gentlemen:

It should not be strange to address the Department of the District of Columbia be-

cause I first joined the American Legion in 1945 as a member of Justice Post, but about 2 years later moved my membership to Fairfax Post 177 in Virginia to which I still belong. 1945 to 1969 is almost half of the time that the Legion has been in existence, so I have had an opportunity not only to participate but to observe your youth and your rehabilitation programs. In my opinion, there is nothing better that we, as Americans, can do than to instill a program of Americanism in our youth and I doubt that there is any finer way of doing this than by sponsoring "boys or girls state or nation." Under these programs, our youth learn of the spirit of America which is essential in our Nation today.

A colleague of mine in the House of Representatives this week inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD written by a county agent from his district. Let me read it to you.

"He is an American—a good man—and as he walked out of the club house of his country club and stopped a few yards from the flag pole, he looked up, his eyes searching for the sparkle of the stars and the glow of the colors, and he realized that it had been a long time since he had paid any attention to the flag. It was dirty, frayed and faded.

He whispered, "say, what's happened to you, old glory? Where's the sparkle in your stars, the beauty of your colors, and the proud way you used to wave in the wind?"

The flag fluttered slightly in the night air, and it seemed that echoes from the ghost of a thousand patriots answered him, "times have changed since World War II."

"Oh, I don't know," Joe shrugged, "I've lost some hair, but I'm just as proud of you as the day we landed in Normandy. Boy! Wasn't that a day! We sure showed the enemy a thing or two."

"When was the last time you did the pledge of allegiance to old glory?" the echoes asked.

"Now, wait a minute. I've been busy. I've got a living to make, a family to raise and I've done a pretty good job of it too, if I do say so myself."

"Have you taught them the pledge of allegiance?" the echoes asked.

"Now, wait a minute! That's the teacher's job. That's what we pay them for," Joe answered.

"When was the last time you did the pledge of allegiance?" the echoes persisted.

"Now how can you expect me to remember? People just don't go around spouting the pledge at the drop of a hat. Besides, they think you are a square nowadays if you get sentimental about things like God, and country and all."

"Would you do the pledge for old glory?" the echoes asked.

"What! Right here in the open? They'd think I had flipped my lid, or something."

As Joe talked, he noticed the flag flap against the pole and go limp. The night hissed about him. Joe looked up and said,

"All right, I guess it won't hurt anybody to say it. Boy! It sure has been a long time. Anyway, here goes—"

He placed his hand over his heart, looked up at Old Glory and said, fervently, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the nation for which it stands, one—

one—" he stammered. "One nation—" The struggle continued, and he finally gave up. "Well, what do you know? I guess I forgot."

"We thought so," the echoes seemed to mourn.

"Say, what's with you anyway," Joe asked. "Has somebody been giving you a hard time?"

"I guess you could say that."

"They have? Who?" he asked.

"Well, for starters," the echoes began, "how about those students in Sweden who painted the swastika over the stars and paraded the flag in front of the American embassy."

"But, why would they do that?"

"Because of the Vietnam war," chimed the echoes, "and in England they climbed the flag pole, tore down Old Glory, and threw it in the sewer."

"But wait a minute!" Joe exclaimed. "They are supposed to be our friends."

"We thought so too." The echoes agreed. "And that's not all. DeGaulle has thrown us out of France."

"DeGaulle has thrown us out of France!" Joe exploded. "Has he forgotten so soon how we hit the beaches of Omaha, caused the breakthrough at St. Lo, crushed the Krauts in the hedge rows over all France, and lit up the streets of Paris with your beautiful colors?"

"He has forgotten," the echoes mourned. "Well, that's over there, Old Glory. You're over here now. We love you over here."

"You would think so," the echoes droned, "But on Veteran's Day in New York they called the police and asked to have the veterans and Old Glory off the streets because they were blocking traffic."

"But—but—but," Joe stammered. "And that hotel in Minneapolis," the echoes continued, "refused to serve our wheelchair buddies because it might embarrass the guests."

"Yes! I remember that," Joe said.

"And how about those parades in San Francisco and New York where draft cards were wrapped in Old Glory and set afire; and then a great, young athlete, a world heavyweight champion who made millions of dollars fighting with his fists, refused to lift a hand in defense of his country."

The echoes grew silent, Joe stared at Old Glory and shivered; and as he turned and walked toward his car it seemed he heard the echoes again as they cried, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The writer must be a concerned citizen and we need more of them. But let's look back for a moment in history. Our country was settled by people who came here to build a nation. They were asking for nothing but a chance to work, and the hardships they faced made them more determined to succeed. These self-respecting people built a great land, a great society, created by the labor and driving force of great Americans. While we would not worship our ancestors, we should remember that individual effort and self-determination operating within a friendly climate provide us with the high standard of living we enjoy today. We still have young men taking any job they can obtain and furthering their education at night; young wives working by day and housekeeping after hours; making their way, building a future for themselves and their families. This is the strength of America. It should be encouraged.

While the American Legion can be proud of its accomplishments, we, as individuals, can do more. We have associated ourselves together to maintain law and order, to foster and perpetuate a 100% Americanism; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. These are familiar words to all legionnaires, but there is nothing in the preamble about a permissive society where any action is tolerated, about a kept society which undermines individual effort and initiative. We can blame the courts for crime and unrest in the country; we can say they favor the accused rather than protect society; we can blame our churches for providing funds for those who riot and demonstrate; we can blame our teachers for encouraging and sometimes joining in disturbances; we can blame the news media for giving unwarranted publicity to militant groups. But if we are responsible citizens, we need to think about solutions to the problems confront-

ing society. As legionnaires we can be proud of the religious emphasis program to bring people closer to their Creator. We can point with pride to the support given to the G.I. bill of rights adopted unanimously 25 years ago in the House of Representatives and providing opportunity for the returning veterans.

But with our pride of accomplishment, there is a need to recognize that problems exist and to look for solutions.

Within the past few weeks, a number of Congressmen, 22 of them in fact, visited college campuses and filed a report with the President about college disturbances. They found that a small nucleus on our college campuses were radicals who were willing to overthrow the university or the country by almost any means, but that a larger number were loyal students who felt that no one listened to them; that they had something to say and an inadequate outlet. Aside from the racial problems, some felt that the Government was spending too much money on defense programs and not enough to relieve poverty and hunger; some felt that there was too much reliance upon force; some felt that there was economic oppression in the country; some felt that they were too remote from the persons making decisions over their lives; some felt that the war in Vietnam was immoral and unjust; some felt that the establishment was hypocritical, that we spoke of ideals which were non-existent in day-to-day life.

Now, for my part, I believe our schools should be operated by the establishment and do not believe that the students generally have the know-how, the wisdom or the experience to operate a school system. In my opinion, authority must be given to the teacher if he is to teach the student. And yet, the student needs an outlet; he needs to be able to submit his grievance to someone who will listen, even though the final decision by the school authorities may be different from his suggestion. I would submit also that any students' attitudes are implanted long before they reach the college campus and that places a responsibility on us as parents, upon teachers in the elementary and high schools, upon those in our church schools and others having contact with youngsters, to train the child early in life to have the proper relationship to society and to government.

I believe we, in our Legion Posts and in our civic organizations, can help with disorder in our city and in our suburbs by recognizing law enforcement officials who have made some outstanding contribution to the community; by honoring the "officer of the week"; by sponsoring "law enforcement days." By encouraging the newspapers to highlight the impact of crime upon the community; by becoming involved. Perhaps the reluctance of the average citizen to become involved is a major contributing factor to today's problems I wonder if the job of a police official is not easier if he feels that the public is interested in his work and appreciates his effort.

One of the items presently being considered in the Congress is the anti-ballistic missile program. As you know, the Senate is now considering the matter and, if approved, it will later come before the House. I read in yesterday's paper that some activists will hold round the clock vigil on the capitol steps in opposition to this program. Yet I'm convinced that a majority of our citizens favor it. The President's program is based upon the best professional and technical advice available to him. It is supported by the National Security Council. It is a defensive program. It's an alternative to offensive action or destruction of our Nation. But some say it will not work; that some missiles may get through; that even if we knock down 9, the 10th may get through. Certainly, we hope that this is not true, but even if it is, the

enemy would have to greatly multiply his arsenal before he would attack us. Some say it is too costly and that we should be spending the money on our cities. But if we fail to defend the country, there may be no cities or suburbs. Now I'm not in favor of waste by any branch of the Government, but, in my opinion, national defense is essential to all other programs. The safety of millions of Americans, the survival of the country may depend upon having a strong defense system. Past experience indicates that we can't expect the Soviet Union to stop military spending if we unilaterally weaken our defenses. They might well exploit our weaknesses. We cannot concede the world struggle to communism by default. This is a program to seek out and destroy missiles that may be aimed at our shores by potential enemies. Therefore, I fully intend to support the President's program if it passes the Senate intact and hope that our country will be united against any threat to our national security.

There is division within the country about how to deal with crime and disorder at home and how to wage war abroad or even whether we should be in Vietnam. And there is reason for concern about this division. For looking at Mark's gospel, we find: "And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end. No man can enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house."

We must not let our country be destroyed by militants who appear to have a vicious hatred for everything good and who would tear the world as it exists to the ground. On the campus of the University of California, one of the militants stated: "If necessary we will destroy the entire university; if necessary, we will destroy the entire government." One of our more thoughtful columnists James J. Kilpatrick has said: "Too many months have been wasted in trying to reason with unreason;" that the term "students for a democratic society" is a travesty of semantics and he offers constructive suggestions by stating that the problem lies in the absence of leadership among the law-abiding students, professors, administrators and public officials. Kilpatrick states that discipline is the foundation of learning and of freedom; that students who are not at the university to learn should be expelled so that those who are on the campus for that purpose can learn.

We hear a lot about student rights, but nothing compels a student to enter a university and to partake of private benefactors or the public purse. Learning is a process of transmitting tradition and analytical understanding from the teacher to the student. If the proper relationship of subordination between the student and the teacher is destroyed in the name of equality or student rights, the probability of teaching and being taught is destroyed.

So whether we are talking about student disorders, crime or national defense, there are questions to be resolved. How far do individual rights and liberty extend before they become license? Is the American heritage of pride in principle as important today as in past generations? Is loyalty and love of country vital and necessary to maintenance of the American way of life? If we answer all of these in the affirmative, to whom do we look to preserve the true character, the dignity, the power and prestige of our country? We must look to you and to others who love our country and respect its institutions. For we know that "bad things happen when good men do nothing."

Most of our citizens are patriotic. They love God and country. But proper leadership is needed in government at all levels, in our schools, in our churches, and in our homes.

Americanism is an expression of faith, of convictions, of attitudes, and actions here at home among our own people. We're as good as we think we are. You and I, the ordinary citizen, must maintain the spirit of America, the will to succeed, pride in our country and its accomplishments.

So I urge you to be active in the affairs of your government, in your church, your schools, your civic and fraternal organizations. It's easy to recall the recruitment poster with the old gentleman pointing his finger and saying: "Uncle Sam Needs You!" This is true not only on the battlefield but on the home front. I am confident that the challenge will be met and that we will not be found wanting.

ASTRONAUT NEIL ARMSTRONG PREDICTED MOON FLIGHT DURING 1964 VISIT TO WEST VIRGINIA

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday I called attention to the contributions of a West Virginian, Col. Charles Yeager, to the accumulation of knowledge and experience that resulted in the manned flight to the moon.

Today I have seen a newspaper article about the visit of Neil Armstrong, the first man to set foot on the moon, to West Virginia. Armstrong visited the National Youth Science Camp in 1964 and talked with the 100 talented young men who participate in its programs each summer.

During this visit Armstrong was interviewed by Eldora Nuzum, the capable editor of the Elkins Inter-Mountain, and confidently predicted that men would go to the moon before 1970.

Mr. President, a United Press International article recounting Armstrong's visit to West Virginia was published in the June 20 issue of the Post-Herald & Register of Beckley, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASTRONAUT WAS RECENT VISITOR TO POCAHONTAS COUNTY SCIENCE FAIR

ELKINS.—"A man who may be the first American to land on the moon was in the outer limits of Elkins Tuesday," the Elkins Inter-Mountain reported on July 8, 1964.

At that time Neil Armstrong of Wapakoneta, Ohio, was one of three civilian astronauts. Early Monday, he and Edwin Aldrin were scheduled to land on the moon.

Armstrong had visited the West Virginia National Science Camp at Green Bank, Pocahontas County, and was interviewed by Editor Eldora Nuzum of The Inter-Mountain at the Randolph County Airport.

"When will the United States attempt the first moon landing?" Mrs. Nuzum asked Armstrong.

"Our intention is to bring men back from the moon prior to 1970," the astronaut answered.

Even five years ago Armstrong expressed the utmost confidence that man would reach the moon.

"Current emphasis in the Apollo program is how to bring a man back to earth from the moon," Armstrong said five years ago.

When Mrs. Nuzum asked the Apollo 11 passenger why he wanted to be an astronaut, he retorted:

"Doesn't everyone want to be an astronaut?"

In a more serious vein, Armstrong said he wanted "to participate in a great adventure and contribute to the knowledge of man."

The astronaut said of the delegates to the science camp, two top science students from each of the 50 states:

"I was impressed by the boys at the science camp. Those boys are intelligent. It kept me on my toes keeping ahead of them."

WE NEED A DAY EACH YEAR TO HONOR THE LEGACY OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would declare the last Friday in May as a legal holiday to honor the birth date of the late President John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy was young, vigorous, aggressive, and scholarly. He was a man who estimated the need of his country and of the world and sought to fulfill the need. He was a man who was wedded to peace and vigorously sought this greatest goal of all mankind. He sensed how catastrophic nuclear conflict could be and he sought a realistic course to avoid it. He was a man who saw the dangers inherent in continuing inequality in our land and sought rational and lasting ways to overcome it. President Kennedy was a man to whom the words "national interest" were much more than words. He believed that each generation must contribute its best to the fulfillment of the American dream.

I believe it is especially appropriate that legislation which would establish a national holiday in honor of the birth date of this great American should be introduced today while we all watch our astronauts zoom homeward toward the completion of their Apollo 11 mission. As I watched the launch from Cape Kennedy last Wednesday morning on television, I was reminded of a hot sunny Thursday in May of 1961 when then President Kennedy rode up Capitol Hill to address a joint session of the Congress on national needs. There was only one real surprise in this speech when he said:

... I believe the nation should commit itself to achieving the goal before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. ...

As we all know, we reached President Kennedy's goal for the Nation this past Sunday night when Neil Armstrong disembarked from our lunar landing ship and stood on the moon surface. The fact that this goal was achieved is a tribute to the Kennedy spirit and to our ability as a Nation to achieve seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

I believe we need a day each year in which we can honor the spirit of challenge which President Kennedy brought to the Nation. When we are facing diffi-

cult times, we should always remember, as President Kennedy did, that this Nation is capable of any goal we set for it. When he said that we should all ask not what our country could do for us, but what we could do for our country, he made us all stop and think. In these times, I think a national holiday in honor of his birth date will make us stop and think and remember how much America means to each of us. Earlier this year, the council of the city of Philadelphia passed a resolution asking the Congress to declare a national holiday in honor of the birth date of President Kennedy. I hope the other Members will feel as strongly as I do about the legacy which this great American left us all and move swiftly to honor him as is his due.

POPULATION CONTROL

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, people in the United States tend to think of population control as something which mainly concerns India, China, and Africa and other areas where teeming millions are already poor and underfed, and where a further surge in population will mean starvation for many.

In an article published in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 20, Dr. Jean Mayer, member of the Center of Population Control Studies at Harvard University, makes the significant point that the world's population control problems lie not mainly in the poor countries, because we will probably be able to meet the food problem in 20 or 30 years, but in the areas of the globe where the people are becoming richer, because:

Rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb ecology more and create more land, air, water, chemical, man and radioactive pollution than poor people.

This is a new perspective on the population explosion, and one which is of direct concern to America. I commend Dr. Mayer's article to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IT'S THE RICH DOING CROWDING

(By Jean Mayer)

One theme of this essay is that food is only one of the elements in the population problem. Admittedly, at present, it is a major factor in some parts of the world, but there are large areas where the national food supply is a minor factor and others where it is not a factor at all. Furthermore, considering the world as a whole, there is no evidence that the food situation is worsening and there is at least a likelihood that food may at some time (20 or 30 years from now) be removed altogether as a limiting factor to population.

Yet to deny that the population problem is basically one of food for survival is not to deny that there is a population problem; it is in fact to remove the appearance of a safety valve and also to reveal the problem in its generality. For were we really to starve

when the population reaches a certain magic number, this in turn would cause a drastic increase in child and infant mortality, decreased fertility and a shortening of the average life span.

In other words, it would cause the increase in population to be self-limiting. If the world can continue to feed—however badly—an ever-increasing number of people, this safety valve (however unpalatable, it would be a safety valve) is missing. And if lack of food is not a component of the definition of overpopulation, rich countries become candidates for overpopulation.

Another theme is that there is a strong case to be made for a stringent population policy on exactly the reverse of the basis Malthus expounded. Malthus was concerned with the steadily more widespread poverty that indefinite population growth would inevitably create. I am concerned about the areas of the globe where people are rapidly becoming richer.

For rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than poor people. So it can be argued that from many viewpoints, it is even more urgent to control the numbers of the rich than it is to control the numbers of the poor.

That the magnitude of the population problem has increased dramatically in recent years is well publicized. Scholars have estimated that after hundreds of thousands of years of slow growth, the population of the world reached the quarter billion mark some time around the beginning of this era. It doubled to 500 million by 1650. Two centuries later, it reached the billion mark.

The next doubling took 80 years, with a population of two billion in 1930. It would appear that the world is on its way to the next doubling, to four billion in 45 years, by 1975; and a population of eight billion may well be reached within the following 30 or 35 years unless rates of growth are drastically decreased. The present growth rate would lead to a population of 500 billion by the year 2200 and give the surface of all continents a population density equal to that of Washington, D.C. at present.

This increase has been due not to an increase in birth rates but to a decrease in death rates. Around 1700, life expectancy at birth of European populations was about 33 years, and had increased little in the previous 300 to 400 years. By 1950, life expectancy in Western and Central Europe and in the United States had increased to 66-69 years, an increase of over 100 per cent.

This decrease in mortality rates is no longer confined to populations of European stocks. In 1946, the death rate of the Moslem population of Algeria was higher than that of Sweden in 1775. In 1954, in spite of generalized guerrilla war on its territory, the death rate of this population was lower than that of Sweden in 1875. A similar telescoping of the drop in death rates is going on all over the world.

From the demographic point of view, it must be noted that a drop in the death rate, with birth rate unchanged, not only results in an increase in the rate of population growth but also produces an acceleration in the rate of growth itself: a decline in age-specific mortality rates in ages prior to the end of the childbearing age has the same demographic effect as an increase in the birth rate. In the United States, 97 out of every 100 newborn white females reach the age of 20; 91 reach the age of 50. In Guatemala, only 70 reach the age of 20; 49 that of 50. If the death rate in Guatemala fell within the next decade to somewhere near the 1950 United States level, a not unlikely development, this alone would increase the number of women reaching the beginning of the childbearing period by 85 per cent.

Because of the high proportion of young

people in underdeveloped countries generally—a country like Costa Rica has twice the proportion of people under 15 that Sweden has—this drop in the death rate in the pre-childbearing period has now and will have in the next few years a gigantic effect on the birth rate. Brazil had 52 million people in 1950, 71 million in 1960 and 83 million in 1966. If present rates prevail, it should have 240 million by the year 2000, or 14 times the 1900 population. With a drop in mortality in the young age groups, the increase could be even more spectacular.

DEPRESSION A FACTOR

The significance of the demographic trends within this country is not generally appreciated. The United States, with a population of 200 million, has at present 1/16th of the earth's population on 1/16th of the land area. Though a number of underdeveloped areas are piling up population faster, we are accumulating about 2.2 million people per year, more than any increase before 1946. The rate of growth seems unimpressive, 1.1 for the year 1967 (the highest rate reached was 1.8 in 1946 to 1957). If the rate prevailing over the past five years persists, the population of the United States will reach 300 million by the year 1990.

What most of us have tended to ignore is that the so-called baby boom of the post-war era followed a period of depression and very low birth rates: from 1920 to 1933, the birth rate had fallen steadily from 27.7 per 1000 in 1920 to 18.4 in 1933. The absolute decline in births was less steep, because the numerical base of women of childbearing age was still growing. When the birth rate started rising in the early '40s, the increase was applied to the still large number of women born between 1916 and 1924. Since 1945, the baby boom that has been so well publicized had actually been taking place on the basis of the shrinking group of women of childbearing age born since 1924.

As of 1963, the last of the undersize groups had entered the reproducing age. From 1964 (when the first girls born in the big postwar years reached the age of 18), the number of women in the childbearing age has started increasing rapidly. While in 1940 there were 32 million women 15 to 44 years of age, in 1950, 34 million, and in 1960, 36 million (a very slow increase), there will be 43 million in 1970 and 54 million in 1980.

While the birth rate is declining (and while a better index, the age-standardized general fertility rate based upon women of childbearing age only, is also declining), the sheer existence of the number of women and girls alive now means that even in the unlikely event that the fertility rate fell to the historical lows of the depression years and never departed from it, the population of the United States would still more than double in the next century. The reader will, I trust, give me credit for not minimizing the problem of total population either at home or for the world at large.

"DENSITY" MEANS LITTLE

With this picture of ever-increasing numbers of people, the first reaction among a portion of the public is that we are running out of space, that the "population density" is becoming dangerously high.

This concept of "population density"—number of people per unit surface—has underlain the concept of "overpopulation" in the past. It is not very useful except where the primary resources are extractive (mining) and where the most primitive types of agriculture (independent of industry for fertilizers, machines, etc., and hence essentially dependent on area) and forestry prevail. It also presupposes that there is no industry to absorb surplus manpower.

It is a concept of dubious value where nonextractive industries are dominant and where trade is possible. The high density band from Boston to Washington has an area

of 14,000 square miles, an aggregate population of over 30 million (or over 2000 persons per square mile) and very limited natural resources. The median family income is \$1000 more than for the United States as a whole. Can this area be said to be overpopulated from a material standpoint?

To those who object that this area is part of a larger and less densely populated whole, one might point to prosperous Holland or Belgium, or even Hong Kong, which, although trade with its hinterland is very meager (imports from mainland China represent only 17 per cent of total imports), not only houses 3.1 million people on 398 square miles (12,700 per square mile) but has shown an unexcelled increase in national product of 7 to 10 per cent per year—a doubling of real output within ten years.

Once one argues that a certain population density should be preserved, such as density with respect to capital, for example, one is dealing with a much more complex concept. From it follows the idea that some sparsely settled countries need rapid increases in population, preferably through immigration, for optimal use of resources. The mental image of population density entertained by most people is, in any case, complicated by esthetic and social considerations, and "high density" is more likely to be ascribed to Calcutta than to Paris, to Costa Rica than to Denmark.

This leads us to the second and more popular concept, that overpopulation can best be appraised with respect to food resources and that the present rate of increase in the world's population is rapidly carrying us to the brink of or to actual starvation. It is my contention that this is not happening.

Furthermore, I do not consider that my belief, which I shall now endeavor to justify, makes me an "optimist" as compared to the legions of conservationists, social scientists, etc., who have embraced a Malthusian "pessimism." If anything, this view makes me even more pessimistic about our chances of limiting the world's population at an early date: famine or the threat of famine is perhaps the worst method of limitation, but it would work.

A SHORT-LIVED "TREAT"

World War II was not a Malthusian check. In spite of the horrendous numbers of soldiers and civilians killed, in spite of the massive genocide perpetrated by the Nazis, food production decreased much more than population. By 1945, intake per capita was 16 per cent lower than the 1934-38 average. The creation of the Food and Agriculture Organization, a specialized United Nations agency that was endowed during its first years with particularly articulate spokesmen, dramatized the worldwide concern over the food situation.

The difficulties inherent in getting agriculture going while industry and the means of communication were not yet rebuilt led to a generalized feeling of pessimism. Cereals, oils, meat, dairy herds were, in succession, the objects of great attention, the conclusion being in each case that prewar levels of production and consumption were not going to be reached for years. The chaotic state of international trade accentuated shortages, which UNRRA and various emergency agreements attempted to cope with on an ad hoc basis.

And yet very quickly the situation improved. The oil shortage vanished first; while the gigantic ground nut scheme of the British government, which was supposed to mitigate it, was taking off to a very slow start, the reappearance in the channels of trade of adequate amounts of fats and oils eliminated the motivation for the scheme itself.

U.S. production of cereals and animal products, which had grown during the war in spite of the lack of abundant manpower

and the diversion of the chemical industry to military purposes, had to be slowed down as surpluses started accumulating and, with their appearance, the threat of a collapse of agricultural prices loomed. By 1952-3, the worldwide rate of per capita production of food had overtaken prewar rates.

Since then, the average rate of increase in the production of food for the world at large has been 3 per cent per year while the population has increased on the average 1.7 per cent. In document No. 8148, the State Department estimates that if individual consumption levels remained at the 1955-7 level, the world at large would show by 1975 an annual surplus of 40 million tons of wheat and 70 million tons of rice. (This estimate is based on the postulate that there will be no increase in rice production in Europe and North America and no increase in wheat production in North America.)

Actually, this slight but steady gain of food production over population is part of a secular trend. E. S. and W. S. Woytinski, in their monumental "World Population and Production," estimate that since 1850 the increase in output has been more rapid than the increase in population.

MALNUTRITION WIDESPREAD

As Chairman of the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, I have been talking of these evils at home for years. I have done extensive work in malnutrition in Asia and Africa and have just returned from a trip to Nigeria and Biafra, where I went to study the famine and the means to alleviate it. I am, therefore, as well aware of the widespread character of malnutrition as anyone in the world.

Caloric undernutrition is still found in many parts of the world, and not always as a result of war or civil disorder, earthquakes or floods, invasions of insects and other parasites or abnormally prolonged droughts. Protein deficiency—kwashiorkor where it occurs without accompanying caloric deprivation; marasmus when both caloric and protein intakes are inadequate—is encountered in varying degrees of prevalence among the young children of most countries of Asia and Africa and in many of Central and South America.

Vitamin A deficiency is perhaps underestimated as a threat to the life, and the sight, of children of most of the same areas where protein deficiency is also seen. Riboflavin deficiency, thiamine deficiency (beriberi in its various forms) and a number of other deficiencies are still very much with us. Still, there is no evidence that the situation is getting worse.

The food balance sheets on which postwar pessimism was based are imperfect instruments. As an officer of FAO, I spent considerable time attempting to gauge such unknowns as figures for waste at the retail level and within families, and that portion of the food supply that does not move within the channels of trade (food grown by the farmer for his family is very inaccurately known, particularly as regards fruits and vegetables, which tend to be underestimated). The nutritional standards against which available supplies are gauged are themselves being refined.

As the results of additional experimental and clinical work become available. It is realized that a number of such standards—those for protein and calcium among others—were probably unnecessarily high. Even without such re-evaluation, the evolution of food balance sheets, the only instruments we have to judge the race between food and population, make it apparent that most regions do show the same slow increase of per capita supplies exhibited by the world at large.

It must be recognized, of course, that many of the worst nutritional scourges of mankind have been historically due as much to ignorance and to callousness as to lack of nutri-

ents as such. Thousands of children die of protein deficiency in areas where the proteins which would save them do in fact exist and are often consumed in sufficient amounts in the very households where infants and toddlers die for lack of them. A faulty understanding of a child's needs may be the main reason he is denied some of the food consumed by his father and older siblings.

As for man's inhumanity to man and its contribution to starvation, it could be illustrated by thousands of examples: cereals being shipped from Ireland under the protection of naval guns during the famine; stocks being withheld during the Congo famine to keep prices up; crop destruction policies in South Vietnam; the food blockade of Biafra.

LAND KEPT IDLE

Certainly, as far as food is concerned, ours is not one world. The U.S. Government rents 20 million acres from our farmers so that they will not grow food on them. A study made at Iowa State University a few years ago suggests that 62½ million acres ought to be similarly retired so that surpluses will not continue to be created in relation to the present market. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Argentina and France have been, or are at present, involved in similar efforts to restrict production.

Nor is this idling of food production restricted to highly developed countries. A recent study estimates that Ghanaian farmers work only an average of two hours a day in the cocoa area, the wealthiest agricultural area of the country.

It is fair to say that in most areas of the world, the race between food and population would be more favorable to the development of adequate nutrition if the rate of population growth was decreased. But I believe that there are no grounds for saying in 1969 that the nutritional state of the world is getting worse. It is not.

And I believe that improvement in communication, availability of surpluses in certain countries, the existence of solid international organizations and the gradual improvement in international morality make large-scale famines, such as the Irish or the Bengal famine, less likely to occur in this era—except perhaps in Red China, because of its alienation from the two richest blocs of countries. (It appears, moreover, that the food situation in China has improved considerably in the past two years, making the recurrence of famine there, as in India, more remote.)

Bad as it is, the present is no worse than the past and probably somewhat better. But what of the future? In absolute numbers, the increase in population is likely to accelerate for some time. Can the food supply be kept up? My contention is that, for better or for worse, it can and will.

First, let us consider conventional agriculture. FAO's figures indicate that 3.4 billion acres are at present under cultivation. This represents less than 11 per cent of the total land area of the world. Some experts—Prasolov, Shantz, Zimmermann—estimate the area that can eventually be made arable at from 13 billion to 17 billion acres. Colin Clark, director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Oxford, uses the figure of 19 billion acres, but counts double-cropped tropical lands twice. (He considers, incidentally, that if the lands were farmed as well as the Dutch farmers work their acres today, it would support 28 billion people on a Dutch diet; if Japanese standards of farming and nutrition were used, this area would support 95 billion people.)

THE FERTILIZER PHENOMENON

The biggest potential increase of food production does not, however, come from the extension of the area under cultivation, but from the increase in the use of fertilizers. The phenomenal increase in food production in

this country has actually been performed with a reduction in acreage farmed.

By pre-World War I standards of cultivation, it took 1½ acres to support an American. If such standards prevailed today, we would need to add at least 40 million acres to our farm area every ten years, or the equivalent of an additional Iowa every decade.

In fact, we use fertilizers instead. One ton of nitrogen is the equivalent of 14 acres of good farmland. The use of between 200,000 and 300,000 tons of nitrogen (and corresponding amounts of other necessary elements) per decade has obviated the need to discover another Iowa.

And our use of fertilizer is less intensive than it is in Japan, where it is well over twice ours, or in Western Europe. (Incidentally, in spite of its already high standards of cultivation, Japan is still increasing its agricultural production at a rate of 3 per cent per year.)

India, Africa and most of Latin America use only an infinitesimal fraction of Japanese or Western amounts of fertilizer, or none at all. Garst has estimated that an expenditure of \$10 an acre per year for fertilizers would, alone add 50 to 100 percent to the low yields in underdeveloped countries. Applying this investment to an area of 1.5 billion acres would be an equivalent to adding at least 750 million acres to the crop areas of these countries, the equivalent of a continent bigger than North America.

It is interesting to note that this primacy of fertilizers was recognized relatively late. In this country, the recognition dates back only to World War II, and has accelerated since the Korean conflict. In Japan, it dates back to 1950 or thereabout. And the leaders of the U.S.S.R. only recently realized that a large-scale increase in fertilizer output would be easier and more rewarding than the extension of cultivation to the "virgin lands."

There are many other advances in agriculture that have yet to be applied on a large scale. The identification of necessary trace elements and their incorporation into fertilizers and feeds have opened vast areas to cultivation and husbandry in Australia and elsewhere. Selective breeding of plants and animals has permitted the development of species with superior hardiness and increased yields. In the greater part of the world such work has hardly begun.

Advances in animal health and nutrition have permitted the mass production of milk and eggs in indoor conditions on a scale that was unimaginable a few years ago. The City of Los Angeles, for instance, is now an important and efficient dairy area. In some large installations, computers programmed to calculate the cheapest method of providing a diet of known energy and known content in ten essential amino acids, total protein and other nutrients, automatically set the controls that will mix basic staples providing the cheapest adequate poultry diet as they are informed of the latest commodity prices.

Herbicides increase yields; pesticides prevent losses from rodents, insects and fungi. In many underdeveloped countries, one-quarter of the crop is lost before it reaches the consumer. Certain methods of preservation of foods by radiation have just been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. The control of weather by seeding clouds for rain, speeding cloud formation by heating lakes by atomic energy, the desalinization of brackish water by various methods are entering the realm of practical feasibility.

FOOD FROM PETROLEUM

Powerful though these methods of "classical" agriculture are, I believe that they will within the lifetime of most present inhabitants of this planet, be left far behind as methods of food production. The general public is still unaware of some new developments, their promise and the extent of the

means likely to be expended in the next decade in bringing the results of research to practical application.

Large-scale manufacture of food from petrochemicals started during World War II, when the Germans manufactured synthetic fats to feed forced labor groups. These fats did not conform to desirable standards of taste or safety (they contained a high proportion of branched-chain fatty acids not normally found in nature and probably not fully metabolized, and retained a petroleum-like odor). After the war, interest in "synthetic" fats persisted for a while during the years when it appeared that a shortage of natural fats was likely to be protracted.

During the '50s, little or no work was done in this field, but recently some of the larger international oil companies have again become actively interested, and pilot plants are now in operation. Fatty acids, triglycerides (the constituents of our common oils and fats) and fully metabolizable simpler compounds, such as 1,3-butanediol, may soon be manufactured at very low cost for human food and animal feeds. While the promise of abundant and cheap atomic power, widely heralded for the morrow in the more immediate postwar period, has shown itself slow to be realized it is coming, and it may well be that oil will be increasingly a raw material for food and plastics rather than a fuel.

As a potential source of food production, photosynthesis can be used much more efficiently in algae than in higher plants. With proper mineral fertilization and with the proper rate of removal of the finished products, one square meter may serve to support algae production sufficient to feed one man. And a large proportion of the calories produced—as much as one-half—are derived from protein; vitamins are also produced into the bargain. Several universities are working with a number of species, *Chlorella* in particular, and large industrial firms are yearly becoming more interested.

The problems entailed in passing from the theoretically feasible to the economically feasible are formidable, but their solution is likely to be hastened for an unexpected reason. Interplanetary travel of long duration and the organization of distant stations require not only recycling of oxygen and waste water; they necessitate the fabrication of food and its integration into the recycling of oxygen, water and excreta.

Over the next two decades, an increasing fraction of the several billion dollars that the United States and the Soviet Union will spend every year for space travel is going to be channeled into life support systems. The money spent in the aggregate on new methods of food production will probably, during that period, dwarf the cost of the Manhattan Project.

In many ways, we may have in space exploration what William James called "the moral equivalent of war." We will probably also have in it the technological equivalent of war without the corresponding losses in men and resources. The usable "fallout" of such research is likely to be enormous. Certainly, if economical harnessing of photosynthesis, through biological units or directly, can be realized under the hostile interplanetary, lunar or martial conditions, it should become relatively easy to put it into effect on earth.

All this is no longer science fiction. It is as much of a reality as the Federal income tax. Obviously, a breakthrough in this field could for centuries altogether remove food as a limiting factor to population growth.

A POOR BATTLEGROUND

I hope I have said enough to show how dangerous it may turn out to link the population problem so closely to food, as so many writers have done. These have generally been conservationists and social scientists rather than agricultural or nutritional scientists,

concerned—rightly—with the effects of crowding which they had observed. At the same time, not sure that the public and governments would agree with them that there was cause for concern and action based on these grounds, they have turned to the threat of a worldwide shortage of food as an easily understood, imperative reason for a large-scale limitation of births.

Had they consulted nutritionists, agriculturists and chemists, they might have chosen a more appropriate battleground. For if we can feed an ever-increasing number of people—even if we feed them as badly as many of our contemporaries are fed—their argument falls. And yet there is a need for the establishment as soon as possible of a sound population policy for the world at large.

There is, of course, another good reason for not tying population control to food. This tie eliminates from contention rich countries and in particular surplus countries such as ours. Our population is increasing faster than it ever has; our major nutrition problem is overweight, our major agricultural problem is our ever-mounting excess production.

Does anyone seriously believe this means that we have no population problem? Our housing problems; our traffic problem; the insufficiency of the number of our hospitals, of community recreation facilities; our pollution problems, are all facets of our population problem.

I may add that in this country we compound the population problem by the migratory habits of our people: from rural farm areas to urban areas and especially to "metropolitan" areas (212 such areas now have 84 per cent of our population); from low-income areas to high-income areas; from the East and Midwest to the South and Southwest; from all areas to the Pacific Coast; from the centers of cities to suburbs, which soon form gigantic conurbations, with circumstances everywhere pushing our Negroes into the deteriorating centers of large cities. All this has occurred without any master plan, and with public services continually lagging behind both growth and migrations.

Let us conclude with one specific example: Four million students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and graduate schools in 1960; six million in 1965. The Census Bureau estimates that eight million will seek admission or continued enrollment in 1970; ten million in 1975; 12 million in 1980. No one questions our ability to feed these youngsters. But are we as a Nation at all prepared for a near doubling of the size of our colleges and universities in 11 years?

PARKS REFLECT TREND

Let us now examine the other argument, that in certain ways the rich countries are more immediately threatened by overpopulation. A corollary of this is that the earth as an economic system has more to fear from the rich than from the poor, even if one forgets for a moment the threat of atomic or chemical warfare.

Consider some data from our own country. We have already said that "crowding" is certainly one of the pictures we have in mind when we think of overpopulation. The increased crowding of our cities and our conurbations has been referred to, but what of the great outdoors?

In 1930, the number of visitor-days at our national parks was of the order of three million (for a population of 122 million); by 1950, it was 33 million (for a population of 151 million); by 1960, it was 79 million (for a population of 179 million); by 1967, 140 million (for a population of 200 million). State parks tell the same story: a rise in visitor-days from 114 million in 1950 to 179 million in 1960, an increase in attendance of over 125 per cent for a rise in population of less than 20 per cent.

Clearly, the increase in disposable income

(and hence in means of transportation and in leisure) becomes a much more important factor in crowding and lack of privacy than the rise in population.

Not only does the countryside become more rapidly crowded when its inhabitants are rich; it also becomes rapidly uglier. With increasing income, people stop drinking water as much. As a result, we spread 48 billion (rustproof) cans and 26 billion (non-degradable) bottles over our landscape every year. We produce 800 million pounds of trash a day, a great deal of which ends up in our fields, our parks and our forests. Only one-third of the billion pounds of paper we use every year is reclaimed.

Nine million cars, trucks and buses are abandoned every year, and while many of them are used as scrap, a large though undetermined number are left to disintegrate slowly in backyards, in fields and woods and on the sides of highways. The eight billion pounds of plastics we use every year are nondegradable materials. And many of our states are threatened with an even more pressing shortage of water, not because of an increased consumption of drinking fluid by the increasing population but because people are getting richer and using more water for air-conditioning, swimming pools and vastly expanded metal and chemical industries.

That the air is getting crowded much more rapidly than the population is increasing is again an illustration that increase in the disposable income is perhaps more closely related to our own view of "overpopulation" than is the population itself. From 1940 to 1967, the number of miles flown has gone from 264 million to 3334 billion (and the fuel consumed from 22 million to 512 million gallons).

The very air waves are crowded. The increase in citizen-licenses from 126,000 to 848,000 in the brief 1960-7 interval is again an excellent demonstration of the very secondary role of the population increase in the new overpopulation. I believe that as the disposable income rises throughout the world in general, the population pressure due to riches will become as apparent as that due to poverty.

I trust that I have demonstrated how dangerous it is to link constantly in the mind of the public the concept of overpopulation with that of undernutrition. I believe that it is dangerous to link it necessarily with poverty. It is absurd on the basis of any criterion of history, economics or esthetics.

Some countries are poor and densely populated. A few countries are poor and so sparsely populated that economic development (e.g. road building, creation of markets) becomes very difficult. It is easy to demonstrate that a couple with many children will be unable to save and invest.

It is perhaps also true that, as the comparison to 19th century France, England and Germany suggests, at a certain stage of development, too low a birth rate (as in France then) decreases the ambition and labor of part of the population so that the savings expected from the decreased birth rate never materialize. (Losing wars because of a smaller population and having to pay a heavy tribute, as happened to the French at the conclusion of the 1870-1 war, also nullified this advantage.)

TAXING THE ECOLOGY

The fact is that we are not yet in one world and that while in general it is true that population increases make improvement in nutrition and in delivery of social services more difficult, the relation of changes in wealth to changes in population has to be examined in each area on its own merits.

We have seen, furthermore, that there is more to the problem of population than the decrease in income consequent to overpopu-

lation. We have seen that the increase in disposable income creates a population problem that is becoming every day more acute. The ecology of the earth—its streams, woods, animals—can accommodate itself better to a rising poor population than to a rising rich population. Indeed, to save the ecology, the population will have to decrease as the disposable income increases.

If we believe, like Plato and Aristotle, in trying for excellence rather than in rejoicing in numbers, we need a population policy now for the rich as well as the poor. Excellent human beings will not be produced without abundance of cultural as well as material resources and, I believe, without sufficient space. We are likely to run out of certain metals before we run out of food; of paper before we run out of metals. And we are running out of clear streams, pure air and the familiar sights of Nature while we still have the so-called "essentials" of life.

Shall we continue to base the need for a population policy on a nutritional disaster to occur at some hypothetical date when it is clear that the problem is here, now, for us as well as for others? Shall we continue to hide the fact that a rational policy may entail in many countries not only plateauing of the population to permit an increase in disposable income, but a decrease of the population as the disposable income rises?

TWO GREAT DREAMERS

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always wise to talk in a positive fashion and yet so much is negative today—we talk, read, and think in the latter day so often. Recently, at the Holiday Inn, in Kirksville, Mo., Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr. had an interesting dialog. Dr. Reuter's part is expressed in "Two Great Dreamers," and I want my colleagues to share in his words.

The speech follows:

TWO GREAT DREAMERS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

Even a chronic optimist must recognize, I think, that this country has entered a great internal crisis, the third in our history. The first came to its climax in the Civil War. The second, which scarred this nation and marked the lives of all our parents, was the Great Depression of the 1930's. The third crisis has developed late in these 1960's, and it still lacks a name. Of course, Americans have always had a curious love-hate relationship with their environment. Unlike the original inhabitants of the continent, the American Indians—who were bound to their land in a marriage of love—the white settler viewed the charms of a virgin continent with greed in his heart.

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

The American conditions are almost anything you want to prove. Without exaggerating any particular item of evidence—just by careful selecting of the items—it is possible to demonstrate that this Class of 1969 is graduating out into a nation in the last stages of social, political and moral decay. Also without exaggerating, just by selecting—and this takes very careful selecting—it is possible to show that you are graduating a group just in time to get in on the ground floor of a Golden Age. Which kind of evidence one hunts hardest for is perhaps a matter of individual temperament or chemistry. I have a weakness for optimism.

When William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote that he would far rather entrust his governance—by which he would include the preservation of his civil liberties and his intellectual freedom—to the first hundred persons listed in the Boston telephone directory than to the faculty of Harvard University, he was saying no more than what Thomas Jefferson or Henry Adams would have thought self-evident. The remark was greeted with considerable derision in Cambridge at the time, but it may be stated with certainty that more than one tenured professor of that ancient institution has come of late to see its truthfulness with excruciating clarity.

Certainly if this violence is not curbed, and the campuses brought under control—and that quickly—the damage to higher education and ultimately to society may be irreparable. Professor Sidney Hook of New York University, a noted radical over the years, has pointed out that "When black students and SDS radicals use the same methods Nazi students employed to destroy the Weimar Republic and trample into the dust traditional ideals of academic freedom, then no matter how different their rhetoric may be, fundamentally both are enemies of the rational process and of those values of civilization which have developed over the centuries against the forces of obscurantism and barbarism." Yes, any individual who damns the land of his birth, desecrates our flag, and mocks Him who died on Calvary's cross is a disgrace to the concept of a nation created under God. Also, one recalls Archibald MacLeish's remark: "There is nothing worse for our trade than to be in style." The equivalent is those whose concern in government is submission to the noisiest problems of the moment to the exclusion of the most important ones.

But so long as a society retains a capacity for non-violent political change, resort to violent political action is anathema. Only if most Americans were convinced that this country was no longer open to peaceful political evolution, to transformation of institutions and policies through the available channels of persuasion, would they consider revolutionary force permissible. That most Americans are not so convinced is evident in the growing vehemence of public attitudes on campus disorders and in the rising popular impatience with the efforts of academic administrators to deal fairly and considerately with student rebels.

RETAINING A SOUND FOUNDATION

Our Founding Fathers built America on a sound foundation without thought of sacrifice. Those gallant men and women of 1776 were teachers, doctors, preachers, farmers, merchants, bankers, lawyers, hunters, and fishermen. This was no revolution of little men filled with big hates, but a revolution of big men who hated littleness in government and were resolved to put an end to it. They recalled Edmund Burke who said: "For evil to triumph, good men have but to do nothing."

Much later in time—in fact it was at the end of World War II—General Douglas MacArthur made one of the greatest speeches of all time when he spoke at the formal surrender of the Japanese on the Battleship Missouri. In that marvelous speech he pointed out the horrors of war and man's

failure to cope with it. General MacArthur said: "The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past two thousand years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Two great intellectual giants have greatly aided in fortifying America's sound foundation. Perhaps, if we reflect concerning their lives it will be easier to build a great tomorrow. The names of these giants are Dr. William Bell Riley of Minnesota and ex-Governor Adlai Ewing Stevenson of Illinois. The first one was among the greatest religious statesmen of all time, and the second one was among the few true "citizens of the world."

A chapter in one of my books, entitled "A Dreamer of Dreams," is about Dr. William Bell Riley. Dr. Riley, who was born in Greene County, Indiana, on March 22, 1861, and who died in Minneapolis on December 5, 1947, was Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis from 1897 until 1943, and Pastor-Emeritus until he died. He was also founder and President of Northwestern Schools. His first book was published in 1914 under the title "The Coming and Kingdom of Christ," and the last three were "Problems of Youth" (1941), "Sunset Sermons or After Eighty" (1943), and "The Preacher and His Preaching" (1947). He wrote some fourteen other well-known books.

Although Dr. Riley completed a teacher's course at Valparaiso, he was ordained as a Baptist minister in 1883. On June 3, 1885, he was graduated from Hanover College. Later, he received an M. A. degree. He had the highest academic average of any person to be graduated from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. He gave the seminary address at graduation in 1888, which was held at the Broadway Baptist Church, and historians have described the address as excellent. Later such well-known and highly respected universities as John Brown University and Union University awarded honorary doctorates to Dr. Riley.

Dr. Riley married Miss Lillian Howard at the Trinity Methodist Church in Lafayette, Indiana, on December 31, 1890. Six children were born to that union. Mrs. Riley died on August 10, 1931. Dr. Riley married Miss Marie R. Acomb on September 1, 1933. His widow still survives and is author of the well-known biography, "The Dynamic of a Dream," a book written in 1938 about her beloved husband.

The First Baptist Church of Minneapolis was organized on March 5, 1853, by Mr. and Mrs. Asa Fletcher, Hezekiah Fletcher, and seven other charter members. It became the largest Baptist church in the Northern (now American) Baptist Convention under Dr. Riley's leadership. This is only one reason why Dr. Riley is still so well remembered. Also, his noble anti-evolution and fundamentals fights, his ability as a church builder, his world-renowned ability as a pastor-evangelist, his opposition to Communism, and his deep interest in Christian education are some of the other phases of his active life.

Just as Mrs. Riley called her husband "a great dreamer for a better tomorrow," so has Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey termed Adlai E. Stevenson "the great world dreamer for a better day." Certainly Adlai Ewing Stevenson was just as dynamic a dreamer as Dr. Riley. Governor Stevenson, although born in Los Angeles on February 5, 1900, was a true son of Illinois. After being graduated from Princeton in 1922, he received his law degree from Northwestern University in 1926. Honorary degrees were awarded to

him from such well established universities as Oxford, Columbia, Amherst, and Princeton.

His best known books were "Call to Greatness" (1954), "What I Think" (1956), "The New America" (1957), "Friends and Enemies" (1958), "Putting First Things First" (1960), and "Looking Outward" (1963). His home life was another story. Three fine sons were born to his union with Ellen Borden (married December 1, 1928), but they were divorced while he was Governor of Illinois. Although future events proved he was the innocent party and that his wife was of unsound mind, the divorce probably prevented him from being elected President of the United States in 1952 and 1956. A series of references to his greatness appeared in a 1957 book² prior to his outstanding service as Ambassador to the United Nations. Few people better understood the meaning of democracy and the purposes of a free society than Mr. Stevenson. For example, in 1963, he said: "Democracy is not self-executing. We have to make it work, and to make it work we have to understand it . . . not only external vigilance but unending self-examination must be the perennial price of liberty, because the work of self-government never ceases."

Five days before he died, Ambassador Stevenson made his last formal speech. It was before the United Nations Economic and Social Council in Geneva, and it was one of his best. These words seem appropriate:

"We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work and I will say the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave to the ancient enemies of man, half free in liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all."

CONCLUSIONS

Only a brave man or a fool would claim to know the full meaning of the turmoil now that wracks the world. But the more I see of it the stronger my conviction grows that we may be witnessing the birth of a new era in relations among men if we can develop the proper type of dreamers to lead us in resolving our problems. Yes, dreamers of the scholarship and leadership of Riley and Stevenson are needed.

Learned Hand, as William James before him, urged that we must develop the habit of an open mind and a recognition that "the deepest convictions of one generation are the rejections of the next." He stated further: "I believe that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy; where non-conformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

Dr. Riley is buried at Lakewood Cemetery in Minneapolis. Governor Stevenson, who died July 14, 1965 in London, England, is buried in Bloomington, Illinois. The eulogy for Adlai Stevenson at Washington's National Cathedral could have been for either dreamer—Riley or Stevenson—and it is consistent with the teachings of Judge Hand. The words follow:

"That voice is still now. But its echoes are likely to be sounding down the corridors of history for a long time. For it is the essence

¹ George S. Reuter, Jr., *Some Educational Statesmen and Basic Principles* (Arkansas A. and M. College: College Heights, 1956), pp. 74-78.

² George S. Reuter, Jr., *Essays in Education and Related Areas* (Arkansas A. and M. College: College Heights, 1957).

of faith to believe that the world in its advancing age will set no less store than have we upon reason, upon intelligence, upon gaiety, upon charity and compassion and grace—all these things and more of and with which this voice has spoken to us so often and so clearly in the past."

Riley and Stevenson were two of our great dreamers. We need more such dreamers to continue to achieve progress. Yes, it is going to be hard work, but we are used to that. It seems to me that we gain encouragement by looking to Don Quixote who was always reaching for that unreachable star. Let's listen for a moment to Don Quixote as he describes our quest:

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

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

VIRGIN ISLANDS GOVERNOR'S INAUGURAL SPEECH

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Melvin H. Evans, Governor of the Virgin Islands, made a perceptive and forward-looking inaugural speech on July 1, 1969. He granted the problems of the islands, but submitted proposals that would assist toward the solutions. His approach is such that much may be expected in the way of improvement. Certainly, this speech by Governor Evans is very appropriate for an inaugural speech. I include it herewith:

INAUGURAL SPEECH OF GOV. MELVIN H. EVANS

Fifty-two years ago, these Virgin Islands began a new life—a life of association with and as a part of—the greatest nation the world has ever seen. It was, to be sure, not a perfect association. The great democratic institutions upon which this Nation of ours had been built, and to which it was securely anchored, were at first denied an arm of government, charged mainly with the defense of this country, was entrusted with the task of assimilating us into the fabric of America. Where will and desire and good intentions were undoubtedly present, the capacity to perform this extraneous job proved insufficient.

The sad impact of the Prohibition Act which deprived these islands of a main source of revenue and the coup de gras of the great economic depression of 1929 reduced these islands to a state of penury as repugnant to the islands as it was unwelcome to the mainland.

It was at this point of time that the conscience of this great country began to stir and in 1931 a civilian form of government became the order of the day.

It would be unfair to dismiss this period with no further comment. Much had indeed been accomplished. Sanitation had been improved; roads had been built; hospitals and medical facilities increased and enlarged, and the educational system expanded. Much money had been spent. But even then, the

soul of man was yearning and striving for more than bread. Even then, that innate force which drives man to place freedom above food, self-determination above satiety, dignity above security was at work and let it be everlastingly to the credit of this great Nation that the pulse of the people was felt and recorded and the diagnosis made that the time had come for more self-government.

And so it was that a former Governor Evans—Captain Waldo Evans of the Navy—gave way to the Honorable Paul M. Pearson who brought with him the hope that at last we were becoming a part of the true America.

One organic act succeeded another—In 1936 granting universal suffrage and in 1954 loosening the economic shackles—until today we stand on a new threshold, one on which the boundaries of self-determination are still further extended so that the selection of a chief executive by the democratic process of election is ours in a matter of less than a year and a half. *It is, therefore, crucial that we evaluate our position now.*

Perhaps we have in the past been like that mythical animal with its eyes in the back of its head so that it could see where it had been rather than where it was going. We have, perhaps, understandably been concerned with how many classrooms have been built, how many housing units erected, and how big the increase in revenue is one year over the previous. I submit we should now take stock and look ahead to analyze our future—the future which is in our hands today. Are we preparing these islands for the full life which is our potential? Are we really cognizant of the fact that the day is past when we could "go it alone"? Do we understand the great turmoil and upheaval in our cities, on the campuses, in the civil rights movement, among the young in general, the minorities, the have-nots, the non-conformists? Do we understand that we are not insulated? Are we seeking to solve these problems while it is still possible—or do we want to wait until the inevitable tide overwhelms us?

Let us take stock.

EDUCATION

A decade and a half ago, a Governor of these islands described the Virgin Islands as second only to one State in the Union in spending the lowest amount per capita on education. Today, the Virgin Islands has lost that dubious distinction as it spends a great deal more for education. Unfortunately, however, an improvement in the end product has not kept pace and there are many informed analysts who would assure you that the quality has deteriorated. Our high school graduates are encountering increasing difficulties in the pursuit of education abroad and our own college has to spend increasing efforts in remedial work with students before or after they enter. We, thus, come to the unavoidable conclusion that money does not necessarily bring success.

What we clearly need is a new thrust, increased efficiency, and an approach more suited to the unique needs of these islands.

The educational system has had more than half a dozen heads in the past fifteen years with no possibility of continuity in conceptualizing, planning and implementing the needed programs. When the very nutrition of a people—the education of its young—suffers, catastrophe can only be averted by prompt, vigorous and imaginative action.

HOUSING

The housing situation in these islands is bad. Deplorable or scandalous would probably be more descriptive terms but hardly more contributory to a solution. The underlying conditions are basically economic. There is a greater demand than supply and the cost of construction, repair and maintenance is astronomical. During the past decade, thousands of homes or housing units have been built. But during these same years, many more thousands of people have come to

the islands to live. Today, many residents who are economically able to pay for good housing are actually unable to find such. Additionally, as the cost of land acquisition and construction increases, the cost of renting also soars not only adversely affecting our own people but also the skilled and professional people we desire and desperately need. Thus, substandard living in this oasis of affluence all too often is the rule rather than the exemption. By the very nature of things, this falls most heavily on those in the lower economic brackets and the deleterious effect on individuals and, yes, on family life itself, is incalculable. What is needed is a fresh new approach—not just a game of catching up. We must not only continue to build and accelerate the rate at which we build but also we must take positive steps to control the run-away demand. Ways must be found to increase the efficiency of building thus increasing the rate of construction and lowering the cost of each unit. *We must find an answer—time is running out.*

POLLUTION

For the past years, we have seemed to subscribe to the concept that the solution to pollution was dilution. Thus, we poured raw sewage into our harbors and bays with the smug belief that dilution would remove all danger. We looked to the tradewinds to carry away all noxious gases while we brought in more automobiles, erected new industrial plants and belched more poisons into the atmosphere. Today our harbors are virtual cesspools—offensive to sight and smell and a constant threat to our health.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL FACILITIES

Generally, the health in these islands has been good. The various indices such as general mortality and infant mortality rates point to good and improving health. But, there are clouds on the horizon. In public health, the rapid increase in population with over-crowding in substandard homes—often without the barest sanitary facilities—is like an explosive charge with a time fuse. The fuse may be long, or it may be short, but eventually the explosion occurs. We cannot continue to ignore the threat of communicable disease which the lack of proper sewage disposal, over-crowding, and inadequate water supply poses.

But, let us consider in a more general way our position. What are we doing to break down the sectionalism that pits island against island, town against town and group against group? Are we really living and working together or we are each occupying our own little territories of home and job and play? Are we really communicating with each other or are we merely talking to each other. I ask this question: Are we Virgin Islanders?—or are we native Virgin Islanders, Puerto Rican Virgin Islanders, or Continental Virgin Islanders? Let us in our own hearts provide the answer.

As we have grown in the past years, have the cultural, social and political aspects kept pace with the economic factors? Has the very growth itself been channelled or controlled—or have we just grown like "Topsy"? Have the economic benefits filtered down through all strata or are we still nurturing pockets of poverty? Have we developed—or are we developing—political education in its broadest sense as a part of our life or are we individually abdicating our civic duties and responsibilities to "the other fellow"?

I have asked these questions. Now let me point directions.

We must differ without fighting. We must debate issues—Not men and personalities. We must listen sometimes—not always talk. We must place home and country before self for even though it may appear naively altruistic, it is a cold reality that without country and home, there can be no self.

We must speak out wholly against that which we consider wrong—not whisper derogations hiding behind anonymity. We must

plan—but planning must not become a euphemism for procrastination. We must oppose when in good faith we feel constrained to do so but we must propose alternatives. Nihilism is not compatible with progress.

I have often said that geometry and forensics should be included in every curriculum—the former to promote logical thinking; the latter to give substance to the cliché that there are really two sides to every question.

And now, as I take the oath of office, I do so with humility, seeing the challenge and not the honor—the opportunity to serve, not to rule: the chance to lead, not merely to complain. I pledge that to the limits of my physical and mental abilities and with constant quest for divine guidance, I shall be the servant of all the people of these islands so that with God's help, we may move forward to a better life for all of us.

WHO PERILS THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within the past 6 months, two books have been published which attempt to frighten the public concerning the alleged dangers of the civilian nuclear power program.

The books are "The Careless Atom" by Sheldon Novick and "Perils of the Peaceful Atom" by Elizabeth Hogan and Richard Curtis.

Both books have been widely discredited by those with a sophisticated understanding of the issues involved. It is clear to me that both are biased, distorted efforts to frighten and confuse the public about a program which has been a high-priority national effort since the end of World War II.

In the event that some Members of the Congress might receive inquiries from concerned constituents about these books, I am including in the RECORD an article from Electrical World magazine of July 21, 1969, which contains a review of "Perils of the Peaceful Atom" by two distinguished experts in the nuclear power field, Dr. James G. Beckerly, president of Radioptics, Inc., and Dr. Norman Hilberry, professor of nuclear engineering at the University of Arizona and a member of the Arizona Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, I am including a review of "The Careless Atom" by Dr. Theos J. Thompson, former professor of nuclear engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and now a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The reviews follow:

[From Electrical World magazine, July 21, 1969]

WHO PERILS THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

Is nuclear power endangering society? Or, is society endangering nuclear benefits? Industry people, who have already read the just-published, *Perils of the Peaceful Atom*, by Elizabeth Hogan and Richard Curtis [Doubleday & Co.—\$5.95], are inclined to agree with the latter—that the nuclear power industry is in trouble, and that the real perils are public ignorance and misunderstanding.

Not that the book points out these perils. It is, rather, an example of them. And, according to one observer, if *Perils* has any sway at all with the public thinking, it will

compound the growing thicket of misunderstanding surrounding nuclear power now.

Laymen authors Hogan and Curtis argue for an abandonment of nuclear power and a return to fossil-fueled generation. They sum up their feelings by the hand-wringing statement: "A survey of the perils of nuclear peace is like a Dantean survey of Hell—one leaves each level certain that he has seen the worst, but ahead lie scenes more fiendish still!"

All of which shows that the authors understand little of nuclear power and even less of the Divine Comedy.

There has been at least one prominent attack on "Perils." The rebuttal comes from Dr. James G. Beckerly, President of Radioptics, Inc. and Dr. Norman Hilberry, professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Arizona, and a member of the Arizona Atomic Energy Commission. It appeared this month in the form of a book review, published by the Atomic Industrial Forum's INFO. The remainder of this Management Newsletter is a précis of that review.

"The Perils of the Peaceful Atom" is an emotional attempt to create public reaction to the menace of nuclear power. The goal of the book is "the complete abandonment of the nuclear power plant program." In the context of the book as a whole, this implies the total renunciation of the use of nuclear fuels as a national energy resource. Although not stated explicitly, the authors eventual goal is the elimination of all use of nuclear radiation and radioactive materials.

Because the authors are laymen and do not appear to have had qualified guidance [they rely completely on published source materials] they have been compelled to substitute for scientific and technological facts a miscellany of excerpts, quotes, and fragments of quotes that, in many instances, are taken out of their original context and are therefore misleading. As laymen, the authors seem to select phrases on the basis of their colloquial or popular usage, apparently unaware of the fact that the scientific and technological usefulness of these phrases depends upon precise definition. That this distorts the meaning of the quote is unrealized, or is ignored. Therefore, "fact" has a drastically different meaning to the authors of this book than to the scientific and technological community.

There are basic informational problems in the book. These are serious, but even more serious are the problems coming from the way in which the authors develop their arguments. Almost every high school student is aware of the essentials of logical analysis upon which scientific and technological progress depends so vitally. The data concerning a given physical or biological system are gathered. They are examined for their completeness to assure that, as far as can be determined, nothing has been overlooked. They are then scrutinized for their validity and reliability. They are studied until they are understood and then are subjected to objective analysis within the framework of recognized natural law. In this way, the basic character of the system is established, and from this it is then possible to predict the system's behavior reliably in a wide variety of circumstances. It is only within such an objective framework that the safety of nuclear power generation, and the nature and validity of the measures taken to assure that safety, can be discussed intelligently.

The axiom on which "The Perils of the Peaceful Atom" is based, however, is: "Whatever can happen, inevitably will happen." This statement obviously can have no standing as a scientific or technological fact, and consequently has no merit in any form of scientific analysis. It has no meaning to the scientists or engineer in his professional role.

Another assumption that the reader must take if he is to accept the conclusions of this volume is that the scientific method is not required to prove the truth of natural law or to provide that understanding which is requisite to bring natural systems under as-

ured human control. All that is necessary is "feeling the truth." Clearly, this approach makes fewer intellectual demands on the subject than exposition to the scientific method and its conclusions. Moreover, the scientific method may leave a member of the lay culture emotionally cold, while the succession of emotional impacts involved in the book's declaratory approach to truth involves him emotionally and gives him a visceral feel that this is indeed the truth.

Before the reader can even open the cover, the principal conclusion of the book has been heralded and it is immediately repeated on the title page—the peaceful atom is perilous. To continue this shock treatment, the next page states, "This book is dedicated to tomorrow's children." Had these first two pages not already signaled the course the book was to take, the next page, the Table of Contents, most certainly would do so. It would be hard to imagine a more blatantly Madison Avenue list of chapter titles than those displayed here. They dispel at once any hope that the book might present rational and objective and understandable information. Thus, the title of the foreword is "In Defense of Fear". The chapter headings sound like the titles of Class B movies of the 40's and 50's including such gems of objectivity as "That Goose That Laid the Radioactive Egg", "Thresholds of Agony", "The Thousand-Year Curse", "Don't Bother Running" . . .

The book drums away with such phrases as: "The menace of nuclear power", "the hazards of nuclear power", "the dangers of nuclear power", "nuclear calamity", "the deadly process of nuclear power", "the atom's nuclear garbage" . . . on goes the chant and eventually the reader's mind is supposed to yield to the hypnotic spell, the induced "belief" becomes ascendant. And with belief achieved, the call to political action promises an almost certain favorable response.

But can this acutely annoying technique of repeated psychological threats of ever-impending doom, strung together with half-truths, honest misunderstandings, and similar "authoritative" evidence offered in substantiation of the validity of the declarative threats, actually succeed? With the members of the scientific and technological community, the answer is "No."

With a considerable number of the members of the lay culture, however, the technique is sure to be successful. The "declaratory" process is one to which they have become thoroughly conditioned. They believe in the "declared" marvels of the latest deodorant and of all the other declared wonders propounded over and over on radio and television and in the magazines and daily press, from the time they get up until bedtime. They have come to prefer authority because it takes so much less mental wear and tear than choosing the right one. And now this book, using this familiar conditioning technique, "answers" the nagging questions that occasionally arise about "these atom bomb power plants."

There are, however, many people who, while not professional members of the scientific and technological culture, are nonetheless, by native interest and ability and to some extent by training, more closely akin to it than they are to the lay culture. These people may be completely baffled by this book. While to correct all the downright errors in it and to remedy all of the mistaken impressions it gives would require more space than is available for this review, some few comments must be made because of specific errors or injustices, and these may provide some guidelines by which these individuals will find it possible to answer for themselves the host of questions that cannot be answered here.

The reviewers were dismayed to note that none of the individuals cited in the "Acknowledgments" appears to be qualified in the technical aspects of atomic power plants. With adequate technical guidance, the authors could have avoided many glaring er-

rors. It is not our intention to make a catalog of these, but merely to point out a few of the more significant mistakes. One particularly disturbing mistake is the equating [e.g. in Chapter IV] of the reactor fission products with bomb fission products without even noting that the release of fission products in any conceivable reactor accident creates a physical situation entirely different from that associated with any atomic bomb explosion. The manner of dissemination of the fission products, their chemical form, etc., are entirely different. And being different, the associated hazards are quite different.

The authors are completely at sea in discussing curies. One curie of a particular substance may present only one-billionth of the biological hazard of one curie of another substance. One just doesn't add up numbers and bandy them around to suit his prejudices as the authors appear to do.

As another example of the authors' technical naivete, the reviewers noted a number of instances where the authors assume that an increase in reactor power level carries with it a directly proportionate increase in the associated hazards. This is simply not true. Different type reactors have different hazards associated with their operation. Even when comparing two reactors of the same type but operating at different power levels, the hazards don't necessarily double if the power level is doubled. In other words, the site and environment, the engineered safeguards, the operational plan, and all other details must be considered in the safety evaluation of each reactor. Unless you get into these details, you really cannot understand the problem.

Another example of the authors' failure to appreciate a technical point is in their discussion of the views of the advisory committee on reactor as safeguards [Chapter VIII]. The "power density" is not the same as the power level. The difference is enormously important in the discussion of reactor safety. Because the authors do not seem to appreciate this, the discussion is misleading. In the same connection, the authors' statement about scaling up the power level of a reactor, that it "amounts to an entire new technology", is not generally correct; it just depends on how the scaling up is done.

A lack of understanding also leads the authors to imply that there is a shady discrepancy between the cost estimate given by the Chairman of the AEC for decommissioning a power reactor and the AEC General Manager's cost estimate for decommissioning another reactor. The figures are different simply because reactors of two different types are involved. [The difference in power level is not the significant difference.] Without some comprehension of the technical aspects of decommissioning, any discussion of costs is meaningless.

All radioactivity looks alike to the authors. In Chapter VIII, they discuss shipments of radioactive fuels, "capsules" radium, etc. in such a mixed-up way that it is unclear what they are concerned about. The tragic story of the radio-cobalt capsule has nothing to do with the safety of nuclear reactors, nor is it relevant to the shipment of wastes. Nor are the trivial comments in the same chapter on paper studies of atomic-powered dirigibles.

In Chapter XVI, the authors consider what the available uranium fuel supply will be in the future. This is a complex and highly technical problem that is treated very superficially. The conclusion that there won't be enough uranium to sustain the projected nuclear power program at a profitable level is at variance with the conclusions of many others. We would only comment that the authors have chosen to make pessimistic and unrealistic assumptions in their discussion. Again, the presentation misleads the reader with "facts" about future nuclear power, which are at best biased "guesstimates".

In connection with future energy resources, the reviewers were surprised at the superficial, almost evasive, discussion of the

problems associated with increasing use of fossil fuel. Sulphur and fly ash pollution difficulties were mentioned, but no mention was made of the really significant problem arising due to increasing the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Effects of such increases on the earth's heat balance will result in irreversible ecological changes of enormous relevance to human life. These are not even touched on in this book, although they are vitally important to any consideration of future energy production.

The reviewers conclude that this book is not a balanced account of the safety aspects of present and future nuclear power production. It is strictly a biased, misleading, sensational political tract. It constitutes a public disservice. We are sorry to see it published, not just because it is a bad book, but because we sincerely feel that a factual, balanced, honest discussion of the problems of nuclear power, as they really are, is badly needed by the public. It could be written. The authors' assertion in Chapter XIX that "vital information about the atomic power program has been obscured from public consciousness" is false. There is a vast amount of information in the public domain. As far as the reviewers know, there is no significant information about the atomic power program that has not been made public. However, the task of integrating this into a book that will be a source-book for public policy discussion and determination will require an order of understanding and a degree of impartiality that the authors of *The Perils of the Peaceful Atom* simply have not exercised.

REVIEW OF THE CARELESS ATOM

(By Theos J. Thompson)

There is a great need for public understanding of the problems we face as a nation in developing adequate sources of electrical power over the next years. The advent of nuclear power has given us an alternate fuel source with some advantages and some disadvantages when compared with coal or oil. Reliable information, full dispassionate discussion, and carefully drawn arguments are needed to help in achieving sound public understanding and, ultimately, in making the correct decisions as to the direction of our future electrical power growth.

The debates, the discussions, and the books covering the various aspects of the problems of how much power we need, and from what sources, should continue to be open and searching for at least a number of years. There is a real need for honest, thoughtful books by qualified authors on these problems.

But there is no need for the distortion of facts and half truths and unqualified opinions which dot the book, *The Careless Atom* by Sheldon Novick. It is a pity that this first book on the subject did not review the provisions made for reactor safety factually and fully. The implications throughout the book are that almost nothing is being done about reactor safety and that only Mr. Novick stands between the general public and disaster. An ad for the book in the New York Times Book Review, March 2, 1969, by the Houghton Mifflin Company reads:

"The Hiroshima bomb is alive—and ticking—in Indian Point. Atoms for peace can blow us to pieces! When electricity is produced by an atomic reactor, the danger is equivalent to a fused H-bomb."

This statement, evidently written by the publisher, since I can't find it in the book, is completely and utterly false. The author of the book, it seems to me, must also bear some responsibility for letting his publisher advertise in this irresponsible manner. I state categorically the reactors at Indian Point cannot be made to behave like bombs—to say nothing of fused H-bombs. Surely, the common sense of the neighbors of the Indian Point Reactors is such that they must realize that the separate safety and regulatory personnel of the AEC's Division of Reactor Regulation, with its 469 em-

ployees and inspectors laboring every day to insure reactor safety, would never permit a potential bomb to be located near them. The parents plus 22 close relatives of one of my MIT colleagues in Nuclear Engineering live within three miles of the plant and, though he is completely technically knowledgeable, he has no worries in regard to their safety. The greed of the publisher in trying for a best seller has completely overtaken his sense of responsibility for honesty and fair-mindedness.

Evidently, Mr. Novick has ambitions to become the Ralph Nader of the nuclear industry. Since safety has always been a fundamental principle of the nuclear reactor industry, he is a little late. There are literally hundreds of genuine experts who have been considering these problems for years. This is an irresponsible book in almost every way. In checking those quotations which I could, I have so far not found a single one which has not been taken out of context, often shortened, to distort or totally change its original meaning.

For instance, Dr. Alvin Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, wrote an article titled "Today's Revolution" in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. XII No. 8, 1956. That was the second year of free exchange of nuclear reactor information after the Eisenhower "Atoms for Peace" Conference in 1955. It was before any civilian reactors were built and this explains why the first paragraph quoted below talks of an "unborn technology". He said:

"My purpose in this essay will be to offer some rational explanation for the extraordinary role which an unborn technology—civilian nuclear power—now plays in public affairs. The viability of the technology cannot be demonstrated until substantial amounts of economic electricity are generated, and this has not yet occurred; still the tremendous impact of the technology on public affairs is undeniable, as the great interest in the Geneva Conference for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy showed.

"There are three quite separate explanations for this curious situation. The first has to do with the connection between nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. *There is an understandable drive on the part of men of good will to build up the positive aspects of nuclear energy simply because the negative aspects are so distressing.*"

The italicized sentence serves as the frontispiece for the book *The Careless Atom*. The quotation is thus completely distorted as the frontispiece of a book purporting to describe nuclear reactors, not nuclear weapons.

Dr. Weinberg's views on the subject being discussed are more nearly reflected in a speech he gave in Sao Paulo, Brazil on November 29, 1963:

"In discussing the social responsibility of science we tend to stress the recognizable dangers to society that technical mistakes would cause. The tendency is to pressure scientists and technologists into *not* trying new schemes because of their evident danger. I believe this is the force of both Rachel Carson's views with respect to insecticides, and of the views of some of the detractors of nuclear energy.

"But there are social consequences, sometimes of an even grave sort, if the technologists does nothing. The new technologies of abundance—abundant power, abundant water, abundant food—convey danger with them. But I believe the new technologies of abundance are mankind's only hope of buying time necessary to stave off the catastrophe of Malthus. It would be well if the problem of resources—i.e., how ultimately to deal with the population explosion—could be solved cleanly and sharply, without compromise or danger. This, unfortunately, does not seem to be the way of the world. The means available to man to solve the problem of pop-

ulation pressure are tainted, even as W. Jacobs' Magical Monkey's Paw that granted its owner three wishes was cursed.

"I continue to be optimistic that science contains a means for removing the taint and the danger. We are deeply concerned with the biological hazards of radiation, both somatic and genetic. Yet, as the examples I have given suggest, we are making significant progress in understanding these problems and with understanding should come an ultimate means of control. We are concerned with the dangers of reactors, yet we continue to make striking progress in the technology of containment, not to speak of the technology of waste disposal. More Generally, with deeper understanding of ecology and insect physiology will come answers to the Rachel Carson problem, or to the general problem of physical insult to the biosphere that seems to be a major untoward byproduct of our ever pervading technology.

"We nuclear scientists have no choice but to view our social responsibility constructively—as the imperative to seek out technical answers to the taints which mar our new technology. We can then look forward with confidence to science providing the means for an abundant and peaceful world with instrumentalities that are untainted—in short, are both socially responsible and scientifically effective."

At the present time, this nation and the world are examining again the Malthusian catastrophe mentioned by Dr. Weinberg. A number of predictions have recently appeared setting the crisis period within this century. When it comes, it will probably not be with a roll of thunder and flashes of lightning, either manmade or heaven sent, but quietly and stealthily.

Even in this country, we can now begin to see the forerunners of the problem. Our waters, which we have used so freely and so carelessly, are polluted and in short supply. Our air is becoming hazy and full of smog. The increase in carbon dioxide content in the air may be affecting the rate of energy absorption from the sun and hence perhaps affecting our ability to raise food and obtain water. Indirectly then, our demands for a higher standard of living, the better life, are hastening the advent of the Malthusian crisis. Certainly, the combination of these demands for higher living standards, combined with the population growth, cannot help but have serious effects on the ecology. We must soon face some grave national and worldwide issues that will not go away. They will grow and engulf us unless we conquer them first.

An important facet of the problem is the growing demand for electrical power. Future projections based on the present rate of growth of power demand are fantastically large. A fair fraction of this new load consists of modern conveniences such as air conditioning, electrical heating cooking, electrical space heating. Even in the northern part of the United States, the peak load demands in large cities now fall in the summer during hot humid weather when everyone has their air conditioners on. Each year the consumers of electricity press harder on the electrical generating and distributing systems of the country, both private and public. Peak electrical capacity is pushed to the limit by the demands. In some areas, electricity must be brought from long distances to meet these demands. Older equipment falls faster under the strain. Construction delays in building new electrical plants become critical items in the public interest.

Amidst all of these demands there has arisen a proper concern for conservation. Those of us who are interested in preserving nature as it was, deplore the pollution of our rivers and air, the replacement of field and forest by subdivisions and factories, and the loss of the chance to be alone with nature. We do not like to see unsightly power lines or to see our rivers grow warmer. But those of us who understand even the vague

outlines of the complexity of the overall problem, know that there is no easy solution. Groups and individuals are trying to attack various phases of this complex network of problems. But almost no one is trying to achieve a balanced view of the overall problem.

The power generating plants of the country are caught in the middle—squeezed by demands for more power, cheaper power and more reliable power—and squeezed by demands for no change in the ecology or the beauties of nature. Often these conflicting demands come from one and the same person or group.

The electrical power generating and distribution industry has only one primary goal—to supply reliable inexpensive electrical power as demanded. They are not advocates for any particular method of generating electricity, be it by use of heat from the nucleus, coal, oil or candles. A survey of the major reactor fabricators indicates that they are involved as suppliers of conventional coal and oil fired plant components as well as nuclear reactor components. The movement of these fabricators and the utilities into the nuclear power field has been taken to follow what appears to be a better and cheaper way to make electrical power. In general, they have no special axe to grind. In fact, both utility managements and the fabricator managements are moving only gradually into the nuclear field following favorable experience with the first generation plants and pending experience with the second generation plants being built now.

Oil and coal fired plants help to create some smog and some contamination of the atmosphere, possibly causing increased disease incidence. The fly ash must be disposed of. The coal piles are unsightly. A nuclear plant is cleaner and does not cause air pollution, but such plants to date release some routine amounts of radioactivity resulting in increased radiation levels—but the increase is small compared to the levels already found in nature to which we are exposed all the time. (It is surprising to find that many people are not aware that each of us since the beginning of time, has had radioactivity contained within his own body, that it is present in varying degrees in the materials we come in contact with every day, not to mention daily bombardment by cosmic rays from outer space.)

Definitive studies of the effects of smog and air pollution on human lives are difficult to make in an unambiguous way. Studies of the effects of low levels of radiation are also difficult to make. I know of no good studies which attempt to compare the possible effects of these two separate problems. It is possible to reduce the amount of smoke or radioactivity emerging from a power plant, at a cost. How much reduction is worthwhile to protect us adequately without going to ridiculous and extremely costly methods—which are ultimately charged to us in our electrical bills? Both coal miners and uranium miners are afflicted with occupational diseases. Reactors require special and often quite costly safety precautions which increase the capital cost of the plants and tends to make coal more competitive. These problems and many others, often similar, sometimes differing, go into decisions to choose a coal fired or a nuclear plant. It is a complex problem. This newly available source of power, the nuclear reactor, is still undergoing changes, modifications, improvements, and size increases. Coal fired plants are being modified to trap more of the emitted smoke and fly ash. New mining methods are being developed. But we can perhaps conclude some things even now.

The presence of a competitive alternative source of heat has had an impact on the cost of electricity and has challenged the coal industry to modernize and become a better competitor. The experience with power reactors to date has been generally encourag-

ing. Clearly, it would be a grave disservice to the country and the world to eliminate, without a many year test, this new and important alternate power source. Its elimination will be principally in the interests of one group—the coal industry. We need experience with these plants. Not all will run equally well. Some unfavorable experience must be anticipated. We must have patience. We must watch developments. We must be careful.

The general tone of *The Careless Atom* is well illustrated by the dust jacket of the book which reads, "In principle nuclear reactors are dangerous. . . . In my mind, nuclear reactors do not belong on the surface of the earth", Edward Teller. Up to now, nuclear accidents have been relatively minor. How long can we hope to avoid major disaster?" The latter part of the dust jacket quote is not from Edward Teller but is presumably written by Sheldon Novick, the author of the book, although the uncritical reader might think both parts were written by Teller. On page 38, Teller is quoted in more detail as saying:

"In principle, nuclear reactors are dangerous. . . . By being careful, and also by good luck, we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents. In my mind, nuclear reactors do not belong on the surface of the earth. Nuclear reactors belong underground."

Now we begin to see the true thrust of Edward Teller's arguments. Although no special friend of nuclear power reactors, he states in the more complete text that "we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents." The abbreviated quote on the dust jacket is a part of a longer quote presenting a statement arguing for underground containment of reactors. The complete text of this statement in the original reference is: E. Teller, "Energy from Oil and from the Nucleus", *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, p. 506, May 1965. Edward Teller acknowledges in the complete text that "we have so far avoided all serious nuclear accidents". He attributed this to "being careful, and also by good luck".

This reviewer believes that it is very largely by being careful and only to a very small extent due to good luck. On page 1 of *The Technology of Nuclear Reactor Safety*, I wrote in 1964:

"Safety has been an important consideration from the very beginning of the development of nuclear reactors. On December 2, 1942 when the first atomic reactor was brought to criticality, Enrico Fermi had already made safety an important part of the experiment. In addition to a shutoff rod, other emergency procedures for shutting down the pile were prepared in advance. Fermi also considered the safety aspects of reactor operation. Shortly before the reactor was expected to reach criticality, Fermi noted the mounting tension of the crew. To make sure that the operation was carried out in a calm and considered manner, he directed that the experiment be shut down and that all adjourn for lunch. With such leadership in safety at the very beginning, it is no wonder that the operation of reactors to date has been singularly free of mishaps.

I have seen no reason to change that view today, five years later.

On page 11 of *The Careless Atom*, Novick writes:

"In 1964, T. J. Thompson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology wrote that there had been nine serious reactivity accidents since 1949 in nonmilitary installations alone. 'To date, nine (reactor fuel) cores have been destroyed or seriously damaged. Three reactors have been put out of action by accidents and never revived.' Late in 1966 there was still another serious accident, at the Enrico Fermi plant at Lagoona Beach, Michigan; as we shall see, this accident was potentially the most serious of all."

The actual text on page 699 of *The Tech-*

nology of Nuclear Reactor Safety reads:

"To date, nine cores have been destroyed or seriously damaged. Of these only two (Borax-1 and Spert-1 destructive tests) can be said to have been destroyed on purpose as a part of a test. Three reactors have been put out of action by accidents and never revived. Two of these, Windscale No. 1 and the SL-1, were deemed beyond reasonable repair. The third, Clementine, had really reached the end of its useful life and was no longer believed to be a competitive research tool. It was dismantled and replaced by another higher flux research reactor—the OWR.

Again Novick has distorted the original text by adding the words, "in nonmilitary installations alone" and taking out sections of the complete text. In fact, no serious reactor accidents at military reactor installations have occurred, unless the SL-1 is considered a military reactor, and it is included in my tabulation. *The Careless Atom* quotes these volumes again several times partially or in a distorted manner.

I am concerned, as the Technical Editor of these volumes and as an author as well, at having the meanings of the writings of the various authors distorted by partial out-of-context quotes. While I have not had time to investigate the correct statements of all of those quoted in Mr. Novick's text, my investigations to date indicate that the cases quoted above are typical. For instance, Mr. Novick quotes part of the minority opinion in the Enrico Fermi Supreme Court Hearing, but not the majority opinion. I am especially concerned when this man not trained in nuclear reactor technology, on his own authority then makes such statements as:

"A reactor like the one planned for Bodega is a complex and temperamental device, under the best of circumstances. It would seem unreasonable to expect such a device to go on functioning safely during an earthquake yet this is precisely what the designers of the PG and E plant intended. (p. 38) or "Although present reactors could, at least in principle, be made safe and clean, it is hard to see how the far greater difficulties of the fast breeder are to be solved."

Mr. Novick's background as a Program Administrator of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis scarcely qualify him to deliver with such authority these opinions on complex and weighty technical matters. Clearly, this book should be read with caution.

As I indicated earlier, safety has been an important consideration from the very beginning of the development of nuclear reactors. The need to insure that large quantities of fission products would not be released to the general environment was recognized early. The AEC acknowledged the importance of this consideration by creating a Reactor Safeguards Committee. Later, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of Congress formalized this action by making the Committee statutory, and thus independent of any influence from the Atomic Energy Commission or from the Joint Committee itself. Thus, with great foresight and wisdom, they created an independent committee of knowledgeable citizens with the sole responsibility to protect the safety interests of the public. In addition, the Commission itself early established a separate Division of Reactor Regulation under the direction of Harold Price which has extensive technical knowledge and which investigated in detail the safety of each proposed reactor. Each power reactor is given a third hearing review by a separate and independent Hearing Board. In fact, a much more true book on the present situation might be titled, "The Careful Atom". Certainly any implication in the book title that safety matters are being treated lightly by anyone, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of

Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, the reactor industry, or the utilities is totally false. Any utility or reactor fabricator can testify and provide facts which document the measures taken and level of expenditures provided to assure reactor safety. Further, I can state that no one within the AEC itself or outside of it has ever tried to influence my personal technical judgment on any reactor license application when I was a member of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, nor have they tried to impede the open and honest consideration of all of the facets of reactor safety considered in the writing of the two volumes titled *The Technology of Nuclear Reactor Safety*. In fact, the AEC reviewers have generally demanded more material and more complete coverage—not less, and certainly, not a muffled coverage.

This comment brings me to one of my chief concerns about this book. Appearance of a book of this sort, which changes the meaning of quoted statements by partial omissions and by taking them out of context and which then adds nonauthoritative opinions as authoritative conclusions, makes almost impossible the task of the engineer and scientist who is trying to prepare an honest safety evaluation or safety technical document.

Safety deliberations by their very nature must consider accidents and their consequences. If one were to talk about an earthquake in the San Francisco Bay area of the magnitude of the design earthquake considered at the Bodega Head reactor plant, many thousands of people would be killed, bridges would probably be in ruin and many buildings would be rubble. Yet the reactor involved was to be designed to withstand such an earthquake "without loss of function." To my best knowledge, no one has deliberated the consequences of a very severe earthquake to the entire population of the San Francisco Bay area. Such questions have only thus far been raised in regard to nuclear power reactors. No consideration has ever been given to establishing a national level of acceptable safety from the consequences of disasters resulting from natural or man-made causes. Such deliberations should be initiated. The nuclear reactor safety deliberations represent one of the first times that the facts concerning conjectures on the consequences of such occurrences have been available to the public. If people like Mr. Novick distort honest attempts to put into the public record and to educate those who need to know about reactor safety, there will be a great tendency to be less open in putting such records in the public domain. No bridge, no sky-scraper, no baseball park, no air field has ever been built without some safety considerations involved. Almost never do these reach the attention of the public. Yet in the consideration of nuclear reactor installations, these are made a matter of public record much more openly than in almost any other present engineering situation. It can be argued that Mr. Novick has done a grave disservice to his fellow citizens by presenting such a distorted document that he will discourage responsible engineers and scientists from further attempts at full open and honest public disclosures.

There is a need for a continuing dialogue on the relative merits of the various types of possible electrical power sources available to mankind. The best solution to the increasing electrical power demands is to reverse our increasing population trend and stabilize our population. But even then, people will probably continue to add air conditioning, new electrical gadgets, perhaps electrical cars. No one suggests or considers cutting back in their own usage of electricity. Therefore, our electrical power needs will continue to rise in the foreseeable future. The question we must answer is, "where does it come from—nuclear, coal, oil, a combination, or something else?"

RESCUING CHILDREN BEFORE SCARS OF POVERTY BECOME INDELIBLE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times earlier this week printed a story about a small town in northeast Vermont which has done something about the children of its poor families.

Testimony before my own subcommittee, the General Subcommittee on Education, has proved beyond question the enormous gains to be made by reaching young children with educational experiences even before they start to school.

It occurred to me that my colleagues would be equally interested in the work of this small community. I know that the efforts of the good people of Barton, Vt., are being repeated in countless communities and neighborhoods across America. Unfortunately, however, we do not have an opportunity to hear about these successes. But it is these very successes, despite their lack of publicity, that will help immeasurably to determine our course for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times article of July 15 follows:

RESCUING CHILDREN BEFORE SCARS OF POVERTY BECOME INDELIBLE
(By Lisa Hammel)

BARTON, Vt.—This town of a little more than 1,000 people in the northeast corner of the state has a scattering of stores on the main street that ends suddenly in cows. Traditional New England white clapboard houses thin out on the edge of town, nestling singly in rising hills that are green velvet under summer sun.

About 100 yards along a quiet road that leads off from the main street is an old farmhouse half surrounded by shadowed woods. At the back of the farmhouse is a playground, filled on a sunny day with children racing around on tricycles, swinging vigorously, pushing doll carriages, running and laughing.

An onlooker would assume that it was a nursery school until he noticed something a little odd: most of the children would be too young for school, for among them are infants gurgling on blankets and fat-legged little toddlers lurching happily across the playground.

If the visitor had been glancing over the fence last summer, he would have observed something even stranger, and not a little disturbing: children obviously old enough to walk, who did not seem able to; children silent and sullen in a corner of the yard; children listlessly playing with the equipment; children grabbing violently and greedily at the toys, as if they would never have another chance at them.

For this is not a nursery school. It is an experimental center for deprived children of very poor families in this area. And the children range in age from infancy up to 3. The Barton Parent and Child Center, as it is called, is one of 36 pilot projects begun in 1967 as a unit of Project Head Start to deal with the physical, intellectual and emotional problems of disadvantaged children under 3.

The federally funded project had its beginnings in the discovery that many children entering the Head Start program for 3- and 4-year-olds were suffering from the results not only of medical and nutritional neglect,

but of intellectual and emotional neglect as well.

HELP MUST COME EARLY

To prevent children from being seriously crippled in their later development, many experts had begun to believe something would have to be done from the moment the child entered the world, and even before, in prenatal care.

The 36 centers, each awarded a renewable one-year grant of \$175,000, are scattered in urban and rural areas throughout the 50 states—including one center on an Indian reservation and another in a migrant workers' camp.

Each has a slightly differing point of emphasis, according to the needs of the community it serves, but there are a few factors common to all. The primary focus is on helping the babies and little children through physical care and affectionate and stimulating attention; the secondary focus is generally on helping the parents or the mothers in whatever ways they seem to need it most.

In this sense, the Vermont operation can be considered typical.

The center is situated in what Vermonters call the Northeast Kingdom—a rather ironic designation for three depressed counties in the northeast quarter of the state near the Canadian border. In Orleans County, of which Barton is the center, and where there are probably more cows than people, the per capita income is about \$1,600 a year, less than half the national average.

The poverty in this area ranks with that of Appalachia, with one additional disadvantage. The winters here are long and bitter, and there are families that cannot afford to heat their dilapidated, dirt-floor shacks. There are few jobs, and there are generally seasonal and poorly paid.

The Barton Parent and Child Center found that it could not even begin helping the children until the chaos in the lives of the 70 or so families it had enlisted in the program was ameliorated a little.

The 10 to 12 family aides hired by the center spent much of their time at first introducing fearful and disorganized mothers to some of the basics of housekeeping, while the professional staff utilized connections with antipoverty agencies and other state operations to relieve some of the worst of the hunger and other physical needs that poverty, isolation and ignorance had produced.

Linda Wright, one of the family aides, went to visit one of her more secure families on a recent morning.

Mrs. Wright, who, like all the other aides, is a mother herself and comes from the area, has had a sufficient taste of poverty to understand it from the bone out.

All of the aides were given preliminary training in subjects that ranged from health care to children's games—a training that continues as they work at the center with the youngsters, who generally each come one day a week, or go around to visit their assigned quota of families, and play with the children in their homes.

The home of Gerry Renard, a sagging yellow clapboard house with an overgrown front yard, just off the main street of Barton, was said to be among the best of the houses that the P.C.C. families live in.

A WOMAN WITH ADVANTAGES

Mrs. Renard has several other advantages. She has a husband who lives with her, unlike about 85 per cent of the mothers, and who is employed, in a local sawmill. And she is within walking distance of stores. Many of the families live on back roads miles from a town and are too poor to afford any kind of transportation.

The small kitchen with its tattered linoleum where her four children, aged 1 to 4, awaited Mrs. Wright's visit, was crowded with a large table on which lay a mammoth pile of dirty clothes that Mrs. Renard endlessly

sorted. In the next room her elderly stepfather sat silently, leafing through newspapers. An overwhelming and acrid smell of dampness filled the rooms.

The children played, a little restlessly, with the bag of toys Mrs. Wright had brought. At one point, William, the 4-year-old, began violently beating the toy figure of a child.

He explained, when questioned, that he was hitting it because "her cried."

The aide said later that the Renard children were wildly destructive with the toys at first, but eventually they had come to understand that Mrs. Wright would bring the bag of goodies back with her each week, and they began to play more calmly with them.

Some of the mothers like to watch or join in when the aide comes on her weekly visit, but some, it was reported, are so jealous of the attention being paid to the children, it is difficult for the aide to do anything.

The children of these families, it was explained, are rarely talked to or played with by their parents. Often communication is limited to a beating.

What kinds of differences has the program begun to make to the children of the 70 or so poor families in the area who are involved in the project, most of them for about a year now?

Penny Wetherell, whose year-old daughter attended the center, now works there under the aegis of the Youth Corps. She said that when she first came, the children seemed "so pathetic" she didn't think she could continue.

But she did, and after a while children who "didn't know how to play and didn't even know what a fairy tale was" began to be more responsive.

There were health bonuses too. "They started gaining weight," she said, "and got color in their cheeks and, many of them who couldn't, learned to walk. We also potty-trained most of them. I think just love and understanding makes that much difference."

Denise LeTourneau, who started last summer as an aide and is now supervisor of the center, said that at first the children "were very shy and sort of closed within themselves."

"Within just two weeks," she said, "the change was so big."

PLAY AND SPEECH IMPROVEMENTS

The hyperaggressive children, she said, began to play better in groups. The inarticulate children, who "weren't asking for anything—just pointing or grunting," began to speak.

"And they all got a lot cleaner," she said. Washing and baths are a regular part of the program.

"At the beginning," Mrs. LeTourneau continued, "there really weren't any make-believe games. It took some time for them to begin to play imaginatively."

"They are just starting to build barns and castles or use a block as an animal or a truck. And the girls are just starting to play house or mothers."

"The sense of fantasy," said Mrs. LeTourneau, "developed through reading books to them and also by visiting with them and playing with them in their homes."

"Before," she added, "they didn't have anyone but the mothers."

BOULDER AND FLAGPOLE DEDICATION

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently the employees of the Robbins Co. of Attleboro, Mass., dedi-

cated a memorial boulder and flagpole on the O'Neill Boulevard lawn of their factory.

The purpose of this dedication—the affirmation of faith in this Nation and its ideals—should not be overlooked in this time of national doubt. The words of Mr. Robert H. Sweet at the dedication are well worth notice, and I submit the following article on the dedication for the benefit of my colleagues:

ROBBINS CO. DEDICATED BOULDER AND FLAGPOLE

Many employees of the Robbins Company were on hand Saturday forenoon for the dedication of a memorial boulder and flagpole on the O'Neill Boulevard lawn of the Attleboro factory, which manufactures jewelry and emblems. A color guard from the Attleboro Veterans Council, with Oscar Watters in charge, was also on hand for the ceremony.

Pres. Robert H. Sweet spoke briefly after introduction by Personnel Director Thomas Marino, and Ernest Falardeau, an employee of the company, raised the flag; the honor went to him because he recently lost a son, Robert, in action in the Vietnam War.

President Sweet spoke as follows: "Today when the loyalty of the American citizenry is a topic of general conversation discussed in the same breath with baseball scores and political issues; when oil companies and veterans organizations are waging campaigns to have Americans display their flag.

"It seems fitting and right that we the People of the Robbins Company somehow show that we are loyal Americans.

"For this reason we have decided to dedicate this flag on flag day during the 275th anniversary of Attleboro, the city in which we work.

"All of us know or have heard of someone who has given their life for our country. All of us here, have either served in some branch of the armed forces or have had a relative or friend that has, and for those of us who haven't served in the armed forces, have done something for our country in our own way.

"Therefore the purpose of this flag dedication today, is to honor all loyal American citizens who have served our country, from medal of honor recipients to housewives, mothers and everyday good Americans."

TIMBER

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been introduced during the 91st Congress several bills to provide a revised timber management program on certain Federal public lands. I have received considerable mail from conservationists in opposition to the pending bills, including H.R. 12440. The general feeling is that the proposed legislation is both undesirable and unnecessary. For my part I am greatly concerned about the impact of this legislation, if adopted, upon the fish and wildlife resources in the timber lands which would be affected by the proposed new management program.

The June issue of the magazine National Parks, the publication of the National Parks Association, carried an editorial on this legislation by Anthony Wayne Smith, the association's president. So that my colleagues may be aware

of the views expressed by Mr. Smith, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TIMBER!

The timber interests having just launched a vigorous campaign for overcutting the national forests, we are moved to reminiscences and forecasts.

The national forest system arose out of widespread raids on the public domain which were leaving forests land in devastation. Gifford Pinchot was the most important figure among a handful of men who brought significant portions of the public lands into the forest reservations and eventually the national forests. Pinchot was an advocate of what we would now call ecological forestry (of which more below), and a bitter enemy of wholesale clearcutting.

Some twenty years or more ago we took part in the successful defense of the national forests against proposals for their surrender through the states to private interests, which were to return them to the Government, after cutting, to hold through the costly period of regrowth, and for eventual surrender again for private harvest and profit.

And more recently there were serious attacks in terms of certain large private grazing interests.

Now it is said to be a housing emergency; more lumber is needed; most of the remaining saw timber is in the national forests; the large private forest holdings have been heavily cut over; most of the small woodlots have been in ruin for generations.

This situation strikes us as a confession of bankruptcy on the part of the private corporate timber interests, and hardly a justification for stepping up the cut in the national forests at the expense of the future. We predict—we do not exhort, but merely predict—that conservationists and environmentalists will unite in opposing the increased cuts in the national forests.

A bad situation in the private timber lands ought not to be pinned on housing. In this day and age there are plenty of other materials if lumber is really short. And perhaps it is not so short, and someone should take a hard look at the lumber inventories of the large corporations. Recent sharp rises and drops in lumber prices more than hint at a privately administered price and supply situation.

II

Confusion between private and public property also seems to have arisen at Mineral King in Sequoia National Forest in California.

We are wholly in favor of the use of the national forests for the kind of natural outdoor camping recreation which has been typical in the national forests in the past.

We have never questioned a reasonable use of the national forests for skiing; we have favored cross-country skiing, non-mechanized, in both national parks and national forests. But when it comes to enormous resorts like Mineral King with a splurge of mechanical ski lifts, a cityful of so-called chalets, the inevitable shopping centers, attendant parking lots, even though at a distance, and the logistics of big highways, the discourse drops to a lower level.

We still think the Forest Service should abandon Mineral King as not in keeping with sound recreational development in the national forests. We think the Department of the Interior should rescind permission to construct an access highway across an arm of Sequoia National Park. We recommend to the prospective concessioner that it withdraw from the enterprise in the interest of its own public relations. And we think conservationists should continue to oppose the project.

It is not just Mineral King; it is the example which will be set for similar developments in other national forests. Simple campgrounds for natural outdoor recreation are one thing; building up vested private inter-

ests in big construction is another; subsidizing concessioners with huge roads and sanitary facilities is yet another. Mineral King moves in the wrong direction and ought to be stopped.

III

The laws governing the national forests provide authority, among other things, for multiple-use management.

We always thought this arrangement was good and will continue to support it. If the traffic which is smothering our national parks, to the injury of what people seek there, is to be mitigated, recreational facilities must be provided outside the parks, and among other places in the commercial cutting areas of the national forests. If timber-harvest and recreation are to be reconciled under the heading of multiple use, harvesting has to be by compatible methods.

Not only for recreational reasons, but for the sake of soil, waters, wildlife, scenery, and most certainly the perpetual yield of wood and wood products, ecological forestry must become the norm. In recent years the harvesting of forest products has been linked too heavily to the convenience of big machinery; it has trended away from selective cutting to clear-cutting; this trend must be reversed. There needs to be a wider understanding that selective cutting was once regarded as the standard of excellence by good foresters; that forests can be managed and timber harvested in ways not incompatible with considerations of recreation, wildlife, and scenery. The journals of the conservation movement, ours among others, should dedicate themselves to such education.

And it is also time we got going on a reforestation program in America. The relations provided by the timber interests in connection with the present overcutting program should shock us as a nation into action.

The national forests are in relatively good condition because the principle of sustained yield has never been wholly abandoned. There are enormous areas of privately-owned land, however, often in large tracts, which were cut in such manner as to leave them unproductive. Small holdings all over the continent, including farm wood lots, have been timber-mined and high-graded to the point where little remains but brush. Complex economic and legal problems are involved but are not so difficult as to defy solution.

We think that the present Administration should have a look at the timber problem as a whole, refrain from being stampeded by pressures for quick solutions which solve nothing, and offer the nation some plans based on the protection of present public holdings against overcutting and recreational commercialization, and for ecological forestry and vigorous reforestation.

The growing awareness of the significance of the entire environment in the life of the nation would ensure a cordial response and strong support for such a forward-looking forestry program.

HOI POLLOI: DO NOT DISTURB MARCUSE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HOI POLLOI: DON'T DISTURB MARCUSE

(By Eric Hoffer)

The anti-Americanism of the foreign intellectual stems not from his fear of the debasing effect America might have on literature, art, music, the cinema, etc., but its effect on the masses. We see again and again

how the Americanization of a country results in the deproletarianization of the workingman.

Americanization means the stiffening of the workingman's backbone, and the sharpening of his appetites. He not only begins to believe that he is as good as anyone else, but wants to live and look like anyone else. The Americanization of a society amounts to giving it a classless aspect, the sapping of its aristocratic traditions, the diffusion of a sameness which has all the earmarks of equality. And it is this that the foreign intellectual fears and resents.

He not only feels the loss of the grandiose background of mute masses ranged in their millions behind him, but he is also deprived of the aristocratic climate which he feels is vital for the realization and exercise of his creative talents. It is to him a drab, uninspiring world where every mother's son thinks himself as good as anyone else, and the capacity for reverence and worship has become atrophied.

Scratch any foreign intellectual, even one who has lived for decades among us, and you find a would-be aristocrat who loathes the sight, the sound, the smell of common folk. Take Professor Marcuse. This self-styled savior of humanity came to this country in 1934, a refugee from Hitler's Germany.

He has lived among us for over 30 years, and now, in his old age, his disenchantment with this country is spilling over, into book after book. When you brush aside the Hegelian double-talk and the philosophical claptrap you discover what it is that is ailing him.

In plain English, Prof. Marcuse is offended by the degree to which common people in America are allowed to intrude into the sphere of life which ought to be the preserve of chosen spirits: "to break the peace wherever there is still peace and silence, to be ugly and ugly things, to ooze familiarity, to offend against good form."

Nowhere on this continent is there a spot where Marcuse can escape the sight, the sound and the smell of the vulgar, common Americans.

Last summer the professor went to Venice. The place was full of Americans and Americanized vulgarians. In an interview with a reporter for *Il Tempo*, Marcuse wondered whether Venice could not be reserved for high-class tourism, so that the *hoi polloi* would not disturb its solemn beauty.

Marcuse was born in Berlin in 1898. He was in his thirties in the days of the Weimar Republic. As one of the far left he probably fought the democratic republic as a sham and a swindle and worked for its destruction. Hitler did the destroying. It is worth noting that in 1956 Marcuse had no use for the Hungarian revolution.

EXTENDS CONGRATULATIONS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago last Saturday, July 19, 1969, Laos became an independent sovereign state within the French Union. On this memorable occasion, I would like to extend warm congratulations to His Excellency Souvanna Phouma, Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Laos; and His Excellency Khamking Souvanlasy, Ambassador of Laos to the United States.

The gentle people of Laos have yearned for independence for many years; her struggle has not yet ended.

The Laotians are descendants of Thai

tribes that pushed southward from China in the 13th century. Free of the bellicosity that characterizes her Vietnamese, Thai, and Chinese neighbors, the Laotians were unfortunately not free of their domination. By 1893, the French had replaced these powers in Indo-China, and Laos became part of the greater French protectorate.

With the onset of the second world war, Laos traded French hegemony for Japanese suzerainty. After the war, the French returned and with the support of the new Laotian dynasty of Luang Prabang ruled the country until 1949. During the Indo-China War of 1950-54, many Laotians who disputed the legitimacy of the Luang Prabang dynasty went to Vietnam under the leadership of Prince Souphannouvong and joined the Viet Minh to fight the French.

On October 22, 1953, the Laotians gained full sovereignty, and all special ties with the French were abolished by the Paris agreements of December 29, 1954.

Ever since, right- and left-wing factions have disputed the leadership of neutralist Prince Souvanno Phouma. We can only hope that the Government of Laos can resolve the differences without the kind of conflagration which is tearing its neighbor, Vietnam, apart.

With over 95 percent of her population engaged in agriculture and an annual per capita income of \$50, Laos easily qualified as one of the world's underdeveloped countries. The political hostilities have had a deep and unfortunate effect on the economy, and we hope that the burdens of poverty will soon be alleviated. Tin, green coffee, and wood are the nucleus of a hopefully expanding trade. Rice is her main staple.

We hope that the third decade of Laotian independence will be a peaceful and prosperous one.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WINNER

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I call attention to the activities and accomplishments of BAYALT, a Junior Achievement company, sponsored by Fisher Body, Pittsburgh.

The excellent education, training and experience provided by the Junior Achievement program is of inestimable value to these young achievers and to the future of our Nation. I invite the attention of my colleagues and submit for the RECORD at this time, an article on BAYALT from the Fisher Body Craftsman.

PLANT SPONSORED JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT COMPANY WINS MANY TOP AWARDS

BAYALT, one of the Fisher Body, Pittsburgh sponsored Junior Achievement companies, won the highly prized Company of the Year Award at the Mon-Yough J. A. Center in McKeesport. The award is based on the best overall performance in management, sales, attendance, company records, liquidation and annual report.

BAYALT achievers added the Company of the Year honors to an outstanding list of accomplishments for the year at the Center, which already included—Company of the Month in each of the five months during which the Mon-Yough Center judged performance, Best Annual Report Award and top company sales with \$2,577.03.

BAYALT Achievers receiving individual honors were company president Bob Pastor, voted Officer of the Year, Dolores Palinsky, Achiever of the Year, and Ed Palinsky and Bob Pastor, Best Salesman Winners. The top individual salesmen of the company were Bob Pastor with \$605.80 and Dolores Palinsky with \$511.83.

SOUTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA HONORS

After sweeping honors at the Mon-Yough Center, BAYALT then competed at the J.A. Southwest Pennsylvania Awards presentation at the Hilton Hotel in Pittsburgh. The Southwest J. A. covers the entire metropolitan Pittsburgh area. It includes ten different J.A. Centers (Mon-Yough is one of them) totaling 3,700 students and 182 Junior Achievement companies.

The BAYALT Annual Report took top honors for Southwest Pennsylvania and now will be entered in national competition. In the "Company of the Year" competition the two top companies from each Center were considered for the coveted honor. After preliminary judging, BAYALT was selected as one of the "Super Six" companies of Southwest Pennsylvania.

The officers of these companies were interviewed by a panel of judges from the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh. The judges then ranked the top six J.A. companies based on their interview scores and the records previously scored by the Center coordinators. BAYALT was awarded the No. 2 spot in Southwest Pennsylvania and will continue in regional finals to be held in Cleveland.

Dolores Palinsky, daughter of Jim Palinsky (Press Room), was presented a citation for having been chosen "Achiever of the Year." She was also awarded this year's \$1,000 J. A. scholarship award for her academic excellence. Dolores, a senior at McKeesport High School, was the Mistress of Ceremonies at the Hilton presentations.

Romance candles, apple-aire refrigerator deodorizers and personalized laminated license plates were the products made during the year by BAYALT. The name BAYALT, meaning Business And Young Achievers Learning Together was chosen as the company name by the achievers.

ADVISOR TEAM OF YEAR

The enthusiasm and energy of the members of BAYALT in this J. A. venture have been outstanding. It was only through team-effort that they were able to enjoy success.

The advisor team for BAYALT consisted of Ken Fair (Master Mechanic), Andy Meszaros (Personnel) and Mario Volponi (Accounting). They were awarded the "Advisor Team of the Year Award".

The future of America depends on the education and training of its youth and a better understanding of the free enterprise system. Fisher Body-Pittsburgh is extremely proud to be a part of the Junior Achievement Program.

PRIDE IN OUR COUNTRY AND UNITY OF OUR PEOPLE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have received such an ex-

cellent letter expressing the general feeling of the people of the United States on the Apollo 11 project, that I want to share it with the U.S. Congress and the general public.

Hal C. Davis, vice president of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, has written to me under the date of July 22, 1969, describing the feeling that the Apollo flight alone has brought an awareness to the people of the United States that unity and pride in our country's efforts should be foremost in our thinking.

It is a pleasure to place this excellent letter in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

July 22, 1969.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. Representative, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you very much for your invitation to Marion and me to attend the launching of Apollo 11 at Cape Kennedy on July 16th.

While it was not possible for us to attend, we consider it an honor and a privilege to have been invited and will proudly keep the invitation among our most valued papers.

The entire mission has been one of awe and majesty and we have watched every minute of it on television. Our flag has been flying day and night since lift-off and, looking around the neighborhood seeing other flags, leads me to believe that perhaps this alone has brought an awareness to the people of the United States that unity and pride in our country's efforts should be foremost in our thinking.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

HAL C. DAVIS,
Vice President.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1969

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is to be complimented for the alacrity and timeliness with which it has submitted a much-needed and long-overdue reorganization proposal for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In the past years, a number of studies of the independent regulatory agencies have pointed out the pressing requirement for a continuity of leadership within these agencies and also the need to delegate authority for internal administration of such agencies to the agency chairman. These studies have often cited the Interstate Commerce Commission as one of the independent regulatory agencies most in need of such reform, particularly in view of the fact that it has the largest body of Commissioners of any of the regulatory agencies.

The requirement for and the desirability of the administration's proposed reforms are clearly and effectively expressed in the President's message to

Congress. Both Hoover Commissions in recent years and the Landis report of 1960 strongly recommended similar reforms of the ICC's leadership function. Within the past decade alone, Congress has approved Presidential reorganization plans which provided for appointment by the President of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Trade Commission and centralized administrative authority in the Chairmen of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I was pleased to observe in newspaper accounts that the current Chairman of the ICC and a number of her fellow Commissioners have already spoken in support of the President's plan. It is my understanding that representatives of the railroad industry have also endorsed this proposal, as have members of the Senate Commerce Committee. This proposal should have the active support of every Member of Congress who is concerned over the present plight of America's transportation industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this proposal represents the initial step to a more far-reaching program for a better coordinated and more comprehensive approach to Federal policy development, ratesetting, and general regulation for our Nation's transportation system.

LET US TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the role of Congress to levy taxes is a clear and unchallenged responsibility. Congress has an equal responsibility to insure that these taxes are wisely spent.

It is apparent to many that Congress in recent years has not fully accepted its job of guarding the public pocketbook. We have too often acquiesced to spending requests from the Executive without knowing all the facts. Abuses have resulted. It is time to reverse this trend.

The Congress has begun to move in the right direction. It recently passed the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1969 which effectively sets a Federal spending ceiling for fiscal year 1970 of \$191.9 billion, \$1 billion below the estimates set by the Nixon administration. President Nixon signed the bill this week. Last year, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act imposed significant limitations on Federal fiscal outlays.

But we must go further. We must insure fiscal responsibility in the billions of dollars consigned each year under Government contracts. We must establish an early warning system against the development of excessive costs on these contracts, such as have mounted in the current construction of the Air Force C-5A cargo transport plane.

I have introduced a bill that would supply this need by providing an annual

reporting mechanism for Congress on Government contracts. The disclosure of cost overruns would be made before they are allowed to soar irrevocably out of control.

Specifically, this bill (H.R. 13027), which has also been introduced by many of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the House, will require annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General on all Federal contracts above \$10,000 where costs are exceeding original estimates by 10 percent or more. These reports would be made within 90 days of the end of each fiscal year.

If we are prepared to vote to increase the taxpayer's burden, we should be willing to pledge more firmly than ever that these tax dollars will not be squandered.

WORLD POPULATION CRISIS

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly encouraged to read the timely and comprehensive message of President Nixon concerning the world population crisis. In recent years, the problem of overpopulation has emerged as the most inevitable of several developments with the potential for destroying human life. I can only stress with the greatest urgency that extensive work in this area begin immediately. Many parts of the world are already strangling themselves as the natural dynamics of human existence are blocked by food storages, land shortages, lack of medical care, and myriads of other problems caused by multiplying populations. I heartily concur with President Nixon's recommendations that we continue to assist these areas of the world with increased funds, with more concentrated research, and with a greater coordination of effort.

The aspect of the July 18 Presidential message which I noted with the greatest approval, however, is the administration's obvious realization of the immediacy of the overpopulation threat to our own way of life. The United States has not yet developed the extensive overcrowding which leads to universal degradation such as is found in some parts of Asia. Yet the symptoms of overpopulation are rampant in our society. There are primary problems such as the millions of unwanted babies born every year, the families forced into poverty because of too many children, and the even more evident secondary manifestations affecting all levels of American society such as the housing shortage, extensive pollution, dwindling resource base, and traffic congestion.

President Nixon's official recognition of the paramount importance of fighting overpopulation and its dangerous effects in the United States, and his concrete recommendations for approaching the problem, provide much hope for viable solutions to safeguard the future of the United States as well as the rest of the world. I wish to offer my heartfelt con-

gratulations and continued support to President Nixon in his courageous attempt to maintain dignity and freedom of choice in human life.

OIL DEPLETION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if the pending cut in oil depletion allowance is enacted the public should prepare itself for an increase in the retail prices of gasoline and other petroleum products.

What some people may not realize is that there has been a 12-year decline in explorations for new oil discoveries, and that the Nation continues to use up its proved reserves faster than new supplies are being found. Exploratory drilling declined from 14,707 wells in 1957 to 8,879 wells last year—a net drop of 40 percent. If the present depletion rate is reduced this drop will undoubtedly be accelerated.

To the gasoline consumer who patronizes the filling stations this spells bad news. As indicated by a Wall Street Journal article, dated July 17, a rise in retail prices may be expected in the near future. I include that article as a part of my remarks. It follows:

OIL DEPLETION CUTS SEEN CAUSING BOOST IN PRICES OR REDUCED EXPLORATION—PROPOSED DECREASE TO 20 PERCENT WOULD LIKELY LIFT GASOLINE QUOTE BY 1 CENT A GALLON, INDUSTRY SAYS

A reduction in the percentage depletion tax deduction for petroleum to 20% from 27.5%, likely would mean higher prices for consumer products or sharply reduced spending on domestic oil and gas exploration, a survey of oil companies and economists indicates.

The director of a leading petroleum research organization estimated that the move, recommended Monday by the House Ways and Means Committee, likely would cause a 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the price of gasoline or a \$400 million reduction in annual domestic capital outlays by oil companies.

"The petroleum industry, whose average rate of return on investment is below that of other manufacturing industries, cannot absorb this additional tax and would have to pass it on to consumers through increases in prices of petroleum products, particularly gasoline," asserted John Houchin, president of Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

In a study being released today the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation Inc., New York, says that full elimination of the depletion allowance would have added \$1.3 billion to the industry's tax bill if it had been applied last year. This, it said, would have raised the oil industry's tax burden to 8 cents of every dollar of gross revenue, up from 5 cents in 1966 and compared with 4.75 cents that same year for all business corporations.

The foundation declared that elimination of the allowance would "inevitably" mean an increase in gasoline prices of 2.5 cents to 3 cents a gallon. It asserted the heaviest burden would fall on families with less than \$3,000 in annual income, who spend 6.2% of their annual expenditures on gasoline. By contrast, the foundation said families with \$15,000 of annual income spend only 1.5% of their annual outlays for gasoline.

It asserted that taking the increased taxes out of earnings would result in a one-fifth

reduction in the industry's 12.2% return on capital investment. That would put oil in the nine lowest of 44 major mining and manufacturing categories for return on investment, despite being a high risk business, the foundation said.

Cities Service Co., New York, said domestic oil and gas reserves already have been declining in recent years "due to steadily mounting exploration costs" and asserted that "a reduction in percentage depletion will increase costs to oil producers, which can only result in higher prices to consumers for petroleum products."

Percentage depletion-tax deductions are granted on 100 minerals. For petroleum, a producer can deduct 27.5% of the gross income from each well up to 50% of the net income from that well. It is estimated this results in an average of about 23% actually being deducted. The industry asserts that the deduction is aimed at avoiding taxation of capital, as opposed to taxation of income, since mineral resources in the ground are considered capital and merchandise rolled into one.

A tax official of a major international oil company, however, reported that the recommendation by the Ways and Means Committee to eliminate use of the 27.5% depletion allowance on foreign oil production probably wouldn't have any significant impact on most companies. The reason for this, he explained, is that in most cases foreign taxes and royalty payments generally exceed any liability for domestic income taxes on the output.

Mobil Oil Corp., New York, asserted, "Any reduction in percentage depletion can only result in reduced exploration for the increased oil and gas reserves in our country—unless this increased tax burden is offset by higher oil product prices."

HATS OFF TO THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Future Farmers of America held a national leadership and citizenship conference in the Nation's Capital. I can report that the conference was full of meaningful accomplishment.

They call this organization Future Farmers of America. Subjects discussed at program sessions demonstrate a dedication to the future. But they also attest to the fact that the organization is not provincial. FFA is concerned with all America.

One session discussed "Adapting FFA to a Changing Program of Agricultural Education." Group discussions determined what adaptations are a must and how they are to be implemented. In another period, the discussion concerned bridging the gap between high school and employment.

In every discussion, the key subject was leadership. This was the matter highlighting the visit to Mount Vernon where the question was asked, "What qualities did this man—George Washington—possess which made him a great leader?"

The chapter presidents from all over the Nation took full opportunity to discover Washington, D.C. Members of the

House and Senate discussed lawmaking and other procedures of government.

I had an opportunity to spend considerable time with the FFA visitors. The contact has again affirmed my pride, faith, and confidence in our teenage citizens. Here were youngsters who are deeply appreciative of our American heritage, of our social, political, and economic systems. They recognize our shortcomings, and they are completely concerned with our problems. But they seek solutions by rational thought and free discussion.

My hat is off to FFA, its members, and its directors.

IN THAT SPOT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Dallas Morning News reflected on the reactions of the people of Dallas to President Nixon and the accomplishments of his administration. According to the article, the general citizenry of Dallas harbors a very realistic attitude toward Mr. Nixon and his performance to date.

Significantly, the article asserts that people are aware of the complex nature of the problems he faces in this high position, and they are aware of his intent to translate proposals into realities.

In his efforts to improve the quality of life of all our people, I think this editorial quite aptly affirms President Nixon's case for the American people.

The editorial follows:

IN THAT SPOT

It is axiomatic among political professionals that politics is the art of the possible. In that context, Dennis Hoover of The News found that the voters of Dallas generally have a very professional attitude toward the Nixon administration so far.

The reactions of most of the people he talked to were neither wildly enthusiastic nor bitterly disappointed, but they were realistic. Fairly typical were a doctor's diagnosis that Nixon is "doing as well as could be expected" and a housewife's observation that "I guess he's been doing as well as he can under the circumstances."

The noteworthy aspect of the present relationship between the President and the people is not what he has done or not done to solve the nation's problems, but the fact that so many voters view these problems with an awareness of their complexity.

Americans once liked their political promises big, bombastic and impossibly expansive. Candidates were expected to guarantee an answer to every problem and the really star-quality performers promised that, once in office, they would pass a miracle on alternate Tuesdays.

Much as voters might like to believe such talk, an increasing number now recognize the fact that miracles are not so easily come by. If Nixon is doing as well as can be expected, those expectations did not include any sudden miracles or overnight solutions to problems that defeated the efforts of other good and able men in previous administrations.

If Nixon is doing as well as he can "under the circumstances," the voter realizes that "the circumstances" are not the type that can be dispelled with a wave of a wand or the railroading of a batch of new spending programs.

In his campaign last year, Nixon directed his appeal to these voters. He did not try to portray the incumbents as criminals, traitors or lunatics, nor did he promise instant paradise after he took office. He did promise to attack the most urgent problems from a somewhat different direction and with somewhat different concepts.

Politically, this candor and understatement has paid off. Witness the voters' statements that "we haven't heard any of the grand promises of the Johnson administration" and "he's fulfilling the promises he made in the campaign, which is unusual."

Even more unusual is the number of voters who have learned that the most powerful office in the world also comes furnished with the world's toughest problems. As an engineer put it, "he's done as well as anyone could do in that spot."

The nation has taken an encouraging step toward political maturity if it realizes that when it puts a man in that spot, it makes him a president but it doesn't make him a magician.

FLIGHT OF APOLLO 11 HAILED BY POPE PAUL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

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

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 21, 1969]

FLIGHT OF APOLLO 11 HAILED BY POPE PAUL— WARNING ISSUED

CASTELGANDOLFO, ITALY.—Pope Paul VI hailed the "extraordinary and astonishing" Apollo-11 flight to the moon but warned against "idolatry" of the instruments of technical progress.

The Pope referred to the day as "a great day, a historic day for humanity" in his weekly blessing yesterday to pilgrims and tourists at the papal summer residence in this hill town.

The Pope also recorded a special message for the three Apollo astronauts to be shown later on Italian television.

Vatican sources said the Pope planned to watch the Apollo mission on television and also to peer at the moon through the giant telescope of the Vatican observatory in Castelgandolfo.

"We will do well to meditate on this extraordinary and astonishing event," the Pope said of the Apollo mission during his blessing.

But he warned that men run the risk of being fascinated "perhaps even to the point of madness" by their own instruments and the products of man's genius.

"Here is the danger," he said. "Against this possible idolatry of the instrument we must be on guard."

Instruments multiply the efficiency of man, he said, but this may not always be to man's advantage.

"Could not the instrument imprison the man who produces it and make him the servant of the system of life that the instrument . . . imposes on its very owner?" he asked.

"Everything still depends on the heart of man," the Pope continued.

"It is absolutely necessary that the heart of man becomes even more free, good and religious, the greater and more dangerous is the power of machines, arms and instruments that man puts at his own disposition."

CLOSING THE DEPLETION LOOPHOLE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have introduced legislation that would phase out the oil import program over a 10-year period. I have also introduced legislation that would reduce the depletion allowance to 15 percent in the case of domestic oil and eliminate it in the case of foreign oil.

You can well imagine how pleased I am with the direction in which the House Ways and Means Committee is moving in this area. In fact, my only complaint is that they may not be going far enough. Nonetheless, important steps are being taken to remedy what is probably the biggest loophole in our tax laws.

With this in mind, I was interested to read a New York Times editorial entitled "Closing the Depletion Loophole" on July 23, 1969. The editorial does a good job explaining why something has to be done about the depletion allowance and why a reduction would help, rather than hurt, the country. It does an especially good job knocking down the national security argument, about which you hear so much. And it also points out how the allowance and the oil import program result in higher prices to the consumer.

I submit, therefore, that editorial for inclusion in the RECORD at this time.

CLOSING THE DEPLETION LOOPHOLE

The House Ways and Means Committee took a significant step toward meaningful tax reform when it voted to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowances from 27.5 to 20 per cent. Proportional reductions would also be made in the allowances for other minerals, which now range from 5 to 23 per cent.

If adopted by the Congress, those recommendations would add about \$400 million to tax revenues. But that figure grossly understates the importance of the reform, both as a symbolic attack on the citadel of tax privilege and as a means of ensuring a more efficient allocation of economic resources.

The petroleum industry has long defended on two grounds the depletion allowances and the companion privilege of writing off drilling costs as a current business expense rather than treating them, for tax purposes, as investments. One argument relates to the risks of oil exploration; the other rests on the national defense need for maintaining proved domestic reserves of oil through continuous exploration.

A spokesman for the petroleum industry pointed out in a recent discussion of the oil and gas depletion allowances that of "50 new field wildcat wells drilled . . . only about one well is likely to turn out to be a profitable producer." Assuming that statement to be accurate, it does not follow that the oil and gas exploration is so much riskier than other business ventures as to justify special tax treatment. The reasoning about risk is

circular because much of the wildcat drilling would never be attempted in the absence of the tax shelters.

The more important question concerns the national defense. First, it should be pointed out that the link—essential to the industry's case—between the depletion allowance and the growth of proved oil reserves has never been convincingly demonstrated. Second, it is doubtful whether the growth of oil reserves within the continental boundaries of the United States is really essential to the national defense.

In a nuclear conflict that engulfed the major centers of population, the adequacy of oil reserves would not be preeminent on the list of priorities. In limited, nonnuclear wars, such as those that have occurred in the Middle East, the flow of petroleum may for a time be disrupted. But the dangers on that score are being diminished by the new strikes in Canada and Alaska as well as the very large reserves in Latin America, Indonesia and Australia.

The economic fact of the matter is that there is a superabundance of low-cost oil outside the United States. Its flow, to be sure, can be interrupted. But it is highly unlikely that all of the sources of supply would be dried up at the same time. It follows that the American public is shouldering an unnecessarily costly burden by subsidizing the oil industry, not only by special tax treatment, but also through the imposition of import quotas and cartel restrictions on domestic production. As a result, prices to consumers are higher, tax revenues are lower and—because of the tax shelter—capital flows into domestic exploration that would yield higher returns invested elsewhere.

The proposed reduction in the mineral depletion allowances will provide a crucial test of whether Congress is willing to vote for a fairer tax system. A failure to adopt the recommendation of the overwhelming majority of the Ways and Means Committee can only lead to the further erosion of public confidence in the democratic process.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week is Captive Nations Week. Throughout the week, Americans everywhere are conducting appropriate ceremonies, television and radio programs, and public discussion forums in remembrance of their fellow human beings who are trapped behind the Iron Curtain.

This is the 10th year since the late President Eisenhower issued the first proclamation declaring the third week in July to be Captive Nations Week. Each year since, we have paused as a people and a nation to reflect on the repression of millions of freedom-loving peoples by the Soviet Union. For the 10th year, our Nation cries out its abhorrence of the enslavement of a hundred million people who, were it not for the guns, the terror, and the slave labor camps, would enjoy the fruits and blessings of justice and liberty.

The observance of Captive Nations Week 1969 is a particularly compelling occasion, for this is the year that the difference between communism and democracy was highlighted by the Soviet rape

of Czechoslovakia and the oppression of liberty which accompanied it, and the historic flight of Apollo 11 which was a monument to American liberty, freedom, and justice. History will record the difference, and I hope that mankind will profit by a study of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to communicate both my feelings and the feelings of the residents in the 18th Congressional District in Texas, and convey to my colleagues our solemn commemoration of this annual time of national rededication to the ideal of liberty and justice for all.

THRESHOLD OF NEW AGE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 28, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report makes several important points with respect to the Apollo 11 lunar landing and the outstanding performance of Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins. Rather than concentrating on the technical achievements of Apollo 11 this article points to other aspects of our national welfare that are supported by a strong national space program.

The article follows:

THRESHOLD OF A NEW AGE

An estimated half billion people in 49 countries, eyes fixed on TV screens, watched in fascination as America's Apollo 11 sped through space on its awesome mission.

For many, back of the spectacle itself was the nagging awareness that something just might go wrong at any point that triumph might be trumped by disaster.

Even so, the feeling was as big as the earth itself that the age of man had entered a new era, and its focal point was the United States of America.

To most—from the world's dignitaries to the man in the street—the entire universe seemed suddenly to shrink. The moon and the stars appeared closer to the heart of the matter than the war in Vietnam or the hatreds in the Middle East. An observation from a European:

"The world has had to forget itself."

BRIGHTER HOPES

The fate of Apollo 11's venture coincided with a host of developments that could only be read as the opening of a new chapter in history. At home and abroad, the feeling spread that the United States was once again on the move—in new and significant directions that had, at most, only a psychological link to space.

Richard Nixon, the 37th President of the United States, assembled a staff for a personal mission to Southeast Asia that for the first time in years was not a war conference.

Mr. Nixon was looking beyond the war to a period of peaceful development in that part of the world—and the role the United States should play in it.

Beyond Asia, his itinerary took him around the world to Rumania, once forbidden territory behind the Iron Curtain. But that Iron Curtain had become a rusted vestige of the days of the cold war. In mid-1969 it seemed to be in sagging neglect. The Communists in the Kremlin were too preoccupied with troubles at home to bridle at the bold jour-

ney of a Western leader to the fringes of the Russian empire that Stalin forced on the world by arms and bluff after World War II.

A TONE OF MODERATION

Instead of cold war, there was a growing prospect of disarmament talks between the U.S. and Russia. The Soviet Union's Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko—once one of the most abusive of America's antagonists—was using soft words and encouraging a closeness between Washington and Moscow that hadn't existed since the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin days of a quarter century ago.

The saga of Apollo 11 tended, even at home to push into the background the very things that were big news not too long ago. The course of events helped that trend.

The American campuses—peopled by summer students—were relatively quiet once again. Nobody who follows the situation closely felt that the "campus crisis" was a thing of the past—it could come roaring back with September—but the respite brought a sense of calm.

It had been, through mid-July, a comparatively peaceful summer in the big cities, when measured against the hot-weather days of recent years. Sporadic trouble in 1969 was nothing like the neighborhood-demolishing riots many metropolitan areas had come to fear.

LESS TERROR?

Street crime seemed less of a terror, even though the statistics showed no significant change.

President Nixon sent a message to Congress calling narcotics "a serious national threat" and urged action. The crime figures supported him, but the average American reacted with a calm that outwardly bordered on indifference.

The pulling and hauling over the extension of the income tax surcharge continued on Capitol Hill. The debate over the President's plan for an anti-ballistic-missile defense against Russia ground on.

But, for the present, such things were dimmed by the light of the moon—a light of such brilliance that mankind's earth may never be the same again.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have just ended the observance of Captive Nations Week. In my mind, this occasion symbolizes the importance of the struggle for freedom of expression in the world. It should provide all Americans with an awareness of the breadth of their constitutional guarantees. It should make us recognize that millions upon millions of people in the world do not enjoy the rights of free speech and free political choice and free thought that we in this country have established and are fighting to preserve.

In Eastern Europe, 100 million people live under the control of regimes that stifle freedom. The shocking events that took place in Czechoslovakia more than a year ago were but a painful warning of the extent to which the Soviets will go to suppress the voice of freedom. And yet the Czechoslovakia experience is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of men and women in the Baltic States, in Po-

land and Hungary and the Balkans—men and women who under the most adverse conditions will dare to be free. Despite their setbacks, they will continue the struggle because they believe that some day they will win that freedom. Captive Nations Week is a reminder of the noble and humane cause of the people in Eastern Europe. I am honored to associate with this cause.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF APOLLO 11

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic and heroic success of the Apollo 11 mission is certainly something in which all Americans can take great pride. The implications of man's first landing on the moon are infinite in terms of future space exploration.

But there are serious implications as well for our entire system of national priorities, and these implications must be carefully considered by the Congress, the administration, and all citizens who are concerned about the future of their Nation.

Two recent articles in the *New York Times*, one by Columnist Russell Baker, the other by the noted historian, Lewis Mumford, deal with this issue from interesting perspectives. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY ON EARTH ARE WE THERE?

BECAUSE IT'S IMPOSSIBLE

(By Russell Baker)

So there he is at last. Man on the moon. The poor magnificent bungler!

He can't even get to the office without undergoing the agonies of the damned, but give him a little metal, a few chemicals, some wire and twenty or thirty billion dollars and, vroom!, there he is, up on a rock a quarter of a million miles up in the sky.

Ask him, "Man, why are you up there on that rock?" And the best reply he can give you is a tired old wisecrack, "Because it's here." He doesn't even know what makes him tick.

What he is doing up there is indulging his obsession with the impossible. The impossible infuriates and tantalizes him. Show him an impossible job and he will reduce it to a possibility so trite that eventually it bores him.

Because it was impossible to make the night blaze with light, he did it. It was impossible to put the world in a box in the living room, so he did it. Because it was impossible to fly, he flew. Impossible to bring the sun's power to earth? Of course. So he released nuclear energy.

The impossible he does with dispatch, but do not bore him with requests to try the possible. He believes with Browning that a man's reach should exceed his grasp, and he is very good at reaching. What he is capable of grasping, however, he has little stomach for.

Like Ahab on the doomed *Pequod*, he would rather die attempting to assert his mastery of fate than cope with the workaday excitement of doing the possible.

This is why the triumph of man on the moon is diluted with so many banal ironies. How ingenious, we may rightly marvel, that man was able to provide himself on this

adventure with a pure atmosphere to breathe on that airless rock.

How ironic that while he was contriving to breathe the pure air on the moon, he was at the same time poisoning the sweet air of the home rock with the byproduct garbages created by old impossibilities overcome.

It is entirely, dully, boringly possible, of course, to preserve the air of the home rock, which is why man has so little appetite for doing it right now. Later, when he is told authoritatively, with the proper Doomsday voice, that it is impossible to salvage enough air here to keep him alive, his blood will stir and he will start trying.

The same principle applies to the other possibilities he declines to pursue because they are "too expensive," or "too complex," or because somebody—industry, labor, kids, parents, teachers, blacks, cops, the establishment, the Russians, etc.—"wouldn't stand for it."

The public school system, for example, was allowed to decay for years when it was possible to do something about it and will probably rot a few more before it is pronounced "impossible" and man's juices begin to flow at the challenge.

When the juices do begin to flow, man is a formidable fellow indeed. Cranking up for one of his impossible feats like going to the moon, he immediately creates for himself the kind of environment necessary for him to perform at his peak. This of course is the same kind of environment he could easily live in at home if doing the possible were not such a bore.

The space vessel must take air. Shall it be the kind of air he breathes in his cities? Good God, No! Get us some air that's fit to breathe.

How about some water from one of the great American rivers or lakes? Insanity! Men's lives will be at stake.

Shall we cut corners on rocket development in order to hold down costs, as we do with programs for mass transportation and city maintenance? Congress, President and public wouldn't dream of it. The lives of three men would lie on their consciences. Let the billions be poured.

No one would dream of asking three men to stake their lives on a program financed as parsimoniously as the programs affecting the lives of the multitudinous poor and city dwellers.

No one would dream of manning the rocket with the product of the typical ghetto school, or of fitting it with equipment of the shoddiness that goes into millions of cars and home appliances.

Doing the impossible, man contemptuously abandons the standards of the shabby everyday world he inhabits, a world made shabby by his blundering refusal to tackle the possible.

And now he is up there and marvels at himself. They said it couldn't be done, so he did it. And if somebody points out something else that can't be done, he'll show them by doing that too.

It is hard not to like him up there. Moby Dick got away from Ahab, but now man is having another last word by bringing back the big one.

("Look what I got in there." "Hey, isn't that—?" "That's right, Jack, that's the old June-croon-moon itself. Bigger than the white whale and twice as dead.")

What courage! What ingenuity! What excellence! What a shame that he will now come back to the mother rock and continue to shirk its possibilities.

And why did he do it? Because it was there? Not really. He did it because it is intolerable to him to know that there is any place in the universe where man can not leave his tracks and boast to an astounded posterity that "Kilroy was here."

LEWIS MUMFORD, HISTORIAN AND
URBANOLOGIST

The most conspicuous scientific and technical achievements of our age—nuclear bombs, rockets, computers—are all direct products of war, and are still being promoted, under the guise of "Research and Development" for military and political ends that would shrivel under rational examination and candid moral appraisal. The moon-landing program is no exception: it is a symbolic act of war, and the slogan the astronauts will carry, proclaiming that it is for the benefit of mankind, is on the same level as the Air Force's monstrous hypocrisy—"Our Profession is Peace."

The program to land men on the moon serves more than one purpose. From a military standpoint, it was deliberately planned as a means of swiftly perfecting the equipment for total extermination—the strategic goal toward which our entire megatechnic power system, in the lethal grip of the "myth of the machine" is now pointed. The secondary purpose of space exploration, which commends it to our affluent society, is to support on a more exorbitant scale than ever the military-industrial-scientific establishment and maintain the current rates of industrial expansion and financial inflation.

In order to achieve both military power and economic "prosperity" and support the power elite and their factotums in the style to which they are accustomed, every other human enterprise must either be trimmed to meet their needs or abandoned. It is no accident that the climactic moon landing coincides with cutbacks in education, the bankruptcy of hospital services, the closing of libraries and museums, and the mounting defilement of the urban and natural environment, to say nothing of many other evidences of gross social failure and human deterioration.

In order to make this misappropriation of public funds and human energies acceptable, the Space Agency has turned the moon landing program into a national sporting event whose excitement is augmented by the fact that, as in speed racing, it provides a morbid thrill in the ever-present possibility of a spectacularly violent death. To further mask the real nature of this enterprise, the promoters of space exploration have made the credulous and the scientifically uninformed believe that a better future may await mankind on the sterile moon, or on an even more life-hostile Mars—as if such a change of scene would bring our sick rulers and their still acquiescent victims back to health.

The old name for such regressive escapist fantasies was lunacy, and that epithet is still accurate as both a topographical and a psychiatric description. If the military space strategists do not terminate their own activities by turning the whole planet into a crematorium, they will soon transform it into a collective lunatic asylum, in which the patients, the attendants, the physicians, and the Board of Guardians (read Pentagon and Kremlin) will suffer the same hallucinations and be under the same escapist compulsions. They have already demonstrated their inability to perceive, still less to cope with, the earthy human realities that urgently demand attention.

If a successful moon landing leads to a further expansion of space exploration, with a further drain on more important human enterprises and a further neglect of the conditions essential for human survival and development, we may look forward to a corresponding increase in social demoralization and psychological regression. Only a return to full waking consciousness, with an overwhelming transfer of interest from our dehumanized technology to the human person, will suffice to bring our moonstruck nation back to earth. Meanwhile, thanks to the very triumphs of technology, the human race hovers on the edge of catastrophe.

BLACK-OWNED BUSINESS NO
LONGER A DREAM

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, much emphasis has been placed in recent times on programs to bring minority groups in America into the productive mainstream of the Nation's economy as owners, managers and entrepreneurs. By whatever name it is called—"black capitalism", minority business enterprise—it is a goal to which President Nixon has committed his administration.

In my home State of New Jersey, the Rutgers University Graduate School of Business has taken the lead in minority business programs. The Newark Sunday News of July 20 published an article describing the Rutgers program and the success it has achieved in the city of Newark.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to read this article. It is highly convincing evidence of the vast potential of minority business programs.

The article follows:

BLACK-OWNED BUSINESSES NO LONGER JUST
A DREAM

(By Chester L. Coleman)

To be black and own a business in the Greater Newark area is no longer just a dream. Such a vision has become a reality for nine aspiring minority group entrepreneurs.

The potential of black capitalism is at hand and its growth is, in some cases, due to the foresight of the Rutgers Graduate Business School.

Rutgers hopes to establish a minimum of 25 minority group businesses each year for the next three years, at an annual cost of \$50,000, according to Dr. Horace J. DePodwin, dean.

Last week the school was awarded a \$65,400 grant from the Ford Foundation to expand its program of aiding black and other minority group members to go into business. E. I. duPont de Nemours and Co., recently gave a \$50,000 grant to support the same program.

The original program was developed by De Podwin and Prof. Louis T. German two years ago in conjunction with the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity and the Small Opportunity and the Small Business Administration.

SEMINARS HELD

The program is the outgrowth of work started after the Newark riots in 1967. German started a series of seminars for minority groups where the rudiments of operating a small business and accounting were discussed.

Among those who have already established businesses, some in areas where the rioting occurred, is Willie Pool, 40, and Wilbur Richardson, 31, partners of the Sky-View Radio and TV Co., 708 Springfield Ave., Newark.

Pool said he was inspired to go into business 12 years ago when he could not get a "break" while employed at a factory in Lancaster, Pa. "I was limited," says Pool, "but in my own business I can push myself and if I fail it's my own fault."

Pool and Richardson, who is married and the father of two children, repair television and radio sets and electrical appliances. They also buy sets in need of repair, recondition them and offer the sets for sale as used equipment.

HELPED WITH LOAN

The two men attended the Rutgers seminar on small business and worked with German in September, 1968. The next month the school helped them obtain a bank loan for \$2,500. Together, they applied for a \$20,000 Small Business Administration loan and now gross \$45,000 a year, after being in business 20 months.

In another case, a man who had a persevering, though unsuccessful record operating small window washing and porter service, was drawing unemployment insurance, but also had his eye on a grocery business.

The man, William O. Wright, an Air Force veteran, attended the Graduate Business School's seminar, and in October of last year he became the proprietor of a grocery-delicatessen at 537 South Orange Ave., Newark.

"I just couldn't get ahead," Wright said, "and I never had money to save for those rainy days."

German estimates that in the first year Wright's income will be approximately \$10,000. Wright, 31, said that the food stamp program recently started in Newark, is a "great asset" to his business.

Benjamin Joseph, a 32-year-old Newark fireman said he had dreamed of owning a small business for years so he decided to attend the lectures.

Joseph was able to purchase a laundromat at 139 Belmont Ave., Newark, for \$20,000 in July of last year entirely on borrowed money.

"I just walked up to the owner one day and made him an offer for the business . . . I didn't have a dime in my pocket at the time," Joseph explained.

SUCCESSFUL LAUNDROMAT

Today he estimates that his business will produce a net income of \$25,000 in its second year. The coin-operated enterprise is described as the largest in the city, with 46 washers and 15 dryers. The firefighter supervises the operation, when he is off duty. He employs one other person.

A highly-motivated entrepreneur had started several small businesses, but saw them go up in smoke in the Newark riots of 1967.

This serious-minded person is John Mitchell, 32, of South Orange.

However, following German's counselling, Mitchell was granted a loan and started a cleaning business at 120 W. South Orange Ave., South Orange. He now has two other stores, one in Newark and another in Westfield.

Mitchell said that by attending the lectures he was taught how to make money and how to spend it wisely. "I was given the strength to help myself and others too," explained Mitchell.

He employs 10 persons and operates the only black-owned business in the South Orange shopping center.

LeRoy Brickus, a trained mortician, had once been a factory worker. He now operates his own funeral chapel at 183 Littleton Ave., Newark.

Brickus, 40, said that by attending German's course, he obtained knowledge that was the "key" to his success. "It had been but a dream so long," Brickus admitted, "but I had the desire to have something of my own."

He received his training at the American Academy in New York and has been in business since April, 1968. His wife, Marie, who is active in civic and social organizations, said, "It's hard work, but the benefits are rewarding."

Another Newark resident who has established his own business under the Rutgers program, is Freeman Thomas, a skilled refrigerator and appliance repair man who obtained a loan to expand his operation at 504 Springfield Ave., Newark.

He received bank financing that helped him provide storage facilities for some 3,000

refrigerators, air conditioners, stoves and washing machines.

WASN'T MAKING IT

Norris Knott, a Montclair fish merchant, had been in business for a little over a year but "wasn't making it."

He was ready to close his shop at 154 Bloomfield Ave., and seek employment, but instead Knott decided to attend the Rutgers course and he gained advice on better management and purchasing policies.

Knott had purchased the business in November, 1967, and his volume was approximately \$200 a week. German said his prices were too high and his volume too small because he purchased fish from a wholesaler who would make deliveries and carry the accounts receivable week-to-week.

Knott needed a truck, but he did not have the cash. It would have enabled him to go to New York to buy fish more cheaply.

German assisted Knott in getting a small business loan for \$8,000 and with this money he purchased a truck. The professor said it is estimated that Knott's income will now be approximately \$10,000 per year.

John Cheatam, father of 10, was referred to Rutgers by Knott. Cheatam is an assistant shop steward with a stevedoring company and had been doing upholstery work from his home, 579 Orange St., Newark, on a part-time basis.

He received a \$1,000 loan from a Newark bank with the assistance of the school and has opened a small upholstery store in Newark.

German said that a program to offer classes for minority group persons who are interested in learning "how they can help themselves" is now under way in Paterson, Camden, New Brunswick and Newark.

Associate Dean David W. Blakeslee said, "We want them to learn how they can help themselves in the approach to government agencies and banks, and ways and methods to improve their businesses."

Benjamin Zwerling, a consultant to the Rutgers business school, said: "This is a program whereby black people with no assets except their initiative and drive, can build a business and eventually hire workers of their own race."

HON. WILLIAM BATES

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the deep sense of loss we all felt upon learning of the untimely death of our colleague, Bill Bates, will not be lessened for some time to come. It is with a growing awareness of the tremendous void in our ranks that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this outstanding gentleman and statesman and in extending heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

We will remember his dedication, his hard work, his knowledge and understanding, his never failing warmth and friendship. Just as it is true that a man lives as long as the memory of him lives, it is true that Bill Bates will live for a long time in our hearts and in the annals of this Nation he served so well.

In our shared sadness, we also want to express our gratitude to the divine providence that gave this Chamber and this Nation the benefit of his wisdom and counsel during these past 19 years.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we are observing Captive Nations Week, I think that this is a particularly appropriate time to honor the memory of Pius Grigaitis.

Pius Grigaitis, an outstanding Lithuanian journalist in the United States, was born on October 16, 1883, in Lithuania and died May 22, 1969, in Chicago. He graduated from the high school—Gymnasium—in Marijampole, Lithuania, and already as a schoolboy was active in national Lithuanian and revolutionary causes against the Russians and their czar. In 1903 he enrolled at the University of St. Petersburg and became active with the Lithuanian amateur theatrical groups as a performer and producer. When in the wake of the revolution the Russian universities were closed because of student strikes protesting the "bloody Sunday" of January 22, 1905, Grigaitis returned to his native country. He was very active in the revolutionary movement, constantly on the move and giving speeches on the meaning of the Revolution against Tsarism. He joined the Social-democratic Party and organized its Lithuanian branch. During one of his trips, on December 6, 1905, he was seized by Russian soldiers, arrested, man-handled, and jailed. A military tribunal sentenced him to death. An appeal to the Russian Prime Minister Count Vitte resulted in a retrial before a civilian court. When the trial failed to take a favorable turn, he escaped on June 6, 1906, with the help of his friends from the prison in Suvalkai and emigrated to the United States. Soon after his arrival he collected about 29,000 rubles to support the revolutionary movement in Europe.

In 1907 he went to Bern, Switzerland, where he finished his law studies and continued to study philosophy for another 2 years. In 1913 he returned to the United States, settled in Baltimore, and edited a Lithuanian weekly "Pirmyn"—Forward—and also a journal "Naujoji Gadyne"—The New Era. In 1914, Grigaitis was initiated to become editor of the newly founded Chicago Lithuanian daily newspaper "Naujienos"—News—and with a short interruption he retained this position until his death. He also earned the degree of doctor of jurisprudence at the University of Chicago.

Grigaitis took a very active part in Lithuanian affairs, as a frequent speaker at Lithuanian events, an astute columnist, an outspoken anti-Communist, and an active fighter for the cause of Lithuania's independence, after his native country was occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940. For many years Grigaitis was a member and secretary of the American Lithuanian Council. He was a participant in numerous Lithuanian delegations to the Congress and the White House, and was well-known to many Members of Congress as a tireless fighter for the freedom of his native country.

GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, conditions in Greece grow more serious by the day. The ruling military junta is proving its desperation by removing the judges it appointed, by making and then repudiating offers for impartial examination of charges of government by torture, and by continuing its policy of midnight arrest of the few qualified military officers it has left.

We know the military junta will fall. We merely do not know the date. Sadly, the United States has not ended its involvement in Greece. We continue to supply military aid, aid used to oppress the people of Greece, who will not soon forgive our sins.

The paradox of American actions and American ideals in Greece was recently outlined in the July 12 New Yorker magazine's "The Talk of the Town." I insert that excellent piece of reporting in the RECORD at this point:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

A Greek-American friend of ours who lives in Boston has written to let us know about the birth of his son, whom he has named Eleutherios, which means "free," and about a few other things that are on his mind: "Of some chapter in Greek history, somebody wrote. 'Today, to be Greek is to be in mourning.' It is a little like that now. Since we are not characters in a Greek tragedy, no messengers have been supplied to deliver the bad news in breathless stichomythy or a three-page heroic utterance; nevertheless, it has been delivered, in voices harsh with pain, testifying in a closed room in Strasbourg, France—voices to notify us once again of innocent persons locked away in the middle of the night, of beatings and reprisals and all the boringly ingenious apparatus of a scared, exhausted tyranny. A number of people were brought by the Greek government to Strasbourg last November to repudiate, at hearings of the European Commission on Human Rights, charges that they had been tortured. Two men duped their custodians and told what I must believe to be the truth; one woman was never permitted to talk. She was last reported weeping over her dinner in the company of her guards. I am haunted by her tears. We are all Greeks. We are patriots of a country that struggled to give a name to pain, that invited man to encounter his destiny on the fiery ground of the spirit. It advanced the idea that suffering is important. I saw the play 'Dionysus in 69' when I was in New York last month, and it horrified me, not because the players kept stripping to the buff (I found this rather diverting) but because they perverted that idea, husking Euripides' shattering play of its sensational brutality and discarding the essential tragedy. With pity and terror, I watched a bunch of naked actors con a nice audience in good clothes into complicity in the death of Dionysus' victim, when you are meant to be a compassionate witness to it. Dionysus makes a convenient Pop hero for this bloody-minded year. It's as though we were all so dazzled by the spectacle of violence we've forgotten the hurt. The Greeks were more concerned with its effects. I think, for example, of Prometheus, heroically wronged, whose loud outrage at what was done to him has to speak for those who are oppressed but silent. There are so many victims around, and no one will ever hold up their suffering

to the clear light of intellect and poetry and ask for an explanation. But we need not assent to it. We Americans could stop giving Greeks rifles with which to beat other Greeks over the kidneys. We could throw them out of NATO until they gave the people back some rights. We could cancel our airline reservations. How many, I wonder, of those who sat with me through all that exciting box-office blood and nudity are streaking toward Greece this very minute to drink ouzo, and discover that the Parthenon is yellow, and photograph the Lion Gate at Mycenae, where poor, crazy Cassandra kept trying and trying to tell about the evil in the house but no one cared to understand what she was saying?"

DAY AT TRANQUILLITY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 21, 1969]

DAY AT TRANQUILLITY

Nothing that can be written, nothing that can be said, no amount of eloquence, could top the drama, the excitement, the superlative performance of Apollo 11. There is no use trying.

Never in history has one step by a human foot signified so much—so much genius and effort to make it possible, such spectacular prospect for the future. The world assuredly never will be the same again; and what it all bodes for the universe at the moment may tax the imagination, but not much after Sunday night.

The dream of going to the Moon is ages old. The first progress undoubtedly began with the early astronomers, who determined the orderliness of the universe—the regularity of the Moon's motions being crucial to Apollo 11.

The evolution of science provided the knowledge for man's venture beyond his own earth, but it was the recent and relatively rapid development of rocket power which provided the means.

In only a little more than 10 years, actually, the United States literally has exploded into space—from Explorer I's comparatively modest probe to Neil Armstrong's cautious footfall in the soft, powdery surface of the Moon.

The only event in history that seems comparable for its time was Columbus' discovery of the Western Hemisphere. But Columbus sailed off into the unknown on a theory, with utterly primitive transport by present standards.

Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin arrived at their destination armed with enormous knowledge of what to expect and fully prepared with unbelievably precise equipment.

It was five months after his discovery before Columbus was able to report the news back to Spain. But the whole world saw the scene instantly as Armstrong and Aldrin went about their chores on the moon. Nobody had to take anybody's word for it.

The amazing clarity of the television pictures and the graphic play-by-play descriptions of the two astronauts made the science fiction of the past come astonishingly true.

It was all simply too overwhelming—from the exhilaration and anticipation of the blast-off to Eagle's manually directed touchdown to the easily heard telephone conversation with the President.

The heavens, as the President said, have

indeed become a part of man's world. But for this momentous occasion, the words by which the history textbooks will mark the event are Neil Armstrong's as he put down his first foot: "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

It brings us to more nearly understand what a famous astronomer, Dr. Forest Ray Moulton, said more than 30 years ago when he assured us that "this apparently limitless planet on which we dwell has been reduced relatively to a particle of dust floating in the immensity of space."

But for the moment, in our goggle-eyed state after a night spent vicariously on the Moon, we can only collapse in prideful relief and join millions and millions around the globe to support the prayer of Astronaut Armstrong's mother that everything goes well all the way back home.

REMARKS ON PROBLEMS OF TODAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the privilege of hearing Mr. William P. Kelly, former director of the Job Corps, address a meeting of the Women's National Democratic Club.

I believe that Mr. Kelly's speech deserves the attention of all of my colleagues in the House because of the excellent insight it gives on problems which should be of utmost concern to us today—the problem of lack of communication between those of us in varying age, economic, and racial groups, and the problems of economically deprived youngsters in an affluent society and affluent youngsters in what they view as a plastic society. It calls attention to the role Job Corps has played in daring to believe that young people who could not read or write and from the worst of economic and social backgrounds, could be trained and given an opportunity to participate in the good life and to know that society cares about what happens to them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that each of my colleagues will read, with particular attention, Mr. Kelly's speech.

The speech follows:

SPEECH GIVES INSIGHT ON PROBLEMS OF TODAY

(By Mr. William P. Kelly)

John Kenneth Galbraith, writing in a recent issue of Harper's, issued the ominous warning that peace, if it comes in Viet Nam, may turn out to be more expensive than war.

He went on to say that waiting off-stage to gobble up the money currently being spent to conduct the Viet Nam war were bigger and better ABM's, new manned bomber systems, new and more sophisticated surface units for the Navy, and on, and on, and on.

America has always been relatively free with its dollars for expenditures on things. It has also been relatively free of criticism of those people who promise success in the production of things and who fail.

There has been little hue and cry over the reduction of automobile warranties from 24,000 miles/24 months to 12,000 miles/12 months. The automobile industry was almost 60 years old before anyone really focused attention on its failures in safety.

We have come to accept planned obso-

lescence in nearly everything we purchase as being the order of the day—and we have been taken advantage of—by automobile service managers and TV repairmen.

This is not to say that our mastery in technology in many fields is not the best in the world, and perhaps good economics dictate some lesser degree of excellence in what we produce.

It would be hard to sell the notion to anyone, anywhere, that our lunar space program is not a marvel of technical excellence and personal bravery. But there are some who mark the beginning of this excellence in the charred command module in Cape Kennedy in January 1967, when three astronauts died.

On the other hand, our view of man has tended to be different than our views of things. From the very beginning of the industrial revolution, which heralded the start of man's triumph over nature, it was not considered a crime to work 8 year old children 14 hours a day in the spinning mills of Birmingham, England, nor was it perceived to be a tragedy that boys began work in Welsh coal mines before they were 10, and were dead of silicosis before they were 20 years of age.

It appears to be a fact of life, and of history, that moral systems lag behind industrial and technological systems. Western civilization was based for more than two centuries on the moral concept of hard work, thrift, prudential management of resources, saving and investing of money, and the repression of personal and private expression of emotion.

Until the third decade of the 20th century, poverty was considered to be the punishment one incurred for violating the principles of hard work and frugal living. Poverty, after all, was the deprivation of things and poverty was the result of being sinful.

It was not until the new deal that the first awareness appeared that poverty was perhaps the result of a failure of institutions to arrange men's lives in such a way that all had equal opportunity to partake of the wealth of the society.

And I think it is interesting to note that for many years prior to the 1930's many people, including theologians, only gave lip service to the ethic of hard work and frugal living, and that during the 1920's, the virtue of thrift was a horrifying thought to a stockbroker selling on margin, or a Ford dealer selling on credit; that hard work and frugal living should be reserved for those who had no jobs nor the wherewithal to participate in a system in which only the few prospered.

Today, in 1969, we have produced the greatest affluence in the history of man, and yet 22 million Americans continue to live in grinding, hopeless poverty.

The creation and availability of more things for more people has created some extraordinary paradoxes in our society. Many of our middle class youth view middle class America as crass, overly commercial, and cheap. Things have not allowed them to find some kind of identity, some kind of meaning to their lives. Things have not really made it possible for them to participate in meaningful kinds of activities.

Many of our middle class youth look on our rich adult society and say, "where are its values?" "What are its values?" Many of our young people have had their fill of split level houses. They perceive white collar life as a business where you don't upset the boat; where one's personality is more important than one's skill and ability; where how you dress is more salient than what you contribute.

Our middle class youth look at all those things and say that in spite of them, we are caught up in a terrible crisis that threatens to destroy us—the war, the cities which have been abandoned to rot and stagnate and which cannot be rescued because of the enormous resources that are going into the

war, and may never be rescued unless we are to heed Professor Galbraith's warning that peace may be more expensive than war.

On the other hand, you have the poor youth who are often too hungry to be concerned about ideological questions, about a philosophy of life; who do not have the leisure time and the luxury to search for an identity; who really do not have the privilege of growing up. This young person is not allowed to take the time to think things over because he has to live on the hustle and by his wits on a day-to-day basis.

He has no middle class parents who will pay his way through life. And this is the kid who doesn't think that homes in the suburbs are overly commercial; who doesn't think that a new car and good food and a good job are either crass or not worth it. He awakens every day to all the symbols of failure: The wino in the alley, the hooker on the corner, the pusher in front of the pool room.

It is a society in which if you are a black male, you are economically emasculated, and if you are a black female, out-moded welfare regulations won't allow a father in the house.

This is the kid who yearns to become middle class, and what he lacks is the ability, the social skills, the verbal skills, the intellectual skills, the resources, the dollars and the power and, most important, the people who can intervene in his behalf.

This is a great problem—the paradox of youth in our society—the paradox of the middle class youngster rejecting a system of values, and the ghetto youngster worshipping them from afar. Both perceive that they have been four-flushed. The youth in the ghetto has the poorest of everything—the poorest schools, the poorest housing, the poorest health care, the poorest police protection, and the poorest access to justice.

Whereas the middle class youngster in an institution of higher learning suffers an estrangement between himself, the faculty, and the administration of the university.

Many faculty members and administrators would probably concede that institutions of higher learning would be wonderful places if there were no kids; if somehow all you had to worry about was whether or not you were going to get a grant from the National Science Foundation, or the Rockefeller brothers; if all you had to deal with were nice, docile, graduate students who would toll in the vineyards of the library producing the next paper that would be read at the next professional meeting, or published in the next edition of a particular learned journal.

The middle class youngster recognizes that the faculty and administrators think that merely talking about the great problems that face the Nation—the poor, the ghettos, the hard-core unemployed, the war—they are somehow participating in the mainstream of American life. And the kids know its a phony.

Out of all of this has been born an alliance—unspoken, tacit, ill-defined—an alliance between the middle class youngster, estranged from his parents and his professors, and the ghetto youth, who has been virtually forced out of society.

If our society, a society of things that the youngsters call a plastic society, is to save itself it must begin to save its people.

And let it be clear that the savings of its people is not just a matter of urban renewal—of things—but of human renewal: That merely giving a man a job does not solve the problem of years of poor medical and dental treatment; a job does not solve the problem of getting him a decent place to live when he is excluded from the suburbs; a job does not get his child a decent school; a job does not get his family decent law enforcement.

And we are not merely saving the poor. We are saving the rich and the affluent because millions of youth who represent the next gen-

eration of American leadership do not perceive that this society is worth saving unless, through their efforts, they save the poor and, in turn, themselves. This is the issue of the 6th decade of the 20th century.

It was not quite 4½ years ago that the Job Corps opened its first centers. And I suppose if we were to sum up the history of the Job Corps there are some words that describe it, typify it, or identify it better than any others. The Job Corps has dared! The Job Corps has risked! Risk and daring are not attributes very often found in this society. That is one of the things that our middle class young people are critical of. It is much safer not to dare; it is much more comfortable not to risk. For those who dare and for those who risk often pay the price of failure, and it takes great courage to contemplate the possibility of failure in any undertaking.

The Job Corps, however, was willing to dare, to help, over 200,000 youngsters who represented the poorest of the poor—and it was willing to risk failure in doing this.

In Washington there is a tendency not to dare. Bureaucrats find it much easier to undertake endeavors in which their next promotion is guaranteed; in which the vista of their career is unclouded.

I suppose it is the same in business. There are those business executives and firms who would not dare to do those things fraught with risk. And I'm sure it is the same for women's organizations and institutions dedicated to education and philanthropy.

But the Job Corps dared to do what no one else had done before. It dared to help youngsters:

30 percent of whom could not read or write.
60 percent of whom came from broken homes.

The Job Corps dared to do what no one else had done—to risk falling 100 percent because it was dealing with 100 percent failures to begin with. But the fact of the matter is that Job Corps suffered no failure at all.

There are those who say that having placed 76 percent of the young people who have been in the Job Corps in jobs, or school, or the Armed Forces, is a spotty record. Those people have never dared anything. Those people have never risked anything.

In last year's political campaign, Job Corps was called an expensive failure, and so it has been consigned to a slow oblivion. And this is the pity of it all—a nation so affluent and so rich that it can spend one billion five hundred million dollars on a B-70 airplane and receive, for ante-ing up this much wealth, two airplanes; or can spend one billion dollars on a Sheridan tank that has hundreds of technical deficiencies; that it can spend nearly a billion dollars on a Cheyenne helicopter that won't fly; that it can spend four hundred and fifty million dollars on a Dinosaur space vehicle that will not operate; and that it can experience a two billion-plus dollar overrun on a C-5A military transport.

Things we will pay for—even things that fail or that we are double-dealed on—but when it comes to people we still have a reluctance to ante-up the treasury needed, or to re-arrange our national priorities, in order to provide the treasure for the good life for all.

The Job Corps demonstrated above all other things that if the Nation was willing to expend, not the kinds of untold billions that is spent on things, but \$7,000 a year on people, that it could produce a situation among the poorest of the poor—and that's what these Job Corps youngsters were—where they perceived that their society cared—and this is the final word to describe Job Corps care—and in perceiving this, they did not attempt to burn down the Job Corps, there never was a sit-in in the Job Corps, no Job Corps administrator was ever bearded in his office—and I think this is the most conclusive demonstration—that if you can make it clear to

people—even poor black people—that their society, that their nation, cares, then we start up a road, a broad road to new freedoms for all men, and where the quality of our society will not be judged by the number of TV sets in our homes, but in the quality of life for our people—all our people.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their well and eloquent speeches they gave in observance of Captive Nations Week. This type of support is exemplary of a well informed Congress concerned with more than just their constituency. I am proud to view it in our midst.

As I pondered upon what would be appropriate to say, I decided that we reflect upon our freedom far too little except when we feel that our freedom has been violated or threatened. I believe this to be true because freedom by its very nature implies the absence of inhibiting boundaries. Yet it is the nature of man, as seen by history to date, that when there are no bounds to freedom, a few always expand their expression of freedom at the expense of others. Thus, in any society, which could be thought of as any collection of more than two individuals who come in contact with each other, there must be a choice by those individuals between the limits of utter chaos, where everyone rules, and totalitarianism where only a few rule. The Government which perpetuates the attitudes of our society is the most difficult of all to construct and maintain. Traditionally it has been the desire of each American to have just enough government to insure that his individual freedom cannot be impugned by another individual with the understanding that he too must not abuse what we believe to be basic human rights.

Just think what we have undertaken. To protect the rights of 200 million people without abusing some people's rights is nearly impossible. But, it is far better that we try and partially fail than to give up and accept the much easier form of government, totalitarianism, for it is much easier to subjugate the many than to represent them.

Such is the case in Communist Russia. Only a few are actually members of the Communist Party. They are the paragons of power. The subjugated missions are subject to their every whim. This week we remind ourselves of the plight of the 100 million people in 27 different countries which have fallen before the red wave of communism.

This observance is important for four reasons. First, we remind ourselves of what freedoms we have. This is an important realization, because, as I have said before, it is in the nature of living in a free state to forget the benefits one receives until those benefits are questioned. Second, it is part of our moral

duty to publicly support our ideology, and in doing so, condemn those states which violate what we feel to be right and just. Third, our recognition of the captive peoples' plight is a source of hope to those who have not forgotten the dream of a free state. Fourth, it is a continual area of irritation for the Communist leaders. Better proof of this could hardly be found than this quote from the Communist newspaper *Trybuna Luna* in Poland:

An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke. . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, it is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S. (July 27, 1965)

Mr. Speaker, our observance of Captive Nations Week shows where our sympathies lie. It is a small stone slung against the Iron Curtain but a necessary one as I have tried to point out. Let us not forget how lucky we are to enjoy the freedom we do, nor forget the toil which lies before us.

POPULATION GROWTH

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the American people have a major problem of population growth that underlies all of our economic and social problems. As chairman of the House Republican task force on earth resources and population, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the text of remarks by Gov. Edgar D. Whitcomb, of Indiana, presented to the Midwestern Governors' Conference on Wednesday, July 2, 1969:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY GOV. EDGAR D. WHITCOMB, OF INDIANA, PRESENTED TO THE MIDWESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, JULY 2, 1969

We are told that the world will soon be unfit for human habitation unless the increase in population, and the pollution of air, land, and water is arrested. We are told that effective steps to prevent the deterioration of our environment can only be taken by the imposition of the repressive methods of a police state. I believe the first statement is true and that the second one can become true unless we change some aspects of the way we deal with public problems.

I am convinced that our environmental crisis is the unanticipated and unwanted by-product of the way we have dealt with public problems in the past. We tend to formulate policies affecting millions of people as a reaction to a crisis not to prevent one. As a consequence, we treat symptoms rather than causes of problems. Because we are forced to act under the pressure of a crisis, there is little time to design alternate ways to deal with the problem and there is little time for realistic consideration of the consequences likely to occur in the event any one of the alternatives is adopted.

We think we know what our problems are. We formulate policies as if we do. I'm not certain that we spend enough time defining the precise nature of our problems. I am certain that our failure to do so may produce disastrous results.

Let me give you some examples to illustrate my point.

In response to the great pressures to resolve the many problems related to the depression of the 1930's, we formulated, under crisis conditions, public policies to help maintain and raise farm income. The farmers' low income was a symptom of some deeper social problems very complicated and ill defined to this very day. By treating the symptom we obscured the search for basic causes. We still have a farm problem after all these years and after the expenditure of billions of dollars. We did not measure the probable consequences nor the total costs of the policies which were adopted. If we had, we might have learned that policies designed to support farm income had the effect of driving small farmers from the land. Where did the farmers go who left the land? Most of them went to cities in search of economic opportunity. When they arrived in our cities, most of them were unskilled laborers—the last to be hired; the first to be fired. Their low incomes forced them to congregate in low rent slums. They and their neighbors were uprooted from their home communities and divorced from most of the human relationships which make a community in the real sense of that word. These are the uprooted, the alienated, the hostile rioting inhabitants of our ghettos. These are the breeders of discontent—grist for the mill of revolution.

The migration of masses of poor, unskilled people to our cities created enormous demands on urban political systems which their tax and human resources cannot handle. Beyond a certain point, the greater the density of population, in urban areas, the greater the unit costs of providing necessary services. It costs twenty times as much to build a highway in Chicago as it does in rural Indiana. Not only this, but there are other effects on human environment which are related to forcing masses of unskilled hostile people into a hostile urban area. People are forced in many cases to live greater distances from the places in which they work. The time it takes them to travel these distances is increased substantially. A man who spends two or three hours a day commuting on smog ridden, traffic-clogged highways not only doesn't have time to spend with his children, but during the time he does spend with them, he is more likely to be a weary, irritable inhabitant of a house than an energetic, interested companion.

The costs imposed on society by such circumstances are absenteeism, delinquency, mental disorders, and impossible demands on urban police, on fire departments, on disposal facilities and on all other urban services. These costs are social costs. Ultimately, all social costs are translated into demands for tax dollars or into behavior which disrupts society. These costs can be so enormous that our failure to consider them in making every major policy decision can destroy this nation.

Government policies which crowd people into areas without sufficient land and tax resources to deal with them create enormous social costs beyond the capacity of administrative sciences and technology to deal with them.

For instance, the awarding of a government contract to an industrial firm requiring expansion of that firm in an urban area because that firm can produce an item at low cost figured in conventional ways may mean more jobs, but it may also create enormous social costs by forcing migration into areas which can't afford the strain on highways, schools, and other public facilities. The cost of eradicating pollution created by the manufacture of an object in an urban area is not included directly in the cost of manufacturing an item, but it becomes a charge on all taxpayers. Tax resources are not unlimited.

A final example of a government policy which compounds environmental problems is the property tax. The property tax, as it is administered in most states, rewards urban decay and penalizes the reconstruction of our cities. In fact, the property tax is a huge public subsidy for the creation of slums. The property tax creates slums faster than any urban renewal program can deal with the problem. It is rather ridiculous to raise billions of dollars in tax money to renew cities when tax policy destroys them at the same time.

The statement I have made today is a departure from the usual treatment of the subject of environmental management. I made such a departure because I think the usual discussions are sterile and do not come to grips with some of the basic causes of environmental problems.

We have created unwittingly powerful incentives to get large masses of people actively and even rapaciously involved in the degeneration of human environment. We have demonstrated such ingenuity and attained such success that there is no doubt in my mind that we have the ingenuity to find the incentives to regenerate that environment. Let us find ways to make it profitable to do what is necessary to preserve life on this planet. Our failure to do so will destroy human society as we know it.

What can we do as Governors to encourage better management of human environment?

Before the federal government spends billions of dollars on untried social policies, we can insist on basic research necessary to give us some indication of the probable consequences of implementing proposed policies.

HUD's program to stimulate the construction of 26,000,000 housing units in ten years is an admirable goal. HUD proposes to do this by aggregating markets. But if we build thousands of houses in areas which we do not have the tax base to support schools and other services adequately, we may create more problems than we can solve.

My argument in essence is this: We need to know more about the existence and distribution of emerging demands on our political system. We need to know more about the human and material resources available to meet those demands under varying conditions. We need to identify, to catalog, and to invent as many proposed solutions to specific problems as possible. We need to develop the information necessary to assess the probable social and political consequences of applying alternate solutions in social and political systems with varying characteristics.

These suggestions are made with the knowledge that the information obtained may be valid for a limited point in time; that the inquiries will be expensive; that periodical retesting on some selective basis will probably be necessary.

Planning is, or should be, an effort to avoid *ad hoc* decisions. It is a desirable function of democratic government. But who are the planners? To what extent are their plans reactions to symptoms? To what extent are their plans relevant to the values of the people upon whom those plans may be imposed?

Planning in a democracy should not be an exercise in abstract idealism. Rather, planning should be done with as much knowledge as possible of the distribution of values and demands held by the categories of people who must live in the areas governed by those plans.

How can we measure current demands? I don't know. But I believe the science of inquiry may be sufficiently advanced to design the appropriate methods. Information derived from the use of such methods can be used to discover specific irritants in the political system; to construct a profile of the needs and wants of the people; and to acquire a sense of the priorities people assign to meeting needs and wants when resources

are scarce. With such information we might develop new indicators of consensus and cleavage in the political system, indicators of the measure of support and opposition to alternate solutions to specific problems, indicators of the kinds of action or inaction most likely to reduce the level of hostility within the system or to redirect that hostility to constructive purposes.

Among other things, information obtained from such survey investigations might tell us more about the dynamics of urban growth. Where do migrants to urban centers come from? What motivated them to migrate? Are their expectations being fulfilled or frustrated? What new demands are they imposing on the political system? Does the system have the resources to meet those demands? If it does not, what are the alternatives, and what are the social and political costs of applying them or failing to apply them?

Information collected from non-survey sources could tell us the degree to which a political system has the material and human capabilities required to meet current and future demands.

As a consequence of collecting and integrating information of this nature, public officials and planners will have some more rational bases for assessing the relevance of their policies to the needs and demands of their constituents. The indicators thus provided might enable us to predict trouble spots in advance, to establish priorities for the solving of problems, to make more rational arguments for changing institutional arrangements which inhibit the effective solution of problems, and to take action to prevent the build-up of explosive tensions where the indicators tell us such action is essential.

Another possible product of the collection and analysis of such information is the classification of communities into those with similar characteristics, tensions, problems, resources, population attributes, and institutional set-ups. Information concerning solutions to problems of communities in the same class, and information concerning unsuccessful attempts to solve problems, could then be made available to other communities in that class.

In summary, we need information to make it possible to assess the probable consequences of applying alternative solutions to problems, to review the capacity of existing political arrangements to solve problems, to establish reasonable priorities for solving problems, to treat causes as well as symptoms, and to avoid actions more likely to aggravate than to solve problems.

When we consider alternative solutions to problems, we must consider social costs as well as economic costs—not only because it is humane to do so, but because social costs can lead to economic costs of enormous magnitude. The social costs of a policy might include the alienation of large numbers of people from the social and political system, the polarization of conflicting ideologies, and the destruction of that degree of consensus on fundamentals necessary to maintain a democratic society.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this administration has made a nonpartisan pledge to promote efficiency and responsiveness in Government by means of an improved organization of its activities.

Accordingly, President Nixon sent to Congress a Grant Consolidation Act on April 30, 1969, which was designed to coordinate the hundreds of overlapping Federal programs and insure that they reach the intended recipients in an efficient, economical, and effective manner.

Today, the President has proposed that these principles of sound and efficient management be applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and has sent Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress.

There are two provisions in this plan: First, it authorizes the President to designate the Chairman of the Commission from its members as he does presently in every other major Federal regulatory agency; and second, it vests the administrative and executive functions of the Commission in the Chairman as recommended by the Hoover Commission almost 20 years ago.

These are sound nonpartisan reforms which, I am confident, will be promptly approved by this body.

A YOUNG MAN OF PROMISE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a young man who lives in my congressional district has been chosen a presidential scholar. Arthur Baron Ellis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Ellis, is an unusually creative individual. Both scientific and humanitarian causes have been of interest to him.

I would like to share with you some of young Mr. Ellis' accomplishments. He was a member of Boy Scouts of America. He reached the highest position of that organization, that of eagle scout, and was selected to be a member of the honorary order of the arrow.

The Miami area is fortunate to have both professional and collegiate football teams. Arthur took advantage of these by sponsoring two exceptional children to the Miami dolphin games and the University of Miami hurricane football games. His own athletic achievements include third position on his school tennis team.

Ellis also completed recordings for "Recording for the Blind." He founded the Spiral Service Club at Florida's Hialeah High School with Lions International sponsorship.

When he found a dangerous traffic intersection lacked traffic lighting, Arthur singlehandedly brought this to the attention of the proper authorities and pushed for the successful installation of such lighting.

Arthur's most definite contributions have been in the field of scientific endeavor. Arthur was one of 14 high school students in the nation to be selected for a summer institute, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, in chemistry at North Dakota State University. He was also one of six in the State invited to the National Science and Humanities Symposium at West Point.

Prior to his graduation from high school, young Mr. Ellis obtained 20 credit hours at the University of Miami in mathematics, sponsored by the National Science Foundation. He was one of six people in the State of Florida asked to present a paper at the State Science and Humanities Symposium. He was one of two boys in the State of Florida to be selected for the National Youth Science Camp in Morgantown, W. Va.

Arthur is a recipient of many outstanding honors. I would like to familiarize you with some of these. He was one of 300 high school students in the Nation to be chosen winner of the Westinghouse awards honors group. He earned the first runner-up award at the South Florida Science Fair by a demonstration of chess being played by calculus. He was chosen first runner-up in chemistry and overall at the Florida State Science Fair. There he was winner of the only scholarship, which was donated by the Gulf-Life Insurance Co.

Arthur is a member of many national honorary groups, some are the National Honor Society and National Math Honor Society, and was a National Merit Scholarship winner. He received further honors as the valedictorian of his class of 960 seniors. He was treasurer of the Junior Academy of Science. He was recipient of the Silver Knight Award in Mathematics, sponsored by the Miami Herald newspaper. He won the Rensselaer medal for juniors and the Bausch and Lomb medal for seniors in Math and Science. He was accepted under early decision by California Institute of Technology.

Arthur is also a member of the German National Honor Society, and in connection with this, he is editor-in-chief of the German Student in Florida newspaper. The fine arts have been of concern to Arthur. He was in the first violin section of the South Florida Youth Symphony and was assistant concert member of the Hialeah High School orchestra.

I believe that all of us can be proud of Arthur Baron Ellis and others like him. Many excell in other fields; all are working for a constructive future. I am very proud that this young man can represent my congressional district as a presidential scholar.

FAMILY MEDICINE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. ROONEY introduced H.R. 10264 a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act. That bill would provide grants to develop training for young men and women as specialists in family medicine.

In short the bill is intended to increase the number of medical students who do not specialize in the sense that we now use the word. The moneys to be authorized by this bill are absolute necessities; to not only the medical schools and students of the country, but also to those lower income citizens who hopefully will

be the prime recipients of the benefits of such a program. In a time where we see constantly spiraling medical costs, and most of those costs of specialists, something must be done to make general medical care available to low-income and other families at prices they can afford. This bill proposes a step in that direction and I suggest to all of my colleagues that we support and pass it.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, our recent experience on Okinawa, along with even grimmer experience elsewhere, demonstrates the immediate need for a change in policy in regard to chemical and biological warfare.

Our programs in these areas have not only become accident prone, but the programs themselves appear to have grown up by accident without careful and public debate. Instead these horrible weapons, weapons which cannot be controlled, have been developed in hidden laboratories.

The case against chemical and biological warfare and possible steps to end this threat have been well outlined by the Mid-Atlantic Committee on Fort Detrick. I insert the committee's statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF POSITION

Secret research led by scientists and military strategists resulted in the development of the atomic bomb which destroyed Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945. The threat of annihilation by still another means is before us. Highly secret research, development and testing of chemical and biological weapons is proceeding at a tremendous rate.

The United States has used weapons of mass destruction in the past and will use them again. Their use threatens the entire human race.

Chemical-biological weapons, like atomic weapons, are indiscriminate, inhumane and uncontrollable.

Our Nation's major biological weapons research and development program is, at this moment, being conducted at Fort Detrick in Frederick, Md. We object to this manufacture of death. The dangers to our environment as well as the prospect of the eventual use of these weapons is horrifying.

No longer should our CBW policy be determined by secretive, military strategists. An informed and concerned public must call for:

- (1) Immediate cessation of all chemical-biological weapons tests.
- (2) Immediate halt to all research, development and stockpiling of chemical-biological weapons with provisions for civilian supervision of disposal of existing stockpiles.
- (3) Immediate resubmission of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for ratification.
- (4) Initiation by the United States of serious chemical-biological warfare discussions leading to international disarmament agreements.

As citizens we have a right and an obligation to demand a voice in affairs which concern our very lives.

CXV—1299—Part 15

THE PRESSING PROBLEM OF CUBA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 of this year the American Security Council issued its weekly Washington report entitled "Nuclear Research in Cuba." It cited the nuclear agreement between Havana and Moscow which had been signed on January 8, 1969, and which was hailed as the most significant of a series of scientific research treaties enabling Cuba to become an important center for oceanographic and meteorological research, according to Dr. Antonio Nunez-Jimenez, president of the National Commission of the Cuban Academy of Sciences. Dr. Nunez-Jimenez added that the arrangement with Moscow would be "within the framework of internationalism, as the Marxist-Lenin ideology forces us to do." He also disclosed that the number of top Russian scientists now serving in Cuba amounts to 231, with 222 more due to arrive by the end of this year. In addition, more than 300 scientific specialists in all fields of advanced research have settled in Cuba from the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe. Considering the Marxist-Lenin ideology, one can pretty much surmise how much of the efforts of these scientists will be expended in the peaceful use of oceanographic and meteorological findings.

The latest development involving the Soviet Union and Cuba is, of course, the visit to Cuba of a Soviet naval squadron comprising a guided missile cruiser, two accompanying missile warships, a frigate and a destroyer, plus two diesel-powered submarines.

Coupled with these developments, the pledge by Castro recently to support "any true revolution" in the Western Hemisphere would compel any sane person to be suspicious of our bearded neighbor to the South.

Yet, a July 19 column by Willard Edwards, the Chicago Tribune newsman of long standing, reports that the "Castro is mellowing" line of thinking is prevalent in some State Department echelons. They believe that Castro would be responsive to friendly gestures, such as a relaxation on travel by Americans to Cuba. Even before the visit of the Soviet naval squadron to Cuba, arguments that Castro was softening were, as in the past, dangerous and wishful thinking.

On July 16 the Christian Science Monitor scooped other newspapers with an account of a Cuban defector, now in the United States, who had served Castro as an intelligence officer in Paris. Although not a major official in the Cuban Government, the officer had considerable access to documents and other intelligence materials as a part of the Cuban intelligence service in Europe. The Monitor article demonstrates once again that Castro is deadly serious about his goal of revolution, and any daydreams about an accommodation with him are unrealistic.

I include the article, "Cuba More Sovietized," from the Christian Science

Monitor of July 16, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

CUBA MORE SOVIETIZED: DEFECTOR FROM CASTRO INTELLIGENCE NETWORK SAYS 1968 PACT BINDS HAVANA TO MOSCOW LINE

WASHINGTON.—A Cuban intelligence officer, who defected to the United States earlier this year, says that Premier Fidel Castro signed an accord with the Soviet Union in 1968 which commits him to a pro-Moscow line.

The assertion, it is felt, would explain the noticeable pro-Moscow line being followed by Cuba—a trend which began at the time of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last August.

According to the defector, Orlando Castro Hidalgo, the Cuban-Soviet agreement requires the Cuban leader to mute his criticism of the Soviet Union and of Moscow-oriented Communist parties in Latin America.

In return, the Soviet Union agreed not to diminish its economic support of Premier Castro's government and also to provide some 5,000 technicians to work in a variety of fields to support Cuba's lagging economy.

These disclosures are part of the testimony being given by Mr. Castro Hidalgo, who is no relation to the Cuban Premier. It was learned from informed sources that he left his post as protocol officer of the Cuban Embassy in Paris late in March of this year and sought asylum for himself and his family at the United States Embassy in Luxembourg.

Since then, Mr. Castro Hidalgo has been undergoing extensive questioning together with explaining an attaché case full of documents he carried with him when he arrived in Luxembourg.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo now is in the United States under protective custody.

The Christian Science Monitor learned of Mr. Castro Hidalgo's presence in the United States, and as far as is known this is the first mention of his defection and his disclosures to United States officials.

It is understood that the Cuban Government has asked the French Government for assistance in returning both Mr. Castro Hidalgo and the documents he brought with him when he defected. But Cuban sources would make no comment on this subject nor admit that Mr. Castro Hidalgo had defected when asked for comment.

Informed sources here say that Mr. Castro Hidalgo has been a veritable gold mine of information on developments in Cuba. Although he was not a major official in the Cuban Government, he apparently had considerable access to documents and other intelligence materials as a part of the Cuban intelligence service in Europe.

That service, according to Mr. Castro Hidalgo's testimony, is put at the disposal of the Soviet Union under terms of the 1968 agreement. Known as General Directorate of Intelligence (or DGI after its Spanish initials), the service has been extending its operations in Europe recently.

According to Mr. Castro Hidalgo, this growing Soviet influence in Cuba was the reason for his defection.

BETRAYAL SEEN

In his own way, Mr. Castro Hidalgo sees this increasing Soviet influence, brought on by Premier Castro, as a betrayal of the Cuban revolution and the goals for which he personally fought both in the Sierra Maestra and afterward.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo, in his testimony, says that his immediate superior in the Paris Embassy, Armando López Orta, returned from Havana last January with word of the Cuban-Soviet treaty and this pronouncement:

"Somos más soviéticos" (We are more Sovietized).

According to Mr. Castro, Hidalgo's version of the accord, which has remained secret until now, the Soviet Union for its part agreed to keep up the level of economic

assistance which has been flowing to Cuba in the past several years. That aid is computed in official circles here at something in the neighborhood of \$350 million yearly.

TECHNICIANS PROVIDED

The Soviet Union, it is understood, also agreed to increase badly needed petroleum shipments to Cuba, to purchase more of Cuba's production of nickel ore, and to send some 5,000 Soviet technicians to advise the Castro government in the fields of science and technology.

These technicians, Mr. Castro Hidalgo says, are to be used in providing support in agriculture, mining, atomic energy, fishing, and military fields.

However, some Soviet assistance in the DGI is part of the agreement.

To informed sources here, this aspect of the secret agreement is particularly significant in that the DGI is understood to have taken on many of the diplomatic activities formerly handled by foreign service officers.

In light of the general reduction of Soviet intelligence operations in France and elsewhere in Western Europe in recent years, the presence of a Soviet-oriented Cuban intelligence system is regarded by informed sources here as important.

CLAIM CONFIRMED

Mr. Castro Hidalgo claims to have been part of that system and the documents he brought out confirm this claim.

But the documents are of even greater importance—although they do not contain the text of the Soviet-Cuban agreement.

Moreover, taken together with his testimony and known facts about situations in Latin America, Europe, and elsewhere, the United States has learned a great deal about Cuba and its activities through Mr. Castro Hidalgo's defection.

The defector was a DGI operative in Paris. He states that he helped organize and operate a clandestine apparatus in the French capital aimed at providing Latin-American revolutionaries and guerrilla leaders with money, false passports, and hideouts during their travels to and from Cuba.

According to Mr. Castro Hidalgo, the Paris center for the DGI conducts operations into South America, while the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City coordinates operations in Central America and the Caribbean.

As far as guerrilla activities in Latin America are concerned, Mr. Castro Hidalgo says that the secret Cuba-Soviet accord makes no specific mention of their role—presumably leaving Premier Castro free to operate much as before in the question of armed insurrection throughout Latin America.

CONFLICTS APPARENT

There are apparent conflicts between the Soviet Union and Premier Castro over this question, but Mr. Castro Hidalgo says that Havana's support for the "export of revolution" to Latin America is not diminished by the accord.

However, the DGI is reported to have told its people that there must be a more meticulous screening of Latin Americans before they are put into the pipeline for guerrilla training in Cuba. It is also understood, according to Mr. Castro Hidalgo's testimony, that Cuba has decided not to send out military leaders to aid Latin-American revolutionary groups until these groups have reached a significantly high state of development.

Implicit in the Castro Hidalgo testimony is awareness on the part of Cuban officials that the guerrilla effort led by Ernesto Ché Guevara made a number of errors.

It is understood that Mr. Castro Hidalgo's disclosures of Cuban plans and the names of agents and others working for Havana throughout the world has been an important development in United States intelligence activities.

The presence of Mr. Castro Hidalgo and his family—a wife and two small boys—was confirmed by the Department of State, although it would give no further details.

Mr. Castro Hidalgo is a 31-year-old Cuban, born in Puerto Padre, in Oriente Province in the eastern part of the island. His mother and five younger brothers and a sister still live on the island.

He joined Premier Castro's 26th of July Movement in March, 1957, fighting mainly in the Sierra Maestra. After Premier Castro came to power, Mr. Castro Hidalgo stayed with the Army and served in campaigns against guerrillas in the Escambray Mountains and against the invaders at the Bay of Pigs.

His schooling has been somewhat sparse. He left in the middle of secondary school and since then has been largely self-taught. He talks slowly, measuring his words carefully, and has an air of self-confidence and sophistication.

SELECTED FOR TRAINING

Selected for intelligence training by the Castro government in 1965, Mr. Castro Hidalgo got a grounding in both intelligence theory and tactics and guerrilla warfare practice. He also was given training in language prior to being sent to France in March, 1967.

His wife, Norma, had originally been on a list of those Cubans desirous of emigrating to the United States under the provisions of a Cuban-United States accord—but took her name off the list when she married.

It is understood that the fact that her name had been on the list was discovered by Cuban intelligence people in Havana and that an investigation of the situation was under way at the time the family defected to the United States Embassy in Luxembourg. Sources here say that she played something of a role in leading to the defection, but at the same time, Mr. Castro Hidalgo had his own reasons for defecting.

OTHER DISCLOSURES

Among other disclosures made by Mr. Castro Hidalgo are these:

Col. Francisco Caamaño Defió, the leader of the 1965 Dominican revolution, is now in Cuba and that he arrived there shortly after Mr. Guevara's death at the hands of the Bolivian Army in October, 1967. At first Cuban officials thought they would use the Dominican officer as a replacement for Mr. Guevara, but since that time there has been no evidence that they have done so.

Guyanese Prof. Dr. Walter Rodney, whose presence in Jamaica last year caused a furore, was helped by Cuban intelligence forces in Paris to travel to Cuba by way of both Paris and Prague.

Prensa Latina, the Cuban news service now regarded as being run by DGI elements, was involved in a plan to infiltrate pro-Cuban agents into the ruling military junta of Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado in Peru.

The names of Cuban intelligence agents in Chile—together with the concern on the part of Premier Castro and his associates that Eduardo Frei Montalva, Chile's reformist president, was usurping Premier Castro's place and influence in Latin America.

THE MOON AND CLEAN WATER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening most of the world watched the most spectacular achievement of America's technological capabilities to date—

the lunar landing of the crew of the Apollo 11.

It is a tribute to the skills and dedication of the hundreds of people who have devoted their lives and their careers to developing and utilizing the techniques of modern systems management in order to deal with the tremendous numbers of diverse and interacting elements and factors of man in space. No problem is as complex, yet we have brought the universe within our reach.

Is it not within our realm, then, to bring the solution to complicated public problems—such as those of our environment—within reach?

In 1966, I proposed that we study the application of our modern management capabilities to our vastly complex and difficult public problems, such as transportation, housing, education, and pollution, in order to find effective solutions. Since then it has become increasingly clear that our traditional methods of problem solving will not suffice. If we are to eliminate these problems, we must use means which are commensurate with the magnitude and complexity of the challenge.

The problem of water pollution is only one area in which a solution is urgently needed, but it is a critical situation and one in which action is most readily at hand. As noted columnist Drew Pearson wrote earlier this month, the Atlantic coast is desperately short of the second essential to man's life—water—"all because of the lack of planning, lack of foresight and lack of money—the same ingredients which have put the moon shot on the verge of success."

I have urged that we put these ingredients to use to clean up our rivers, and in 1966 proposed that the Merrimack River Basin become a demonstration project for the application of systems management in pollution control from which the entire Nation could learn.

Mr. Pearson has stated that "the same ingenuity used in reaching the moon would solve our water problems," and the Merrimack demonstration project would be an important step in realizing this potential. It is a concept which has gained the interest of the administration and the endorsement of the General Accounting Office, which has already awarded a contract for a mathematical "systems" model of the Merrimack River to obtain additional water uses at reduced cost. It is a direction for our efforts that needs every support, and I am hopeful that Mr. Pearson's comments, which I am including here, will be as persuasive to my colleagues as they have been encouraging to me in continuing my own efforts:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe,
July 12, 1969]

WE CAN LAND ON THE MOON, BUT WE
CANNOT KEEP WATER CLEAN
(By Drew Pearson)

Along the Atlantic seaboard right now are two illustrations of man's efficiency in achieving the thrills of life and man's inefficiency in not achieving the necessities of life.

At Cape Kennedy, the United States is about to launch the most carefully rehearsed, most expensive, most unnecessary project of this century by which man will reach a piece of drab, radioactive, lava-like real estate hitherto romantic because of distance—the moon.

The launching will succeed because a vast amount of money and the best scientific brains in America over a period of seven years have been lavished on this moon shot.

Meanwhile, up the Atlantic coast, the capital which voted the 20 billion dollars to reach the moon is desperately short of the second essential to man's life—water—all because of lack of planning, lack of foresight, and lack of money—the same ingredients which have put the moon shot on the verge of success.

The Potomac River from which the capital of the United States draws its water is gradually drying up. Its upper reaches are so shallow that rocks stick out of the stream bed like the bones of a starving old woman. Drained by communities and real estate development along its banks, the upper Potomac is starving.

Below, as it flows through Washington, the once majestic river has become an open sewer. Two hundred and forty million gallons of human excrement, detergents, wash water and industrial waste are poured daily into the river. The sewage is only partially treated.

Not even fish can live long in this poisonous water. The days when small boys splashed and cavorted off the piers of Alexandria are no more. The bacteria count is 100 times higher than the level considered safe for swimming.

However, none of this had to happen. Twenty-five years ago the Roosevelt administration foresaw the fact that growing Washington would need more water, and the Army Engineers prepared a comprehensive plan for a far-flung system of dams and reservoirs on the Potomac and its tributaries.

Immediately there was an outcry from real estate interests and big farmers whose land would be inundated. The plan was shelved. It was revived under Kennedy, only to be shelved again. This time the conservationists joined the real estate interests.

There was talk of small dams instead of big ones—dams which would not spoil the river's natural beauty. But nothing was done. There was a lot of talk. A tri-state commission was appointed. Surveys were made. Commissions traveled up and down the river, inspected the Virginia and Maryland tributaries. But nothing happened.

So for lack of planning, lack of action, lack of money, the once full-bosomed, beautiful Potomac has become an emaciated old lady, her bones protruding, smelly, unkempt, unsightly.

And water is short all over the capital of the United States while the same government which has neglected its own front yard reaches for the moon.

The plight of the Potomac is not confined to the capital alone. It illustrates what is happening all over the United States, from New York City where drinking water is still not served in restaurants, to Chicago which is reaching further and further into Lake Michigan for its water.

Gradually at first, but now accelerating rapidly as the population grows, water is becoming a problem. Yet the same ingenuity used in reaching the moon would solve our water problems.

There is an illustration. Russia has reversed the direction of some of its great rivers which flow into the barren Arctic where they freeze and are wasted. What a communistic nation can do, presumably a capitalistic nation can do—if it eschews politics.

For less money than it takes to reach the moon, the Missouri River could be diverted westward at around Omaha and made to flow through the parched plains of Nebraska, Kansas and Texas instead of adding its vast volume to the already brimful Mississippi.

What the nation needs, however, is a water pollution czar who can look ahead, make

plans, spend money, as the moon-shooters have done. Until that time, the city of Washington will be periodically starved for water as will other cities of this short-sighted nation.

ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST THE SOUTH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening for a Southerner to note that more and more people from other sections of the country are becoming suspicious of the intensified blasts against the South. The American people are seeing through the misrepresentations against Southern products—tobacco, cotton, rice, sugar, and even oil.

Many Americans now question whether the economic warfare is directed against the products or against the region—the people, the culture, and self-sufficiency of the South. They are remembering statements made by those dedicated to the overthrow of the United States indicating that the South would be the final bastion of religious and moral strength and individual liberty in our land. They are realizing there is an economic war against the South.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Frank Capell's Herald of Freedom, Zarephath, N.J., of July 15, 1969, entitled, "Economic Warfare Against the South" following my comments:

ECONOMIC WARFARE AGAINST THE SOUTH

Television viewers have been subjected to a scare campaign against the use of tobacco which has been growing in intensity and which on the surface would seem to be motivated only by humanitarian concern for the health of "our children." Another campaign which had the same ostensible motivation was the drive to "poison the wells" of our nation by the fluoridation of central water supplies. We have been told that the next target for the fanatical guardians of our health will be peanuts (another product of the South), excessive eating of which they will try to convince us is a cause of cancer, that dread disease whose cause is still unknown.

One of the guidelines which has proved quite reliable for conservatives who wonder about an issue which does not lend itself to a "left" or "right" interpretation is the manner in which the matter is treated in the "liberal" press. When only one side is favorably and constantly reported we can be sure that it is important to the left-wing planners' designs. Its immediate purpose may seem fine, logical and ethical but, at the risk of seeming "paranoid," we must warn that things are not always what they seem. In the case of the tobacco controversy it has been pointed out that what is involved is both a power grab and a blow at the South where tobacco is important to the welfare of the people.

Although the youth of America is in far more danger from the smoking of marijuana and the use of LSD, heroin and other dangerous drugs, the busy bureaucrats are trying to "save" them from tobacco. While the use of tobacco may not be desirable, and those who oppose it for moral or religious reasons are honest and upright people, those who are emotionally opposing it for "health" reasons seem a bit too anxious to impose

their will. Those who are against the use of tobacco for religious or moral reasons are usually also against the use of alcohol. This is logical as both serve no useful purpose and can be classed together as temptations of the flesh to be avoided, but our anti-tobacco bureaucrats and their do-gooder helpers seem to have no concern over the hazards of alcohol in their "Big-Brother" health program.

When the tobacco industry was called a "legal" industry, one Congressman went to great lengths to point out that in many states it is not legal for persons under a certain age to smoke, thereby implying that this casts doubt upon the "legality" of the tobacco industry. He did not bother to list the other things which persons under certain ages cannot do, among them vote and drive a car as well as drink alcohol. All these things apply to persons deemed by the makers of the above regulations or laws to be too young, and after a certain age the law no longer applies to them. In the case of the anti-tobacco forces there is to be no age limit at which we can escape their ministrations. The Volstead Act and "Prohibition" were a dismal failure and brought more evils than they cured, taking the alcohol business away from legitimate industry and putting it in the hands of gangsters and "bootleggers." People did not stop drinking, they merely got their alcoholic beverages in "Speakeasies" and from criminal sources, or made their own "homebrew" or "bathtub gin."

The way the bureaucrats hope to destroy the tobacco industry is not by prohibiting smoking, as they prohibited drinking during "Prohibition" but by frightening the American public into turning against smoking. By requiring the cigarette manufacturers to print in a prominent spot on each package a warning about the horrible things which will happen if the prospective buyer is foolish enough to go through with the purchase, Big Brother will see to it that only a mentally ill person would want to be seen possessing such a dangerous weapon. And, of course, there will be bigger and better ways of dealing with persons who set such a bad example and are so incapable of taking the good advice Big Brother forces upon them at every turn of the radio or TV knob.

The warning approved by the House of Representatives reads: "Warning: The Surgeon General has determined that cigarette smoking is dangerous to your health and may cause lung cancer or other diseases." The Federal Trade Commission has proposed the following: "Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death resulting from cancer, coronary heart disease, chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema and other diseases." Anyone who continued to smoke after reading the above would really have to be a masochist.

The fact that no scientific evidence has ever been introduced to prove that cigarette smoking actually causes any of the above diseases, including the "and others," does not seem to enter into the picture. All the fear peddling stems from a report, called the Surgeon General's Report of 1964, which "was developed not by the time proven method of hearings involving confrontation and cross-examination, but instead was based on a 'review of the literature'—a review which proved to be highly selective and did not cite much contradictory experimental evidence." (CONG. REC., June 17, 1969, p. 16172.)

How seriously the Surgeon General took his own report was commented upon by Rep. Carter on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"You know, the Surgeon General appeared before our committee, and in my opinion he is a real fine gentleman, and he had three other distinguished advisors with him who strongly supported legislation for labeling cigarettes and I understand perhaps would

go even further. Yet at the same time I saw that they were all heavy smokers, including the Surgeon General. As I sat there we saw great layers of smoke arising from the witness stand and going up to the ceiling. In other words, they were saying in my opinion, 'Do not do as I do, but do as I say do.' This was the Surgeon General of the United States."

Hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives during the end of April 1969 and on May 1. Out of these came 1420 pages of testimony which added no further information supporting the Surgeon General's Report of 1964 but which did produce information refuting it. A funny thing happened, however, the anti-tobacco forces continued their propaganda and the testimony which did not support their "cause" received little or no publicity. Commenting on this, Rep. Harsha stated: "It is an ironic commentary on our times that the testimony of medical and scientific experts who dispute the scientific evidence against smoking cigarettes is buried by the press. Yet the same kind of testimony that questions the scientific evidence against the use of marijuana gets headlines. Apparently many Americans are closed minded about a legal product and open minded about an illegal one."

Congressman Richardson Preyer prepared a press release, generally ignored, which sums up the "evidence" pro and con, and states in part:

"Experimental research conducted since the Surgeon General's Report of 1964 and brought out in the recent tobacco hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, raises the most serious doubts about the conclusions reached in that report," the North Carolina Representative stated. . . . "Evidence reveals it is at least as likely that constitutional factors other than cigarette smoking are the cause of lung cancer, heart disease, and emphysema. Not a single witness for the anti-smoking forces testified to any research which he himself had done, while 18 witnesses testified that their own research cast serious doubts on the theory that cigarettes cause disease," Preyer declared. . . . "Actually, the experimental and statistical evidence has seriously undermined the conclusions of the 1964 report," he said.

Rep. Preyer went on to list seven "myths" and accompanied them with the facts to refute them. They were as follows:

1. Myth: "Every smoker is damaged by his smoking."

Fact: Most smokers suffer no impairment or shortening of life. For example, the disease most closely connected with smoking is lung cancer. The lung cancer incidence among smokers is 5/100 of 1%.

2. Myth: "There is an epidemic of lung cancer."

Fact: There has been a tremendous reduction in overall respiratory disease since 1900 when respiratory death rates were over five times what they are today. It is particularly misleading to say lung cancer is an "epidemic" in view of the declining rate of increase (indicating that the incidence will level off in the next few years).

3. Myth: "Cigarette smoking causes 300,000 premature deaths a year."

Fact: These claims have no basis in fact.

4. Myth: "Cigarette smoking turns the lungs black," or "Doctors can tell cigarette smoker's lung from a non-smoker's lung."

Fact: It is impossible to tell a smoker's lung from a non-smoker's lung upon examination either grossly or microscopically.

5. Myth: "Heavy smoking will shorten your life by 8 years."

Fact: This statement is based on a statistical study by Dr. Cuyler Hammond who has refused to disclose the raw data in his studies so as to permit independent evaluation. To the contrary, recent "twin studies"—

where one smokes and other does not—indicates there is no difference in their death rate.

6. Myth: "Giving up smoking makes one healthier."

Fact: According to the Public Health Service "Morbidity" report former smokers have more ill health than present smokers or those who never smoked! This may only show how misleading statistical information can be.

7. Myth: "There are 77 million excess work days lost each year by smokers."

Fact: The study on which this claim has been based has recently been found to contain such unbelievably large errors that it is worthless. These new analyses have been made available to the Public Health Service with no result.

Rep. Quillen of Tennessee challenged the anti-tobacco forces:

"Mr. Speaker, we grow tobacco, not cancer, in the First District of Tennessee and throughout the Nation, and I challenge the Surgeon General of the United States to prove otherwise."

"In the uproar over the alleged connection between smoking and cancer which followed the Surgeon General's report, many people were led to believe that there is conclusive medical proof of such a connection."

"This is not true. In spite of all the research that has been undertaken, there is still dispute, even among members of the medical profession, about a connection between smoking and ill health."

"It is unfair to let one individual and a bureaucratic agency put a great industry out of business, when it is entirely up to the individual whether he wants to use tobacco."

"The issue goes far beyond the question of smoking and health. It strikes at the fundamental question of policymaking by the elected legislative branch or by appointed regulatory agencies which have been called the headless 'fourth branch' of Government."

"The American people have been barraged with anti-smoking literature, commercials on radio and television, newspaper stories, films before their civic clubs, and pamphlets, and all of this has been one sided."

Rep. Quillen then introduced the statements of many eminent physicians concerning the claims of the anti-tobacco forces that smoking causes a long list of terrible diseases, lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, black lung, besides being addictive and shortening life.

Lung cancer: Sheldon C. Sommers, M.D., Clinical Professor of Pathology, Columbia University College states: "After at least 30 years of experimental work, and many smoke inhalation experiments in animals, lung cancers of the most common, squamous cell human type have not been produced. It is usually difficult to prove a negative, but if cigarette smoke were a cause of lung cancer, it is indeed surprising that no animal experiments have succeeded in its production."

Victor Buhler M.D., Associate Clinical Professor of Pathology and Oncology at University of Kansas School of Medicine, and former president of the College of American Pathologists, states: "The cause of cancer in humans, including the cause of cancer of the lung, is unknown."

Duane Carr, M.D., Professor of Surgery, University of Tennessee College of Medicine; "As of the present date, the cause of lung cancer remains unknown."

Heart disease: William Evans, M.D., former consulting physician, the Institute of Cardiology London, England, states: "The incrimination that smoking causes or accelerates heart disease is wholly unwarranted."

Walter S. Priest, M.D., Emeritus Professor of Medicine at Northwestern University Medical School, states: "It is very doubtful that such a relationship exists. If heavy smokers suffer coronary thrombosis in a significantly

greater proportion than non-smokers the cause of the phenomenon could be related to the stress that usually goes together with the smoking habit."

Campbell Moses, M.D., Medical Director, American Heart Association, states: "There is no proof that cigarette smoking causes (disease of) coronary arteries. . . let's be sure we understand the American Heart Association position. We do not say we have the data which says cigarette smoking causes coronary artery (disease)."

Emphysema: Edwin Rayner Levine, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine, Chicago Medical School, states: "I cannot find any actual evidence that. . . cigarette smoke or anything else, has a causal relationship to the development of this disease."

John P. Wyatt, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Department of Pathology, University of Manitoba, states: "Most authorities agree that emphysema presents a complex problem which awaits scientific explanation."

Israel Rappaport, M.D., Former Associate Clinical Professor, Columbia University Medical School, states: "The 'protagonists of the anti-smoking campaign' have refused to face this paramount question: 'If it is true that we do not know what emphysema is and whence it originates, how can they maintain the claim that it is linked to cigarette smoking? How can their position be reconciled with scientific principles?'"

Black lung—"Smokers' lung": Dr. Sheldon C. Sommers states: "The knowledge of what the black pigment represents, namely, carbon particles or coal dust, is known to every well trained second-year medical student, and. . . it is not possible to equate blackening of the lung to exposure to tobacco products."

Hiram T. Langston, M.D., Professor of Surgery, University of Illinois College of Medicine, and President of the American Association for Thoracic Surgery, states: "The color of the lung has to do with the matter of carbon, and I am unable to recognize the difference between a smoker and a non-smoker. . . and I have never been able to correlate it with the use of tobacco."

Dr. Victor Buhler states: "I have examined thousands of lungs—and I cannot tell you from examining a lung whether or not its former host had smoked. . . I state flatly and unequivocally and emphatically that cigarette smoke will not turn the lung black."

The biased approach of the anti-smoking propaganda was noted by two others.

John W. Sawyer, Ph. D., Professor of Mathematics, Wake Forest University, stated: "The (Public Health Service) Morbidity Report expressly conceded that errors in some of the results were too large to permit meaningful conclusions; at the same time conclusions from these results were advanced. This type approach is not scientific, but shows bias and desire to reach predetermined conclusions."

"(The Public Health Service) has gone even further in using portions of the Morbidity Report, often out of context, as a basis for a condensed propaganda pamphlet entitled 'Smoking and Illness.' This pamphlet boldly ignores even those inherent limitations acknowledged in the Morbidity Report. It flatly, and without qualification, asserts precisely how much illness and disease is due to smoking. Nowhere does the pamphlet disclose that the basic data included no medical diagnoses by doctors but only self and proxy diagnoses by laymen. In the light of this Critique, the further use and compression of the Morbidity Report in this pamphlet can only be regarded as a dangerous and misleading deterrent to further scientific study."

Dr. Duane Carr stated: "Unfortunately, many supposedly well informed officials in the Public Health Service and certain voluntary health organizations have permitted

their emotionalism and zeal to outdistance the actual scientific knowledge and proof. This has resulted in misleading the public into believing there is proof where none exists. A bandwagon effect has resulted even in the medical and scientific community where too many have accepted the pronouncements of dedicated zealots, lacking the time to examine the scientific basis, or lack of it, for such pronouncements."

Science today seems to be the handmaiden of politics and propaganda. The hardy soul who makes a scientific discovery which disagrees with the "accepted" viewpoint (especially on the race question) had better just keep it to himself if he does not want to be ostracized and intimidated into "reevaluating" his facts. All these men of science who have dared to oppose the propaganda myths concerning the dangers of smoking to health may find their lives becoming a bit more difficult since the anti-smoking forces like the anti-gun forces will not give up until their mission is accomplished. This means destroying or discrediting the opposition.

Since the danger of smoking cannot really be scientifically proved, it is obvious that there is more to the scare campaign than meets the eye. Since drugs and alcohol are so much more dangerous to health and happiness and do not evoke such an emotional attack, the anti-smoking zealots are not just interested in health problems even if they are sincerely convinced smoking is dangerous, for there are more dangerous things for them to crusade against. Alcohol and drugs break up homes, cause children to be neglected and result in untold misery to others beside the user himself. Alcohol is the cause of over half of the automobile fatalities with the innocent suffering along with the guilty. Tobacco may or may not injure the user in some way but it cannot harm an innocent bystander or the user's family.

Homer Brett Jr., a former Commander in Naval Intelligence, a career officer with 25 years of intelligence experience, and an expert on Soviet clandestine economic warfare, stated in a prepared speech at a Herald of Freedom Seminar: "It is my opinion that the political and economic war against our tobacco industry goes far deeper than the question of whether or not smoking is healthy. I believe it is a war to damage a great American industry and to damage the South a most recalcitrant area of this nation . . . a conspiracy of International Socialists in America is now waging clandestine economic warfare against what they call 'Imperialist' American free enterprise. . . . If, as I believe is highly probable, a USSR economic warfare team operating inside the USSR embassy in Washington, mounted the clandestine operation against the American tobacco industry, the officer or officers who conceived and mounted this operation are outstanding."

Commander Brett recalled that a move had previously been made against the tobacco industry by an "Easterner" in the Senate and had been prevented by Sen. Strom Thurmond proposing that equal restrictions be placed on the production and sale of liquor as the "Easterner" had proposed for tobacco. He warned that: "For years the Executive Branch of the American Government seems to have been completely incapable of resisting the assaults of the USSR economic warfare strategists against American free enterprise and America's foreign trade. . . . After deep and prolonged study in this field, some of us, who are vitally interested in the problem, have reached the conclusion that we are slowly and steadily being choked out of the world's trade routes. So far the USA has not felt any major effects from the Soviet economic garotte, but in time we will. This is a large and powerful country economically. It takes time and patience to choke a giant to death."

In case anyone is wondering which side of the tobacco controversy the U.S. Com-

munists are on, he has but to look at page one of the official Communist organ, Daily World, of July 2, 1969. It features a half-page photo of Surgeon General William H. Stewart leaning on a large sign which says "No Smoking."

ED LAHEY'S FINEST STORY IS ENDED BY HIS DEATH

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Ed Lahey, who died last Thursday in this city, was in my judgment the most expert writer of our times. Not only were his reports informative but a delight to read. With all of his friends and admirers, I mourn his passing and extend my deepest sympathy to his family. To refresh the minds of those who have read him, I would like to extend the obituary carried in the Detroit Free Press, a Knight newspaper, and his employer.

Also, I would like to extend the remarks of Mr. John S. Knight concerning Ed Lahey in "Knight's Notebook":

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 18, 1969]

ED LAHEY'S FINEST STORY IS ENDED BY HIS DEATH

(By Lee Winfrey)

Edwin A. Lahey, whose writing was admired by millions of readers and whose character was admired by hundreds who knew him, died Thursday in Washington (D.C.) Hospital Center at the age of 67.

Lahey had been chief of the Washington Bureau of Knight Newspapers 13 years, and then its chief correspondent. He was a reporter 42 years altogether, the last 28 of them in Washington.

Services will be at 11 a.m. Saturday in Blessed Sacrament Church, 6001 Western Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. Burial will be in Gate of Heaven Cemetery, Wheaton, Md.

He is survived by his wife, Grace; two daughters, Mrs. Allen Kobliska and Mrs. Bernard Nigro; two brothers, James and Joseph; a sister, Mrs. Gertrude Meiers, and five grandchildren.

Personally and professionally, Ed Lahey was for three decades one of the most respected reporters in this country.

A small, gruff, hard-bitten Chicago Irishman, he rose from grammar-school dropout to become the friend and confidante of presidential candidates, Supreme Court justices and national labor leaders.

Along the way he conquered alcohol, cigarettes, an inferiority complex caused by never having attended college, and the determination of hundreds of news sources to keep him from the truth.

Thirty years ago, after already having built a reputation as a reporter of crime and labor news in Chicago, Lahey was a member of the first class of Nieman Fellows to attend Harvard University in 1938-39.

Moving to Washington two years after leaving Harvard, Lahey scored a number of news beats that made him nationally known.

In 1953, he was first with the story of the resignation of Martin Durkin, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first secretary of labor.

In 1954, he predicted the coup that overthrew the procommunist government of Guatemala a month before it occurred.

In 1952, he interviewed a brooding Sen. Robert A. Taft in Quebec—a story credited

with arranging Taft's famous Morningside Heights reconciliation with Eisenhower, then the Republican presidential candidate.

In 1956, when communist Gilbert Green decided to surrender to federal authorities after jumping bail, he made his decision known, in a special delivery letter to Lahey.

To his colleagues and competitors Lahey perhaps was most admired as one of the best lead writers in the business. He had a gift for compression, for distilling the essence of a story into 15 words or less in a sentence at the top.

An ex-communist employed by the Ladies Garment Workers Union to fight communism never really recovered from Lahey's description of him as "Half coat-and-suit, half cloak-and-dagger."

When kidnap-killer Richard Loeb was killed in prison after making a pass at a fellow inmate, Lahey's lead said: "Dickie Loeb, despite his erudition, today ended his sentence with a preposition."

Lahey's personal language was salty, pungent, often ribald. Some of his best lines never got into print, such as his frigid description of Lyndon B. Johnson:

"Johnson always reminds me of a small-time pool hustler in Odessa, Tex., leaning against the wall cleaning his ear with a kitchen match while he waits for some sucker to come in."

While unstuffing stuffed shirts and deflating windbags in public print, Lahey mocked himself with equal good humor.

The Chicago Newspaper Guild gave him an award in 1966 for "outstanding contributions to the newspaper industry" "which I guess was for leaving Chicago," Lahey observed.

"My reputation as a prophet was unalterably established," he liked to tell friends, "when I predicted that Fidel Castro wouldn't last six months."

Lahey's personal style, unbuttoned and informal, was the product of a hard childhood and a rough early youth.

He was born in Chicago Jan. 11, 1902, the son of a machinist. Unclear all his life was the matter of exactly how long he went to school.

When he signed in at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow, and was faced with the blank labeled "previous education," he wrote in: "Fourth grade, Chicago public schools."

Apparently he dropped out at the age of 13 or 14. "None of that Abe Lincoln stuff," he said years later. "Everybody did it, not to build character, but to bring in \$5."

He worked as an office boy, a shipping clerk, a hod carrier and a railroad yard clerk. Once he made some move-on money as a dishwasher aboard the old excursion steamer Tashmoo, running between Detroit and Port Huron.

Years later he loved to ride in railroad sleeping cars. Recalling his early itinerant days, he said: "I rode so many miles on the outside of the car, it's nice to ride inside now."

He broke into the newspaper business in 1927 as a reporter for the Glen Ellyn (Ill.) Beacon, a now-defunct weekly.

"The newspaper industry," he later recalled, "rescued me from a life of toil in Yard Three of the Proviso (Ill.) yards of the Chicago and North Western Railroad."

He liked to say in later life that one of the reasons he enjoyed the newspaper business was that there was "no heavy lifting."

From Glen Ellyn, Lahey moved on to the East St. Louis Journal and the Associated Press. In 1929, he landed a job with the Chicago Daily News, "the only paper I ever wanted to work for."

In the gangland-era Chicago of the early 1930s, the hard-drinking, hard-working Lahey was one of the best police reporters around. He seemed to know everyone he wrote about on both sides of the law.

When "Machine Gun" Jack McGurn was

killed, for example, in a Chicago shooting match, Lahey wrote a sympathetic obituary that took note of the mobster's love of golf. His story concluded:

"Jack was killed last night. He died in the low Eighties" (an address on the South Side).

After several years of covering crime, Lahey volunteered for his first labor assignment in 1936. His coverage of steel and auto sit-down strikes in 1937 brought him a wide reputation.

The next year he went to Harvard to "cure the worst damn inferiority complex about college you ever saw."

He was less than awed, however. To a long-winded teacher, he observed: "Would you mind summarizing that last point in 10,000 words?"

Felix Frankfurter, later a Supreme Court justice, was a Harvard law professor at the time. He gave Lahey a collection of essays with a flyleaf inscription saying: "To Ed Lahey, to whom I owe so much of my education."

Lahey did not neglect his old gangland contacts meanwhile. He took one of his hoodlum pals to New York's Harvard Club for a chat, saying: "I figured nobody there would recognize a couple of crumb-bums like us."

Lahey quit drinking in 1940, joined Alcoholics Anonymous and stayed dry the rest of his life. In 1941, the Daily News sent him to Washington, where he reached his greatest fame.

He traveled extensively in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II and old photographs of him at work there still lined his office wall in Washington's National Press Building more than 20 years later.

His byline appeared from all over the world, from Europe and Africa and Latin America—the latter a particular interest of his for which he taught himself Spanish so that he could travel.

In 1956 he was named chief of the Washington bureau of Knight Newspapers. He remained with Knight after the Chicago Daily News, his old home paper, was sold in 1959 to Marshall Field.

Lahey covered every presidential campaign from 1944 through 1964. "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."

Always he abided by his personal motto: "Fawn not upon the great," a quotation from Thomas a Kempis. Always his point of view was irreverent, as when he diagnosed John Kennedy's victory in the 1960 election:

"Nixon had the wrong kind of kisser. Kennedy sends the women."

It would be difficult, without sounding cloying, to tell how much Ed Lahey was loved by people who knew him.

Among his close friends were many of the great—Robert F. Kennedy, Arthur Goldberg, Robert A. Taft, Philip A. Murray, Clarence Mitchell.

Equally admiring were a host of newspapermen he helped. He never was too busy to offer writing advice, give background information or simply entertain a caller with a story or two.

Lahey always looked small and a little frail—"He reminds you of an elf who grew too big for the burrow and had to go live with people," wrote J. A. C. Dunn of the Charlotte Observer.

In 1960, his health began to fail.

He underwent surgery that year for what doctors thought was cancer. His friend, Arthur Goldberg, helped make out his will.

When surgery showed no cancer, one of his friends who knew how Lahey like to be approached, told friends: "Tell the bum to send back the flowers."

But in 1963, Lahey developed emphysema and had to quit smoking, a habit that burned up two to three packs a day for most of his life.

By June of 1968, he no longer was strong enough to get to his Washington office regularly. After covering every presidential campaign for 20 years, he had to sit out last year's race.

The newspaper business will miss him, because he was one of a kind. In the 1950's, when everyone was apprehensive about the atomic bomb, he liked to say that "the only defense against a nuclear blast is a state of grace."

If anyone ever died in that blessed state, his friends will all swear that it was Ed.

JOHN S. KNIGHT'S NOTEBOOK: ED LAHEY, REPORTER

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 and 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 asked 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 the 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 CRITICAL NEED FOR DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, I was privileged to testify before the Select House Subcommittee on Education which held hearings on the proposed Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, of which I am a cosponsor.

In view of the reaction to these remarks that I have received from my district and other Members of Congress who have read them, it was my thought to have them reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues; many of whom who have expressed an interest in this serious national problem of drug abuse:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN ON THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969 TO THE SELECT HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, JULY 9, 1969

Mr. Chairman, as one of the co-sponsors of H.R. 9314, (the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969), I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of this proposed legislation.

I also want to take this opportunity, at the outset, to commend this distinguished committee for scheduling early hearings on what, in my judgment, may well be one of the single, most important, and most vitally needed legislative proposals to be considered by the 91st Congress.

Drug abuse—a critical national problem: Drug abuse and narcotics addiction have reached staggering proportions in recent years. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs reports, based solely on law enforcement statistics, that one out of every 3,000 persons in this country is a "recorded addict"—that most addicts are from four states (California, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey)—that nearly 46% of the "recorded addicts" are between 21 and 30 years of age—that, for some "hard users", \$100 a day is needed to feed the habit—that drug addicts not only "feed the coffers" of organized crime but account for a high percentage of street crimes such as muggings, holdups, shop lifting, robbery, forgery, and prostitution.

The Bureau further advises that the cost to the taxpayer for rehabilitating just one narcotic addict per year is approximately \$1,300 and \$3,000 per addict is needed for a full six weeks of inpatient rehabilitation treatment.

While these figures are alarming—they do not begin to tell the real story of the drug problem in America.

WHO ARE DRUG ABUSERS?

The fact is, that these figures and statistics deal only with "recorded addicts", as reported by private and law enforcement agencies. The users of marijuana, hallucinogens, stimulants, and depressants, however, are seldom "recorded" or discovered unless they are arrested.

Therefore, at the present time, there just is no way to account for this vast army of "drug abusers". But, if the estimates of our educators and guidance counselors mean anything, there may be as many as 20 million "drug abusers", in addition to the one out of every 3,000 "recorded addicts" in this country.

The truly shocking facet about the "drug abuser" group, Mr. Chairman, is that the vast majority of them are in their teens!

And, regrettably society has failed to meet or even properly recognize this national threat because drug abuse in America is, beyond any shadow of doubt, a very serious, compelling, and potentially explosive national problem.

For those of us in the so-called "over 30" age group, drugs are drugs. Period. We've known about them for a long time and we've heard about the "dark recesses of society" in which addicts live—half free, half alive!

Times are changing: What apparently has passed us by, however, is the fact that, in recent years, drugs have suddenly become a source of growing fascination for millions of young people. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that an entirely new "subculture" has developed around drugs and narcotics that the adult generation in America is only vaguely aware of—or, more realistically, totally unaware of.

To a great extent, in my judgment, the basic problem involved in this entire area of narcotics addiction and drug abuse—is one of "communication"; no matter how abused and overused that term has become of late.

Too often, both sides of the "generation gap" are very reluctant to let facts interfere with opinions when it comes to drug abuse. Quite frankly, I'm of the view that

the general public has neither been adequately informed nor sought to learn the vital facts or the real truths about how drug abuse can completely ruin a young person's entire life.

A "creeping social disease": I have seen at first hand how easily and how relatively unnoticed the drug problem can "creep up" on a community, a school, or a family. It is happening right now in my Congressional District in California and throughout America, and, in spite of valiant local efforts to fight back, we have a long way to go before we can even fully comprehend the total dimensions and impact of this "social disease" that is sweeping across our land.

As a concerned parent, citizen, and legislator, I have come to the realization that we've made many mistakes in the past in attempting to deal with this drug abuse problem. I have received hundreds of letters and even phone calls late at night from the grieving parents of addicted or "experimenting" teenagers asking: "Where did we go wrong—what can we do now?"

Americans still uninformed: In 1962, the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse stated that:

"The general public has not been informed of most of the important facts related to drug abuse and, therefore, has many misconceptions which are frightening and destructive. This situation is due to many causes, among which are the failure of schools to recognize the problem and provide instruction of equal quantity and quality as that provided for other health hazards."

This conclusion was reached, Mr. Chairman, in 1962 at the executive level of our government. However, in the seven years that have slipped by since then, the general public has still not been awakened to this drug abuse threat, no significant role has been undertaken by our schools to combat it, and the problem itself has been compounded three-fold.

A community fights back: One of the communities in my district, Fort Bragg, discovered in 1967 that at least 50 percent of the students in the local high school admitted "using drugs". Even this estimate seemed low, however, since 35 percent said they were having "a serious involvement with drugs".

Several counselors and key officials at Fort Bragg High School, once the initial shock subsided, quietly decided they had to act. So, they proceeded to "wake the town and tell the people". In addition, they visited a nearby State Hospital where former addicts were being utilized in a drug abuse program there as counselors. *The thought was, if these high school kids who are "experimenting with drugs won't listen to their parents, church leaders, or school officials on the subject of drug abuse, perhaps they will listen to former drug addicts who have known and lived in the tragic, unreal world of narcotics and drugs.*

At first, the idea got nowhere. The community was apprehensive and suspicious. By and large, the people of Fort Bragg were in an understandable state of shock and not readily amenable to any "new" or "radical" innovations. The bitter, hard, cold facts, however, clearly revealed that:

1. The use of drugs among teenagers is very widespread.
2. Teenagers in general have no real knowledge of the dangers involved in drug abuse and, in fact, are unbelievably naive on the subject.
3. *Those procedures previously thought to be effective in combatting drug abuse (i.e. law enforcement and clinical rehabilitation) have caused only alienation and bitterness between teenagers and their parents, teachers, and the community at large.*

The "awareness house concept":

In Fort Bragg, as the realities became better known and understood, shock soon gave way to reason. Something had to be done! A

new approach was needed if there was to be a meaningful and effective solution to this community's problem.

And, it came in the form of "Awareness House"; a place where young people could go voluntarily and anonymously to receive expert and qualified guidance and counseling in the true dangers of drug abuse from former, rehabilitated narcotics addicts.

(Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert at this point in the record a reprint from the March 21, 1969 issue of Life magazine and several reprints from local newspapers in my district detailing the background, organization, and effectiveness of the "Awareness House" concept.)

A model community action program: In April of this year, the future potential of the "Awareness House" concept as a pilot community action program for the entire nation was recognized in the form of a training grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Under the Education Professions Development Act (PL 90-35), this grant will be utilized to train 12 former drug addicts to serve as counselors in the public school system of Mendocino County, California, using the "Awareness House" experience as a basis for this training.

The fact of the matter is, that the "Awareness House" approach has worked effectively where other so-called community action programs to combat teenage drug abuse have failed.

Why? Fundamentally, because the "Awareness House" philosophy recognizes that "times are changing" and that a new technique of communication with young people is vital to not only closing the so-called "Communications Gap"—but to solving the drug abuse problem!

The answer, I believe, lies in one word—"Awareness"!

Grave misconceptions about drugs can and do interfere with sensible talks between parents and their children or effective instruction between teachers and their students. For years it has been said that smoking marijuana is "bad"—but a deafening silence usually follows when a teenager asks what is so different about alcohol or nicotine so commonly used by adults?

The education-generation-communication gap: How many parents or teachers can talk about the mental effects of prolonged marijuana smoking—or about the relationship of LSD and birth defects? More important, how many parents or teachers are talking about it at all?

How many schools today have a realistic, effective drug abuse program or even a "block of drug abuse instruction"? Regrettably, very few! Some states do not even require it. Many are devoting more time and attention to shop, sewing, cooking and sex than they are to the exploding social cancer of "mind-bending", life-destroying drug abuse by teenagers.

Today, responsible, realistic and constructive drug education is being hampered by three basic factors:

1. A lack of "awareness", and effective training by our educators.
2. An uncertainty about and unavailability of the "right" teaching materials.
3. Prevailing community resistance to any form of effective drug education—a continuing reflection of public fear and controversy over drug abuse.

But, I submit, that unless and until we begin to "communicate" with our young people about the real dangers of drugs and narcotics, the problem of teenage drug abuse is going to grow and eventually become totally destructive to them and to our society.

The kind of communication I refer to here applies to parents, educators, law enforcement officials, and young people and, in my judgment, education is the key.

The role of education in combatting drug abuse: As was done in Fort Bragg by the

high school staff, our educational institutions in this country must now "wake the nation and tell the public" that drug abuse has become a social menace in America and that, through knowledge and truth, we can avoid having the young lives of millions turned into a nightmare from which for many, there is just no return!

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I am such an enthusiastic sponsor and supporter of and believer in the need for The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969. Experience has amply and clearly demonstrated that our law enforcement agencies, rehabilitation facilities, and community action programs are largely "after the fact" stop-gap measures which, at best, deal with drug abusers "after" they become personally involved.

What we need, Mr. Chairman, is an effective and hard-hitting educational program for adults and teenagers alike that tells it like it really is—"before" the damage is done!

Federal funds authorized under this proposed legislation could be used to devise and evaluate factual and realistic new drug education curricula, help communities set up "Drug Alert Seminars," and assist local school districts in providing demonstration projects for drug abuse education.

In addition, a key section in this bill, in my judgment, would make funds available so that our educators, law enforcement officials, and community leaders could participate in short-term or summer college-level courses on drug education.

Getting together—finally: Using the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 as a vehicle of cooperation and coordination, I can foresee all parties to the drug abuse problem coming together and joining forces—parents, teachers, students, law enforcement officials, and community leaders. Only in this way, as I see it, will we achieve that "better understanding" that is vitally needed to combat drug use and abuse.

Along with the enactment of this legislation, I believe we, as a Nation, must move forward on many other fronts. Among these, are:

1. *Law enforcement:* The absolute necessity for Federal and state law enforcement agencies to crack down even harder on the "pushers" responsible for illegal traffic in dangerous drugs and narcotics and who prey on the weaknesses of human beings.
2. *Community action programs:* The compelling and urgent need for more communities to develop local action programs such as the "Awareness House" concept or comparable projects which utilize rehabilitated addicts to "tell it like it is" and reveal the real dangers to young "drug abusers".
3. *Coordination and cooperation:* The critical necessity at every level of government and within every political subdivision in America to enlist the support of the news media, civic and social groups, and our educational and law enforcement institutions to work together to help combat drug abuse through factual information, logic, and a better understanding of both the nature and the scope of the problem.

4. *"Drying-up the source":* A more concentrated effort to determine how, when, where, and by whom narcotics and dangerous drugs are entering this country and being made available to the general public. Where applicable, such as in my own State of California, hearings and investigations by the Congress and the Justice Department should be conducted to determine if additional border restrictions with neighboring countries should be implemented during this emergency period.

5. *Education and training:* The fundamental and underlying ingredient of any effective drug abuse program in America is factual and meaningful education and training. Federal legislation in this regard, such as the Drug Abuse Education Act, must be supplemented and "dove-tailed" by state and local drug abuse education programs

that are tailored to cope with special or local problem areas.

6. *Treatment and rehabilitation*: The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 recognizes and provides for greater emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation rather than on disciplinary action as the primary role of society in coping with addicts. While these programs are and will be improved and expanded, the gains made by patients quite often cannot be maintained after discharge due to the almost total absence of "aftercare services" in the community.

7. *"Aftercare services"*: More privately endowed "aftercare drug centers" are needed throughout the country where the progress and, if necessary, follow-up treatment of recently released drug addicts can be secured. These include private hospitals, "halfway houses", service organizations and religious groups.

Summary: At a time when all of us are vitally concerned about spiraling inflation and especially the skyrocketing costs of education, the absolute essentiality of priority spending is most acute. Nowhere, in my judgment, is the need for a high priority in domestic spending more acute however, than in the area of drug abuse.

I view the drug problem in America, quite frankly, as part and parcel of the rising spectre of moral, social, and national decay that is creeping over America. I see it as an important and integral part of the effort underway to alienate young people in this country from their parents, the family structure, the church, the educational institution, the so-called "establishment", and from those basic precepts and moral values that Americans have long held valid and enduring.

What better way to alienate and immobilize young Americans, than to "bend their minds and bodies inside out with "easy to get" drugs and narcotics?

For too long, we have tried "preaching and sermonizing to our young people about the dangers of drug abuse—and it has been notoriously ineffective!

With The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, we can provide a well-coordinated and integrated national program whereby the required funds and assistance will be made available for realistic, effective, and vitally needed drug abuse education.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge favorable action and swift passage of this legislation in the deep belief that it is both imperative and mandatory that we in the Congress move in a positive, constructive way to put down this threat to American youth and the society in which we live.

As President Nixon has said: "America faces a crisis of the spirit." Certainly, the drug abuse problem is part of the crisis and millions of Americans look to us for an answer.

The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, in my judgment, goes a long way in providing that answer!

IS IT TIME FOR A PAUSE IN OUR CONQUEST OF SPACE?

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us take great pride in the tremendous achievements of our space program, climaxed by the latest great demonstration of our scientific ability in the successful lunar landing of Apollo 11.

The question has been asked repeatedly: Where do we go from here?

There is much yet to learn in space, of course. We have literally but scratched the surface.

But, at the same time, is it perhaps a time when we really should pause, maybe even take a step backward, and decide where we should go next.

I have been a strong supporter of the space program and I still am. I also am cognizant of the drain which the space program has been on our Federal budget.

Nearly 40 years ago, Germany pioneered in rocket research—in those pre-World War II days—under the guidance of a large team of scientists, including Dr. Walter D. Dornberger and Dr. Werner von Braun, who since the war have been doing vital research work for our own country.

Dr. Dornberger, now a resident of the town of Boston, a suburb of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., was at the launching of Apollo 11 last week. He is now retired from his research role at Bell Aerosystems Corp., Buffalo, but he was a guest of Dr. von Braun for the launching.

Calling the Apollo 11 launching "the greatest technological accomplishment in the history of mankind," Dr. Dornberger says he feels that now it is time to pause in seeking new ventures and begin to make practical use of the wealth of information we have accumulated.

He feels that the United States now should be concentrating on establishing space stations in permanent orbit 200 or 300 miles above the earth.

With these stations, he believes the Nation then could cut its space exploration costs by having recoverable and reusable rocket-propelled vehicles which could operate as shuttle vehicles between earth and the space satellites.

Dr. Dornberger elaborates on his well-founded views in the following article from the July 16 issue of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express:

EX-BELL SCIENTIST AWAITS LIFTOFF

Dr. Walter R. Dornberger of Back Creek Rd., Town of Boston, will watch the blastoff this morning of Apollo 11 on its moon trip from Cape Kennedy, convinced he is seeing "the greatest technological accomplishment in the history of mankind."

"This is the final, crowning triumph of my life," the 74-year-old Dornberger told The Courier-Express by telephone Tuesday from Coca Beach, Fla., where he is waiting out this morning's lunar launch.

He concedes that the Apollo 11 moon shot is a "magnificent achievement." But he also believes it may have cost too much and may be a misguided use of the science of rocketry to which he has devoted 40 years.

SEES NEED FOR STATIONS

"We had to do it for political and prestige purposes," he said. "Now I think with the present money problems we have in the country, we should take one step back and really start to study space."

Dr. Dornberger then mentioned a theme that has become a favorite with him since he retired four years ago as vice president in charge of research for Bell Aerosystems—space stations in permanent orbit 200 or 300 miles above the earth.

"All my life has been spent with chemical propulsion," he explained. This system is just too wasteful—throwing all that hardware into the ocean or burning it up in orbit, we could devise rocket-propelled vehicles which would be both recoverable and re-usable.

"These really would be shuttle vehicles, flying from Earth to the space stations on schedule, like an airline. If we can launch 50 planes a day from Kennedy Airport to Europe, we can learn to launch six or seven rocket flights a day from Earth to space stations."

CITES UNTESTED NUCLEAR POWER

Orbiting platforms outside Earth's atmosphere would permit man to undertake serious research into space itself and that incredible source of energy—the sun, he said.

"From an orbiting launch platform 300 miles out in space we wouldn't need all those million pounds of thrust we will use to get Apollo 11 off its pad at Cape Kennedy," Dr. Dornberger said. "We wouldn't have to contend with Earth's gravity. We probably could use some of the efficient, durable electric and nuclear propulsion systems which have been conceived but never tested.

"They can't be tested here on Earth because the thrust is too low. But they will work in outer space—and they may give us faster space vehicles and last longer than chemical propulsion."

WE CAN BUILD HOSPITALS OUT THERE

Dr. Dornberger believes both space and the sun offer immense practical benefits to mankind—the kind of thing that will give "taxpayers something in return for the money they're spending."

"We can build a hospital out there to give patients radiation treatments for things like arthritis and other hardening of the bones and joints," he explained. "We have a perfect vacuum out there, something we cannot create on Earth. We should use it on research into technical procedures which private industry needs.

"Our space satellites can make geological and hydrological studies of the minerals and waters of Earth to tell where oil or iron might be found, or where ocean currents go.

"We can do research into sunlight, our greatest source of energy. Perhaps we can learn to concentrate this energy and build plants to convert it into power. Or maybe we can use it to cultivate the deserts of Earth—the Sahara and Rocky Mountains. The possibilities are limitless.

"And space is beautiful. Perhaps we can even get Hilton or the Holiday Inns to build a resort in space."

Dr. Dornberger believes that the moon is as far into space as we should go in the immediate future. It took man only 20 years from the time he fired his first rocket into space to reach that mysterious satellite of Earth, and there's no real reason to hurry any more, he said.

"Mars and Venus are not inhabited, so why get there?" Dr. Dornberger asked. "As far as we know, the planets of our solar system are uninhabitable.

"Perhaps in the next 100 years or so, we will have inventions that will enable us to leave our solar system. Meantime, we have space and we must learn to take advantage of it."

IN NO HURRY FOR SPACE ISLAND

Dr. Dornberger believes sincerely that the system of orbiting space stations will not cost as much as the Apollo lunar shot—"and everybody knows what that has cost so far, \$40 billion."

"We are in no hurry," he explained. "It will take at least 10 years before we have a successful space station."

Dr. Dornberger will watch the launch as a guest of the National Aeronautics & Space Administration (NASA). He will see the blastoff from one of the official visitors' platforms while Dr. Werner von Braun, who used to work for him at Peenemunde, Nazi Germany's rocket-research station on the Baltic Sea, will see it from the main control station at the cape.

A DIFFERENCE IN CHEMICALS

Though the Apollo 11 will develop millions of pounds of thrust in its liftoff phase, it is still essentially the same chemically-propelled rocket with which Dr. Dornberger began working in 1929.

"I used liquid gas oxygen and alcohol; Apollo uses liquid oxygen and hydrogen," he said.

Dr. Dornberger began his military career with the German army two days after World War I broke out in 1914. He served continuously until 1945, when he surrendered to the American army. He was a major general.

He attended the Technical University of Berlin, Charlottenburg on leave from the army from 1925 to 1929. He took a doctorate in jet propulsion in 1934.

TAKES VON BRAUN TO PEENEMUNDE

In 1931, he laid the basis for Germany's pre-eminence in pre-World War II rocket research by establishing a center at Kummersdorf-West, near Berlin, to which young von Braun and other brilliant scientists were attracted.

This group under Dr. Dornberger transferred in 1937 to Peenemunde, where, as "Army Experimental Station North," they developed the V-1 (buzz bomb) and V-2 rockets which bombarded Britain in the late stages of World War II.

Dr. Dornberger spent two years in a British prison after World War II. He and von Braun, now one of the top executives in the U.S. space program, came to this country under the famed "Project Paper Clip" program which recruited more than 100 Nazi rocketry experts for work in our rocket-missile program.

Dr. Dornberger joined Bell Aerosystems in 1950. He retired in 1965.

Though he did not get one of von Braun's closeup seats at the launching, he did get to interview the three astronauts who have been picked to ride Apollo 11 to the moon. He found them "very relaxed, very confident" and "everything running smoothly" in the tense hours before blastoff.

CHARLESTON HOSPITAL WORKERS STRIKE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the recent conclusion of the Charleston hospital workers' strike may well signal a new and vital phase of the civil rights struggle in America. It is the kind of incident that occurred in Memphis last year and indicates that a combined effort for racial harmony and simple economic justice can bring together black and white Americans in common cause.

The implications of this strike surpass those of a normal labor dispute or even of another racial confrontation in the South. Rather it signifies the compounding of a labor problem with a civil rights issue into a social, economic and political operation. The settlement—which included de facto recognition of unions and a statewide minimum wage increase of 30 cents per hour effecting 20,000 low-wage employees—was a success for the black hospital workers and

for similarly impoverished workers throughout the country.

The poor of this Nation which Michael Harrington referred to as the "other America," continue to be denied recognition as full citizens with equal opportunities for self-determination. Society glorifies work as the prime tool for social and economic mobility, yet even employment does not preclude poverty when the terms of the job are defined by absolute decree of the employer. The non-white poor are particularly vulnerable to such exploitation, lacking both the political and physical power with which to resist. As the Freedomways editorial points out, the Charleston strike evidences a growing sense of class among the "underclass," a feeling shared with the Mexican-American grape pickers in another part of the country, that only through unity and organization can they gain recognition as equal citizens.

The battle for the right to unionize was supposedly fought and won several decades ago, but evidently not so for black workers in Charleston, S.C. Their attempts to improve working conditions and inferior wages—\$1.30 per hour—through organization were answered by the firing of their leaders. Efforts in behalf of the striking workers by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference produced police abuse and outrageous handling by the courts. An example of this was the charging of Rev. Ralph Abernathy, renowned for his nonviolence, with "inciting to riot" and then setting bail at \$50,000. As Magistrate Donald Barkowicz explained his action—recorded in *Jet* magazine July 10, 1969:

For an offense of this nature, in fairness to the people of this city, I cannot order bond for a penny under \$50,000.

Within Charleston the sides divided on strictly racial lines, although the issues and the means of settlement were economic.

Political support for the strikers from around the Nation was interracial, however. Four of my colleagues and I spent a day in Charleston to support and identify with this important movement. In contrast to this and similar efforts by concerned people is the attitude of the Nixon administration to which my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch), refers in his account of our trip reprinted below. For over a year, HEW has been negotiating with the hospital over numerous violations of civil rights laws that could have had the legal result of cutting off Federal funds. Late in June HEW indicated that funds would be stopped unless the discriminatory employment practices, among the main issues in the strike, were ended. A few days later, however, that position was withdrawn. The administration had apparently retreated into the neutrality which President Nixon advocated in his letter to Congressman Koch. It was that attitude which prompted my colleague to quote from Dante:

The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who, in time of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality.

From this incident in Charleston, repercussions will emanate throughout the South and the Nation, announcing to all

who are enslaved in poverty by low wages and discrimination without recourse for change that they need not tolerate that condition any longer. Charleston marks a way to break through: a coalition between the civil rights and the labor movements. The recognition of common interests developing between the economic and racially exploited within this Nation is leading to a unity and a political strength with which the underclass may achieve equal citizenship.

I would offer for my colleagues' consideration the following articles pertaining to the strike by hospital workers in Charleston, S.C., which has finally been settled. They provide accounts of the strike from several perspectives emphasizing different aspects of the situation. They testify to the monolithic resistance from the State of South Carolina and all its resources—with the Federal Government too long a silent accomplice—encountered by poor blacks in Charleston as they assert their basic right to unionize. The articles document one instance of a determined attempt made by the employed poor to overcome their status.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From Freedomways, spring 1969]

CHARLESTON—BATTLEGROUND FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE POOR

At this writing the Hospital Workers' Strike in Charleston, South Carolina is well into its third month. The arbitrary dismissal of workers for their union activity, court injunctions arbitrarily limiting the number of pickets to a token, mass arrests of citizens of all ages, who have attempted peaceful demonstrations in accordance with their rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution—such is the experience of the hospital workers today. It must be kept in mind that the employer in this instance is the State of South Carolina. The State is carrying out its declared policy of not recognizing unions among employees who work for the State. This is a policy articulated in words by the Governor and the Attorney General and reinforced in deeds by the use of state troopers, national guardsmen and police to create an atmosphere of intimidation.

The South Carolina Medical College Hospital and the Charleston County Hospital are public institutions financed by the taxes of South Carolina citizens, including the hospital workers—yet not even Federal law guarantees these workers the right to have a union to bargain for wages and conditions with their employers. The South Carolina hospital workers are indeed part of the public but they are also part of the poor of America which numbers some forty million Americans.

In their courageous strike the hospital workers in South Carolina are serving as the advanced guard representing the aspirations of more than three million other workers in hospitals and nursing homes throughout the country who have such low incomes they are part of the poverty scene in spite of the fact that they have full time jobs and work long hours. The machinery of the State in South Carolina, confronted with this effort of the hospital workers to gain respect, union recognition and job security, is showing its contempt for the poor and demonstrating once again how unrepresentative government is in our country. And once again the glaring contradiction is posed that what this nation is allegedly fighting to guarantee to South Vietnam it hasn't guaranteed to the poor in America—that is, representative government.

The State of South Carolina, in this instance, has created a social crisis through the preponderant use of the military and then

used the atmosphere that it has created as an excuse for imposing a curfew on the city of Charleston, which, of course, is supposed to be in the interest of "public safety."

Charleston is a crucial battleground, therefore, in this new phase of the Freedom Movement. The dignity of the poor is being asserted in a determined effort to build organization powerful enough to deal with the conditions under which they labor. Like every healthy movement it is producing its own capable, indigenous leadership. Mary Moultrie, President of the Hospital Workers Local 1199B in Charleston, is one example and there will be many more as the movement spreads.

Fortunately, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference has brought the talents and prestige of its organization to the support of the hospital workers in Charleston. The Reverend Ralph Abernathy, President of SCLC, has called this the opening of the "second chapter of the Poor People's Campaign." With characteristic energy and dedication Reverend Abernathy and members of his staff have lent their physical presence and involvement to the struggle in Charleston—while at the same time cementing bonds of unity and cooperation with the leaders of the Mexican-American farm workers on strike in California.

The multi-ethnic character of the developing movement of the poor is one of its greatest strengths. The Mexican-American workers striking the commercial grape farms on the West coast and the Afro-American hospital workers in Charleston are in a common struggle against exploitation. Symbolizing the employed sections of the urban and rural poor these current struggles embody the best in the nation's future. Once they and others so situated win the power which comes through organization, they can become the rallying center for all of the poor across the nation.

The cold arrogance which President Nixon and members of his Cabinet recently showed the citizen's delegation from the Poor People's Campaign will surprise few. Much to the contrary, it served to clarify relationships in our country today. The present Administration in Washington, in its composition, is very much the brainchild of Strom Thurmond, Mendel Rivers and the military "Defense" Establishment—political forces in American life antagonistic to the aspirations of the poor for a better life.

The struggle for the human dignity and "civil rights" of the poor is rapidly being defined as the unfinished business of the Freedom Movement. This definition is being spelled out in the over-all experience of the hospital workers in Charleston and the farm workers in California. And success can absolutely be assured by massive support from the public at large throughout the country in as many tangible forms as possible.

[From Jet magazine, July 10, 1969]

BEATINGS, HOSPITAL STRIKE END IN CHARLESTON, S.C.

Only hours after William Kircher, director of organization for the AFL-CIO threatened already uptight Charleston, S.C., with an economically strangling dock shutdown, Medical College Hospital, largest of the two struck hospitals in the city, agreed to demands for recognition of 400 striking workers, mostly black and mostly women. The hospital even agreed to rehire all the strike leaders it fired earlier. The heavily black Longshoremen's Union was set to close the ports when one hospital capitulated and the other, County Hospital, appeared ready to settle.

Rev. Andrew Young, executive vice president of SCLC, hailed the settlement as "a great victory for nonviolence," and observed that more than 20,000 black and white state employees will benefit to the tune of \$5 million next year as a result of the militant

three-month-long stand of 400 SCLC-backed black strikers. Said Rev. Young: "The civil rights and labor coalition begins a new era in the struggle for economic justice."

Notable also in the agreement is the stipulation that SCLC president Rev. David Abernathy, winner of his first major victory as top leader, and an aide, Hosea Williams, will be released from jail on personal recognizance bonds. Abernathy and Williams were charged with inciting a riot, parading without a permit and disorderly conduct after Police Chief John Conroy ordered an Abernathy-led demonstration of 400 black marchers to disperse. Both Abernathy and Williams, who knelt to pray, were picked up bodily by police and put in the paddy wagon. They had been in jail since, and Abernathy had refused to eat. Mrs. Juanita Abernathy, his wife, expressed concern for his health. Abernathy's personal physician, Dr. C. A. Brown of Atlanta, flew in and after performing a thorough examination, announced that Abernathy was in good health. Another visitor to the jail was Rev. Martin Luther King Sr.

SCLC lawyers filed suit in federal court to invalidate the South Carolina law that encompasses "inciting to riot." They say the law is vague and unconstitutional. In setting an unusual \$50,000 bail on Abernathy and Williams, Magistrate Donald Barkowicz declared, "for an offense of this nature, in fairness to the people of this city, I cannot order bond for a penny under \$50,000." Civil rights observers noted bitterly that Abernathy, a nonviolent leader for 14 years, "is now charged with inciting a riot while praying. It's preposterous."

The hospital strikers, mostly black and female, fought hard for union recognition, higher pay (they were paid \$1.30 an hour), upgrading, on-the-job security and dignity as workers and the rehiring of 12 workers who were fired in the first days of union organizing. The strike involves two of the city's largest hospitals, both state operated.

SCLC has supported the strikers since almost the beginning. While Abernathy and Williams were in jail, the Rev. Andrew Young SCLC veteran activist was in charge of the organization's activities. When Abernathy and Williams were arrested black youths reportedly responded by throwing rocks, bricks and bottles. Gov. Robert McNair reimposed a curfew and National Guardsmen were reactivated. About 40 youths were arrested a few days later.

(NOTE.—Captions under pictures accompanying JET article: "With bayoneted rifles at a menacing ready, heavily armed guardsmen advance in wedge formation on black demonstrators." "At start of march, Abernathy, strike leaders Mary Moultrie, Williams are accosted by Police Chief Conroy, cops, newsmen." "Undaunted by amputated foot, veteran SCLC rights worker, Ben (Sunshine) Owens, joins march with Hosea Williams.")

[From the Park East, June 12, 1969]

BID FROM ABERNATHY TAKES KOCH TO STRIKE-TORN CHARLESTON

(By Edward I. Koch)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—On a recent one-day visit to strike-torn Charleston, So. Car., Park East Congressman Edward I. Koch met with leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, toured the city and gained what he believes are certain insights into the entire question of relations between blacks and whites, both here in New York City and throughout the nation. Here, he chronicles his day in Charleston, from the correspondence which preceded it to the thoughts which concluded it. We felt that it would be of interest to our readers as an example of how men and women of dedication and compassion can work together towards a common goal, despite the differences in the color of their skin.)

On April 29, I prepared and sent the fol-

lowing letter to President Richard Nixon which I circulated here on the Hill among my colleagues in the House. Out of the 33 to whom I submitted the letter, 25 cosigned it. The letter reads as follows:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The most serious problem which this country faces and which you as our President must deal with every day is the racial confrontation. It shows itself in a multitude of forms: the violent student demonstrations, the wild melees in our ghettos sometimes resulting in burning and looting, the disrespect for law and order. We all know that while violence can never be tolerated, it too often arises because the peaceful forms of protest, the lawful avenues of dissent, are shut off from those who have been shut out of our society. A vivid and current demonstration of the hopelessness and helplessness which lead to violations of the law and in this case, apparently peaceful non-violent demonstrations, is taking place in Charleston, South Carolina.

"In Charleston, hospital workers, seeking the right to unionize so as to be able to attempt a peaceful way to secure for themselves and their families a decent wage are being subjected to the kind of treatment that those who now make up the great unions of the country were faced with in 1935 when we had the age of the factory sit-ins, when courts enjoined picket lines. The workers of that era, primarily white, overcame the power structure of that day and as a result of their efforts, the Wagner Act was passed which made it clear that collective bargaining from that point on was to be the norm and not the exception. Today in Charleston, the most deprived of our society are seeking the same norm, namely collective bargaining and the power structure is again resisting.

"Mr. President, you have the opportunity to use the prestige of your great office and intercede on behalf of our most impoverished citizens who are not on welfare but are attempting to earn a living wage and who need our help. The same issue was present in the Memphis sanitation strike which culminated ultimately in the tragic assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., who was present for the purpose of leading a protest march in support of the sanitation men on strike. History has a way of repeating itself so that today we see his widow, Coretta King, going to Charleston for that same purpose. We urge you to send your most trusted representative to be present so that those who feel they have no stake in our society will know that the President stands with them."

THE PRESIDENT RESPONDS

As I write this article, I have before me the response from the President dated May 6 which reads as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I appreciate your letter of April 29, co-signed by various of your colleagues, requesting that I send a representative to Charleston 'to be present so that those who feel they have no stake in our society will know that the President stands with them.'

"The Administration has kept itself fully apprised of developments in Charleston during this controversy. I have directed the Attorney General to have observers on the scene. He is keeping me informed on a regular basis.

"I question whether the presence of a Presidential representative would aid in a fair resolution of the controversy, under the circumstances. I think each of us has an obligation, in situations of this kind, to do what we can to urge contending parties to resolve their differences in a calm atmosphere of mutual good faith. Let us join in urging the parties to quiet the situation and continue to seek a peaceful and mutually satisfactory solution to their problems.

"Sincerely,

"RICHARD M. NIXON."

The day after I sent my letter, I received a telegram from the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, as did a number of other congressmen here on the Hill. The telegram requested that I come to Charleston on May 11 to participate in what he referred to as a Mothers' Day March in support of the hospital employee strikers. When I received the telegram, for a brief moment I thought of the day of relaxation that might have been, but how could I not go?

In 1961, when New York State did not recognize the right of collective bargaining for its hospital workers, I marched in a picket line in front of the Manhattan Eye and Ear Hospital. And last year, when the sanitation workers in Memphis, Tenn., were seeking union recognition from the city, I marched with them.

So, I left LaGuardia Airport on Sunday morning at 11:10 a.m. for Charleston. For the next three hours I had as a seat companion a gentleman to whom I introduced myself and who, it turned out, was an affluent member of the business community. He had just come back from a pleasure trip to Greece and Turkey.

As we ate our meal and were served our drinks we talked. I rarely drink at 11:30 in the morning, but what can you do when the stewardess rolls through the plane with her liquors and plunks two—not one but two—miniature bottles of whatever you want on your table? When I was young I thought that the only people who drank during the day were the superintendents who fixed the plumbing when my mother called them. After they had fixed it, she would give them a drink with a tip. But, there I was, thirty or more years after those childhood episodes, drinking in the morning.

All I could manage was one Bloody Mary and when I returned the second bottle unopened to the stewardess, she said, "But, take it with you, it's yours."

TAKING NO CHANCES

"No," I said after a moment's thought. "I am going to Charleston and I don't know what's going to happen down there, but if I get arrested, I don't want the cops to find a bottle of liquor in my pocket." So, my seat companion took it home with him.

In those three hours of conversation that I had with my acquaintance, whose name I don't even recall now, I asked him about the racial situation in New York City. What did he think? What would he do? And he said, rather wistfully, "The people who used to be satisfied to earn a good living are now militant past the point of propriety." I decided not to argue with him—what good would it do? But I thought to myself, "What would he say to those on strike in Charleston who are earning \$1.30 an hour? What would he say to the great number of under-employed and unemployed blacks in this country?"

We made one stop before Charleston—it was Charlotte—and about eight blacks got on the plane; one in particular stood out because of his flamboyant manner. Dressed in a suede vest cut with an Indian floral pattern, dark glasses and sideburns, he looked for all the world as though he were acting a part. I was sure he was going to the march and, sure enough, about two hours later I saw him on the platform at the County Convention Hall where he was introduced as Jessie Jackson, the man who was in charge of affairs at Resurrection City last year.

When we disembarked at Charleston and I approached the terminal, I noticed three blacks wearing buttons which said "Committee." I looked expectantly at them and one asked, "Are you Congressman Koch?" It was Mr. Harrison, a member of SCLC, who was to drive me to the motel where the committee was meeting. He was a big heavy-set man who said he taught school. I commented that he had no distinguishable southern accent for he really talked like a New Yorker, and he seemed startled by this observation.

At the motel, I entered a small room where there were about 15 people. In the center was the Rev. Ralph Abernathy and as I looked around I saw two old friends, Deputy Mayor Tim Costello and Jim McNamara. On every march I have ever been in involving civil rights, Tim and Jim were always there and I thought, "How nice."

I was introduced to Mr. Abernathy who was the only man in the room wearing cuff links and a carnation in his lapel, but somehow they did not seem out of place. "Let's all have lunch," he suggested, and we proceeded to the hotel's dining room. Sitting next to me was Ralph Abernathy's son, Ralph Abernathy III, a youngster about ten years old with a bright eyes and a sweet smile. He told me he was the only black child in his class which was located in a white Atlanta neighborhood, that he liked his teachers and that he was learning French. I asked him, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" And he said to me, "Well, I haven't made up my mind. I want to be either a minister, an attorney or a freedom fighter."

Also sitting next to me was a young man I judged to be about 30 years old. He said he was employed by the State of South Carolina and assigned as a bodyguard to Mr. Abernathy. I asked him whether being employed by the state made him suspect by others and he said, "Sure, it does for some." But, it was clear that there was a wealth of good feeling between the minister and his bodyguard.

When we left the restaurant to go to the county auditorium, I saw the Rangers for the first time, the men assigned to the job of security and order for the march. They wore red Texan stetsons, white bush jackets and trousers, black boots, and red or black kerchiefs. How different they seemed from the Black Panthers who, had they been present, would have worn their black berets, leather jackets and dark glasses. My hostility toward the inflammatory Panthers made me feel an empathy, a rapport with these Rangers who clearly were capable of defending the march without scaring the marchers. One of them, Francois Alvarez (the leader, I believe), looked like a young Juano Hernandez and assisted me in finding a seat on the platform.

In the car on the way to the County Hall, I sat next to a young black who was still in high school. Asked what he planned to do after he finished school he said he had already been interviewed by the FBI for placement with them and that he hoped to be accepted. It occurred to me that we have come a ways if J. Edgar Hoover is seeking out blacks and blacks, in turn, are thinking of an FBI career.

Perhaps 60 people were grouped on the platform, union leaders who included Leon Davis, the head of Local 1199 who had grown whiskers since I had last seen him. Then there were the interminable speeches, two of which were very moving—one by Walter Reuther, the other by Walter Fauntroy.

Mr. Reuther talked about unionism and solidarity and how they had brought General Motors to recognize in the early '30s that men have the right to organize in defense and sale of their labor. After speaking, he gave a \$10,000 check to Mary Moultrie, a young black woman, chairman of the hospital strikers, who was perhaps 28 or 30. He kissed her as he gave her the check and then, as he gave Ralph Abernathy a bear hug, one of the people on the platform said to me, "The \$10,000 will last us three days." Reuther, of course, had recognized this and said there would be more money coming so long as the strike lasted.

And then Walter Fauntroy, a minister, spoke. He talked about Martin Luther King. He repeated over and over that "Martin had impossible dreams and had made some of them come true." He said, "Martin was different—he talked the talk and walked the walk." At the conclusion of his speech he sang the "Quest" song from The Man of La

Mancha—of the impossible dream and the unreachable star. And the hall was hushed as he sang a *capella*, and tears trickled down his face.

When he finished, two ladies were introduced; one was the mother to be honored that day, the other was Rosa Parks, the woman who, in Montgomery, Ala., back in 1956 or so, had been the instigator of the Montgomery bus boycott. She was a woman, very fragile and serene, who appeared almost white in feature and color and said not a word as she held the floral bouquet that was handed to her. Here, I thought, stands one of the great women in America's history who had the courage and the stamina not to give up her seat to a white man just because the law said she must, and who, because of her bravery, inspired Montgomery to walk to work for 364 days until the bus company was brought to its knees and changed its rules, rules which, had they been attacked in court five years later, would have been ruled unconstitutional in any event.

Time was running out; we would have to leave shortly to catch our plane. Congressman John Conyers from Detroit, who led the delegation of five Congressmen—which included William F. Ryan, Allard K. Lowenstein, and myself from New York, and Charles C. Diggs Jr. and John Conyers from Michigan—was asked to speak for all of us. As I sat there, a train of thoughts ran through my head which went something like this. What has happened since the March on Washington? Why is it there are warmth and brotherhood here in Charleston and coldness and apartheid in New York City? I thought of other civil rights campaigns I had been in—walking in the 1963 Washington March; volunteering as a lawyer in Laurel, Miss., in 1964; and lending moral support in Montgomery, Ala., in 1965 and in Memphis, Tenn., a little over a year ago. I remembered those events and I thought of New York City today and wondered why we had permitted the lunatics, black and white, to end the partnership.

Then, John Conyers introduced each of us by name, and as I returned to my seat, Mary Moultrie held out her hand, saying thank you. I gave her a kiss and then went over to Ralph Abernathy who stood with his arms held out. We embraced one another in an *abrazo*.

As I left the hall to get to the airport in the Volkswagen that was jammed with three Congressmen and one Deputy Mayor of the City of New York and a driver, I kept thinking of what I would have liked to have said. I wanted to tell them that Ralph Abernathy III had summed it up when he said he wanted to be a freedom fighter, and I would have told them that he would not have to choose as he thought, but that he could be a freedom fighter along with being a minister or an attorney. Sophomoric as it might have sounded, I would have said that I intend to be a Congressman and a freedom fighter.

I thought again of President Nixon's response, "I question whether the presence of a Presidential representative would aid in a fair resolution of the controversy . . . How different from what John F. Kennedy would have said, and I was reminded of the quote from Dante which the late President often used, "The hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who, in time of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." It is not the President alone, but all of us who will be damned if we stand aside.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1969]
SECOND HOSPITAL ENDS CAROLINA STRIKE—113-DAY WALKOUT MARKED BY TURMOIL IN CHARLESTON

CHARLESTON, S.C., July 18.—A 113-day strike at Charleston County Hospital ended today.

The settlement came three weeks after an end to a larger, companion strike at the South Carolina Medical University Hospital.

The walkout by low-paid Negro nonprofessional workers, most of whom are women, brought organized labor and the civil rights movement together for the first time in the South.

Sitting beside Miss Rosetta Simmons, chairman of a five-member negotiating team for the strikers, Mitchell Graham, chairman of the Charleston County Council, told a news conference, "I am happy that strike and turmoil in the streets of Charleston have ended."

Miss Simmons said, "We are returning to work with a relation of mutual respect and dignity."

Forty-two of the 65 workers will return to work Tuesday and the council agreed "to make every effort" to employ the others within three months without any overstaffing.

An announcement of the settlement scheduled for 10 a.m. was delayed six hours by a disagreement over details of a grievance procedure.

Finally, the County Council agreed to a proposal by the workers to end the strike, but to continue to work on the grievance procedure.

After a two-hour morning session ended without agreement, the Charleston project director for the Southern Christian Leader-

ship Conference, Carl Farris, was arrested outside the council offices on a disorderly conduct charge and a charge of blocking a driveway while leading a demonstration of about 30 teenagers.

About an hour earlier pickets had been ordered to return to the hospital, and there was a possibility that the settlement talks would collapse.

The workers' committee and the County Council met most of Wednesday and yesterday working out settlement terms.

Mr. Graham termed the settlement a victory "only for the people of Charleston county and those who are ill at the hospital."

"We gained recognition as human beings in this community," Miss Simmons said of the striking workers. "It has accomplished a lot for the poor people of the city," she said. Mr. Graham promised a minimum hourly wage of at least \$1.70 next year and to attempt to make it \$1.75.

The hospital had increased its minimum wage from \$1.30 an hour to \$1.60 on July 1 to conform with the new minimum at the Medical University Hospital.

A week ago the County Council had refused to set a time table on the rehiring of all the workers, a key demand by the strikers.

Miss Simmons expressed confidence that all would return to work before 90 days.

In addition to accepting the timetable for re-employment the County Council also

dropped a ban on union activities by the workers from its offer of last week. Also dropped was a provision that would have made a worker with pending criminal charges ineligible for re-employment.

Several workers had been jailed during street demonstrations earlier in the strike.

The strike brought the leadership conference and Local 1199 of the Hospital and Nursing Home Workers together in Charleston. Miss Simmons praised leaders of both groups for their roles. Isalah Bennett, state director of Local 1199B in Charleston, said the next emphasis would be on voter registration and an attempt to organize poor workers throughout the state.

The grievance procedure was slowed by an insistence by the workers' committee for a written provision to allow a worker with a grievance to have another worker accompany him at any stage of the grievance procedure.

This was provided in the settlement of the Medical University strike.

Mr. Graham said the grievance procedure would be reviewed with all county employees and changes adopted if found necessary. But a union official, Henry Nicholas, told newsmen later that the council had agreed privately to continue negotiations with Miss Simmons and her committee on this point. Mr. Nicholas is assistant national organizing director of Local 1199 in New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 24, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The Lord is my light and my salvation;
whom shall I fear?—Psalm 27: 1.*

O God, our Father, in a world filled with the noise of those who put their faith in violence and whose loud clamor would drown out the efforts of those who seek the rights of men in the right way, we come praying to be kept steady in a world of change and to be made strong in a swiftly moving age.

Grant unto us a vision of Thy greatness and an experience of Thy presence that we may lead our Nation in the good paths of righteousness and peace.

Help us to meet this hard day with high courage, to do our demanding duties with undying devotion and to practice what we profess lest our professions be proven impractical.

Give to these leaders of our people the insight and the inspiration to lead our beloved Republic in making the American dream a reality in our day.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, July 24, 1969, to file a report on the bill H.R. 13079, to extend the interest equalization tax until August 31, 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 13080

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 13080) to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Abbutt	Diggs	Lujan
Arends	Dingell	May
Blackburn	Dorn	O'Konski
Broyhill, Va.	Halpern	Ottinger
Cahill	Hawkins	Pike
Carey	Howard	Poage
Celler	Ichord	Powell
Clark	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Kleppe	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Landgrebe	Stokes
Dawson	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	Lowenstein	Wiggins

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority?

Mr. ASHLEY. It is my understanding that this has been cleared; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.