

Printing-cost estimate—Continued

Volume 2:	
Back to press, first 1,000 copies.	\$1,165.44
4,000 additional copies, at \$336.-	
33 per thousand-----	1,345.32
<hr/>	
Total estimated cost, volume 2-----	2,510.76

PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 291) to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-334), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 291 would provide that a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that 16,125 additional copies of such document be printed, of which 10,975 copies would be for the use of

the House of Representatives (25 per Member), and 5,150 copies for the use of the Senate (50 per Member). The copies of the document would be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of 60 days, after which the unused balances would be distributed by the respective Senate and House document rooms.

House Concurrent Resolution 291 would also authorize the printing of President Nixon's inaugural address as a separate pamphlet, in such quantity needed to serve as inserts for the existing number of copies of the former edition (through President Johnson) still available for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

My BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business

today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LATEST AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been making weekly inquiries as to the number of casualties we are suffering in Vietnam.

The Department of Defense reports that for the week ending July 19, 1969, we suffered 182 killed by hostile action, 39 killed by nonhostile action, and 1,405 wounded, making a total of 1,626 casualties last week.

This brings the total of casualties suffered in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon to in excess of 51,000.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 25, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"IMPOSSIBLE" MOON LANDING A VICTORY FOR MIDDLE AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, since all men of good will are so happy, so pleased, and so grateful for the successful conclusion of "the impossible achievement, the unimaginable voyage to the face of the moon," and the magnificent return to earth, a column by William S. White, in the Washington Post of July 24, 1969, is particularly appropriate.

The column follows and I hope it is read not only in America, but all around this world:

"IMPOSSIBLE" MOON LANDING A VICTORY FOR MIDDLE AMERICA

(By William S. White)

The impossible achievement, the unimaginable voyage to the face of the moon, offers this country the opportunity for a far better and far less abrasive life here on this earth if only the human implications can be grasped amidst the technological vastness of it all.

For not the least of the lessons of these unique days in the story of the human race is the profound proof that the heart of the Nation is still strong and sound and that at the end it is the quiet, undemanding competence and talents of simple and unaggressive Americans, and not really the petulant posturings of a self-nominated "intellectual elite," that express the real America.

Neil Armstrong came from a middle-class family in a middle-American town in Ohio and never knew that he was "alienated" from his family, his region, or even his flag. A strange sort of fellow for a thinking type—he fought without complaint in Korea. He spoke without "glamour" or "style" and even with a certain common touch.

Edwin Aldrin went aloft quite unashamed that he was taking along with him a Presbyterian communion. Mike Collins, in the hovering Columbia, was content to talk language far removed from the more ivied cant of our more ivied halls of learning, and even further removed from pretense and preciousness.

So removed, too, were all those fellows down there in Houston, whose doctorates of philosophy did not alter their casual humanity, their inherent good taste and their humility in the face of something approaching the infinite.

But, most of all, nobody involved in this mission of such unspeakable power and purpose and meaning felt it necessary to act with the arrogance of self-seeking, to press forward at all costs with the promotion of number one.

It was, come to think of it, a quiet vindication for many men who are very far from chic by the standards of the intellectual elite. One of these was a fellow called Lyndon Johnson, who not too long ago was driven from office by this self-same new leftist new elite for lack of "style" and for persisting in designs so big and dangerous, like the moon search, as to be intolerable to minds so oddly pre-occupied with the small and the mean.

For it was Johnson, whatever his faults and shortcomings, who above all others made this adventure politically, administratively and financially possible, first as a Senator

creating a space agency and later as Vice President and President. And another man called Richard Nixon was big enough to tell Johnson so, in a telephone call from the White House to that ranch in Texas.

Contributions scarcely less vital were made, too, by John Kennedy, who had the vision and the courage to go on while the new elite of his time was picking and carping and pointing to the undeniable, if also irrelevant, truth that there were still slums in this Nation.

So, too, of the third man here, Richard Nixon. Any one of these three harried Presidents could so easily and so safely have run away from this challenge of transcendental cost and risk and could have bought so much in quick and cheap popularity by bellowing that he was prudently "saving" billions and was ready to pour them all out in a great, benign flood to cure all ills and discontents in this Nation.

Indeed, for years here in Washington the shortest way to promotion and pay among the elite new leftists, short of being against the war in Vietnam, was to make epigrams at the expense of the space program, though not going quite so far as openly to obstruct it, lest it might after all really work.

So, finally, whose triumph was all this?

It was a triumph of doing men over merely talking men; of plain, outlander types who would never be acceptable in the ultra-liberal drawing rooms; of men out there in the hinterland who still believe there are such things as vital national interests and that it is not necessarily stupid to serve them.

Where, indeed, lives the authentic intellectual elite of this country? At least some of them must be said to live and work a good distance away, in every sense, from those ultra-liberal drawing rooms.

POST OFFICE REFORM BILL

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I recently conducted a poll in my State to sample the feelings of my constituents in regard to the Post Office reform bill. The results of this survey might be of interest to Senators. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my press release of July 11, 1969, in this regard be printed in the RECORD.

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

POST OFFICE REFORM BILL

Kentucky's U.S. Senator Marlow Cook today released the results of his poll on the president's proposed post office reforms. Cook said he received 3,700 replies to the 10,000 questionnaires mailed.

Of those answering 2,743 replied yes to the question "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of converting the Post Office Department to a public corporation?"

Cook said he decided to conduct the survey, which was a sampling of all areas of Kentucky, "because I had reached no final conclusions on the president's proposals and wanted to see how the people of Kentucky felt."

Several of those who returned the questionnaire refused to answer either of the two questions but just vote across the questions "let's forget about domestic affairs and get to work on getting our boys out of Vietnam."

The post office reform bill is in the House now and probably won't come to the Senate before August, the Senator said.

The full results of the poll follows:

Question 1: "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of taking politics out of the postal system?"

Number voting:	
Yes	2,743
No	435
Percentage:	
Yes	86.31
No	13.69

Question 2: "Do you favor President Nixon's policy of converting the Post Office Department to a public corporation?"

Number voting:	
Yes	2,169
No	934
Percentage:	
Yes	69.90
No	30.10

Some of those who answered the questionnaire did not respond to both questions.

FIRST PRIORITY—RELEASE OF AMERICANS HELD BY VIETCONG AND NORTH VIETNAMESE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, thousands of American families face the cruel uncertainties each day, not knowing whether sons, husbands, and fathers, missing and believed captives of the

Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, will ever return.

Recently I received a letter from the mother of one of these missing servicemen. She wrote:

My son has been listed as missing in action since Oct. 17, 1967. We have never received any news of his condition other than he was seen parachuting from his disabled aircraft over North Vietnam, nor have we received any mail from him, so we do not know if he is alive or dead.

She adds:

My son has a wife and four children, and when the children ask grandma when is daddy coming home, it just breaks my heart not to have the answer.

She closes with this appeal:

Please urge the ones in authority in the Paris peace talks to make the release of these prisoners of war the highest priority. They cannot wait until after final political solutions in Vietnam are reached; to wait could mean the lives of these men. Please help in any way you can.

I understand that more than 1,300 of our men are missing in action and that many of these are believed captives of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

The release of Americans held by the Communists should be one of the first considerations in the negotiation of an agreement to end the Vietnam conflict.

GEN. SAMUEL C. PHILLIPS: MODEST HERO OF THE APOLLO PROGRAM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in all the annals of man's explorations, of all his voyages to territories unknown and to regions previously unseen, there is nothing to compare with the glory of this moment. The success of our astronauts in blazing a trail to the moon may well herald the dawn of an age of travel and growth as little dreamt of today as the industrial age was in the time of Christopher Columbus. From Marco Polo to Admiral Byrd, from Columbus to Lewis and Clark, from Magellan to Charles Lindbergh, intrepidity has always been the hallmark of the pioneer. We have seen that hallmark emblazoned on the heavens this past week by the Apollo team.

Unlike previous explorations, the moon landing involved more than solitary individuals. This enterprise represented the commitment of an entire Nation. There are countless men who were essential to the success of the mission, although they did not ride in the capsule itself. Foremost among these is Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, the director of the Apollo program and a native of Cheyenne. The quiet and effective leadership of this man was of primary importance in the long campaign to place a man on the moon and of the many who deserve the thanks of the Nation for this technological triumph, he is certainly one of the chief.

Sam Phillips has been a personal friend of mine and it gives me great pleasure to congratulate him on this

occasion—at the triumphant conclusion of 5 years of ceaseless, untiring effort. To guide an operation so complex and so large is a job which few men could successfully undertake: Sam Phillips could and did.

He grew up in the vastness of Wyoming and when he left he took with him the straightforward manner and the methodical and diligent approach to duty which proved so important to the Apollo program. This was not the first task which General Phillips has done for his country, however.

During World War II he was a fighter pilot in the Army Air Corps. When the cold war set in, he worked with the various guided missile programs. In 1959 he was appointed director of the Minuteman program and proceeded so efficiently and quickly that in 1963 he was transferred to the manned space flight program. Within a year Phillips was the director of Apollo. Long before the tragic fire in 1967, he had seen the need to tighten up the program. Unfortunately, his recommendations went unheeded until too late.

The fire had a sobering effect and General Phillips revamped the program completely. The result of his efforts may be seen in the flawless conduct of all subsequent tests and flights.

Today as we extend our appreciation to the astronauts and all those who contributed to their achievement, we should single out General Phillips, for his was the central role. He is a self-effacing man and his name has never been in the limelight, but he has been there all along and we are grateful that he has. I would like to express my own thanks and congratulations and I am sure that the Congress and people of the United States would also.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post of July 18, 1969, and an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune of July 11, 1969, commending General Phillips for a job well done.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1969]

HONESTY, DISTASTE FOR FANFARE MARK APOLLO PROGRAM CHIEF
(By Thomas O'Toole)

HOUSTON, July 17—If Samuel Cochran Phillips was 10 years younger he probably wouldn't be Apollo program director—he might be an astronaut on his way to the moon as an Apollo 11 crew member.

"If it flies, I can fly it," Phillips once said. "I like to think I can fly anything."

Sam Phillips wasn't boasting. In his quiet Western way, he was just telling it as he saw it, without fanfare and with complete honesty.

That is just the way he's been in his five years as top man in the Apollo program. No fanfare. Complete honesty, no matter how it might hurt.

The fire that killed three Apollo astronauts in 1967 hurt everybody in the program—but nobody more than Phillips.

"He took it personally," one of his aides said at the time. "I've never seen a man drive himself the way Sam did when the smoke cleared."

While he immersed himself in work, people heard little of him until Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) mentioned his name at a Senate space committee hearing on the fire.

Mondale asked NASA Administrator James

E. Webb if he "knew anything about a Phillips Report."

The irony of it was that Webb hadn't but in the next few weeks the whole Nation heard about it—a collection of notes and reports that Phillips had made up before the fire on the work done by prime Apollo contractor North American Aviation. The report criticized just about everything North American did—its engineering, testing and production of the Apollo spacecraft.

"The Apollo fire cost us a year in time," Phillips said once. "Six months to make all the changes we had to make, and six months to explain them all to Congress."

Phillips just about cleaned house after the fire. He fired people, shifted people and brought in new people. He studied every phase of the program, and where he felt there should be change—he changed it.

He even changed little things—like ordering that test conductors no longer be allowed to bring their lunch and dinner to their consoles during any Apollo test. One day, he walked through the firing room at Cape Kennedy and noticed a sandwich lying on one engineer's desk. Without a word to the engineer, he picked it up and dropped it into a nearby wastebasket.

Raised in the "big sky" country of Wyoming, Phillips behaves just the way he looks—cool, quiet and very determined.

Like every other boy growing up near Cheyenne, Phillips learned to ride a horse—but he also learned how to fly a plane. The fact that he had his pilot's license helped lead him to the Army Air Corps during the Second World War.

A fighter pilot, Phillips served two tours in Britain, first flying a Lightning P-38 and then a P-51 Mustang.

When the war ended, Phillips moved on to missiles, first the Falcon and Bomarc and then the Minuteman. In 1959, in the heat of the so-called "missile gap," he took over as director of Minuteman, and in a crash program had the first ballistic missiles in their silos inside two years.

It was his work with Minuteman that brought him to the attention of the space agency, and in 1963 he was brought in as deputy director to Dr. George Mueller, associate administrator for manned space flight. A year later, he was named Apollo program director.

He is modest about his role in Apollo, claiming it is teamwork that has brought the program so far so fast.

"But if you asked the men in Apollo to pick the five most important men in the program," an Apollo official once said, "Phillips' name would be on all the lists."

When the crew of Apollo 11 lands on the moon and returns to earth safely with their moon rock, Phillips plans to go back to the Air Force.

He won his third star in May, 1968, and is in line for a big job in the Pentagon—if he only takes the time out to ask for it. Besides that, the work of the last decade—five years as Minuteman director, five years as Apollo director—has left him a little bit tired of the director's chair.

"Ten years in the hot seat," he said recently, "is too long."

In the time he's spent in the hot seat, Phillips has been called many things—dour, phlegmatic and unflappable.

But last Christmas morning, when the crew of Apollo 8 headed back out of moon orbit and on their way home, Sam Phillips could no longer contain himself.

"Look at him," one of his aides in the Mission Control Center said, "he's almost smiling. If this keeps up, we'll have to call him Smiling Sam Phillips."

SAM PHILLIPS, MODEST HERO

Cheyenne's Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, director of the Apollo program, already has made his mark in the nation's space program regardless of what happens in the Apollo 11

moonflight project commencing next Wednesday that hopefully will place a man on the moon.

But Apollo 11 will be America's crowning glory; it will rank in history with Marco Polo's voyage to Cathay, Columbus' discovery of America, the feat of the Wright Brothers and Lindbergh's flight across the Atlantic. The greatest credit if credit is due any one individual, must go to General Phillips, 48, a modest, unassuming, self-effacing, dedicated and exceptionally capable public servant.

In the Apollo program as in the space endeavor in general, Sam Phillips has been overlooked, somehow, in all of the hullabaloo that attends every achievement; it is only in instances of trouble that he somehow is injected into the picture. The deaths of the three Apollo astronauts in a fire while practicing a countdown in January, 1967, is an example. Phillips immediately came to the fore then, but when the going is good, somehow he is overlooked.

Perhaps his skill and management ability is something to be expected by the news media and the political fatcats; but without it, Apollo nor indeed any space program nor anything else can succeed. It is the man at the top who is the deciding factor; to him must go the credit for success and the blame for failure.

As the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance in a story by Don Kirkman points out in today's Rocky Mountain News, Phillips has borne "a burden few Americans are capable of handling and accomplished with such quiet efficiency that few of his fellow Americans know his name."

Kirkman reports Phillips is preparing to leave the space program and return to the Air Force which he entered as a ROTC graduate from the University of Wyoming early in World War II. But the Scripps-Howard reporter says it is to be doubted President Nixon will permit Phillips to leave without some credit of the tremendous accomplishments that belong to him.

Kirkman did not suggest what these rewards and acknowledgements might be, but surely the nation's highest decoration in a non-valorous capacity—the Distinguished Service Medal—is due General Phillips for what he has done; and furthermore, if the United States government is interested in keeping talent, then Phillips ought to be considered for the highest job within the government's capacity to offer its servants—for Phillips, perhaps the top post in the Strategic Air Command, or chief of staff of the Air Force.

A man who can organize and run a program like Apollo, and carry it out with great success even in the face of rare, bitter failure, over a period of five years, and do it so modestly and self-effacingly, deserves no less than the highest consideration of our government and of his fellow Americans.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS ON EARTH

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, we all are still elated and awe-struck by the flight of our three astronauts in our space program.

The accomplishments are above mere rhetoric. We are deeply indebted to Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins and to the thousands of men and women who have worked anonymously to bring our space program to this apex of success.

The feat was so astonishing that it tends to dwarf all other phenomena. And yet, it is nearly 2,000 years since the lessons of peace and brotherhood first were taught, and man has not yet learned to live in harmony on this planet. Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, in a column published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on July 19, pointed out this paradox and attempted to put the space program into the proper perspective of the 20th century. They wrote:

If government, science and industry can combine to put man on the Moon, governments, science and industry can combine to put peace on Earth.

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

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

VOYAGE TO MOON CHALLENGES MANKIND TO END WAR, HUNGER

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—This logical, unsurprising, fantastic round-trip to the Moon is surely the greatest achievement in 20 centuries.

Out there speeding through weightless space are three of our best who, with the aid of 350,000 NASA collaborators, a budget of \$24 billion—and a prayer—are proving that man can escape the confining forces of one planet, land on the Moon and return.

It would be well not to belittle the prayer because 20 centuries ago a man, who knew more about prayer than anyone who ever lived, matched and far-exceeded anything we are witnessing during the week of July 16, 1969 A.D.

Here was a spiritually scientific genius, name of Jesus of Nazareth, materially penniless and with only twelve associates, some untrustworthy, who set some colossal benchmarks for all time by reversing the material laws of space and gravity, demonstrating teleportation and proving concretely that man lives after death.

This world wouldn't be in the mess it is today if mankind would accept the works and words of this scientific pioneer.

NOT IMPOSSIBLE

Could there be a better time than right now to ponder whether we shouldn't resolve to apply the daring and vision of the American and Russian space feats to deal with some of the unfinished business on Earth, especially banishing war and ending hunger? And do it before it's too late.

The greatest byproduct—perhaps its primary value—of the manned flight to the Moon is its moral and mental stimulus, its evidence that anything man can think of, he can do. It says to all mankind: Nothing is impossible, everything is attainable.

It is harder to get peace on Earth than it is to go to the Moon, but it is possible. It is harder to end poverty on Earth than it is to fly to Mars, but it is possible.

This is the vital impetus which the world's two greatest living historians, Arnold Toynbee and Will Durant, ask men in every nation to ponder as they watch the flight of Apollo 11.

Toynbee sees it this way: "Will mankind's common feat of landing on the Moon move us to put our terrestrial habitat in better order, morally and politically? Will it move us to subordinate our 125 local states to some form of world government that will be effective enough to be able to put a stop to our cherished practice of waging wars with each other? If landing on the Moon is going to serve as a substitute for waging a Third World War, the courage and skill and wealth that have been spent on this enterprise will have been spent to good purpose."

NUCLEAR DANGER

Durant, in his challenging new book, "The Lessons of History" (Simon and Schuster), takes the same view that until our nation states "become members of a large and effectively protective group they will continue to act like individuals and families in the hunting stage." But Durant warns that it may be only the prospect of interplanetary war that "we of this Earth" will unite.

Fear is a powerful incentive, but on Earth today there is already a more powerful and pervasive danger—the danger of extinction of the race by nuclear blunder or nuclear recklessness.

If government, science and industry can combine to put man on the Moon, government, science and industry can combine to put peace on Earth.

If we want it enough, we can achieve it. Anything is possible—the worst or the best.

APOLLO ENGINEERING FACTS

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 Iron Age, July 17, 1969]

APOLLO POSITS, THE POSSIBLE AND BEYOND

The Apollo program has been described as the greatest scientific, engineering and exploratory challenge in the history of mankind. So says the North American Rockwell Corp. Few would dispute the issue.

This highly ambitious project, much of it of direct interest to metalworking, has pushed out the boundaries of nearly every technical discipline and has even created new disciplines.

In perspective, the sheer feats of logistics become a virtual Ripley's.

COUNTERING WEIGHT PROBLEMS

Precision is more than the name of the game with Apollo.

Consider: with approximately 2½ million solder joints in the Saturn launch vehicle, if one-thirty-second in. excess wire and an extra drop of solder was used on each of these joints, the excess weight would be equivalent to the payload of the vehicle.

HONEYCOMB PROTECTS LUNAR MODULE

An adapter protects the lunar module during launch and provides the structural attachment of the spacecraft to the launch vehicle. This is jettisoned when no longer required.

The adapter is constructed of eight 1.7-in. thick aluminum honeycomb panels. These are arranged in two sets of four. The upper panels are about 21 ft. long, the lower about 7 ft. long.

The exterior of the adapter is covered completely by a 0.030-in. thick layer of cork. This thin layer helps insulate the lunar module from the heat generated by the spacecraft pushing through the atmosphere during boost.

Honeycomb materials are used extensively on the Apollo, for their great strength to weight ratios.

Another honeycomb aluminum is used in Apollo's inner crew compartment. It is 40 percent stronger and 40 percent lighter than ordinary.

The heat shield itself is made of a stainless steel brazed honeycomb that is in turn brazed between steel alloy face shields. It varies in thickness from ½ in. to 2½ in.

SERVICE MODULE STRONG ON SIMPLICITY

Consisting of a center section or tunnel surrounded by six pie-shaped sectors, the basic structure of the service module is relatively simple.

Basic structural components are forward and aft bulkheads, radial beams, four sector honeycomb panels, four reaction control system honeycomb panels, an aft heat shield, and a fairing.

Throughout the structure, it is obvious how much development time was spent on reducing weight. The radial beams for example are made of solid aluminum alloy. Through machining and electrochemical machining these beams are as efficient structurally as possible, ranging in thickness from 2 in. to 0.018 in.

Footpads on the service module are made of two layers of spun aluminum bonded to an aluminum honeycomb core. This is equally efficient.

WOULD YOU BELIEVE 50 ENGINES

Aboard the Apollo spacecraft there are 50 engines. Of these, 16 are reaction control engines on the service module, 16 reaction control engines on the lunar module, and 12 more reaction control engines on the command module.

In addition, there is a service propulsion engine, lunar module ascent and descent engines, the launch escape motor, tower jettison and pitch control motor.

Only the last three burn solid-propellant. The other 47 burn a hypergolic liquid propellant composed of an oxidizer and a fuel which together ignite and burn on contact.

FUEL CELLS DELIVER POWER PLUS

Three fuel cell power plants are coupled individually to a heat rejection system, the hydrogen and oxygen cryogenic storage systems, a water storage and power distribution system.

Produced by the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Div. of United Aircraft Corp., the cells produce as a byproduct potable water for consumption and cooling.

Weighing 245 lb each, they are constructed mainly of titanium, stainless steel and nickel. They are rated at from 27 to 31 volts under normal loads. There are 31 separate cells in a stack, each producing 1 volt.

Each cell consists of a hydrogen and an oxygen electrode, a hydrogen and oxygen compartment, and the electrolyte. Each gas reacts independently to produce a flow of electrons.

They are normally operated at 400° F with limits of 385° F and 500° F. Water-glycol is used for temperature control. The fuel cells are nonregenerative.

HOW MUCH IS 160,000,000 HORSEPOWER?

If all the moving waters of North America were channeled through turbines at a given moment, you would have about 80,000,000 hp.

The five F-1 engines deliver twice that amount. Even the fuel pumps of the F-1's deliver fuel with the force of 30 diesel locomotives.

In the first stage alone, there is enough liquid oxygen to fill 54 railroad tank cars.

The power of one Saturn V is enough to place in orbit all U.S. manned spacecraft previously launched.

APOLLO DOES A HOT STRIP

Temperatures encountered on the Apollo mission range from -280° F to +5000° F. The former on the cold side of the moon, the latter upon re-entry into the earth's atmosphere.

The heat of re-entry is the most critical obviously. And the only way to protect the spacecraft was to develop an efficient means of dissipating heat. Most metals melt below 5000° F.

An ablative material carries the heat away. It is a phenolic resin, a type of reinforced

plastic. The material turns white hot, chars, and then melts away. But this is done in such a way that the heat is rejected by the shield and does not penetrate to the surface of the spacecraft.

Several outer coverings make up the heat shield: a pore seal, a moisture barrier (white, paint-like plastic material), and a thermal coating that looks like aluminum foil.

This foil like material is 0.5 mil Kapton high-temperature film coated with about 5 millionths of an inch of vacuum-deposited aluminum and overcoated with about 40 millionths of an inch of silicon oxide.

Film is manufactured in tape form. It helps protect the heat shield from premature ablation during the lower, ±250° F, heat extremes of space travel.

WHAT IS A TRULY LEAKPROOF TANK?

The tanks which hold the cryogenic liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen on the Apollo spacecraft are unbelievably sound.

It's been said that they come close to being the only leak-free vessels ever built.

North American Rockwell Corp. estimated that if an automobile tire leaked at the same rate as these tanks, it would take the tire 32,400,000 years to go flat.

Heat leakage from the same tanks is likewise incredibly small. If one hydrogen tank containing ice were placed in a room heated to 70° F, it would take a total of 8½ years to melt the ice. It would take four years more for the water to reach room temperature.

Gases in the cryogenic tanks are utilized in the production of electrical power by the Apollo fuel cell system and in providing oxygen for the crew.

ENGINES USE PURE MOLYBDENUM

On the service module there are 16 radiation cooled engines grouped in clusters of four 90° apart.

These engines are the only nonablative engines on the command and service module. The thrust chambers on these engines are made of pure molybdenum, an unusual use of the high melting temperature material.

Nozzle extensions on the engines are a cobalt-base alloy. Each of these engines is 13.4 in. long and weighs 5 lb.

Nominal thrust of each of the 16 engines is 100 lb, and the service life is about 1000 seconds. It works out that any combination of intermittent, or pulsed, and continuous operation up to a maximum of 750 seconds of steady state firing is possible with the engines.

The radiation cooled engines have a minimum firing time of 12 milliseconds. The result of this is that the engines have a capability for 10,000 operational cycles.

The short firing time is important because these engines are used for translation and rotational maneuvers and for star sightings.

TEXANS SUPPORT MOON DAY AS DAY OF NATIONAL PARTICIPATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I recently placed in the RECORD a petition I received from several of my constituents urging that the day of the landing on the moon be made a national holiday. I was quite gratified to see the President take that action.

Recently, I received a petition on this same matter signed by 18 Texans supporting that action. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that this petition along with the names and addresses of the signers be printed in the Remarks.

There being no objection, the petition and list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH:
The Honorable JOHN TOWER:

We the undersigned desire that you advocate and support the declaration of a National Holiday to recognize and celebrate man's first landing on the Moon. Surely no other exploratory effort in the history of mankind will have been as meaningful.

SIGNERS

Earl L. Chase, Pasadena, Tex.
Frank H. Broz, Houston, Tex.
Myreta H. Buckholt, Pasadena, Tex.
Ron Kelley, Houston.
Mrs. Willie Thompson, Houston.
Mr. Frank S. Ware, Houston, Tex.
William A. Lankin, Houston, Tex.
James L. Kahlich, Houston, Tex.
Wesley T. Blackmon, Houston, Tex.
Floyd D. Dardar, Houston, Tex.
Bob Flack, Bellaire, Tex.
Deene Sullivan, Houston, Tex.
Shirley B. Cornelius, Pearland, Tex.
Donald R. Bartay, Houston, Tex.
Leroy W. Morgan, Houston, Tex.
Janet Pendleton, Houston, Tex.
Peggy P. Thomas, Houston, Tex.
James L. Godera, Houston, Tex.

CATASTROPHE IN FUNDING: THE PARTNERS RENEGE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege recently of serving on a panel with Dr. Norman Drachler, superintendent of schools in Detroit, Mich., during a conference held by the Education Commission of the States in Denver, Colo.

Dr. Drachler made some pertinent and interesting remarks on the problems of school funding. As superintendent of one of our Nation's largest big-city school districts, I think his statements will be of interest to my colleagues, and I take this opportunity to have Dr. Drachler's remarks printed in the RECORD:

CATASTROPHE IN FUNDING: THE PARTNERS RENEGE

(By Norman Drachler)

Financing or funding are disciplines in which most school superintendents cannot claim expertise—after all we've had such limited experience with funds. But as an educator facing a growing deficit for the third year in a row—I specialize in catastrophe! And, like some other superintendents have lost faith in our existing partnership.

Since 1950 the population of Detroit has declined by about 250,000 inhabitants while the public school enrollment has increased by nearly 60,000 students. During the past school year 14,702 students left our school system and 15,847 entered from all sections of the nation. After registration is completed in the fall, we go through each year a school mobility rate of about 40%, ranging from 2.7% in the most stable school to 117.8% in our most changing neighborhood. Detroit is a fiscally independent school district with nearly 300,000 students of whom about 170,000 live in areas eligible for Title I.

Last fall our voters rejected a request by the school board for additional millage—resulting in serious educational retrenchment—and growing unrest and discontent in the community. The last three millage elections have also had racial overtones. In areas where the enrollment is predominantly white, we lose—where the enrollment is over 75% Negro, we win. Due to the erosion of our city tax base—a school mill in 1968 brought in \$700,000 less in school revenue than in 1960. Last year this amounted to a loss of \$14 million.

Two years ago our state legislature allocated \$200,000 for a study on school finance. It was completed in 1968, has not been acted upon and recently our Governor has appointed a commission to review educational needs for our state. In the meantime chaos in school finance prevails throughout the state.

Federal appropriations to Michigan schools have decreased by 10% since 1966—as elsewhere.

Ladies and gentlemen the partnership is not working! Politically the term *partnership* may sound attractive but realistically it has not worked effectively to meet our present needs.

John Gardner observed that the error of the mid-twentieth century was: "... to release aspirations without designing institutions responsive enough to satisfy these aspirations." And, Eric Hoffer reminds us that a people who "are discontented, yet not destitute" are most likely to plunge into an undertaking of vast change. Due to America's progress in public education, we have all the ingredients for massive discontent and change.

I conclude, therefore, somewhat regretfully, that the federal government must assume an over-all responsibility for public education. It is the only body that can tap our nation's human and financial resources capable of assessing and performing the task ahead. We simply do not have the time for 50 states to struggle with common challenge independently.

I am not worried about federal control. We are pragmatic people and with the transition of responsibility we can develop guidelines and processes which will result in much greater local influence than we have had in the past. Students of America stress that we have demonstrated in the past, a talent for preserving idealistic principles while devising pragmatic means to adjust to new conditions. We can do so again. Real partnerships can only be achieved when states approach one another as equals in quest of a common cause—and this can be achieved only through equal educational opportunity.

Instead of partners we must think of ourselves as one nation. A nation with a great deal of mobility—where boundaries cannot quarantine ignorance. A nation that realizes that no metropolitan area can survive or prosper if the central city, the heart of the metropolitan community is permitted to deteriorate or decay. A nation, to paraphrase a noted scholar, may be likened to a tree, whose roots are planted in our federal constitution, and whose branches spread over the fifty states. A tree cannot flourish without roots. Yet, how can it bear fruit without branches? Let us be careful with our branches!

INDEPENDENCE DAY—THE MALDIVE ISLANDS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 26, the Republic of the Maldives

islands will celebrate their fourth anniversary of independence. On this occasion I extend warm greetings to His Excellency Amir Ibrahim Nasir, President of the Republic; and His Excellency Abdul Sattar, Ambassador of the Maldives Islands to the United States.

Located about 400 miles southwest of Ceylon, the Maldives constitute 20 atolls, which cover about 1,087 islands—only 210 of which are inhabited—from Minicoy in the north to Addu island in the south.

The Maldives have a population of about 103,801 and an area of 115 square miles. The people are known for their kindness and generosity, and their virility.

Although the Maldives have no banks, doctors, libraries, or museums, the people are healthy in spirit and many of them are literate in Arabic. Not primarily industrial, the Maldives do maintain a flourishing dried fish industry, and coir making is important.

Since the Islamic conquest in 1153, there has been an unbroken line of 92 elected sultans. From 1759, sultans have been chosen from members of the Didi family. On November 11, 1968, another historic date, the Maldives ceased being an elective sultanate and became a Republic. On that date, Ibrahim Nasir was elected President.

We can only wish the best of luck to Mr. Nasir and his country in the future. The world, who is indebted to the Maldivians for the word "atoll," realizes that to live in peace and tranquility like the Maldivians is sometimes all that a country can hope for.

MAN'S HISTORIC MOMENT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 14, 1969, issue of Aviation Week contained an editorial by Robert Hotz discussing what has now become the successful Apollo 11 flight. Mr. Hotz' editorial cites many of the benefits being derived from our national space program and outlines well the feelings of all Americans on the occasion of this historic event. The editorial follows:

MAN'S HISTORIC MOMENT

(By Robert Hotz)

Man is poised for an historic moment in his long tenure on this earth. If all goes well on the Apollo 11 mission scheduled for launch from Cape Kennedy this week, the first men will set foot on a celestial body outside their own planet. Twice, within the last seven months, U.S. astronauts have rocketed to the moon in Apollo spacecraft and reconnoitered its surface from close range. Now two of the three Apollo 11 crewmen are scheduled to land and begin man's exploration of the moon.

In this final interval, before the dreams of Apollo are transformed into reality, some retrospect may be appropriate. Apollo is a U.S. program. Its boosters, spacecraft and astronauts all are emblazoned with the Stars and Stripes. It is an American flag that will be spiked into the lunar sand. Every American should take immense pride in the mag-

nificant accomplishment of his nation in reaching this point. But man's voyage to the moon goes beyond any purely nationalistic boundaries. It is really a triumph of man's indomitable spirit and a source of pride for all mankind.

Certainly history must record an indelible debt to the Soviet Union, whose Sputniks began the space age and whose early pioneering in space exploration shocked this country into successful competition. Although the odds are overwhelming that the U.S. will beat the USSR to a manned lunar landing, the Soviets will still play a vital role in lunar exploration. They will certainly send men to the moon, probably within another year.

Man's overpowering urge to voyage from his planet, which began with such vigorous and productive competition, may reach maturity in a cooperative effort to build scientific colonies on the moon and utilize it as a joint base for further manned exploration of the solar system. Americans and Russians will have to get along together on the moon because they are all humans facing a totally hostile environment. Perhaps the lessons learned there will not be completely disputed back on earth.

Certainly this is the time to remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of these United States, who made the bold decision to commit this nation to sending men to the moon before the end of this decade. It was his message to Congress on "Urgent National Needs" May 25, 1961, that set the lunar landing goal. This transformed the U.S. space program from a sluggish, reluctant reaction to Soviet triumphs into a sparkling American challenge that demanded the straining of industry, science and technology to their utmost potential to achieve pre-eminence for us as a space-faring nation.

Jack Kennedy knew this nation needed a jolt and a challenge. He would be more than pleased to see how it responded in reaching the threshold of the goal he set eight years ago. This has been no easy achievement. It has taken its toll in treasure, sweat and lives. But history will prove it is one of the most profitable and prudent investments this nation ever made in its future.

The tangible technical benefits are already falling out of space research faster and in larger quantities than even the most optimistic prophets anticipated. Science and industry are already absorbing this vast wave of new knowledge. But the real challenge remains for the political leaders of the world. Can they change their outmoded concepts of organization and administration to permit the wonders of space age technology to conserve and enhance the resources of this planet for a better life on earth?

Space research is pointing the way toward better education, better communications, less pollution, better food production and better conservation of natural resources. But man and particularly his political leaders appear unduly slow in receiving this message.

Even though the initial investment in space technology will return tremendous material dividends in the decades ahead, this tangible fall-out may not be man's most important benefit from his venturing into space.

Perhaps the most significant benefit of all may come from the new perspective on himself and his home planet that man will acquire from his new vantage point in space. The six U.S. astronauts who have voyaged to the moon on Apollo 8 and 10 were profoundly philosophically impressed by their changing perspective of earth as they left it 250,000 miles behind. As the first men in the history of the race to get this perspective, their experience may presage some changing concepts of man's relationship to his environment and fellow men.

The Apollo crewmen were sharply surprised by the speed with which all of man's

works on this planet faded from view as they sped through space. Only the greens and browns of the continents, the blues of the oceans and the swirling white spume of cloud patterns were visible from their orbits around the moon. They were astonished at what a relatively small planet earth really is when seen in the vast black void of space and how hospitable it seems in contrast to the barren bleakness of the moon and the surrounding infinity.

From this vantage point, it was apparent that we are all voyagers in space clinging precariously to the spacecraft earth, protected from the searing sun and cryogenic night only by a thin layer of gases trapped by gravitational force. Perhaps if the key political leaders of this world could enjoy the same perspective, they might shift their endeavors toward improving humanity's opportunities for survival on this planet instead of striking sparks that could burn it up.

The prayers and hopes of all mankind will be traveling with Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins as they make man's most wondrous journey.

OUR LATIN AMERICAN ERRORS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to our colleagues' attention a very fine letter from our former Ambassador to El Salvador, the Honorable Murat W. Williams, regarding American military assistance to Latin America, which appeared in Monday's New York Times.

An outstanding and dedicated diplomat, Ambassador Williams has very forcefully and succinctly pointed out not only the questionable value and size of U.S. military missions in Latin America but their oftentimes detrimental effect as well. His remarks certainly reinforce the recent recommendations of our distinguished colleagues on the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee that a thorough review of our military assistance programs in the Western Hemisphere should be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Ambassador Williams' remarks deserve our full and careful consideration and sober reflection and I insert his letter herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

OUR LATIN AMERICAN ERRORS

JULY 16, 1969.

To the EDITOR:

It is easy to imagine U.S. military missions as "seconds" to the fighters in that bloody and useless contest in the Salvadoran-Honduran forests.

The missions should not be in either country. With transient encouragement from Dean Rusk, I urged our Government in 1963 and 1964 to phase out our ridiculously large missions in El Salvador. (We had more men in our air mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.)

The Secretary was getting too busy with other problems and he left my plea to deputies. One of these said: "I agree with you, but we can't do anything. You have annoyed the Pentagon by making the suggestion."

A many-starred general was sent to "negotiate" with me. After several days, he consented to cut back two out of about forty positions, but not until the end of the tours

of duty of the individuals concerned, a year or so later.

Anyone can see now that if money spent on military missions and supplies had been put into more economic development, not only would more have been done to root out the social and economic causes of this war, but also we would not be guilty of helping to build up armed forces, on both sides, that make fratricidal war possible. [Editorial July 20.]

We would not have helped thwart progress towards the fraternal union that the people of Central America have dreamed of achieving in their Patria Grande.

By now the missions may have wistful instructions to "urge restraint." But do we need still more arguments against fomenting military buildups in the once Good Neighborhood?

MURAT W. WILLIAMS,

U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, 1961-64.
MADISON MILLS, VA.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues, a bill to authorize the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway.

Several members of the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads have just returned from hearings in Montana and Alaska where we received testimony from the proponents and opponents of the Alaska Highway. The support for paving was so overwhelming that I am convinced of the urgent need to commence work immediately.

For my colleagues, who are not familiar with the Alaska Highway, its present total length is 1,525 miles, and it stretches from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska. Only 383 miles of this 1,525 are paved. The greatest percentage of the highway is a gravel-soil base causing hardships either from extreme dust or from complete erosion and slippage.

The highway from Dawson Creek winds southward through the metropolitan centers of our northern neighbor. Both the provincial government seat of Edmonton, Alberta, and the oil capital—Calgary, Alberta, are serviced by this highway, and are linked to the "Electric City"—Great Falls, Mont., with the road terminating at the intersection of Interstates 90 and 15, near Butte, Mont.

I would like to take time to give you a little history about the Alaska Highway, not a new concept in the short span of years we have been on this continent. Even before the United States had acquired the "Folly" of Alaska from the Czar in 1867, a plan was formulated—the Gilpin plan—proposing a railway to Alaska and across the Bering Straits to Siberia as part of a worldwide rail system. The year was 1849. With the adverse reaction to the purchase to Alaska, it would take more than 20 years from the

date of purchase before Congress would dare inaugurate legislation suggesting a route to Alaska. Once again the idea was a railroad. The Senate passed on April 19, 1886, a bill requiring a study of a rail route between the United States, Russia, and Japan. This was about as popular as the purchase of Alaska by Seward.

The thoughts about railways for the next few decades turned to an east-west direction, and so the dream of a link with the great frontier of the North was to lie dormant for more than 50 years until the military needs of this Nation revitalized discussion of a route to Alaska.

The gold rush, the fisheries, and World War I drove home the need for some type of land route to the North. Finally in 1933, Congress for the first time authorized the appointment of a commission to report on the construction of a highway from Seattle to Fairbanks. Ten years would pass with the commencement of World War II before Congress would again consider the highway. In 1942, the Corps of Engineers surveyed a route for a railroad to Fairbanks. However, this was abandoned after the decision was made in the same year to build the Alaska Highway. On February 26, 1942, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense recommended that the highway be built. The route followed a system of airfields. The road was built and remains in practically the same condition, providing a miserable trip north for commerce and tourists.

Since the war, a 1950 railway study was once again urged, but refused by the Canadians as unnecessary. Not until the sixties did any real enthusiasm for the reconstruction of the Alaska Highway appear.

In 1961, the Battelle Memorial Institute presented a report on the transportation requirements for the growth of Northwest North America. In its study, the paving of the Alaska Highway is strongly urged. Subsequently there have been other studies particularly designed to determine the cost-benefit ratio and need for paving the Alaska Highway. Most notable and infamous of these is the Stanford Research Institute report of 1966. This one report which hinted that the cost-benefit ratio was not satisfactory turned the Canadian Government against any further consideration of the project. I agree, the immediate ratio is not encouraging, but the projection—especially with the growth of Alaska and her oil fields—is the growth and net return criteria that I rely on.

With the election of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, I am hopeful that he will be receptive to reconsideration of developing this highway, and for that reason Chairman KLUCZYNSKI agreed to conduct hearings along the proposed route to gain firsthand insight into the problems that face us.

Last year I introduced H.R. 2124, requesting the paving of the Alaska Highway. For the first time we had hearings on this matter, and as a result, my colleagues consented to travel to Montana, Canada, and Alaska last month. Today I am reintroducing a bill once again call-

ing for the paving of the Alaska Highway.

Alaska, western Canada, and the great Inland Empire of the Northwest are linked economically, socially, and geographically. But our commerce links, especially north and south, are very poor. Certainly, the railways have opened up our vast expanses, but only for east-west traffic. This is the case in both Canada and the United States. What we need now, before it is too late, is a north-south route.

I could ramble on for hours about the rationale of why we should pave the Alaska Highway, but I will only take time now to say that we need this route for commerce, for defense, and for tourism.

The commerce to the north now is so risky that prices on the receiving end are often twice those in the Continental United States. A yearlong, modern highway would do a great deal to alleviate this situation.

Our 49th State is of strategic military importance. Because of its proximity to the Soviet Union, early warning systems, Strategic Air Command and missile bases and tracking systems in Alaska are our first line of defense. Yet, our only means of speedy communication is by air and water. This is hardly a satisfactory answer in time of war.

Alaska and the Northwest have received a great influx of tourists in recent years. The last escapist retreat on our continent has the capacity to receive even more people, if they could travel comfortably to its great expanses. There is a great deal of misunderstanding in Continental Canada and the United States in regard to travel conditions in the North. The Alaska Highway goes through areas of very low rainfall and low snowfall, and has few natural hazards to travel. Modern technology has overcome the technical problems of working in areas of continued low temperatures and this is a relatively minor hazard for motor vehicles. This inland route has generally easy grades, a low profile with low passes, and is relatively inexpensive route for trucking.

Of Montana's total tourist traffic during 1963-64, more than 50,000 visitors stated they had Alaska as their destination. And even though the Stanford report was adverse to paving of the highway, it projected an estimated 15 percent per year growth in traffic after completion of the highway.

Our subcommittee has returned completely convinced of the need for this project. It has been more than 25 years since this highway was constructed, with little if any improvements. The Northwest is a growing, vital area with oil in its veins, gold in its teeth, and lumber as its backbone. To share this wealth, and to in turn bring much needed commerce from the industrial States of the Continental United States, we must have a land link easily accessible, safe, and open all year.

Today, we returned man from a safe and speedy trip to the moon, tomorrow let us give him a safe and speedy highway to Alaska.

I insert the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, TO DESIGNATE THE ALASKA HIGHWAY, AND TO AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT OF PART OF SUCH HIGHWAY, INCLUDING A CONNECTING HIGHWAY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that (a) Chapter 2 of Title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 215. ALASKA HIGHWAY.

"(a) A highway between Butte, Montana, through Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska, the exact route which shall be determined as provided in this section, is hereby designated as the Alaska Highway.

"(b) The route of the Alaska Highway from Butte, Montana, to the border between Montana and Canada shall follow the presently designated route of Interstate Route 15, through Great Falls, Montana, to a connection with the route designated in "d" of this section.

"(c) The route of the Alaska Highway within Alaska shall be along that highway in existence on the date of enactment of this section between Fairbanks, Alaska, and the border between Alaska and Canada, which highway prior to such date was also known as the Alaska Highway.

"(d) The route of the Alaska Highway within Canada shall be as follows:

"(1) from the border between Canada and Montana to Dawson Creek, British Columbia, the route shall be designated by the government of Canada along existing paved highways so as to connect with the United States section of the Alaska Highway in Montana; and

"(2) from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to the border of Canada and Alaska the route shall be generally along the highway in existence on the date of enactment of this section between such points, which highway prior to such date was also known as the Alaska Highway."

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the government of Canada in the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway within the borders of that country (including a connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) between Dawson Creek, British Columbia, and the border between Alaska and Canada.

"(f) There shall be no expenditure of any funds authorized by this section until the governments of Canada and the United States shall have entered into an agreement providing, in part, that the government of Canada—

"(1) will pay its equitable portion of all costs of the construction, reconstruction, and improvement authorized by subsection (e) of this section of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders;

"(2) will provide, without participation of funds authorized in this section, all necessary rights-of-way for the construction authorized by subsection (e) of this section of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders, which shall forever be held in violation as a part of the highway for public use;

"(3) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged, for use by vehicles or persons of any portion of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders;

"(4) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) by vehicles or persons of the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such country;

"(5) will grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers licenses; and

"(6) will provide for the year-round maintenance of the Alaska Highway (including the connecting highway to Haines, Alaska) within its borders, including snow removal, after its completion in condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic."

(b) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
"215. Alaska Highway."

TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF FUNDING THE FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT BY CHIEF EDWARD A. BEADLE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing problems that confront the people back home is adequate protection from the dangers of fire. In recognition of that problem, Fire Chief Edward A. Beadle of Union City, N.J., appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations to testify on behalf of funding the Fire Research and Safety Act.

I have been privileged to know Chief Beadle for many years. He is not only respected and honored in his community, but within his profession as well. He has been fighting fires for over 34 years and has been fire chief in Union City for the last 10. Chief Beadle has served as head of the Eastern Association of Fire Chiefs and, in 1968, was elected president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Because fire protection is a matter of grave concern to all of our citizens, I would recommend that my colleagues consider the testimony of Chief Beadle and at this time I include that testimony in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF CHIEF EDWARD A. BEADLE

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the committee, I am Edward A. Beadle, chief of Union City, N.J., Fire Department, and president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs with a membership of well over 7,000.

We are here to testify in behalf of funding the Fire Research and Safety Act in order to implement both title I and title II of the act.

We believe the Department of Commerce, through the National Bureau of Standards, can make a significant contribution to fire safety for the people of this country and at the same time assist the 24,000 local fire departments improve their operations.

While there are many avenues which can be taken to initiate such action, we call your attention to the report entitled "Wingspread Conference on Fire Service Administration, Education and Research." While this was the work of an ad hoc committee, it has been adopted by the International Association of Fire Chiefs as an official position and does spell out 12 significant areas we believe require serious consideration.

The language and terminology employed in the report cover broad areas of concern to the fire service and encompass action we believe is required to meet the needs. Independent organizations have exhausted their available resources in attempting to meet the challenge. The Federal Government can assist through the Fire Research and Safety Act in the following manner:

1. Through significant demonstration projects and research the National Bureau of Standards can assist the fire service to meet the objective spelled out in points 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Wingspread report covering demands on the fire service due to social and technical changes in our way of life, public complacency toward loss of life and property, communications with the public behavioral patterns, and assisting in establishing criteria for public fire protection.

2. By establishment of a high level training academy for the fire service to assist in upgrading the professional standing of the fire service members, in conjunction with presently developing college level education and by supplementing existing local level training.

In addition, the implementation of title II of the act will permit the establishment of a Commission which can define areas of necessary action for the National Bureau of Standards. By bringing together persons of prestige such as Members of Congress and representative fire protection authorities from all sections of this country, we believe that the people can be made aware of the areas of concern and the necessary action required to meet the needs for the welfare of our communities and our Nation as a whole.

We wish to call to your attention that this association has supported the necessary action required, over a period of some 8 years, which led to the culmination of legislation in 1968 from which came this act. In all this time we have worked cooperatively with the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO in an effort to get Federal recognition of the many problem areas that exist in fire protection and to swing the weight of the Federal Government behind the efforts to find solutions.

One is prompted to ask, "Are we losing the fight against fire?" But even more frightening to us is the life safety factor.

In our great country, boasting the highest standard of living in the world, we must also realize that we have the poorest fire record of any major nation. It is shocking that our per capita death rate from fire is twice that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and six and one-half times that of Japan.

In 1968, loss of life in fires numbered over 12,000 men, women, and children, and statistics indicate that for every death, there are about 200 injuries and disfigurements from fire. That's over 2 million people directly affected by the physical tragedies of fire.

We in the Fire Service, charged with the responsibility of protecting against these grim statistics, have long cried out for more public concern.

We were pleased when the Fire Research and Safety Act became law. However, we know that unless funds are made available to provide effective action under both title I and title II, little good will have been accomplished.

May we thank the chairman and the committee for the opportunity of appearing before this august body this morning.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Chief Beadle, for a highly interesting and informative statement.

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an article, appearing in the Copley newspapers, by Dumitru Danielopol, with

reference to President Nixon's forthcoming visit to Rumania. Mr. Danielopol is a former Rumanian banker, economist, and diplomat. He was Secretary General to the Economic Delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1946, and he is convinced that the Rumanians have used the western newsmen to perpetrate a hoax which will help them to get credits.

The article follows:

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—At a recent press conference, Romanian Ambassador Cornelius Bogdan refused to discuss the agenda of the Bucharest talks between President Nixon and Nicolae Ceausescu.

But it's not difficult to predict Romania's strategy. The Reds will try to get the most out of the visit and give as little as possible.

Ceausescu is likely to tell President Nixon that Romania intends to pursue an independent foreign policy. That it would like to be another Yugoslavia.

To achieve this, he'll say, Romania needs to become economically independent from the Soviet COMECON and the only way this can happen is if it gets help from the West, especially the United States.

There will be hints that Bucharest might honor Romanian treasury bonds owed to American holders and unredeemed since World War II.

Ceausescu will express the hope that the United States will grant Romania "most favored nation" trade status which would permit more Romanian goods to be imported into the U.S.

But Ceausescu will not offer to use his dollars to purchase American goods. He will ask long-term credits with guarantees from the Export-Import Bank.

Romania being an independent country, Ceausescu will say, he cannot accept political strings to such assistance. He will argue that because of its proximity to Russia and its basic Communist tenets, Romania cannot, in fact, become completely neutral but will have to remain a member of the Warsaw Pact.

No internal liberalization is possible, he will say, because it would give the Russians a chance to subvert his regime. He will point to Czechoslovakia.

What Ceausescu will not tell Mr. Nixon is:

(1) How much of the Romanian "independent" attitude has been adopted with the approval and even at the instigation of the Kremlin.

(Some Kremlinologists distrust Ceausescu's "independence." They say that it suits the Russians that Romania, a country of Latin origin, should play such a role with a view of convincing some Latin American countries that under communism, independence is possible.

(2) That Romania is in dire economic straits. Her economy is near bankruptcy—despite glowing reports published in Bucharest and parroted in some Western publications.

(3) That he is head over heels in debt to many Western nations including Western Germany, without any hope of becoming solvent.

(4) That the "most favored nation" clause will make very little difference to the Romanian economy because he has few goods acceptable to the sophisticated American market.

(5) That Romania is already over-industrialized in relation to its shrinking internal market. That she therefore produces mostly for export and her products can't compete. Some are sold at bargain prices as much as 50 per cent below cost.

Ceausescu also will not mention that while Romanian food products are offered for sale abroad the Romanian people go for weeks

without eggs, meat, bacon and even onions. He won't remind the President that Romanian canned goods shipped to Canada for the United States have been turned back by American health authorities because they were judged a hazard to public health.

Shoddy textile products shipped to Austria have been refused even by poor peasants in Austrian mountain villages. About 90 per cent of a recent shipment remains unsold.

Nor will Ceausescu mention that the much ballyhooed tourist traffic to Romania is in fact a deficit operation. In order to attract hard cash customers from the West he has to offer bargain prices which in some cases represent a 50 per cent loss per tourist.

Who makes up the deficit? The Romanian people naturally.

One can go on and on.

The President must not lose sight of the fact that Romania—one of the richest countries of Europe before the war—is virtually another Cuba.

If Ceausescu is trying to emulate Yugoslavia politically, he must also do so economically. He must give peasants, workers and entrepreneurs the incentive to produce and the necessary purchasing power to buy the products.

PHYSICAL FITNESS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson, commenting on the Nation's physical fitness, made the following observation:

Despite the ease and convenience of modern life, the crucial task of our times demands as much strength and stamina as in the past. Physical fitness is, therefore, a matter of national concern. It should also be a matter of personal concern for every citizen. People who spend some leisure time in vigorous and enjoyable activities are far more likely to lead long, productive lives than those who confuse leisure with laziness. More and more, we are coming to recognize that physical fitness in the young is the best insurance against infirmity and enforced idleness in old age.

Our former President thus gave eloquent expression to the growing awareness among Americans, particularly over the past decade, that physical fitness is vital to general well-being.

This awareness has given rise to the development of facilities that are geared to meet and help the physical fitness needs of our citizens—facilities which are indeed performing a service to the community because of their emphasis on the relationship of fitness to overall good health.

A leader in this burgeoning field are the Holiday Universal, Inc. physical fitness and recreational centers, whose services include fully supervised individual exercise programs and modern physical fitness departments for men and women.

Holiday Universal, Inc., based in Baltimore, currently owns and manages health and recreational centers in Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, and New York.

Holiday Universal's 15th center will be dedicated on July 30 by business and

community leaders who will gather for the public opening of the modernistic facility in West Hempstead, N.Y.

This organization's achievements in fostering improved physical fitness among thousands of people are a reflection of the dedicated efforts of its president and director, Frank Bond. The organization's vice president, Jack Lipsky, has been the trainer of the U.S. Weight Lifting Team for many years.

Indeed, Mr. Bond's proven and successful methods to attain physical fitness have won him wide acclaim. He has been honored by the State of Maryland for establishing physical fitness and exercise programs for the State Police. The city of Baltimore has paid him similar accolades for creating such programs for that community.

Through the years, our Nation's leaders have constantly stressed the importance of physical fitness, and have sought to set an example for our citizens by personal participation in sports and in various fitness programs.

This is why I believe it is noteworthy to point out that among those who hold a membership card to Holiday Centers is President Richard Nixon.

Recently, Charles B. Wilkinson, special consultant to the President, wrote Mr. Bond to express Mr. Nixon's appreciation for the membership card.

Mr. Wilkinson went on to say that:

The problem of maintaining physical fitness in an increasingly technological society is of concern to all citizens. Your organization is a positive asset in this regard.

In light of the accomplishments of Holiday Universal health and recreational centers, this is indeed a well-deserved tribute.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week 1969 is a most appropriate occasion for the American people and their Government to reaffirm their commitment that the people in Communist bondage shall some day enjoy freedom. This will not come as the result of catastrophic armed conflict but, rather, because of the strength and vitality of democracy and individual freedom.

Mankind's struggle toward liberty has endured for thousands of years; it continues today around the world. Modern technology has endowed oppressors with the military might and the means of political control to hold captive vast numbers of people. Witness, for example, the brutal Soviet action in Czechoslovakia. Only this week, the Russian people were denied by their government the wonder of seeing man's first step on the moon as it happened. While the Kremlin released word of the event to its people, people on the Chinese mainland remain ignorant because the government continues its suppression of the truth.

In spite of the denials of the turned-off elements of our society, it is the American revolution—the ideals that inspired it—that today inspires national drives for independence and liberty. Some men, some systems of government, have corrupted the ideal of freedom and turned it to their personal power and enrichment. But, they will not last, for history shows that the people and their desire for freedom will sooner or later prevail.

The signs that the Communist monolith is crumbling are unmistakable. But, it is premature to believe that dictatorships and totalitarian governments will soon or easily surrender their power. Neither is it reasonable to believe that the Communist ideological hatred of Western democracies and their economic-political systems is a thing of the past. Having endured alternate periods of "thaw" and "freeze" in our relations with the Soviets, we should look hard at today's cordiality, hopeful that it will last, but maintaining realistic skepticism.

The realities of the modern age dictate that nations do their utmost to avoid ultimate catastrophe, all out nuclear war. It is in our national interest to ease international tensions and to channel national rivalries toward more constructive ends.

American society is not perfect. Many of the criticisms voiced about our society are valid. But more than any other nation, we are trying to come to grips with these problems and to overcome them within the context of our national experience and in a manner that preserves personal freedom. In spite of our problems, then, this country can serve as an example of a nation willing to acknowledge its shortcomings and to undertake to solve them. As we in this country move forward toward perfecting our own freedoms, we shall continue to lend our support and encouragement to people around the world who work for the same cause.

UNDERESTIMATING THE FARM PROGRAM

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray Pierce of the High Plains Journal, one of our Nation's leading agriculture publications, recently wrote an editorial that I think should be required reading for all employees of the Department of Agriculture.

The article is based primarily upon a most unpleasant fact. The American farmer is being driven into poverty. Caught between low prices for his products and inflated prices for the things he must buy, the farmer is in a most desperate condition.

Faced with this unpleasant reality, the farmer turns to Washington for help only to discover Washington is preoccupied with the problems of our Nation's cities.

While the plight of our Nation's cities is very real and demands immediate at-

tention we should at least take a commonsense look at the plight of the man whose job it is to feed America. I am sure within the depths of the Department of Agriculture the charts, the graphs, the computers, and, most important, the planners have already determined what constitutes an efficient and accepted farm operation. What they have not computed is the simple fact the American farmer is a human being tired of being ignored.

Mr. Speaker, Ray Pierce's article sums up the frustrations of the farmer very well, and it is written in language every bureaucrat should be able to understand.

So that my urban colleagues will have the opportunity to truly gage the thinking of rural America, I include these remarks and the article by Mr. Pierce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the High Plains Journal, July 21, 1969]

UNDERESTIMATING THE FARM PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECT MAY LEAD TO FURTHER UPHEAVAL IN ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

We keep receiving rather disturbing reports from the Washington scene—from people back from Washington, from conversations with people in Washington, and from observers. We feel that the administration, our Congressmen and Senators, and staff members both in Congress and in the departments of the federal government are underestimating the farm program, the temper of the American farmers, and the effect that continuation of that farm program may have on the national economy.

At the present time everything has a tendency to slide away like a house on a California hill into the slough of the poverty program. Even the moon shot had back-ground noises about spending all that money to go to the moon, when it should be given to poor people.

The first solid consideration of the farm program—in connection with Congressman Bob Poage's bill, which ties the program up with his pet food stamp program—is questioned. How much, for instance is it in earnest, and how much is it for bedeviling the Secretary of Agriculture?

We reported on the trip of the House Agriculture committee touring the wheat area, and opined that contrary to all the noise being raised about how the tour was conducted, the Congressmen received some new and interesting information about the farm program. This seems to be so, from reports trickling back.

Apparently, some of the information gleaned by our Representatives has penetrated the Department of Agriculture vell which has been up ever since Hardin became Secretary of Agriculture. It has been causing some difficulty, we understand, in the Bureau of the Budget, whose pencil pushers have decided there needs to be a 16 per cent cutback in wheat acreage.

Word is that farmers think a 10 per cent cut in wheat acreage is enough and that 16 (24 also was suggested) is too high. And this word, apparently, has been relayed to the USDA, and taken into consideration in their thinking.

Conclusion to make, it would appear, is that if a 10 per cent cut comes out, Secretary Hardin will have won a round with the Bureau of the Budget. Farmers will be able to see how well Secretary Hardin can represent them.

We also hear rumblings about the International Grains Arrangement.

Wheat groups are concerned because other countries have been able to manipulate the

IGA and cut their prices considerably below prices the United States is required to ask for our wheat. Wheat groups in Washington asked that the provisions of the IGA be reviewed, and that U.S. wheat be kept competitive in the world market.

One of the problems of the situation is that the IGA has the force of a treaty, and the State department has a great deal to say about this sort of thing. The State department has been a thorn in the side of the drive to increase exports, in any case, because wheat has been used in international relations, and many leaders are convinced that State department policies will relegate the U.S. to the position of residual supplier in the world wheat market with the State department allowing everything else to "go first."

If there is an overhaul of the IGA, as Congressman Sebelius has suggested in the story on the front of this week's Journal, you can be assured that Secretary Hardin has had some difficulty with the State department before it was achieved—and if it is not overhauled, that the State department view prevailed.

It does not seem that the planners in Washington who predict, for one thing, that we'll have a national guaranteed income in 10 years, can see the effect of driving wheat producers out of the farm program by limiting payments under the program. If big producers pull out and plant wheat fence to fence, there may be a saving on federal expenditures for the programs, but the wheat farmers will suffer from ruinous low prices because of the excess of wheat which is produced.

There is no point in shrieking about a poverty program while you are driving another group of people in the country into that program.

It also does not seem that the planners are taking into consideration the desperate condition of American agriculture caught between low prices for their product and inflated prices for the things they must buy.

One observer comments that this may be the last time the limitation of payments measure is turned down by Congress. The demand is too strong from city constituencies. We feel that it is of utmost importance that these city groups understand the bargain they are getting in food now—that the agricultural producers are subsidizing the consumer through their low prices—and that a fair price will be reached (or more than a fair price) if they continue to drive people off the farms and ranches until agriculture is in the hands of a few who can control their markets by themselves.

We have seen all kinds of protests, demonstrations, and things which can be called nothing but irresponsible riots, because of demands of groups on our government. We believe that the American farmer probably the least likely of all American groups to indulge in such behavior, is close to following suit if he is ignored as a "safe bet" in national legislation.

American farmers don't want to be retrained for city jobs—they want to farm. And if the estimate of needs for food in the world are valid, we had better see to it that he does farm and that his production is marketed.

If we read the signs aright, the American farmer is in no temper to serve at the whims of bureaucrats anywhere, or to be a guinea pig for unrealistic program experiments, or to be shoved down the priority totem pole below the poverty program, the indigent, the unemployable, and the non-producers he has been supporting with taxes to these many years.

This is no time for underestimating American agriculture.

CONGRESS WARNED ON TAX REFORMS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a column by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of July 23. This is one of the most important analyses of the entire economy of the Nation that I have seen for some time.

I have been disturbed over the daily releases of the happenings in the Committee on Ways and Means. The daily press accounts do not indicate a vociferous minority who have as yet not taken flight away from their senses and who realize that tinkering around with basic tax problems can throw this Nation into such confusion that a real economic depression can be triggered.

These sessions are supposed to be "Executive," but one side of the story seems to get out every day, which leaves an erroneous impression in my State of California that I am acquiescing in all of these decisions, and I most certainly am not.

So far, we have succeeded in killing the municipal bond market, and in removing the incentive for philanthropy. We have staggered the petroleum industry. We have nearly wrecked the farm operation and have killed capital operations by eliminating any alternative capital gains tax.

The fine hand of the AFL-CIO is found in every decision, and I, for one, am not ready to turn the tax writing over to the AFL-CIO. I am anxious for tax reform, but not at the expense of economic sanity, and I will state here and now that I will file a most vigorous minority report and oppose the bill at every step.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 23, 1969]

CONGRESS WARNED ON TAX REFORMS

(By David Lawrence)

The big news today affecting the pocket-books of the American people has not yet reached Congress. But back home millions of taxpayers—both individuals and businesses—find themselves confused, uncertain and worried about so-called "tax reforms."

If Congress extends the tax surcharge which has been in effect, this would not disturb the economy. The vague innuendoes and contradictory declarations, however, by the leaders of the Democratic party in Congress have brought a state of uncertainty that could have a damaging impact immediately on business and on employment.

This does not mean that the public doesn't want tax reforms that are proper and equitable. But it doesn't want to see laws enacted that will upset business operations and planning by individuals, including the future of estates and bequests for their children.

Nor do the American people want to see local taxes throughout the country suddenly increased because Congress may have taken away the tax exemptions now permitted on income obtained from interest on municipal and state bonds.

Tax regulations are imbedded so deeply in the whole economic mechanism that if Congress tampers with many of the existing rates and rules, it can only result in panicky sales of property that would not otherwise have taken place. Also, real estate taxes and perhaps sales taxes will have to be raised in almost every state of the union in order to obtain funds for local projects which were previously financed by money borrowed from the general public by the states and cities.

Plenty of concern is being exhibited by colleges and universities, as well as by hospitals and charitable institutions, which have been dependent upon large contributions from persons of middle or high incomes. For the government to require higher tax payments than before will merely diminish the money given to charity. The future value of lots of family farms, too, will be adversely affected by changes in tax rates on what are known as capital gains.

Tax loopholes that ought to be closed can, of course, be found in present laws. But it is one thing to correct inequities here and there, and quite another to institute a program of "tax reform" which changes the basic principles of the existing income tax system. To tamper with the capital gains tax, for instance, is a risk to the economy, and may encourage the sale of property that ought to be held for long term investment.

What is back of all the demands for tax reform? Presumably it arises from a public sentiment which favors tax relief for middle- and lower-income groups. But most people, including members of Congress, will be surprised when they find out the simple truth—namely, that a 100 percent tax on all taxable incomes over \$100,000 a year for married couples, and over \$50,000 a year for single persons, would produce a revenue of only \$3 billion a year. At the same time, this would deprive the American free enterprise system of much capital that is used to build new factories and provide employment for an increasing population. Instead of curbing inflation, the imposition of such a levy could be one of the factors that would bring on a serious breakdown in the national economy.

What is the answer? For one thing, Congress should extend the income tax surcharge promptly. Also, if it is going to enact any tax reforms, they should be adopted in the next few weeks instead of allowing the whole matter to drift for many months while private planning is frustrated and properties subject to the capital-gains tax are dumped on the market, with values falling.

There is, to be sure, a need for tax revision. But unless the Democratic party, which is in control of both houses of Congress, can act immediately to let the people know how they are going to be taxed and what is to be exempted, the United States may find itself in the midst of a recession by the early part of 1970, if not by the autumn of this year. The responsibility for this will be placed in the 1970 elections upon the Democratic party and not on the administration.

All members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate will be elected next year. Unless the current tactics of the Democratic majority in Congress are changed, the resentment of the citizens generally will be apparent in the heavy vote cast against the party in power.

SOLON WANTS NEWSMEN TO DISCLOSE EARNINGS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the July 12 Editor & Publisher may be of interest:

SOLON WANTS NEWSMEN TO DISCLOSE EARNINGS

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—The minority leader in the Ohio Senate has suggested that newspaper reporters covering the Ohio Legislature should be required to disclose their annual earnings.

Charles J. Carney, Democrat, of Youngstown, said: "I am convinced that most reporters are honest. But a few have conflicts of interest because they have been on the payrolls of various lobbyists."

The Senator said that, under his proposal, members of the press corps would be made officers of the court.

THE FLAG WAVED PROUDLY IN THE MORNING LIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, faced, almost daily, as we are, with examples of flag desecration and examples of disrespect for our country and its institutions, as well as a general lack of patriotism, it is very refreshing when someone takes the opposite stance and gives a public display of their love of their country.

Mr. Speaker, I came across such an instance recently when reading a copy of the Midland Cooperative, a publication going to more than 180,000 families in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and North and South Dakota.

The editor, Erick Kendall, came to America 46 years ago as a 15-year-old boy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and all of the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial written by Mr. Kendall and which, appropriately, appeared in the publication just before the Fourth of July.

The editorial follows:

THE FLAG WAVED PROUDLY IN THE MORNING LIGHT

(By Erick Kendall)

Foghorns were ululating their mournful song in the early dawn of a March morning as the S.S. United States cautiously entered the New York Harbor. "We are there," shouted a fellow immigrant, shaking the 15-year old boy. "We are in America!"

The boy jumped into his home spun suit, bashed the furry Cossack cap on his head, and followed the other steerage passengers to the upper deck.

Suddenly, as if on command the fog lifted and there on the port side loomed a world famous lady with her torch of liberty, and near at hand the star spangled banner waved proudly in the light breeze, its red, white and blue brilliantly lit by the early morning sun.

The boy removed his cap and broke into a happy, triumphant smile. "Good bye, old world," he thought. "This is now my land, and these are its symbols. May both of us have luck."

That was 46 years ago and the then 15-year old, now this elderly editor, has been through many a mill. But through depressions and doubts, through national policies he couldn't agree with, through periods when his seemingly god-like heroes turned out to have feet of clay, he has never completely lost that teen-aged enthusiasm for America's symbols.

There have been times when his faith

wavered. The great depression. The Joe McCarthy witch hunts. The current growing power of the military and the hopeless muck of its Vietnam quagmire. But the rays of that long-ago morning sun lighting up Old Glory and the torch of liberty have always been beacons becoming toward the perfectibility of a nation and its citizens. Beacons to light the way when he backed away from dubious thoughts and questionable associations.

Question policies? Yes. Criticize corrupt or misguided leaders? Of course. Sneer at "the establishment" in youthful, impatient heat? Naturally. Point to potentially better ways of operating our economy and body politic? That is a duty of all free Americans. But to desecrate our flag? Never!

It is too bad indeed that the immature minds who desecrate our flag and the institutions for which it stands have never shared that wonderful moment of the 15-year old—shared that exultant thought of a steerage passenger, "this is my land!"

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY, 1969

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago today, July 25, a constitution unique in all the annals of government was proclaimed. On that day Luis Muñoz Marin, Governor of Puerto Rico, announced the fulfillment of a compact between his people and their fellow Americans on the mainland.

A semicolonial area had evolved from a status of dependency into a condition of partnership with the Federal Government. Puerto Rico had become a free Commonwealth associated with the United States, and henceforth was to be fully autonomous in local affairs. Its dignity as a self-governing unit within the national framework could be reduced or altered, moreover, only by the mutual consent of the Puerto Rican and Federal Governments.

The proclamation confounded those professional critics of America who had propagated the myth that Puerto Rico would never be permitted to come of age.

In truth, however, this lovely—if "stricken"—island had not fit the classic colonial mold since 1917, when American citizenship was accorded all those Puerto Ricans who desired it. Under this grant, any Puerto Rican who chose American citizenship could, at any time, migrate to the mainland and enjoy all the rights of citizenship accruing to any resident of any of the States.

As for the United States exploiting the island economically, the record reveals the precisely opposite practice. Virtually devoid of natural resources, Puerto Rico's economy was entirely an agrarian one until the inception of "Operation Bootstrap" in the 1940's; and Washington was generous indeed in providing assistance to the impoverished islanders. From 1930 through fiscal 1952 the Federal Government gave Puerto Rico a total of \$591,671,582 in direct grants and Federal aid payments. Certainly, this largesse does not reflect imperialistic iniquity.

But even within America's own territorial complex, Puerto Rico has not followed the norm. The island has never been granted the status of an incorporated territory, which means that, while it belongs to the United States, it is not an integral part of this country. This is why Puerto Ricans pay no Federal income taxes.

Nevertheless, Puerto Ricans have enjoyed since 1947 the right to elect their own Governor. On the other hand, the people of Alaska and Hawaii were denied such a right until their territories, which were incorporated, became States.

Thus, the unprejudiced observer must dismiss any allegation of exploitation with regard to the residents of our Caribbean Commonwealth. The Puerto Ricans govern themselves, they participate in most Federal programs, including social security, and they live under the mantle that protects all American citizens—the American flag—and yet, they are not subject to pay taxes.

This is not to say, however, that the Puerto Ricans live on a one-way street. Their sons are subject to military duty in America's Armed Forces while their own voice is all but silent in the election of national officers and in the determination of national policies. While resident on the island, they are denied entrance into the electoral college and their only direct influence on the Congress lies in the person of their Resident Commissioner, who has unlimited right to talk in committee and on the floor of the House, but cannot vote in either place.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Hon. JORGE L. CORDOVA, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico, who was elected to serve in the 91st Congress and has done an admirable job in representing his people since coming to Congress.

The annual observance of Puerto Rican Constitution Day is of profound importance in at least two major respects. First, the Constitution spelled out, in an instrument approved by the people and governments of both Puerto Rico and the United States, the nature and extent of Puerto Rico's right to govern itself. Its provisions, unlike those in an act formulated by Congress alone, are not, in all probability, subject to unilateral modification. The Constitution, in other words, is a compact, or a contract, written in concrete.

Secondly, the Constitution represents to a proud people an enlightened affirmation of freedom and self-government which they fashioned entirely on their own; Uncle Sam did not dictate a word and offered no patronizing advice. Cognizant that they are masters of their own destiny, the people of Puerto Rico have been inspired to write one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of man's material and spiritual development. They have transformed their "stricken land" into a showcase of democracy in action. They have made magnificent progress in erasing the pinch of poverty from the faces of the young and in smoothing the furrows of despair that had marred the faces of the old. And they walk with pride befitting a people who have lifted themselves by their own

bootstraps to an elevation unattained by the citizens of any other country in all Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particularly warm and close feeling in my heart for the Puerto Rican people, for I have the privilege of representing many of them who reside in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois. They have made valuable contributions, in the United States as well as in Puerto Rico, and I want to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for continuing peace and prosperity in the years ahead.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to join in this salute to Puerto Rico and her people on the occasion of Puerto Rican Constitution Day.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. L. J. SVERDRUP,
AND HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
NATION'S SUCCESSFUL MOON
LANDING

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, thousands of people and hundreds of different companies and agencies contributed to the successful landing of our astronauts on the moon. But as General Ferguson recently said in a public address at the formal opening of the Arnold Engineering Development Center's new airfield:

In a real sense, the route to the moon passes through Tullahoma, Tennessee and the Arnold Center.

Carrying that thought a little further, the route to the moon also passed through the little village of Sulen, Norway, back in January of 1898. It was here that the man who designed the giant wind tunnels and test cells at Arnold Center, which figured so prominently in the development of the Apollo vehicle, was born.

Eventually, Leif John Sverdrup found his way to the hills of Tennessee, among the people whom I am honored to represent in Congress. Since his life and numerous contributions to the building of this Nation are important and of interest to my colleagues and the American people, I place in the RECORD herewith a few of the facts regarding General Sverdrup and the great company which he heads.

He came to this country in 1914 and 4 years later became a naturalized citizen. He graduated with a B.A. degree from Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn., in 1918, after serving with the U.S. Army during World War I and with a B.S. degree in civil engineering from the University of Minnesota in 1921.

He was employed by the Minnesota State Highway Department, after which he joined the Missouri State Highway Department. In 1928, he entered into a consulting engineering partnership, Sverdrup & Parcel, with John I. Parcel, his former professor at the University

of Minnesota, and he is now senior partner of this corporation. Numerous companies have grown out of this partnership, including ARO, Inc., which was organized in 1950 to manage and operate the Arnold Engineering Development Center for the Air Force at Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn.

Sverdrup & Parcel served the Air Force as consultant and engineer-architect for the preliminary investigation, site selection, master planning, detailed design of most test facilities, and certain other specialized facilities and preparation of design criteria for facilities to be designed by others at the AEDC.

After the design had been substantially completed, the Secretary of the Air Force asked General Sverdrup, utilizing the expertise of the design team, to establish and set up an organization to bring into fruition the capability of managing and operating the center.

Utilizing the design team as the nucleus he then brought together with them the finest scientific and engineering talent available—from all parts of the country—and trained hundreds of native Tennesseans in the arts and crafts of aerospace testing. More than 3,600 people are currently employed on ARO's payroll and some 300 Air Force personnel both military and civilian are assigned to the Arnold Center—which represent the payment of nearly 39 millions in wages and salaries in my district this year.

To date, AEDC represents a national asset totaling more than \$415 million and provides this Nation with the largest environmental test facility in the free world. Such a costly laboratory has, in the words of Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, recently retired head of the Air Force Systems Command, "paid for itself many times over through its contributions to our aerospace progress." Our success in meeting President Kennedy's announced goal of reaching the moon in the next decade, is further affirmation of the center's value to the Nation.

Because of the developmental testing of the Saturn V Apollo spacecraft at Arnold Center, we were successful in landing American astronauts on the moon before the Russians. These tests began on June 6, 1960, with a small scale model of a proposed launch vehicle. They continued until the end of the Apollo 11 mission—when all of the rocket engines, boosters and components of the vehicle had proven that they could get our astronauts to the moon, land them there, and bring them back safely. Years of development time and millions of dollars were saved because of the flexibility of Arnold Center's giant wind tunnels and test cells, and the capabilities and ingenuity of the people in Tennessee who operate them.

The man who is chiefly responsible for the design and operation of this giant complex had been honored many, many times by local, State, National, and international governments. In 1953, Norway conferred upon him the highest decoration which that Government can bestow on a noncitizen, the Order of St. Olav, grade of Commander with Star.

For his outstanding performance in the building of 200 airstrips and airfields,

numerous roads and bridges, as well as hospitals, docks, and other installations needed in the Pacific during World War II, he has been decorated with this Nation's Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, the Purple Heart, and four foreign decorations. He returned from the Pacific in 1945 with the rank of major general. In 1957, Secretary of the Army Wilbur Brucker awarded General Sverdrup the Department's Certificate of Achievement for his outstanding contributions to the Army.

The company headquarters is located in St. Louis, Mo., with 11 regional offices in the United States including Nashville and Tullahoma, Tenn., and in other cities of the world such as Bangkok, Oslo, Rome, Tokyo and Toronto. He has engaged in engineering achievements throughout the world, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Libya, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, South Pacific (Aitutaki, Fiji, New Caledonia, Penryhn, Tongatobu), South Vietnam, and Thailand.

These achievements include transportation facilities, buildings, industrial facilities, research and development facilities, electric power, water management, and construction management. Within these broad categories we may identify a few, such as the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel; the two span continuous bridge over the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo.; design of the unloading pier at Mena Al-Ahmadi, Kuwait on the Persian Gulf; Lake Maracaibo Oil Field Repressurization System in Venezuela; the Mississippi Test Facility Saturn V Complex; the Thatcher Ferry Bridge over Panama Canal at Balboa, Canal Zone; the Sidney Lanier Bridge near Brunswick, Ga., winner of honorable mention in AISC Annual Aesthetic Bridge Competition.

He also designed and provided engineering supervision during construction of the AMF monorail at the New York World's Fair; the Busch Memorial Stadium; the U.S. Air Force Academy Field House, Colorado Springs, Colo.; the Granite City Steel Co. office building and First Granite City National Bank, Granite City, Ill.; the Anheuser-Busch, Inc., brewery, Houston, Tex.; the Mueller Co. plant at Brea, Calif., selected in 1965 by *Factory* magazine as one of "Ten Top Plants of Year"; engineering services for "Titan I Missile Launcher System," American Machine & Foundry Co.; the Spacecraft Assembly and Testing Laboratory, McDonnell Co., St. Louis, Mo.; the Polysonic Wind Tunnel Facility, McDonnell Co., St. Louis, Mo., the 12.5 billion electron-volt zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, operated by the University of Chicago for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; the Dalles Powerhouse on Columbia River, Oreg., construction management of V/STOL Wind Tunnel for the Lockheed-Georgia Co. at Marietta, Ga.

Don't look back, look forward. The building will be in the future, not in the past. The "good old days" are mainly old. The

future is the bright and shining thing to look toward.

He said this, and I say these few of his many enumerated achievements are indicative of the ingenuity and capabilities of the man. The State of Tennessee, the Fourth Congressional District, and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have Leif John Sverdrup as a citizen and a friend. His contributions are immense.

CHANNELS OF TRADE FOR ALASKA

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will open more channels of trade for Alaska. Specifically, it will exempt copper mined in the State of Alaska from the Export Control Act of 1949, and allow Alaskans to export it to non-Communist countries.

Under the present law, unrefined copper ores, concentrates, and matte are under a "closed quota" export system. This means that the Department of Commerce does not approve export licenses unless the unrefined copper cannot be processed in the United States because of technological or economic reasons. Even if a license is granted, it must be renewed every 6 months, with approval by no means guaranteed.

It is difficult and expensive for Alaskan copper to be shipped to the "south 48" States for refining. Thus, domestic processing is impractical. Japanese firms would be interested in developing and purchasing Alaskan copper if long-term contracts could be negotiated, but economical arrangements cannot be made on the insecure half-year basis imposed by the license regulations. As the State director of the division of mines and geology stated:

It is not a case of getting better prices in Japan, but it is a case of allowing us to get into business because of cheaper shipping in that direction, if we can clear the way for long-term export contracts.

Meanwhile, a wealth of copper prospects are still awaiting development in the State.

Not only are the resources rendered useless, but the economy of the State and the Nation is being hobbled. U.S. smelter production from imported primary copper materials during the time between January and October, 1968, totaled 220,000 tons. During the same period, 700,000 of blister and refined copper and 654,000 tons of unmanufactured copper came into the country. Since we are importing so much refined copper anyway, it would be beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments to supply copper to those foreign industries which are processing ore for America. In addition, mining is a labor-intensive industry. Men, machinery and supplies are required to excavate, crush, concentrate, and transport ore to market. These requirements will be met through the creation of more jobs for Alaskan workers.

The State Division of Mines and Geology and two branches of the Alaska Miners Association have encouraged me to secure trade routes for Alaskan copper resources. While the Export Control Act of 1949 may perform a valuable service in protecting American interests in many cases, in the instance of copper in Alaska, it has only been a hindrance. This bill will enable American industries to free mineral resources, it will boost the Alaskan economy, and it will improve the national balance of payments.

OUR NATIONAL PASTIME

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this centennial year of professional baseball serves to remind us that the game of baseball may truly be considered our "national pastime." It is a game whose popularity first developed during the first half of the 1800's. Interest in the game multiplied yearly, ultimately evolving into the establishment of the Cincinnati Red Stockings in 1869, America's first regular professional team. It is my pleasure to be able to enthusiastically join all Americans in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of this important moment in the history of the sport.

The game of baseball is actively enjoyed by large numbers of Americans. The youth of this country seem to gain an enthusiastic appreciation for the sport which serves them throughout their lives. This enthusiasm is of a nature which allows one, when unable to actually participate in the game, to vicariously experience the many joys and sorrows connected with this great game. The many radio listeners and television viewers, as well as the thousands of fans who flock to the ballparks to support their favorite teams, all point toward this time-honored American baseball phenomenon.

In this country today Americans are forced daily to withstand the tension from the many existing national problems. It is an era where war and the threat of war is the order of the day. It is a time when urban problems and domestic strife place great pressure on every responsible American. It is thus my belief that there has never been a time as fitting as the present when the Nation should express its gratitude for having such a pleasurable national pastime. By attending one of the many games of baseball, an individual, if only for a few short hours, is often able to leave many of his troubling cares and worries at home. Viewing a game often allows one to be able to not only lose oneself in the excitement of the game, but to rid oneself of many of one's pent-up emotions. Few experiences are as totally carefree and enjoyable as to be able to root one's favorite team to victory. It is an enjoyment equally appreciated by all; it is an emotion that knows no social barriers.

The free expression of this type of emotional release has never been more clearly demonstrated than in regard to my hometown team, the Red Sox. Over the years, along with the thousands of other Red Sox fans, I have cheered and supported the team through its many trials and tribulations. At times, I must admit, it seemed that the Red Sox had more than their share of "bad breaks"; but my enthusiasm never waned. In 1967, after a long and particularly rigorous season, the Red Sox won the American League pennant. After an initial lull caused by the traumatic shock of actually winning the race, the fans broke out of their trance and went wild with elated joy. One could actually feel the emotional fervor and excitement. Names like "Reggie," "Yaz" and "Conig" were proudly on the lips of the many baseball enthusiasts in the Boston area. It was as if every Red Sox fan, through his tenacious and avid support for the team had personally helped the individual players earn the pennant.

This centennial year of baseball is of particular significance to me. One of my all-time favorite Red Sox baseball players, Ted Williams, has come to Washington, my second home, to aid the Washington Senators in their quest to win an American League pennant. I wish Ted all the luck in the world, and hope that he is truly successful in carrying his team to a second-place finish—behind the Red Sox, of course. Drawing from my observations of his managerial performance, he has already instilled much of the same kind of Boston enthusiasm and spirit which I have enjoyed over the years through the Red Sox.

I would also like to take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate Joseph E. Cronin upon his being recognized as the greatest living shortstop. Mr. Cronin is not only a fine baseball player, but is a great gentleman and a credit to the game of baseball. The award could not be given to a more deserving individual.

I should finally like to close by offering a salute to the game of baseball, and thank it for performing its continuing and important role of acting not only as a welcomed emotional outlet but as a source of pure enjoyment for all Americans.

MORMON SETTLERS TO MOON SPACEMEN

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of days for all Americans as our most modern-day explorers return safely from the greatest step of mankind—onto the moon. I am reminded of our early-day Americans who took mighty big steps themselves in the exploration and settlement days of our Nation.

It is on this day, July 24, 1969, with the return of the Apollo 11 astronauts, that 122 years ago a very famous and proud people stepped into a new fruitful

adventure themselves. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the thousands of Mormon residents of my State of Nevada and neighboring Utah whose ancestors moved into Utah and 22 years later established Las Vegas, Nev. These were the first settlers of Las Vegas. It is to them, and those first Mormons into Utah, to whom I pay tribute today along with our newest of explorers, the crew of Apollo 11 who touched down on the moon, and thankfully, returned safely to earth today.

Mr. Speaker, as the drama has unfolded for Americans these past days during the epic flight of Apollo 11, so must have been the case for the early Nevada and Utah pioneers. And, those pioneers would surely know Nevada and Las Vegas are as space oriented as our new space age itself when one looks upon the technology located in and around Las Vegas, and, more notably, our own actual space effort at the Nevada Nuclear Rocket Development Station at the Nevada test site.

The settlement of Las Vegas, which grew at first with the 2½ acres which each Mormon settler allotted himself, has grown into the most exciting city Americans know it to be today. So Nevada, and especially Las Vegas, owes much of its heritage to the faithful and brave pioneer Mormons. Today their numbers range from 30,000 to 35,000 in southern Nevada. Their contributions to Nevada have not gone unnoticed nor will they be forgotten, just as the contributions by the Apollo 11 astronauts will be properly recorded in history, never to be forgotten.

JOURNEY FOR ALL MANKIND

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1969, the Kansas City Star had a particularly wise editorial on the significance of the great journey for all mankind. It follows:

JOURNEY FOR ALL MANKIND

With the touch of his booted foot on an arid lunar plain, man has turned the planet of his creation from a space-locked island to a universal port of call and proclaimed dominion over the stars.

Surrounded and sated by our lesser miracles—the steel birds in the July night overhead, the cataclysm ticking patiently in buried silos, the electronic picture coming live across a quarter million miles—we received the news. And in those tentative steps of the first moon men, rediscovered our capacity to wonder.

There is pride of nation in this moment, and that is forgivable. But there is also a larger pride of species. The creature with the apposed thumb and the boundless dream—scarcely equipped even to rule his own environment—has dared call himself "the eagle" and go where wit alone would let him live. And we—the collective we—are that creature.

One thing is certain: Man's view of himself, or of the potential of his reach, can never again be the same. Children too young today to mark an era's passing will, tomorrow, let go their toes and grasp a universe.

To the biologist, Apollo's journey may be

the crowning triumph of an ordered accident in nature. To the anthropologist, it is tool-making of a consummate order. To the geologist, it may be the key to the cosmic mystery. To the theist, it is a profession of faith by men who, though not divine, are touched by divinity. The plaque left behind in the searing noons and frozen nights on the Sea of Tranquility is a blend of the rational and the ethical.

"Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the moon," it reads. "We came in peace for all mankind." It is written in stainless steel and meant for the ages.

Yet the great pyramids and the Aztec ruins and the flint arrow points in the secret sands of a thousand rivers are there to remind us that the dream is so terribly vulnerable. Only when a divided mankind has met the larger test—which is the test of spirit—can it be known whether that steel marker will be a monument to vision or, perhaps, a wistful artifact of a species that failed.

MRS. HELEN DE YOUNG CAMERON

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must inform the House that a great lady of San Francisco, Mrs. Helen de Young Cameron, has died.

Mrs. Cameron was a lady of great intellect and human kindness. She was a daughter of Mr. M. H. de Young who was a pioneer newspaper publisher in our city and with his brother founded the San Francisco Chronicle. At her death, Mrs. Cameron was a director of that newspaper publishing company.

During her lifetime Mrs. Cameron was an active participant in the social, cultural, intellectual, and charitable life of our community.

She was a director of the San Francisco Symphony Association and the San Francisco Opera Association, and honorary president of the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum.

During her long lifetime of 86 years Mrs. Cameron was a leader in the local Red Cross, in Catholic charities and hospitals, institutions for foundlings and indigents, and organizations for helping the blind.

She was chairman of the women's board of the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1939, at which time the New York Times referred to her as "one of the leading hostesses of the West, familiar with social technique at home and abroad, a linguist of distinction and a friend of celebrities on two continents."

Mrs. Cameron was born in San Francisco and educated at the Convent of the Sacred Heart there, the Dominican Convent in San Rafael, and the Convent of the Assumption in Paris. She later studied music and languages in Berlin and Dresden. She spoke French, Italian, German, and Spanish.

She married George Toland Cameron in 1908. They built their home, Rosecourt in Hillsborough, in 1913. It was here that she died.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Cameron was a great patron of the arts, a woman who

cared for her community and for the well-being of its people, whose charities were boundless and joy of life a delight.

Her death is a great loss to San Francisco, a city of whose spirit she was a living example.

We deeply sympathize with her family during this period of sorrow and know they will have consolation, as do we, that the good she has done still lives and will, beyond our lifetime.

GERMAN YOUTH RESTLESS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Waldman, professor of political science at the University of Calgary and recognized German scholar, has recently returned from a 2-month research and factfinding visit to Germany.

As part of his continuing study of and interest in the problem of political radicalism, Dr. Waldman published in the Calgary Herald of July 5 an enlightening account of restlessness and rebellion among German youth.

In order to share with my colleagues Dr. Waldman's interesting views I am pleased to place his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

GERMAN YOUTH RESTLESSNESS (By Dr. Eric Waldman)

Most newspaper readers realize that the Federal Republic of Germany also has her share of student violence and other revolutionary actions, primarily the activities of youthful political radicals. This unrest among the youth is a phenomenon which during the last few years had spread throughout a large part of the world. In spite of the fact that many countries are subjected to these experiences, they are not simply the result of the same set of causes. There are, of course, a number of influencing factors which are similar in nature because they are the outcome of the modern industrial society. These factors are to some degree even of significance in the countries ruled by Communists. Probably among the most important influences are the de-personalization of the production process, the levelling impact of the mass society, and the intensification of an ever-increasing alienation, an experience which must not only be considered in its Marxist interpretation. However, it should be noted that deep changes of our basic values and concepts preceded these developments. The secularization process, beginning with the Enlightenment, and the progressive materialistic conceptualization of our lives provided important stimuli to these developments.

The young men or women, living in a more or less affluent society, are strongly affected by their belief that our world does not offer them a worthwhile purpose or challenging ideals. Many of them become disenchanting and overcome by a frightening boredom and feeling of loneliness in the midst of an urban society.

The "disillusioned" youth frequently becomes impressed by the most radical and critical views of the existing and "decadent" situation, combined with vague notions of a non-realizable future utopian arrangement. Some of these young people join the revolutionary activists wholeheartedly while others

merely sympathize with the revolutionary cause.

It would, however, be quite incorrect to include the entire youth in these categories. The largest percentage of young people in most countries, and the federal republic must certainly be included in this observation, has a pronounced conservative attitude toward existing values and institutions. The logical and correct deduction is that the radical and militant revolutionaries are not representative for today's younger generation. However, the small though vocal minority has a perfect knowledge of the best methods of making itself heard. And furthermore, these revolutionary and radical militant groups receive a great deal of support from a substantial portion of reporters and commentators working for the mass media of communication who either are themselves in sympathy or agreement with the revolutionary objectives or who depend on sensationalism in order to sell their questionable products. Also this is a situation which exists in most of the Western countries, although the federal republic might have a larger share of left-oriented so-called intellectuals, and the journalists and reporters are definitely included in this group.

Some observers assert that over 50 per cent of German "intellectuals" are left of center. This high percentage is hardly representative of the political attitude of the over-all German population. As a result of the highly one-sided reporting of incidents of public disorder and violent student actions, the impression is frequently created that "the German youth" or "the students" are pursuing the objective of a revolutionary change of the present value system and of our political and social institutions. One should realize, for example, that from the 20,000 students attending the University of Cologne only about 30 form the cadre of the militant revolutionaries. But still these 30 dedicated activists are capable of keeping the entire university community in a continuous uproar and have managed to create among administrators, faculty and students a feeling of insecurity and helplessness. In other words, when evaluating the significance of the left radical movement in the federal republic, a distinction of the qualitative and quantitative impact must be made.

All left radical organizations and revolutionary groupings are quite small while their influence and disrupting activities are very noticeable in present-day German life. These small groups have been able to disturb official gatherings, national conferences of the major political parties, have managed to organize strikes at the universities and conduct acts of individual terror against professors, judges, and public officials. They have been able to obtain on certain occasions support for their activities from a broader segment of the population because they utilized their activities on issues which are of interest to people who as such are not interested in the real objectives of the militant revolutionaries. For example, the issue of a contemplated increase in the bus and street car fares in Hanover was used to organize mass demonstrations and widespread vandalism.

It is also of interest to point out that the "ideological" basis of the revolutionary part of youth in Germany is a mixture of various influences, and covers a spectrum from Maoism, orthodox Communism, nihilistic anarchism to some of the very confusing doubletalk of the so-called neo-Marxists. Some of the groups stress more the Leninist concepts of the proletarian revolution while others are lost within incoherent notions of revolutionary romanticism. Therefore it is not surprising that the "ideology" loses more and more in significance and the action receives increasingly more attention.

We find here a revival of the syndicalistic tendencies which in some European countries were quite noticeable at the beginning

of this century. The "general strike" propagated at that time by George Sorel celebrates a remarkable renaissance in the various violent actions against the "establishment." Sorel emphasized that in the course of the revolutionary struggle, the forms of the future society would emerge and that therefore a statement concerning the future political, economic, and social order represented a "bourgeois" approach and for this reason must be rejected. In the opinion of this writer, the "ideological" idle talk should not be taken too seriously.

The methodology of revolutionary actions in various countries shows a certain similarity. This is at least in part explained by existing personal contacts and the exchange of revolutionary leaders on an international level. For example, German revolutionaries participated during the May revolt of 1968 in Paris and in the demonstrations in London. But also individual revolutionaries are "invited" by left radical groups in other countries to conduct "lecture tours" which in part at least are utilized to pass on experience gained during "revolutionary actions." While there are similarities in the actions, the issues used in the various countries are of considerable difference. For example, a fight against "Fascism" in the federal republic as a result of the passing of the emergency power amendments to the German basic law has absolutely no meaning in North America. In the U.S. the war in Vietnam and the racial problem furnish far more effective issues to conduct the revolutionary struggle against the existing political, social, and economic institutions.

It is the view of many observers that the coming fall will find a marked change in the situation in the U.S. with regard at least to student rebellion and campus disorders. It can be expected that definite actions will be undertaken by governmental organizations, supported by the vast majority of the population which has grown tired of "campus revolutionaries," in order to bring to an end the disrupting influences of the non-representative revolutionary minority. In spite of the fact that within an operational democracy only constitutional means can be used, it must be expected that the implementation of this policy will immediately be identified with a swing to the "right" and with the actions of a "police state." Some leading Canadian politicians have already prophesied this development for the U.S.

It is the opinion of this observer that this significant change in the confrontation between the revolutionary minority and the rest of the population cannot yet be detected in the federal republic. That means that the process of making the people more and more insecure will in all probability continue. This, however, constitutes a development which might have devastating results. This writer does not share the optimistic evaluation of the situation as pronounced by various German public officials, and this includes the federal minister of interior. It is consistently asserted that the peak of the revolutionary activities of the political left has been passed. Quite the contrary is the case. At present, a suitable issue for mass actions is lacking, as was, for example, provided by the fight against the emergency constitutional amendments at the end of 1967 and the beginning of 1968. However, the number of revolutionary actions has very definitely increased. Some of these subversive activities are carried on as long-range objectives, such as the subversion of the high school students and future teachers still studying in the teachers' colleges. Also the soldiers of the German armed forces are a long-range target, but some results can already be seen at this time, as the ever-increasing number of "conscientious objectors" and the number of sabotage acts seem to indicate.

Furthermore, the German SDS (Socialist German Student League), the most active of

these revolutionary groupings, managed to infiltrate and to take over a number of other organizations which now serve the revolutionaries to broaden their subversive activities under a variety of names.

As pointed out before, the main targets for the revolutionaries are the students attending the upper level classes of the German high schools, the future teachers still at the teachers' colleges, and the members of the German armed forces. The alarming observation made by this writer, is that little or nothing is done against these activities with the important result that the school officials, the company commanders in the armed forces, and the police officials at all levels recognize the fact that they do not receive the essential political support from their highest governmental authorities.

In many instances their resignation and "accommodation" to this situation has shown itself through their inactivity. This observer sees in this undermining process of the democratic institutions, and in the failure of the responsible public and party officials to face squarely the issues caused either by inadequacies of present practices or by the militant revolutionary activities, the greatest danger for the young German democracy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the captive nations of Europe have a sad and tragic history, which in the case of some extends through more than three decades. The freedom of the Germans in East Germany had become a casualty of Nazi tyranny before the outbreak of the last war. Unhappy Czechoslovaks shared a similar fate. But the Poles, Baltic peoples, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians became captive nations during the war. These peoples suffered and endured the hardship of the war, hoping and praying that their freedom would be restored to them at the war's end. That natural expectation was wholeheartedly shared by the peoples of democracies of the West. At the end of the war, however, when the Nazi tyranny over these peoples was shattered, they found themselves under the Communist totalitarian tyranny imposed by the Kremlin.

This tragic turn of events, deliberately brought about by the duplicity and treachery of the Soviet Government, was the rudest shock felt by the leaders of the West's democracies. They rightly felt that they were hoodwinked by the Soviet Government, and did their best to come to a just and satisfactory understanding on the status and the fate of these peoples with the Soviet Government. But the Soviets considered the issue nonnegotiable, declaring that these peoples were now living under governments of "people's democracies." Actually and unhappily the Communist governments in all Eastern and Central European lands were instituted by the Kremlin and maintained there by the Red army. The Soviet Government then had raised the infamous Iron Curtain between East and West, enslaving all peoples east of that Curtain. Thus Kremlin's perfidy and treachery had caused the captivity of

more than 100 million innocent souls in their once free homelands.

The fate of these captive nations has been a most disturbing and serious concern for the governments of the West, especially for the Government and people of this Republic. We have done our utmost to keep that issue alive, and have vowed—through a congressional act and Presidential proclamation—to keep that issue before our public by observing Captive Nations Week in the third week of July annually until the freedom of these peoples from Communist totalitarian tyranny. I am indeed glad to take part in the observance of Captive Nations Week.

DEPEW, N.Y., OBSERVES DIAMOND JUBILEE

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the village of Depew, N.Y., this week is observing its diamond jubilee. Depew is in the district I have the honor to represent and is, I believe, the kind of ideal village we all have in the American dream.

It is small, friendly, filled with lovely well-kept homes. Several key industries provide employment and a healthy tax base. Depew residents are noted for their God-fearing attitude and abiding American patriotism. During World Wars I and II, in the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam, Depew sent her brave young sons off to serve their Nation. They have always been fearless and brave soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

The Fourth of July is always a major event in Depew and it has been my honor to speak at these observances. I have attended religious services and social events at Depew's churches and her people have been very good to me. My wife and I harbor the deepest feeling of respect and affection for her people. Many of our dearest friends live in the village of Depew.

So that my colleagues will see the breadth and variety of activities planned for Depew's 75th anniversary, I am including in the RECORD at this point a comprehensive article about the observance from the Buffalo Evening News of Saturday, July 19, 1969:

DEPEW SET FOR DIAMOND JUBILEE

Depew has planned a week-long birthday party starting Sunday with a plentiful array of contests, spectacles and touches of the past.

A pageant depicting the village's 75-year history is slated each weekday evening and highlights the diamond jubilee festivities.

Depew residents under the direction of professional producers will take part in the pageant on a 200-foot outdoor stage at Dawson Field, Lincoln and Olmstead Sts.

Other features of the celebration include a Parade of Years, and drum corps competition, an inter-faith religious service, costume and beard contests and a carnival show.

OPENS 1 P.M. SUNDAY

The jubilee opens officially at 1 PM Sunday with Mayor Joseph Natale reading a proclamation concerning the week to come.

Next, at 1:30, a horse-pull contest is scheduled at F & L Ranch, 4447 Broadway. A total of \$260 in prize money is being offered.

The inter-faith service at Dawson Field starts at 2 PM Sunday. Depew's eight churches are expected to participate in the service with choirs and youth groups from various churches giving presentations.

Following the service, Depew officials will dedicate a memorial in front of the post office to Dr. Albin Kwak, a long time Depew physician who died earlier this year.

A 90-MINUTE PAGEANT

A picnic at 6 PM at St. Augustine's Catholic Church at Penora St. ends the day's scheduled events.

The pageant first will be performed at 8:30 PM Monday. Entitled "A Song of Man," the 90-minute show features six major sections with 16 various episodes. Five other choreographed sections will trace Depew's history from early settlement to industrial growth.

Winners of the art show's \$450 in prize money will be announced prior to the first pageant presentation. The show will be judged earlier Monday and works will remain on display throughout the week in an outdoor tent in Firemen's Park.

The drum corps competition, with a prize list of more than \$2500, helps conclude the week of activities at 3:30 PM July 26. The Parade of Years follows three hours later.

The complete schedule of events follows: Sunday, Faith of Our Fathers Day: Official jubilee opening, 1 PM, Village Hall; horse pull, 1:30 PM, S&L Ranch; inter-faith service, 2 PM, Dawson Field; choir sing, 3 PM, Dawson Field; dedication of Dr. Kwak Memorial, 4 P.M., front of post office; dinner at St. Augustine's Catholic Church, 5 PM; picnic at St. Augustine, 6 PM.

Monday, Chauncey Depew Homecoming Day: Display and library and Department of Public Works open for inspection, 10 AM, Village Hall, adult flower show, 11 AM, lobby of Middle School on Transit Rd., adult hobby and crafts show, 11:30 AM, Middle School lobby; adult art show, 2-10 PM, Firemen's Park; a Night in Munich, Knockwurst and dancing, 6 PM, Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church, French rd.; Queen's Coronation Ceremony, presentation of court and special pageantry, 8 P.M., Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, first performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field.

Tuesday, Youth Day: Youth parade 1 PM, Gould to Bellevue to Terrace to Firemen's Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; midway and carnival opens, 2 PM, Firemen's Park; diaper derby, contest for infants, 3 PM, Veterans Park; Return to Munich, 6 PM, Blessed Sacrament Church; band concert featuring Lancaster Town Band, 7 PM, Veterans Park; judging for ladies and children's costumes, 7:30 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, second performance, Dawson Field 8:30 PM.

Wednesday, Ladies Day: Boy Scout camp-out, 10 AM, Veterans Park; baking contest, 1:30 PM, Veterans Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM; Firemen's Park; luncheon with award for Depew baby born closest to anniversary time, 3 PM; industrial display, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; Night in Poland, Polish dinner and dance, 6 PM, SS, Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Church, Berlington St.; judging for men and family costumes, 7 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, third performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field.

Thursday, Club & Organization Day: Invitational swim meet, 1 PM, Pool 1, Firemen's Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; industrial display, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; ball game, Lancaster Fire Department vs. Depew Fire Department, 7 PM; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, fourth per-

formance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field; fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

Friday, Business & Industry Day: Adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; industrial exhibit, 4 to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; judging of beard contest, 7 PM, Firemen's Park; presentation of day's highlights, 8 PM, Dawson Field; outdoor pageant, fifth performance, 8:30 PM, Dawson Field; adult moonlight swim, 9 PM, pool 2, Firemen's Park; fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

Saturday, Veterans & Firemen's Day; industrial exhibit, 10 AM to 10 PM, Southside Fire Hall; fire department open house, fire-matic display, carnival midway opens, 10 AM, Firemen's Park; rifle salute, military display, 11 AM, Veterans Park; planting of time capsule, 1:30 PM, Veterans Park; adult art show, 2 to 10 PM, Firemen's Park; drum corps competition, 3:30 PM, Dawson Field; parade of years, 6:30 PM, grand finale and fireworks, 11 PM, Dawson Field.

VIETNAM LAND REFORM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Appleton, Wis., Post Crescent several weeks ago indicating that the United States is supporting—to the tune of \$10 million—land reform efforts in South Vietnam to break up large landholding concentrations in the hands of a small portion of the Vietnamese population.

I applaud the purposes of this program. But it is ironic that at the same time we are spending large amounts of money to break up concentrated landholdings thousands of miles away, there has been a tremendous increase in the accumulation of farm land by relatively few people and corporations in our own country—aided and abetted by unfair Federal tax policies.

The land reform plan described in the article which follows would distribute 3.2 million acres of rice land in South Vietnam to 800,000 small farmers. Mr. Speaker, in the United States many times that number of acres of farm land are owned by nonfarm corporations and the conglomerates who buy farms for the sole purpose of writing off their farm losses against nonfarm income.

I applaud our efforts at land reform in Southeast Asia. I think, however, we should precede our efforts there by setting an example at home. We must take action to eliminate the inequity in our present tax law which promotes at home the concentration of landholding which we are discouraging abroad.

The farmers in my congressional district are fully aware of the growth of the corporate farm menace. They do not understand why they should be forced to compete with corporations who, because of our tax laws, do not have to make a profit in order to stay in business—and are anxiously waiting to see what the Congress and the administration are going to do about it.

I include the following article for reprint in the RECORD in the hope that it will stimulate the Congress and the administration to do for the family

farmer here at home what it is trying to do for the small farmer in Vietnam.

\$10 MILLION ALLOCATED FOR VIETNAM REFORMS

SAIGON.—The United States today allocated \$10 million to support a radical new South Vietnamese land reform program which would give land to more than 800,000 rice farmers.

The plan is the most sweeping in a long series of largely ineffective reform attempts and could have strong political implications.

The enemy long has capitalized on the fact that a handful of landlords own most land used in producing rice, South Vietnam's most important crop. Attempts at land reform have been made for nearly two decades, but vested interests and administrative snarls sharply limited their effect.

PUSH FOR APPROVAL

President Nguyen Van Thieu's government is pushing for legislative approval of the program within a month so it can begin redistributing land in August.

As outlined by the agriculture and land reform minister, Cao Van Than, the plan would involve expropriation of 3.2 million acres of rice land from private landlords, religious groups and local governments, which would be paid 20 per cent of the land value in cash and the remainder in eight-year, 5 per cent bonds.

Tenants would be "allowed and encouraged" to apply for title to their plots, which would be free of taxes the first year.

COUNTERINFLATION

The three-year program would cost \$400 million, 10 percent of which the government hopes to get from the United States. The funds allocated today in an agreement signed by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Foreign Minister Tran Chanh Thanh are contingent on activation of the program. The grant is in commodity import aid designed to counter inflationary effects of the program.

In recent years, the Viet Cong has given land to farmers in areas it controlled and promised to continue free land distribution if it gains control of the nation. To counter this, the Saigon regime's new program is being boosted with a big propaganda effort.

Bunker and Thanh signed another agreement today which will give South Vietnam 150,000 tons of American rice valued at \$25.5 million.

AFTER MANKIND'S GIANT LEAP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

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

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1969]

AFTER MANKIND'S GIANT LEAP

The first men on the moon are returning to their home planet. Tranquility Base and Eagle have both been abandoned, their missions gloriously completed, their claim on historical immortality secure.

Here on earth, millions remain stunned and awed, still hardly able to believe that they were eyewitnesses to Neil Armstrong's first step on the moon and all that followed during those unprecedented two and a quarter hours when men first walked on another planet. It was indeed, as Armstrong said, a "giant leap" for mankind.

Artists of every description—poets, novelists, composers, sculptors, painters—will cel-

ebate this event down the ages. This generation, so incredibly fortunate as to be present at humanity's first stride across the void, is too close to the event to be able to judge its full significance.

But one important and immediate lesson learned from the triumph of Apollo 11 is that men can live and work effectively on the moon, limited only by the supplies of oxygen and other life-sustaining essentials available to them. No one who watched Armstrong and Aldrin bound gracefully, comfortably and purposefully around Tranquility Base can have any doubt that the moon can and will be a future focus for human activity of the most diverse kinds.

In the midst of the exciting and unprecedented events of these historic days came the mysteries that surrounded Luna 15. The contrast between the complete openness of the terribly hazardous Apollo flight and the secrecy surrounding the unmanned Soviet Luna effort could hardly be more complete. Soviet space secrecy contributes only to raising suspicions and casting a cloud over the future of that international cooperation so desperately needed for man's journeys toward the planets and beyond.

THE LEXINGTON SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the world stands in awe after witnessing man's most recent advancement to the new frontiers of space. Last Sunday's moon landing was truly one of the most significant events in the history of mankind, and established a milestone in the art of communication.

Today, I would like to call to my colleagues attention another impressive effort in the art of communication. I refer to the work being done by one of the finest schools of its type in the Nation, the Lexington School for the Deaf, located in Jackson Heights, N.Y., in my district. Although not as dramatic or glamorous as the Nation's farflung space communications activities, Lexington, nevertheless, is making an outstanding contribution to the world we live in. It teaches deaf students to communicate with the hearing world.

An interesting account of the work being done by Mr. Oscar Cohen, director of Lexington's after school division, recently appeared in the New York Times, and prompted President Nixon to write a commendatory letter to Mr. Cohen. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD, the article and the President's letter, which I think my colleagues might find of interest:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 23, 1969.

MR. OSCAR COHEN,
The Lexington School for the Deaf,
Jackson Heights, N.Y.

DEAR MR. COHEN: I read a recent New York Times report of the work that you are doing at the Lexington School for the Deaf to widen the outlook of some of your students.

As you mention, the lack of real communication in life is based on fear. However, I know that the gentle assistance you are giving your students will go a long way

toward breaking down the barriers between them and others their own age who can hear. I have a feeling that as your program develops many will appreciate the choice you are giving them and will move with confidence in both the deaf and the hearing worlds.

With my very best wishes as you continue your dedicated work.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

SCHOOL BROADENING HORIZONS OF THE DEAF

Jimmy Hinchcliff, pitching for the Mets/Yankees against the Baltimore/Tigers, was delighted when the umpire called, "Strike!"

Though living in a soundless world, Jimmy who is 12 years old, grinned when he saw his excited teammates screaming. "That's the way to go, Jimmy baby, strike him out!"

Jimmy, like more than half of the boys playing ball the other day on a grassy field in Jackson Heights, Queens, is a student at the Lexington School for the Deaf at 26-26 75th Street.

As the two teams used up the last rays of the late afternoon sun, Jimmy led his mixed team—some boys who could hear and some who couldn't—to an 8-to-6 victory.

The deaf students, 7 to 12 years of age, were taking part in an experimental after-school program with a group of neighborhood children designed to break down the barriers between them and boys of their own age who can hear.

AWARENESS OF WORLD SOUGHT

"We want deaf children to become aware of people who can hear and not fear them," said Oscar Cohen, 28-year-old director of Lexington's after-school division. "And we want people who can hear to get over feeling sorry for deaf kids."

"The only way our students can stop feeling inferior is for them to compete with children their own age in sports and activities where they have a chance of winning."

Mr. Cohen's program seemed to be working. "We've even had a few fights between deaf and neighborhood boys," he said. Mr. Cohen doesn't encourage such behavior, but he also does not want his deaf students to be coddled.

The Lexington School, considered one of the finest schools for the deaf in the country, teaches its students to speak because it believes that they should leave Lexington equipped to communicate with the hearing world. They also learn lip-reading, but are not taught sign language.

TEENAGERS NOT INVOLVED

Although the excitement of the softball game broke down many of the reservations of being "different," Mr. Cohen does not consider the program a panacea.

"I don't want to give the impression that just by putting deaf and hearing children together that something magic happens," he said. "It took a month before deaf and neighborhood children would work together in our arts-and-crafts program."

Mr. Cohen has not had much luck involving older teen-agers in the after-school program.

"Their minds are set," he said. "They say, 'We're deaf and we want to stick together.' To combat this feeling, he is planning a work-and-recreation summer program for older teen-agers, who will be paid \$2 an hour for four hours' work a day, and must participate in afternoon integrated activities with neighborhood teenagers.

Mr. Cohen likened deaf person's relationship with the hearing world to that of blacks and whites.

"Deaf people live in a world set up by the hearing and they feel left out," he said. "They spend most of their social lives only with other deaf people."

OTHER ACTIVITIES OFFERED

As a first step to removing Lexington's students from the insular world of the deaf, Mr. Cohen solicited the help of synagogues, churches and schools 14 months ago when the 100-year-old school moved from cramped quarters at Lexington Avenue and 68th Street to its present spacious new six-acre site.

Thirty-eight neighborhood children responded the first semester. This semester 75 of 160 applicants enrolled in the after-school program of arts and crafts, swimming, softball, Scouts and drama club.

All of the deaf students participating in the school's Drama Club production of "Romeo and Juliet," rehearsing in a basement recreation room at the school, spoke their lines. Although they have been taught to control the loudness and softness of their speech, their voices lack inflection, which is learned by hearing others speak.

The Lexington School is supported by state funds. All residents of the state can go free of cost, but out-of-staters are charged a yearly tuition of \$4,600. A total of 330 students from seven months to 17 years old attend the school and 130 of them live at the school. These resident students participate in the after-school program.

"We started this program," Mr. Cohen said, "to give our students a choice. When they leave Lexington they can choose to live in the deaf world or in both the deaf and the hearing world."

Encouraging hearing children and deaf children to form close friendships is Mr. Cohen's next project. "Right now the neighborhood children come to the school and play with our students but they haven't spontaneously invited any of the deaf kids home."

POSTAL REFORM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of late about the proposed Postal Corporation and the need for adequate and commensurate salaries for our postal employees as related to cost of living and the pay adjustment effective July 1, 1969.

To get closer to what is actually happening, with respect to postal employment, I obtained some statistics from the Hawthorne, Calif., post office on employee turnover and length of service. Employee tenure is most important in any continuing organization. I believe the statistics for Hawthorne to be fairly representative of not only the 17th Congressional District of California, but for much of the Nation. At Hawthorne, 43 employees out of a complement of 159 resigned in 1968 and only 48.1 percent have over 5 years of service.

The 1968 experience and also the record for several prior years concerns me and it appears the postal service needs further attractions or benefits for its personnel and one of these, I am confident, is an adequate wage with in-grade adjustments. The 4.1 percent effective as of July 1, 1969, I believe is inadequate.

Following are some detail statistics relating to the Hawthorne, Calif., post office, which I believe will be of interest.

Present complement of employees: 159.

In 1966 21 employees resigned; in 1967 37 employees resigned; in 1968 43 employees resigned; for a 3-year total of 101 employee resignations.

Of the 101 employees who resigned during the 3-year period, 89 had under 3 years of service in the Department.

The breakdown as to years of service of those presently employed is as follows:

Under 3 years of service, 40.8 percent.

Over 3 and under 5 years of service, 11.1 percent.

Over 5 years of service, 48.1 percent.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire and for the information of the Members and other interested persons, I am pleased to present it today. The results of the questionnaire are set out in the form of a newsletter and contain the following caption: "Newsletter from your Open Door in Washington—Congressman Albert W. Johnson, 23d District of Pennsylvania, No. 15, July 1969."

The newsletter also contains a picture of myself in front of the door of my office in which picture I am holding a recent publication of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce entitled, "Discover the New Pennsylvania." The newsletter then continues as follows:

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: The tabulation of the results of a recent Questionnaire mailed to homes in the District has now been completed and I am pleased to devote a "Newsletter" to report the results. The response to the poll was very gratifying, and the returns were accompanied by over 3,000 letters or comments, which we are separately acknowledging.

The results of the poll and the comments are as follows: Where the percentages do not add up to 100%, the difference represents those who had no opinion.

[Answers in percent]

Question No. 1—the war in Vietnam: Withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means a Communist takeover..... 10
Continue present holding operation.... 3
Gradually withdraw, forcing South Vietnam to assume a bigger role in the war. 47
Mounting a strategically sound effort for a military victory..... 38

The war in Vietnam continues to be the most important crisis facing our nation today. This was recognized by President Nixon in his speech to the nation on May 14, 1969. In this speech, he stated that he had "ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on our battlefield, ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal, or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat." The President's offer: (1) a simultaneous start in withdrawals by both sides; (2) provide a real opportunity for each significant group in South Vietnam to participate in the political life of the Nation.

As is now well known, the U.S. has started its gradual withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. President Thieu of South Vietnam has agreed to elections in which the Viet Cong will take part. It is now up to North Vietnam

to respond to these steps toward peace. The President added in his speech: "If the needless suffering continues, this will affect other decisions."

As the poll indicates, 47% of those replying favor the Nixon plan. However, a large percentage—38% favor a military victory. I note in examining returns of other Congressional Questionnaires that there is a strong sentiment to win the war.

On the question, Should we increase military pressure on North Vietnam, the following are some results:

[Answers in percent]

Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois: Yes.....	44.0
McClory (R) 12th District, Illinois: Yes.....	44.3
Burke (R) 12th District, Florida: Yes.....	52.9
Foreman (R) 2d District, New Mexico: Yes.....	56.7
Schneebeli (R) 17th District, Pennsylvania: Yes.....	57.0

Question No. 2—Diplomatic recognition of Red China. The answer:

Yes	43
No	50

I was really quite surprised at the rather large number of persons who favor this move. I note in the comments by those replying that they feel we would be better off to have a window as it were in Red China.

Here are some comments:

"We need China's views made public, good or bad." "It would probably be no more productive or dangerous than our recognition of Russia." "Maybe we can exploit these markets." "It would be better to negotiate with them now, rather than fight it out later." President Nixon has stated he does not favor recognition.

Question No. 3—The draft:

Continue in its present form.....	19
Replace with an all volunteer army.....	26
Restore World War II draft lottery.....	28
Retain the draft, give draftees option to name call-up date during 4 years..	22

The poll indicates a displeasure on the part of the citizens of the District with the present draft system with only 19% favoring it. Realizing this widespread dissent, President Nixon on May 13th sent to Congress a far-reaching draft-reform plan keyed to a lottery. Under the plan, a youth would be subject to the draft only during his 19th year. At the beginning of each year, 365 capsules would be drawn from a fish bowl, on each capsule being a different date. If a 19 year old was born on the 4th of July, and that date was on the first capsule drawn, he would be in the first group drafted. If he was not drafted during his 19th year, he would be free of the draft, except later in case of an emergency. This plan is an excellent plan, as it gives a youth the knowledge that his draft duty will come only in his 19th year.

Smith (R) 40th District—New York—asked this excellent question: Do you believe an all-volunteer army can be established to replace the draft system after Vietnam? The answer: No: 60%. I would agree with this conclusion.

Question No. 4—Choosing Presidential candidates by national primaries instead of party conventions. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	81
No	14

The fact that the last Presidential election could well have been decided by the House of Representatives has caused pressure to be put on Congress to reform our method of electing our President. As indicated above, a large segment of the population in the District want a direct primary. A similar question in other districts brought these results: Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia—

Yes: 48.6%; Burke (R) 10th District Florida—Yes: 84.1%. There is presently no serious consideration being given in the Congress to do away with the nominating conventions.

Question No. 5—The method of electing a President after nomination:

[Answers in percent]

Retain present system.....	6
Direct popular vote.....	77
Allocate the electoral votes in each state in proportion to the popular votes cast, making a 40% electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President.....	6
Count one electoral vote for the winner in each Congressional District, with two additional votes for whomever carries the State.....	9

President Nixon, in a special message to Congress on February 20th, called for changes. The President said he was not "wedded" to any particular plan, but stated he preferred No. (c) plan above. On April 29th, the House Judiciary Committee approved by a 28 to 6 vote, a proposed constitutional amendment which would provide for direct election of the President by nationwide popular vote. In order to win, a candidate would have to get 40% or more of the total popular vote; otherwise, a runoff election would be held between the two candidates with the most votes. The proposal has not yet been voted on by the House.

The chances of final adoption before the next election are slight because it must receive a two-thirds majority vote in both Houses, plus ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures. Many doubt that the necessary three-fourths of the states will ratify, inasmuch as the most populous states will gain political power, and the smaller and sparsely settled states would lose influence. Also, many are becoming of the opinion that this plan will destroy the two-party system in this country. Thoughtful citizens should study this proposal carefully. Results in other districts: Direct popular vote? Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, Yes: 77%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, Yes: 62.6%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, Yes: 65%; Ford (D) 15th District, Michigan, Yes: 85%.

Question No. 6—Lowering the voting age to 18. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	42
No	57

This is the second year that I have submitted this question. In 1968, the result was No: 56%. This result follows the same voting trend as indicated by other polls elsewhere in the nation as follows: Ford (D) 15th District, Michigan, No: 63%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, No: 61.2%; Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, No: 66.7%; Bennett (D) 3rd District, Florida, No: 52%; Smith (R) 40th District, New York, No: 52%; Quillen (R) 1st District, Tennessee, No: 55.8%; Ottinger (D) 25th District, New York, Yes: 50%. This question brought forth many comments from those who replied, such as: "If a man can be drafted to serve his country, he should be able to vote." "I would restrict it to those under 21, who are members of the Armed Services." "Indications are they are not ready for it." "The 18 year olds might have the education and knowledge, but not the wisdom of how to use it correctly."

Question No. 7—Deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	50
No	41

While the debate over the limited safeguard system progresses, the people back home are being heard from. For instance, the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, New Jersey, has just released the results of

a poll taken, in which the question was asked whether Congress should approve the limited ABM system as outlined by President Nixon. 73% voted yes, and 10% no. In other polls taken by Congressmen, the results vary as follows: Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, Yes: 65%; Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois, Yes: 60%; McClory (R) 12th District, Illinois, Yes: 64.6%; Marsh (D) 7th District, Virginia, Yes: 62.5%; Bennett (D) 3rd District, Florida, Yes: 75%; Minshall (R) 23rd District, Ohio, Yes: 45.2%; Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, Yes: 74.6%. Those in Congress who favor the President's plan state that they would have to be absolutely convinced that the President was wrong before they could in good conscience oppose him on a national security matter of this magnitude. With this, I agree. Those against it argue that it won't work when the button is pressed; it is too costly; it will escalate the arms race and present a new threat to the Soviet Union; on completion, because of technological changes, the missile will be obsolete.

Question No. 8—Terminate all public financial help to students found guilty of participating in disruptive demonstrations. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	92
No	6

The nation has become disgusted with the large increase in student demonstrations this past year, particularly with what took place at Cornell. Congress is most certainly to act on this challenge to our institutions at this session of Congress. One plan calls for colleges to file a set of regulations of student conduct before the college can qualify for Federal aid. Other plans are directed to the student himself, such as an end to Federal scholarship aid or loans. All answers to this question nationwide are about the same, viz: *Expel* violently disrupting students: Yes: 94% (Smith (R) 40th District, New York); *Deny colleges Federal aid* in case of continued flagrant campus disorders: Yes: 78.6% (Minshall (R) 23rd District, Ohio).

Question No. 9—Terminate political patronage in the Post Office Department. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	92
No	5

President Nixon named Winton M. Blount as his Postmaster General. In appointing Mr. Blount, the President gave him a free hand in re-organizing the Postal system. One of General Blount's first decisions was to divorce the system from politics. On February 5, 1969, he issued an order that removed all postmasters and rural carriers from political patronage and provided for their appointment by national impartial selection boards. This landmark decision at first caused widespread dissent from politicians, but now these persons realize that something must be done to save our postal system from a complete breakdown. As the poll result indicates, the people back home soundly approve.

Question No. 10—Converting the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation. The answer:

[Answers in percent]

Yes	54
No	33

Carrying out his resolve to make our postal system the best in the world, and meet the demands of the next 30 years when our national population will reach 300 million people General Blount has asked Congress to turn the postal system over to a government owned corporation, like the Tennessee Valley Authority. This will eliminate the role of Congress in rate making and in fixing postal salaries, and will provide for continuity of management. Hearings are being held on the proposal. I favor it strongly, provided the rights of postal workers will be secured and

protected. The plan is favored nationwide as the following polls indicate: Reid (R) 15th District, Illinois, Yes: 70%; Scott (R) 8th District, Virginia, Yes: 57%; Whalen (R) 3rd District, Ohio, Yes: 67%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, Yes: 74%; Ottinger (D) 25th District, New York, Yes: 63%; Snyder (R) 4th District, Kentucky, Yes: 71.3%.

Question No. 11—The right of public employees, other than firemen and police, to strike. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 43
 No ----- 53

This question was prompted by the many strikes that have occurred in the past year by school teachers, garbage workers, and other public employees. The bill before Congress grants postal workers the legal right to organize a union, but does not grant the right to strike. The almost imperative necessity that 60 million monthly social security checks be delivered on time makes such a strike unthinkable. Most polls in other districts indicated the majority do not favor strikes by public employees; viz: Foreman (R) 2nd District, New Mexico, No: 61%; Burke (R) 10th District, Florida, No: 72%; Meskill (R) 6th District, Connecticut, No: 65%; Chamberlain (R) 6th District, Michigan, No: 70%; Corbett (R) 18th District, Pennsylvania, No: 59%.

Question No. 12—Repeat 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (Right to work section). The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 25
 No ----- 50
 No opinion ----- 25

The results of this question indicate by the large number of persons registering no opinion (25%) that many persons are not familiar with the issue. While union leaders are strong for the proposal, right now in Congress the matter is in abeyance because of the pressure of other business.

Question No. 13—A constitutional amendment to permit voluntary non-denominational prayer in public schools. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 84
 No ----- 15

Members of Congress have received more mail on this subject since the Supreme Court in 1963 outlawed prayer and Bible reading in our schools than any other issue. Hardly a week goes by but what I receive a petition signed by many persons urging the above amendment. Senator Dirksen is in the lead of the forces to pass the amendment. If the Judiciary Committee in the House would release the resolution to the Floor for a vote, it would pass easily. So far, the Committee is sitting on the resolution. I have sponsored the Dirksen resolution in the House.

Question No. 14—Increase in first class mail rate from 6c to 7c with a guarantee of air mail delivery. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 32
 No ----- 65

Two years ago, postal rates were increased substantially for all classes of mail, and the bill also contained a raise in the salaries of postal workers with the intention that the raise in wages would bring them up to comparability with similar jobs in industry. Now two years later, the postal deficit is \$600 million, the workers are demanding additional wage increases, which if granted makes a raise in postal rates almost a foregone conclusion. To bring these factors into a business-like balance, I have agreed to support the creation of a postal corporation which when set up will be charged with the duty to solve the various problems and the deficit.

Question No. 15—Statehood for Puerto Rico. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 55
 No ----- 33

This spring, I spent the weekend in Puerto Rico attending a conference on Urban Growth. I had the opportunity to tour the island and visit forts, the harbor, the Governor's palace, etc. I became convinced that Puerto Rico should become a state. We need this country as an assured part of our defense system, and to help them prosper and raise their standard of living. The target date for statehood is 1980. The population is over 2½ million, and they will, therefore, have at least six members of Congress and, of course, two U.S. Senators. We owe citizenship to the young Puerto Ricans serving in our armed forces. I found the leaders in Puerto Rico of the highest type and well educated men.

Question No. 16—Should the President be allowed to commit U.S. troops to conflicts on foreign soil without the consent of Congress? The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 19
 No ----- 80

Since sending out the Questionnaire, the U.S. Senate has voted on this issue. By a vote of 70 to 16, the Senate approved a resolution to the effect that the President should make no "national commitment" without the consent of Congress. A national commitment is defined as "the use of armed forces of the U.S. on foreign territory, or a promise to assist a foreign country, government, or people by the use of armed forces or financial resources of the U.S., either immediately or upon the happening of certain events." Those who voted against the resolution argued as follows: "It is essential for the President to have wide flexibility in the field of foreign relations in order to respond swiftly and appropriately to the mercurial exigencies of international diplomacy in this nuclear age."

Congressional polls favor the Senate action as follows: Quillen (R) 1st District, Tennessee, Yes: 64.78%; Burke (R) 10th District, Florida, Yes: 66%; Whalen (R) 3rd District, Ohio, Yes: 65%.

Question No. 17—Ceiling on individual Federal farm subsidy payments. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 93
 No ----- 3

When the farm subsidy bill was before the House, the Members adopted an amendment limiting payments to \$20,000. I voted for this restrictive amendment. The bill is now in conference with the Senate who has deleted the limitation. It goes without saying that our farm subsidy system of controlled production requires a complete overhaul. The Agriculture Committee has been studying the whole program and promises corrective legislation. Some comments on the Questionnaires on this subject were well-reasoned. Here are a few: "Let farmers grow enough to feed the nation. Paying farmers not to grow and people going hungry, I just can't see this." "There are too many free loaders as it is. Let's cut back." "Let supply and demand regulate prices." "Help the poor farmers, not the wealthy ones."

Question No. 18—Return to the States a percentage of the Federal income tax. The answer:

[Answers in percent]
 Yes ----- 73
 No ----- 22

President Nixon has announced that he considers revenue sharing with state and local governments a high-priority program. Two months ago, ten mayors of the nation's biggest cities at a White House meeting bitterly opposed returning the money to the states. They wanted the money to go directly to the cities. At the White House recently a compromise was reached wherein the money would still go to the states, with a

specific amount earmarked for cities. The plan is scheduled to go into effect starting July 1, 1970.

Question No. 19—Transfer of the more successful antipoverty programs to other departments. The answer:

Yes ----- 50
 No ----- 32

Under the date of February 19, 1969, President Nixon issued an executive order which as of July 1, 1969, transfers the Head Start Program to the Health, Education and Welfare Department. The Job Corps was transferred to the Department of Labor, and many Job Corps Centers ordered closed.

On March 18th, the U.S. Accounting Office issued a report which questions the results of the Poverty Program. It has cost the taxpayers \$7.5 billion in five years. The report charges that the program has been poorly administered and most programs have fallen far short of their goals. The Job Corps, which has cost \$1 billion at a 1968 cost of \$8,300 per boy, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps which has cost \$1.16 billion were both severely criticized. Head Start, which has provided pre-school training for 2 million children was also questioned as to its permanent value. Community Action programs were generally praised as a community mechanism.

The Nixon Administration has decided to give the Poverty Program two more years of life, to be funded at \$2.048 billion, with greater state participation and duplicating programs consolidated.

And now in closing, I want to thank those who took the time to return my questionnaire and thus make this report possible. I hope you have found this Newsletter both interesting and informative.

Sincerely yours,
 ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

LET US DISPLAY MOON SAMPLES IN THE ROTUNDA

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have drafted a joint resolution for introduction early next week which would provide for permanent display in the Rotunda of the Capitol Building of a portion of the moon.

I think we will all agree that the flight of Apollo 11 rates as one of the most spectacular American achievements in the history of this Nation.

Ordinarily, displays of great scientific or historic significance are established at the Smithsonian Institution or other major museums. I would expect this to be the case with some of the moon samples returned by Apollo 11, but I believe this material is of such tremendous and lasting interest that some of it should be placed in the Rotunda so that the millions of U.S. and foreign citizens who visit the capitol annually may see it.

I agree that it is proper that most of the material should be utilized for scientific studies, but I think it is only right that the American people, who made the expedition possible, have a chance to see moon materials during visits to the Capitol.

I would hope the display could be arranged shortly after the quarantine period for Apollo 11 ends in mid-August.

PERSPECTIVE ON POLLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great public interest in steps to effectively combat water and air pollution, I was impressed to note a letter by Mr. T. F. Patton, chairman and chief executive officer of the Republic Steel Corp., in that company's monthly magazine, June 1969.

Mr. Patton is a well-respected corporate executive who is providing the necessary, progressive leadership to this area of corporate responsibility.

Mr. Patton's letter follows:

PERSPECTIVE ON POLLUTION

FELLOW REPUBLIC EMPLOYEES: As you will see, several pages of this issue of *Reports* are devoted to the subject of air and water quality control.

I urge that you look over this material because I think it may give you added insight into what has become a very important and controversial public issue.

It is understandable that in recent years, the American people have shown a growing concern over the quality of our air and water. After all, most pollution is caused by the activities of people, and within a relatively short period of time we have become a much larger and busier nation. For example, in 1940 our population totaled about 132 million; today, it is more than 200 million. Today, our total output of goods and services is more than three times as high as it was in 1940. And whereas in 1940, we Americans were driving approximately 32 million motor vehicles on our streets and highways, today we operate more than 100 million!

As you know, even such an essential thing as the heating of our homes and buildings discharges impurities into the air. The tilling of our farms deposits unwanted materials into our streams and rivers, as does the fertilizing and spraying of our crops, the clearance of land for building purposes, the everyday use of soaps and detergents and, yes, the disposal of untreated or inadequately treated human wastes.

I cite these examples because too often, people will point to industry as either the sole or the major cause of air and water pollution in this country. But, the problem is much bigger than that resulting from industrial activity alone. And it cannot be solved by industry alone.

Unfortunately, air and water quality control has become a highly emotional issue—one that some persons are quick to exploit to gain public favor. Under such conditions, facts are frequently ignored and reason often takes a back seat to passion. Consequently, the public outcry for immediate remedies has created demands on industry which are often unrealistic in terms of time, cost and the availability of knowhow and equipment capable of accomplishing the desired goals.

It is the firm policy of Republic Steel to incorporate feasible and practical air and water quality controls into its operations. Over the last ten years, we have spent \$42 million toward that objective, and we have appropriated another \$38 million for control projects to be completed within the next few years. In addition, Republic is planning still further air and water quality control facilities requiring the expenditure of many more millions of dollars. I believe this is an impressive testimonial to Republic Steel's dedication to an improved environment for our plant communities.

But again, I emphasize that the job cannot be done by industry alone, nor can it be done overnight. If we are to successfully accomplish the task of safeguarding the quality of our air and water, we're going to require the cooperation of every one concerned and we will have to approach the problem with utmost intelligence. We're going to have to know the precise facts of each and every adverse situation, exactly what can be done to correct it, how much it will cost to correct, how much time it will take, what parties should rightly contribute to the control effort, and finally, whether or not the benefits to be derived in a particular situation are worth the costs involved.

If we can approach air and water quality control in this manner and spirit, I am sure we're going to achieve great progress in making our communities cleaner and more pleasant places in which to live and work.

T. F. PATTON,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

REDEEMING A MANDATE: TAX REFORM NOW

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent vote on the bill to extend the surtax was a mandate for tax reform. The President, the leadership of both parties, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee all made solemn commitments that tax reform would receive top priority on our legislative calendar.

Today, I have sent the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee a letter outlining the urgent need for tax reform, and especially tax relief—considering that the continued rise of inflation and taxes is sapping the purchasing power of the average American family.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.

HON. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The vote on the bill to extend the surtax was a mandate for tax reform, it is now incumbent upon the members of Congress to fulfill their solemn commitment to make meaningful tax reform the next major priority of business. To do less will have earned the scorn and wrath of the American taxpayers.

For a not-so-quiet revolt is brewing across the heartland of America.

The average working family is being victimized by rising taxes and rising prices, and frankly, they're fed up with the excuses they're hearing for inflation and the justification for accelerating taxes.

We all know that the Internal Revenue Code is riddled with favoritism and notorious inequities, and we all know what has to be done.

Laws were meant to help men govern, not to tyrannize and plague them. Yet its been 15 years since Congress last seriously reviewed our tax legislation. This year some 130 of my colleagues in the House and nearly half of the Senate members have introduced various measures calling for an end to tax abuses.

It would be unconscionable for the leadership to now ignore this mandate for reform. To do otherwise would be suggesting that Congress has a callous disregard for the plight of the American taxpayers.

One-third of the population, those earning between \$5,000 and \$15,000 annually, are unfairly shouldering the nation's tax burden—paying two-thirds of federal taxes, while the very rich escape paying taxes altogether, or pay pitifully little.

Is it any wonder then that the American taxpayers look with suspicion upon Congress?

But not only must we close the loopholes and eliminate preferential treatment, but we must liberalize the deduction and exemption provisions, making them consistent with the economic realities of modern America. It would be fiscally irresponsible if we didn't now extend tax reform to mean tax relief.

The average American taxpayer is living today under the impact of one of the longest sustained inflationary periods in American history that is depressing his buying power. On top of this, people are fed up with the spiraling cost of local government. This year states and cities tried raising nearly \$5 billion in new revenue—through property taxes, income taxes, sales taxes and various fees—and in many localities, the taxpayers revolted.

A decade ago 27 percent of the average American's wages went to taxes. Today the tax bite is up to 34 percent. And it's been estimated that this year the average American will work two-and-a-half hours out of every 8-hour day to pay all his taxes.

But, Mr. Chairman, that's only part of the depressing fiscal straits hampering Americans today. Consumer prices are also rising faster today than are salary increases.

A recent study in New York City suggests that in 24 major industries, employees received anywhere from \$8 to \$30 in weekly wage increases in the last three years—but rising taxes reduced the actual net gain by 50 percent, and inflation nibbled another 50 percent from the employees' take home purchasing power.

Incredible as it may sound, the \$8 weekly increase actually equals a net weekly loss of \$6.32 after \$4.78 for taxes were deducted and the affect of inflation is considered. The individual earning up to \$30 a week more did a little better. He lost \$11.13 of his increase to taxes, and after inflation is considered, he is left with \$4.93.

Horrible as the word sounds, the Wall Street Journal recently stated that the spiraling cost of living has brought on a recession—"a recession in the standard of living" for many Americans.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, it took \$9,076 for a family of four to live moderately well in 1967 in urban America, but today that salary buys 9 percent less because of rising prices. Indeed, average weekly purchasing power declined from \$79.86 to \$77.62 in this period.

The Wall Street Journal quotes economic consultant Leonard M. Strunk as saying the nation is "in the early stages of a depression" in which "an increasing proportion of the population will find itself pushed to ever lower economic standards of living" even though salaries may increase.

And a Chase Manhattan Bank Vice-President believes purchasing power will continue to decline until the present inflationary period subsides. "We will be fortunate if that can be done in less than a year, and two or three years is a more likely estimate."

In these circumstances, it is imperative that Congress cease arguing tax reform and produce immediate action. To reiterate, what is needed is a two-pronged attack: reform of existing abuses and tax relief for the average American family. Such an approach is encompassed in an omnibus 12-point tax reform bill and seven-point tax-relief program which I introduced earlier this year. For some time, similar proposals have been

offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Reuss, and in one form or another by several of our colleagues.

Indeed, if the 12-point tax reform package I advocate was enacted, it would yield, I believe, up to \$15 billion for the U.S. Treasury, perhaps increasing the potential for a genuine tax reduction. I call for:

Taxation of capital gains accumulated in estates.

Removal of unlimited charitable deduction.

Taxation of stock option gains at income tax rates.

Require a minimum income tax of 20 percent on net personal income of \$50,000 and above.

Requirement for related corporations to be taxed as a single enterprise.

Elimination of tax-free status of municipal industrial revenue bonds.

Reduction of domestic mineral depletion allowances to 10 percent from a high of 27½ percent.

Eliminate depletion allowance on oil produced outside of United States.

Increase of gift tax rates to those established on estates.

Requirement that government bonds used to settle estate taxes be valued at current market prices.

Limitation on farming loss deductions for "gentlemen farmers."

Removal of accelerated depreciation allowances on speculative real estate transactions.

I also advocate that the growth of taxpayer-subsidized foundations be sharply curtailed. The philanthropic purposes of foundations must be vigorously scrutinized, carefully delineating the scope of their tax-free advantages. And the profit earned by foundations on commercial investments must be curbed.

The key elements of the tax proposals, of course, are the closing of the loopholes that permit the rich to escape taxation completely. This is the outrage that really lies beneath the public's indignation.

For instance, under capital gains, the profit made from the sale of stocks and bonds owned for at least six months is now covered under a special tax rate which permits only half of the profits on most long-term investments to be taxed. This allows millions of dollars of revenue to escape taxation.

Municipal bonds are another notorious abuse. Complete exemption from tax income received on state and local bonds permits millionaires to invest large sums to secure tax-free incomes which otherwise would be taxable if they were invested in stocks or property.

It is reported that one wealthy widow earned over \$1.5 million tax free annually through municipal bonds while her gardener, earning \$5,000 yearly, pays \$350 in federal taxes.

One of the more scandalous abuses is the oil depletion allowance. This permits oil and gas companies to enjoy a "depletion allowance" under which 27.5 percent of their net income is exempt from taxation, in addition to being allowed to reduce their tax liabilities by rapid write-offs of operating costs. The result is that many oil companies pay no taxes at all. And it's been pointed out that one non-paying oil firm with a net income of \$65 million over a five-year period actually received a \$235,000 tax refund one year on losses incurred in a previous year!

These tax abuses are outrageous, and suggest to the average American taxpayer that our tax structure is not really progressive, based on one's ability to pay. The discrepancies must end. But after all those years of abuse, isn't it time that the average American, forced to shoulder an unfairly large share of the tax burden, be given just consideration? Shouldn't real tax reform also mean tax relief where it is most needed and justified?

I call for:

A \$1200 personal exemption for individual taxpayers and their dependents instead of the present \$600.

A \$1500 deduction for the cost of college tuition.

A \$250 deduction for commuting expenses. An exemption on the first \$5000 of retirement income.

A \$1000 annual deduction for monies expended on home repairs and improvements.

A depreciation allowance for homeowners of one-family homes, similar to the deduction now granted owners of multi-family dwellings and other commercial properties.

A rent payers deduction on income tax for percentage of rent paid by landlord for taxes and mortgage interest charges.

All of these relief measures are necessary and feasible, but if any priority can be given them I say raising the personal exemption rate is the major weapon for granting the average American taxpayer immediate tax relief.

The original purpose of the \$600 personal income tax exemption was to provide the taxpayer with sufficient untaxed funds to sustain himself and his family. However, since the time when this provision was enacted, the cost of living has more than tripled, and yet the exemption for the taxpayer and his dependents have remained the same.

In 1948, when the existing personal exemption rate of \$600 was adopted, the average American family earned \$3,031 annually. At that time each \$600 deduction meant 20 percent of a family's annual income. Today, average family income is \$8,017, which means the \$600 exemption comes to only 7.5 percent.

My proposals providing relief for homeowners also deserve priority. It's high time we gave the homeowner a break. For far too long he has been the forgotten man, except when it comes to paying property taxes. His basic rights and needs are all too often neglected or forgotten.

The cumulative effect of delayed home repairs and maintenance is especially vexing. Home deterioration is a progressive blight. A repair that goes undone one year may cost twice as much to correct in the second year.

Since there has been a steady increase in the cost of home maintenance, we can hardly hope that the rate of deterioration has decreased. In fact, we can safely assume that the dilapidation has spread.

The \$1000 deduction could be an effective way of stopping the spread of home dilapidation and community deterioration.

And the depreciation allowance I propose would give the homeowner the same break now granted to the owners of income-producing property. Why should there be any differential? Surely the taxpayer who invests in home property has the same taxes, overhead and maintenance problems as a commercial property owner.

Before the American taxpayer loses confidence in Congress we must put an end to tax abuses, eliminating the "double standard" which makes a mockery out of our tradition of taxation based on ability to pay.

Since the American taxpayer pays considerably more than do the wealthy, and the disparity between what the average family pays and what the privileged don't pay, is now public knowledge, Congress is faced with a crisis of confidence that can only be alleviated by direct, immediate tax reform and tax relief.

Otherwise, disrespect for our laws will increase, and the healthy democratic relationship between those who are taxed and those who are representing the taxpaying public in the halls of government will be threatened.

Sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress.

REPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the English language press in South Africa continues to report on developments in that country with great courage. Following are two articles from the Johannesburg Star of Saturday, July 12, 1969, which make very vivid the steady movement toward political repression. What is so striking about this history is the appalling nature of what can be done under the righteous banner of anticommunism and antiterrorism.

The first article is by Jean Sinclair, President of the Black Sash, a women's organization founded in 1955 to defend the South African Constitution:

FREEDOMS WE HAVE LOST

(Jean Sinclair)

"It is difficult for those who have not themselves lived through the gradual establishment of a tyranny to understand the subtle dangers of the 'softening-up' process, the effect on all but the strongest personalities of intimidation. Laws which would have aroused the fiercest opposition in 1947 meet with sullen acquiescence in 1957."—"Civil Liberty in South Africa," by Edgar H. Brookes and J. B. Macaulay.

And from 1957 to 1969?

Detention without trial.

Gagging without trial.

More people placed under house arrest without trial.

More passports withdrawn and refused with no reason given.

No longer is a person innocent until proved guilty. Some of our laws now state that you are guilty until you have proved your innocence.

We all forget what we have lost under this government.

What have we lost?

Freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment.

The protection of our courts.

The right to know.

The right to explain.

How did we lose it?

1950: The Suppression of Communism Act defined Communism so widely that avowed anti-Communists are deemed Communists; and gave the Minister powers normally held by the courts.

1953: The Criminal Procedure Act further diminished the powers of the courts, allowing the Minister to refuse bail and to order summary trials.

1962: The Sabotage Act defined sabotage so widely that many normal activities can be punished as "sabotage" in certain circumstances.

1963: 90-day detention clause; replaced by

1965: 180-day detention clause allowing detention for indefinitely recurring periods of 180 days and excluding the courts from access to persons detained.

1967: The Terrorism Act provided for indefinite detention for interrogation and defined terrorism so widely as to include "embarrassing the administration of the affairs of State." This Act was made retrospective for five years before it became law.

1969: The Boss Act makes it an offense, punishable with up to seven years' jail, to communicate anything about security, including anything about what the Bureau for State Security itself is doing. It also deprives the courts of the right to decide whether evidence shall enjoy State privilege, i.e., be

silence. This applies to evidence affecting not only security but also the "interests of the State."

WHERE INNOCENCE MAY NOT HELP

A police spokesman has confirmed that in the latest swoop between 30 and 40 people are being held under the Terrorism Act in Pretoria. How many are there all over the country?

We have no means of knowing. We are told we have no right to know. Their relatives have no right to know. Parliament has no right to know.

The Minister refused to give figures to Parliament of the number of people detained under the Terrorism Act because "it is not in the public interest."

When asked if all detainees were visited by a magistrate at least once a fortnight he replied "Yes, except in exceptional cases, where the circumstances did not permit such visits."

When asked how many were not so visited, for what period, and what were the circumstances, his reply was "in view of the volume of work involved in the collection of the particulars asked for it is not practicable to furnish the required information."

If this happened to you, your certainty of your own innocence would avail you nothing.

Four people have died this year while in detention: one on the day following his arrest, one three days after, one four days after and one three months after.

Thirty-two people were detained during 1968 under Proclamation 400 of 1960 in the Transkei. Seven people had already been detained this year under this Proclamation by May 20.

Twenty-seven people were detained under 180 days in 1968. Eleven people had already been detained this year under this clause by May.

Banned without trial: On August 30, 1968, 490 people were living under banning orders. Others have been banned since that date.

Mr. Robert Sobukwe, released from jail after serving six years detention imposed by Parliament, in addition to the three years he was sentenced to by the Court, was immediately placed under severe restriction orders.

Forty-two people are at present subject to house arrest. Eleven house arrest orders have been renewed for a further five years. Nine of these people have to report daily to a police station.

If this happened to you, your certainty of your own innocence would avail you nothing.

Banished without trial: 39 people are at present subject to removal orders in terms of the Bantu Administration Act.

Passports refused: 322 people were refused passports or travel documents in 1968. Sixty-nine people left the Republic on exit permits during 1968. They can never return.

The Government spends thousands of rands each year publicizing South Africa overseas but 1,251 applications for visas to visit South Africa were refused during 1968.

What have we got to hide?

Peace at any price: "... we can live in the year 1969 in a South Africa which is calm and peaceful. . . ."—the Prime Minister.

A strange sort of peace when bannings, banishments, house arrests, detention without trial, passports refused, secret police, informers, interrogation are an accepted part of our everyday life.

SYMBOL OR SENSE?

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading an editorial regard-

ing the attack on the oil depletion allowance which makes sense to me.

I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the other Members of this body, this editorial from the Dallas Morning News of July 23, 1969, which is as follows:

SYMBOL OR SENSE?

The attack on the oil depletion allowance, which has long been a regular feature of each political season, seems to have thrust closer to its goal than ever before.

The depletion allowance is a favorite symbolic target of liberals. It is usually portrayed to the public as a loophole in the tax laws, an escape hatch by which the privileged and the get-rich-quick promoter can get away with money that rightfully belongs to the government.

To add to that propaganda advantage, liberals can play on the current revolt of the ordinary taxpayer, who is fed up with bearing the burdens of an increasing load of government. This justifiably angry citizen can easily be set in a rage by the propaganda which shows depletion as a bonanza for the wealthy few, the rich oilmen.

The oil industry, to combat the emotion-charged rich oilman stereotype and the loophole charge, has only facts and figures to defend its case. While these have always been enough in reasoned debate to convince thinking men that the allowance is just, they are not effective weapons in a political propaganda match.

The oilmen have pointed out, for instance, that the depletion allowance was not the result of a loophole, an omission. It was designed carefully by Congress to give the oil industry and other industries that produce natural resources the ability to renew their reserves, as manufacturing industries renew their plants through depreciation allowances.

They have pointed out that in the past the allowance has provided an added incentive to the development of oil production in this country. Having oil available within our own borders has been a vital factor, not only to the growth of the economy, but to national security when war or unrest cut off supplies from overseas.

They have listed facts on the enormous contribution that the industry gives both the economy and the tax revenues of all levels of government. In Texas, for example, the number of oilmen working for the industry is 212,000, plus thousands of landowners, merchants and employees of firms that do a substantial share of trade with the industry.

But perhaps the most eloquent counter to critics' charge that the depletion allowance is a get-rich-quick bonanza of tax-free funds is provided by the market economy itself. If depletion-aided oil production were, in fact, such a bonanza, the market would work to flood that field with new capital and new businesses. It is obvious that businessmen and investors will go into the types of enterprise that return them high earnings. That's the economic common sense.

Yet in the supposedly sure-thing business of oil production, the trend has been the other way. In the past 10 years oil well drilling has slumped by a third in the U.S. In the same period, about 50 per cent of the nation's independent oil companies have got out of the business.

In Texas, with only a third of the prospective oil area sufficiently tested, the slump in drilling has contributed to a one-billion-barrel decline in underground oil reserves in the past decade. We're not finding new oil to replace oil that we are using.

If the oil-finding business were the tax-free cinch the critics say it is, it would be drawing swarms of enterprisers and the oil search would be booming. In fact, despite the growth in energy demand and the slump in available reserves, men and money have been going elsewhere to seek profits.

If the prospect is discouraging with the allowance, it's not hard to see what it will be without the allowance.

ONE SMALL STEP—ONE GIANT LEAP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 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.) Post, July 21, 1969]

ONE SMALL STEP—ONE GIANT LEAP

The creature who once stood blinking at the door of his Paleolithic cave has come a long way. No longer is he tied to the area or even to the world where he was born. The heavens lie open now. The time nears when he will roam his solar system. At long last, man is on the brink of mastering the universe.

The technological and scientific achievements demonstrated yesterday in the landing of a manned spacecraft on the surface of the moon surpass all that have gone before. The three-man team of Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins has shown that man can travel incredible distances, land safely on non-earthly bodies, devise equipment to sustain human life where nature has not provided for its existence, and prepare to return to earth. Few of their forerunners who explored the planet earth reached their goals with so good a chance of returning to tell of it.

The exploits of these brave men, and of the tens of thousands whose work have made them possible, open new vistas for exploration and thought that end man knows not where. A mere scoopful of soil and rock from the moon could help unlock some of the secrets of the universe and may reveal things about which no one now dreams. The implications of their voyage for religion, philosophy and even human behavior can be foreseen only dimly for they have done the impossible. Man has safely landed in a vehicle, emerged, and walked upon the moon.

This is the third great scientific achievement in an era full of achievements—military, political, and technological. Within the lifetime of most Americans alive today, man has split the atom, broken the genetic code, and conquered space. In each of these, men have pried out of nature some of the very fundamentals of creation. By doing so, they have extended the horizons of all mankind by holding out the promise of unlimited energy, perfection in reproduction, and new knowledge of what life itself is all about. But each of these magnificent achievements holds also the seeds of disaster. Few greater evils could befall mankind than for men to carry their earthly disputes to the stars.

There is, however, something humbling about the landing of men on the moon. Six men have now seen the earth as it really is—a speck in the infinity of space. In that context, man's exploits must seem puny and his egocentric view of the universe must disappear. He is merely baggage on a planet in a solar system that is a tiny part of something he can scarcely begin to understand.

Thus, while this is no doubt a day for national rejoicing and thanksgiving, it is also a day for national renewal. It is true that the United States has won the race to the moon and has thrown back into the face of the Soviet Union the boast of then-Premier Khrushchev, just seven years ago, that his country's space achievements would

"demonstrate the great advantage of the socialist system." But it would be tragic if Americans viewed this great event in a nationalistic framework. If this Nation stands taller in the world today, it does so because it stands on the shoulders of men of many countries—the men who from Copernicus and Galileo through Goddard, Von Braun, Tsiolkovsky and Oberth dreamed of such a day. Armstrong and Aldrin landed on the moon not just as Americans but as representatives of the human race.

The hope of Apollo 11 is that this achievement, along with the others in space, past, present and future, Russian as well as American, will rekindle man's dreams and revive his lagging spirits. The world needs men now who believe in their dreams of prosperity and brotherhood at home, peace and good will on earth, and adventure and cooperation in space.

The record of history makes it possible to believe that this hope of Apollo 11 is not in vain. Writing of a part of the world at the time this last great frontier was opened, Samuel Elliot Morrison said:

"At the end of 1492 most men in Western Europe felt exceedingly gloomy about the future. Christian civilization appeared to be shrinking in area and dividing into hostile units. Institutions were decaying, well-meaning people were growing cynical or desperate. . . . Islam was expanding at the expense of Christendom. Every effort to recover the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, touchstone of Christian prestige, had been a failure. The Ottoman Turks, after snuffing out all that remained of the Byzantine Empire, had overrun most of Greece, Albania and Serbia; presently they would be hammering at the gates of Vienna."

Then came the voyages of Columbus and the other captains who pursued the vision of Henry the Navigator. As word of their exploits spread, Morrison wrote, "new ideas flared up throughout Italy, France, Germany and the Northern nations; faith in God revived and the human spirit is renewed."

It was not without good reasons that historians arbitrarily selected the year 1500 as the beginning of modern history. After the discovery of a New World, Will Durant has written, "A pride of achievement inspired the human mind just when Copernicus was about to reduce the cosmic importance of the earth and its inhabitants. Man felt that the world of matter had been conquered by the courage of the human mind. The medieval motto for Gibraltar—*ne plus ultra*—was denied by abbreviation; it became now *plus ultra*—more beyond. All limits were removed; all the world was open; everything seemed possible."

That, then, should be the spirit in which this Nation and the world celebrate the achievement of our astronauts. A new frontier has opened. New worlds are there to be conquered. But success brings responsibility as well as glory. The landing of men on the moon is a challenge as well as a triumph—a challenge that men get on with the task of solving earthly problems as well as confronting nature in space, that he learn to live in peace as well as to compete for supremacy.

Above all, however, every human being can rejoice at being alive today as the space age begins. The words of William H. McNeill never have had a stronger ring of truth. Writing in *The Rise of the West*, he said, "Man some centuries from now will surely look back upon our times as a golden age of unparalleled technical, intellectual, institutional and perhaps even of artistic creativity. Life in Demosthenes' Athens, in Confucius' China, and in Mohammed's Arabia was violent, risky and uncertain; hope struggled with fear; greatness teetered perilously on the brim of disaster. We belong in this high company and should count ourselves fortunate to live in one of the great ages of the world."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this year the President of the United States again issued a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week." Similar proclamations have been issued since 1959 under the provisions of Public Law 86-90.

On the 11th observance of this most important commemoration, I think it fitting to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the act that provided for Presidential notice to the American people that we have not forgotten others less fortunate than ourselves, and also the proclamations issued by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—PUBLIC LAW No. 86-90

RESOLUTION

S.J. Res. 111

H.J. Res. 454, 459

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate

and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are basic human rights to which all men are entitled; and

Whereas the independence of peoples requires their exercise of the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas these inalienable rights have been circumscribed or denied in many areas of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1967 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

GUN CONTROL COMMENTS

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two measures affecting the Gun Control Act of 1968 which was signed into law on October 22, 1968. One measure would repeal the ammunition portion of the law, and the other would repeal the entire law itself.

I feel so strongly about the adverse affects of the Gun Control Act, and particularly the ammunition portion, that I included this question on my recent first annual legislative questionnaire.

The questionnaires returned to my office have indicated that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma are overwhelmingly in favor of at least repealing the ammunition portion of the law, that I felt compelled to introduce legislation that would do just that.

The ammunition portion of the act defies all rules of logic. Why punish sportsmen and hunters by restricting their purchases of ammunition? The average criminal will not be seeking this ammunition, nor will he obtain it through normal channels. Why burden our sportsmen with having to go through mountains of bureaucratic red tape simply to purchase a box of ammunition to enjoy a hobby that has been a part of this Nation since its very beginning?

Even more important, in my mind, is outright repeal of the Gun Control Act itself. If I had been a Member of the 90th Congress when this measure was up for debate, I would have opposed it with all the vigor and might I could summon. Why did Congress feel compelled to punish the law-abiding citizens of this Nation when the only laws of this type should be directed toward criminals? Why did Congress think the crime rate would drop if it passed such a law? Obviously, such has not been the case, as our crime rate has been soaring ever higher.

I would like to share with my colleagues a few of the comments my constituents have made to me.

From Arnett, Okla.:

The entire concept of controlling weapons is wrong, unduly restrictive and oppressive since only people commit crimes, and only people can be convicted of crimes. Laws should be more stringent against people who commit crimes using firearms.

From Ponca City, Okla.:

Please repeal this bill and concentrate on the speedy prosecution and conviction of

the thousands of known criminals and law violators in this country.

From El Reno, Okla.:

I wish to ask you to resist all attempts at further restrictive gun legislation and to use your influence to repeal those portions of the existing law that pose a hardship on law-abiding citizen-sportsmen. The only laws of this nature should be directed solely at the criminal and his association.

From Laverne, Okla.:

I feel we need a law punishing the ones that misuse the guns, instead of punishing the respected and honorable citizens that own guns.

From Mustang, Okla.:

This is my first letter as a voter in 28 years of voting in the state of Oklahoma, to a legislator, and I would like to stand up and be counted against any further absurd gun legislation against the people of the United States.

Another strong objection I have to this act is the manner of enforcement practiced by the Internal Revenue Service. I invite my colleagues, if they have not already done so, to take a few hours to read 19 pages of rules and regulations in the Federal Register of Saturday, December 14, 1968. It is quite interesting to see what the Internal Revenue Service has read into the Gun Control Act passed by the 90th Congress. I also urge my colleagues to take a look at some of the forms IRS has prepared for businessmen selling firearms to complete. This Government has besieged its businessmen with mountains of forms to fill out, and the Internal Revenue Service gave them another one with its interpretation of the Gun Control Act.

In my mind, the Internal Revenue Service has grossly misinterpreted the intent and will of Congress and has created "back-door" firearms registration. It is my information that last year Congress voted overwhelmingly against such registration. Why then should an agency of the Government proceed with such registration against the expressed wishes of Congress?

It is time for Congress to accept its responsibility and pass legislation that prosecutes criminals, particularly those who use firearms in the course of committing a crime. It is also time for Congress to restore to our law-abiding citizens the freedom they are entitled to enjoy, rightfully possess and exercise—the right to bear arms.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT—THE MOON IS SAFER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have felt it appropriate to call to the attention of our colleagues the appalling conditions which exist in Washington, the Nation's Capital. Unfortunately there is no improvement, nor is there any prospect of progress until we in the Congress exercise our constitutional responsibility to provide a system

of government for the District of Columbia run by responsible people. The operation of the present municipal government is a disgrace.

Tuesday night a Member of the other body was the victim of an armed robbery as he drove his car into the garage at his home here. Wednesday morning an intruder rifled the purse and stole the wallet of one of my secretaries in my office in the House Office Building. Last night my car was broken into while parked at the diplomatic parking area, while visiting the South Vietnamese Embassy and some of my personal property was stolen.

Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago this Nation demonstrated the high point in our technological development by the launching of a successful expedition to walk on the moon. Today that expedition returned. I include local news clippings illustrative of the deterioration of the civilization in our Nation's Capital during this period following my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 16, 1969]

WOMAN IS ROBBED, RAPED BY GUNMAN

A 25-year-old Southeast Washington woman was raped and robbed at gunpoint early yesterday as she walked home from a bus stop after seeing a movie.

Police said the woman told them that while she was walking in the 800 block of 21st St. NE she was approached by a man who drew a pistol and ordered her into the bushes, took \$4 from her purse and then raped her.

DISTRICT LAWYER FORFEITS \$25 ON DISORDERLY COUNT

A District lawyer was charged yesterday with disorderly conduct after an incident at the D.C. Court of General Sessions.

The lawyer, Thomas M. David, did not contest the charge and was allowed to forfeit \$25 by Judge John J. Malloy.

The incident occurred Friday afternoon. A workman who had been installing air conditioning at General Sessions accused David of committing an unsanitary act in a stairwell above the court's third floor.

David, whose office is listed in the Washington Building, 15th and K Streets NW, is a regular practicing attorney at General Sessions, where he handles mostly traffic cases.

POLICE EMPLOYEE WOUNDS BANDIT, FACES GUN COUNT

A civilian employe of the Metropolitan Police Department has been charged with carrying a dangerous weapon as a result of a run-in Sunday night with three bandits.

John A. Herzig, 47, of the 500 block of 20th Street SE, told police he routed three holdup men who confronted him in front of his home, shooting one in the abdomen.

Herzig did not have a permit for his gun, a .25-caliber automatic, according to the U.S. attorney's office, and he was charged with carrying a dangerous weapon, a misdemeanor carrying a maximum one-year sentence.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 24, 1969]

GIRL, 16, REPORTS RAPE BY FOUR MEN

A 16-year-old District girl told police that she was raped by four men in downtown Washington early today.

The girl said she was strolling with her boy friend, also 16, in the 1100 block of W Street NW when four men approached them. She said one of the men grabbed her by the neck and her boyfriend ran off to seek help.

She said the four forced her to the rear

of a building in the 2200 block of the 11th Street, where all four raped her.

She was treated at D.C. General Hospital and released.

COMMON-LAW HUSBAND CHARGED IN NORTHWEST KILLING

The common-law husband of a 38-year-old Northwest Washington woman who was stabbed to death yesterday afternoon, has been charged with homicide, police said.

Daisy R. Bolden, of the 2300 block of 18th Street NW, was found in front of her home at about 3:30 p.m., police said. She had been stabbed once in the shoulder and once in the stomach. Charged with homicide was Robert Thomas, 36, of the same address.

MAN SHOT, KNIFED BY TWO YOUTHS

A Northeast Washington man was shot and knifed last night by two youths who stopped him and asked for a match.

John Davis of 847 21st St. NE is in "undetermined condition" today at the D.C. General Hospital.

According to the police, he was stopped about 9 p.m. at 44th and Ead Streets NE by two youths who asked him for a match. When Davis failed to produce one, one youth cut him with a knife and the other shot him in the abdomen.

NIXON ASKS ADDED ROLE FOR WHITE HOUSE POLICE

(By Ronald Sarro)

The Nixon administration today disclosed plans to more than triple the size of the White House police force and use it to protect crime-plagued foreign embassies and chanceries in Washington.

Administration spokesmen said that the plan was devised at President Nixon's personal direction after complaints about crime against foreign personnel and property "became a matter of urgent concern of the President."

The plan for a major departure from the traditional role of White House police, which under the Secret Service have limited their duties to protecting the White House and its offices, was disclosed at a hearing before the House subcommittee on public buildings and grounds.

Before the committee is a measure which would remove any statutory ceiling on the number of White House police and fully authorize the President to use the police and Secret Service for protection as he sees fit.

Committee members expressed support for protection of embassies, but they had serious questions about an unlimited White House police force and granting presidential authority in "blank-check" fashion.

Eugene T. Rossides, assistant secretary of the Treasury for law enforcement, said the administration wants to increase the size of the White House police from the 250 authorized since 1962 to 850. He said 400 of the new men would be assigned to embassies.

Since most White House police transfer from the D.C. police department and U.S. Park Police here, it seemed clear that the plan would siphon off men from those two departments which are currently trying to increase their own strengths.

Maj. Glenard Lanier told the subcommittee that the 500 additional positions could easily be filled from the District and Park police forces. He said they like the idea of working for the White House, but "they do not want to be policemen on the streets."

Rossides said the State Department has identified 20 or 21 embassies or chanceries in the city as needing full-time protection. Motor patrols would be used to cover the balance of the 117 embassies and chanceries, he said.

Rossides said the United States has been exposing itself to serious international prob-

lems "terribly" by not living up to its responsibility to protect embassies properly.

He said that when the complaints from embassies came to the personal attention of the President, Nixon called a White House meeting and it was decided to place embassy security under the Secret Service and White House police instead of the State Department's security forces.

Rossides emphasized, as did James J. Rowley, Secret Service director that the Secret Service will work closely with former D.C. Police Chief John B. Layton.

Layton has resigned from the police department to become a special assistant to Ambassador Emil Mosbacher Jr., chief of protocol, to work on the foreign embassy protection problem.

COMPLAINTS RISE

Rowley said that in recent months, "the administration has been receiving numerous complaints from members of foreign delegations . . . concerning the high incidence of crime resulting in the loss of embassy property and the victimizing of embassy employees."

"Embassy personnel have been subjected to acts of vandalism, robbery, bombing threats, and other crimes in close proximity of their embassies," Rowley said, citing specific examples at the Ethiopian Chancery in July and Saudi Arabian embassy in August 1968.

The Secret Service chief said he also wants additional men to provide an adequate force at the White House itself to respond to any eventuality, including rioting, without having to rely on outside forces.

As outlined by Rossides, District police would continue to do investigative work after arrests are made and to control demonstrations and disturbances near foreign property under an arrangement with D.C. Chief Jerry Wilson and Deputy Chief George Donohue.

In response to committee questions, Rossides said the President was not seeking a "blank check" to use the Secret Service for protection duties as he sees fit, but only wanted a congressional stamp of approval on his use of the Secret Service to do such things as guarding Gov. Nelson Rockefeller on his Latin American trip as well as visiting heads of state.

Rossides said the administration would not object if the committee put an 850-man ceiling on the White House police instead of an unlimited one and indicated he did not object to the restriction of their use at this time to the Washington area as long as this did not interfere with protecting the President's family.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL CIVIL ENGINEERING LANDMARK

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended the ceremonies providing for the designation of the Great Falls Canal and Locks as a National Historical Civil Engineering Landmark at the Great Falls Park, Va. The designation of these landmarks is a program carried on in conjunction with the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and the American Society of Civil Engineers. This is a remarkable program, and very worthwhile, as it preserves our heritage in the field of civil engineering—which has played such a large role in the advancement of our country.

The bronze plaque was presented by the president of the society to the director of the National Park Service. The Great Falls Canal and Locks was an undertaking pioneered by George Washington, as president of the Potomac Co., in 1785-89. The completion of the canal and locks marked a major engineering feat in America. Even before the Revolution, a navigable Potomac waterway as a route for trade with the west beyond the Alleghany Mountains was proposed by George Washington. As surveyor, engineer, and military emissary for Virginia into frontier country, he saw the need. Later, he succeeded in importuning the Virginia and Maryland legislatures in 1785, to charter the Potomac Co. to make the river "a common highway for—navigation and commerce." The construction of the Great Falls Canal and Locks took from 1785 until 1802, and were operated until 1821. They marked the first major river navigation system to move this country westward.

It is noteworthy that the ASCE, founded in 1852, representing the private sector of our country, and the National Park Service, representing the Government, are working so closely to preserve this historic landmark.

I would like to take this opportunity to give special recognition of those who made yesterday's program such a success:

REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Frank H. Newiman, Jr., President.
Graham P. Willoughby, Vice President,
Zone II.

Eugene W. Weber, District 5 Director.
William H. Wisely, Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL CAPITOL SECTION

Albert A. Grant, President.
GEORGE WASHINGTON CANAL AND LOCKS
COMMITTEE

Gall A. Hathaway, Chairman.
John Nolen, Jr., Vice Chairman.

HISTORY AND HERITAGE OF AMERICAN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Neal Fitzsimons, Chairman.

REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

J. E. N. Jensen, Associate Director for
Planning and Development.

Nash Castro, Regional Director, National
Capitol Region.

Floyd B. Taylor, Superintendent, Great
Falls Park.

PUERTO RICAN DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday the State of New Jersey will once again celebrate Puerto Rican Day, commemorating the attainment of commonwealth status by that lovely island on July 25, 1952. The close association between the United States and Puerto Rico goes back many more years, however, years of increasing mutual benefit and cordial cooperation.

Under its present constitution, Puerto Rico has made tremendous strides to-

ward transforming itself from an agricultural economy into a modern industrial society with a diversified economic base. In many ways, Puerto Rico has been a pace-setter, an example to the world of how economic development can be undertaken and achieved in a young and vital democracy.

In the development of new industry, in the training of workers, in the improvement of education, Puerto Rico has achieved outstanding successes. In the 7 short years between 1959 and 1966, Puerto Rico's national income more than doubled.

Today, she continues to make impressive progress: unemployment is gradually being reduced, while rapid development in both manufacturing and tourism have triggered a phenomenal rise in the standard of living. Puerto Rico has become a model of planned economic development and political stability.

Constitution Day is one for celebration, a day on which to pay tribute to the magnificent Puerto Rican people who love their country, their families, and their heritage. As U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans have made significant contributions to all areas of public life—we have Rear Adm. Horazio Rivero, Commander in Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe; tennis great Charley Passarelli; Peruchin Cepeza in baseball, Metropolitan Opera star Justino Diaz, actor Jose Ferrar and actress Rita Moreno. In my own 10th District, many of our leading citizens are of Puerto Rican background. I am looking forward to joining them in Newark on Sunday for the annual Puerto Rican Day parade, and I am delighted to add my warmest good wishes to all Puerto Ricans on this festive occasion.

ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND SECRETARY-TREASURER WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER OF THE AFL-CIO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be present with many others at a dinner held on July 17, 1969, in Washington, D.C., honoring William F. Schnitzler, the retiring secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO.

Under unanimous consent I submit the text of the two principal addresses delivered on this occasion, the first, by President George Meany of the AFL-CIO, and the second by Mr. Schnitzler for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AT THE RETIREMENT DINNER FOR WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER, SECRETARY-TREASURER EMERITUS OF THE AFL-CIO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

I don't have to tell you that I am delighted that so many representatives of the AFL-CIO and its affiliates are present here tonight to honor Bill Schnitzler on his retirement and

to wish Edith and Bill the best in the years to come, to enjoy that retirement.

Bill came to Washington 17 years ago as secretary-treasurer of the AFL, after many years of service in the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union. He has continued as secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO from the merger for the last 14 years.

He has seen much progress in that time—the progress of the AFL-CIO measured by the only measurement that is worth anything and that is the measurement of human values. In other words, benefits to our membership have been steady by any measure that relates to the primary function of a trade union center:

Better wages, better contracts, better conditions on the job, higher pensions, welfare benefits, more effective political action and an enhanced reputation and standing as a "peoples' lobby" here in Washington, lobbying for legislation that benefits all the citizens of this great country—education, minimum wage, civil rights—all of these enactments of the last few years bear the AFL-CIO label.

Of course it is not all a success story. We have by no means in these past 14 years pleased everyone by our actions. Some say that we are too powerful, that our wings should be clipped by putting us under the anti-trust laws as an illegal conspiracy against the public interest. And we are told that we are responsible for inflation, among other evils. We are portrayed, almost daily in the Soviet press, as agents of imperialism or lackeys of Wall Street.

And then there are those that say we have not really done our job, that we are essentially a narrow, economic pressure group, unmindful of the problems of our total society.

For instance, we have been told that we failed to develop the social consciousness required to reorder our priorities so as to achieve total commitment of our resources in order to expand the scope and quality of a broad range of essential community and social services (that is quite a mouthful) including guaranteed income for all. This, we are told, can be done by enlisting the maximum and meaningful participation of all those who live in the inner city, as well as consumer and professional groups from the liberal sections of our society.

In addition, we are told that we have failed to work with others to raise the level of public understanding of the great social, political and economic issues that face the American people, understanding that is necessary to stimulate and encourage maximum citizenship participation in the affairs of our nation.

Also, that we have failed to repair the alienation of the liberal intellectual and academic community, as well as the progressive forces dedicated to freedom, democracy, as well as building bridges to the totalitarian world dominated by our totalitarian brothers.

Also, we are told, that we are not responsive to the forces of change which are shaping our tomorrow as we should be, if we are to deal effectively with the new challenges that must be met, if we are to realize the bright new promises of the technological revolution which is shaping the fabric and structure of American life.

We lack, we are told, a sense of national commitment, as well as a sense of national purpose, which we must have if we are to cope with man's deteriorating environment. We should reorder our priorities and then commit ourselves to the implementation of those priorities in order that we may facilitate and accelerate the forces of peaceful social change by developing the economic social mechanism to make this possible.

We must, in short, reassert the sovereignty of man over things. And, we are asked, are we equal to the call of greatness?

Well, all I can say is that I am sorry about that.

Seriously, we must, of course, look ahead. There is much to be done that directly concerns all of us, our membership and their families. We must, for instance, for the benefit of our membership and their families and of all America, raise the minimum wage of the lower paid people of this country.

We must bring about the creation of a massive new jobs program to eliminate hard core unemployment. We must improve our educational system with fully funded programs, scholarships and facilities, with a better paid staff of teachers.

We need 26 million new housing units between now and eight years from now, in 1977.

So I can say to you here tonight that labor is aware of its problems. It is prepared to move ahead in the 1970's to discharge our obligations to the workers of America and to the community of which we are a part.

We need lower interest rates for mortgages so the people of this country can buy homes.

We have come to the point in this nation where a man making \$20,000 a year with an average family cannot afford to buy his own home under the present monetary system.

We have got to do something about that. We need a 50 percent increase in Social Security benefits.

We need a better deal for consumers. We need better protection, by law, for the safety of workers on the job.

And we must attack inflation at its base, the price-profit squeeze of the big corporations of this country.

And we need fair tax laws—laws that will make all pay their taxes in proportion to their income.

So I can say to you here tonight, while we are enjoying ourselves, that we have got to think of 1970—1970 is going to be a crucial election year.

All of the things we believe in will be at stake in that election and I hope it is true that they say we have the best political machine in America. I hope that is true because it is going to be needed in 1970.

And I am sure, as we proceed, that Bill Schnitzler will be an interested observer of the things to come. I am sure that he will have more than a passing interest in the work of the AFL-CIO and in the future progress of the workers of this country.

And, likewise, all of us here tonight (and I think we have demonstrated this by the presence of so many from so many organizations), will have a keen interest in what Bill and Edith will be doing in their retirement.

I am sure that I voice the sentiment of all those in the AFL-CIO and all those here tonight when I say to Bill and Edith:

Good luck, good health and many happy years to enjoy your retirement.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM F. SCHNITZLER, SECRETARY-TREASURER EMERITUS OF THE AFL-CIO, AT HIS RETIREMENT DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1969

On an occasion like this, there are many things a man feels and many things he wants to say.

Some of the words won't go past the lump in my throat—so I'll settle for the "priority items", as they say in the jargon of official Washington.

First on the list of priorities is to count my blessings:

My devoted family—which has been not only tolerant of my travels and absences during the past 35 years—they have stood behind me and encouraged me in my work even when the miles I travelled were many and my absences were frequent and long.

I count my blessings for my many friends—those of you here tonight—those who can't be here—and those who have passed on and I'll never see again.

And I consider it a blessing that I have had a chance to work in the labor movement. I'm grateful that the members of Local 84 of the Bakers Union chose me to lead them back in Newark in 1934. They supported me then and I'm proud to say that they supported me for the next 35 years right up to June 30th. Let me say that it is not hard to be a union official when you have stand-up troops like those behind you.

But if I count my blessings, I also have to examine my regrets. I have only one, really. It is that I should have done more for the labor movement. What and how much, I don't know and it isn't really important. But as I stand here tonight I am sure that, along with achievements and successes, I've experienced my share of missed opportunities and setbacks. I know it and I'm aware of it. And I regret those omissions that could, perhaps, have helped to advance the cause of the labor movement.

I have tried to figure out what single achievement gave me the most satisfaction and which could be honestly considered a significant contribution to the cause of America and the labor movement. Without hesitation I come to the work of the Civil Rights Committee, which it has been my great honor to chair.

Long before other organized groups in America took affirmative action to abolish racial discrimination and eliminate prejudice, labor was at work in the field doing it. And since the merger in 1955, we in the AFL-CIO have made great strides to improve human relations and to ensure equal opportunity for all. To me, the chairmanship of the AFL-CIO Civil Rights Committee has been a true experience in brotherhood. Let me tell you, there is no greater cause than brotherhood but achieving it presents a never-ending task.

I would be less than honest if I didn't admit there were times when my heart was heavy and my mind in doubt about the fate of the labor movement. There were times when employer resistance to unions was fierce and to be a union member was to be less than a full citizen in their eyes. Good, hard-working men and women were physically assaulted and beaten and their dignity affronted—those were the times when my heart was heavy.

And then there were times when it was revealed that inside the house of labor itself there were those who weren't true to their trust and I had private doubts and fears again that the American labor movement might not survive.

If I had a guiding principle in those dark days of despair, it was simply to leave the gloom at home and never show it to my fellow trade unionists. I always tried to look ahead and keep my eyes on the doughnut rather than the hole. I tried to inspire confidence and steadfastness in my fellow union members.

But tonight will be wasted if I dwell too much on the past.

It is true, lessons are learned from the past. And we've taken our lumps and learned a great deal. But we've enjoyed some spectacular successes too—and they outweigh the bad days.

Look at the New Deal legislation of the thirties; The Wagner Act, the Social Security Act and unemployment insurance were at the top of the labor movement's legislative agenda and we pushed that legislation through the Congress at a time when there were only 3 million members in our ranks. The lesson here seems to be clear. And it presents a challenge to the labor movement of today and tomorrow. If 3 million union members could win legislative battles for the betterment of America, in the 1930's, then why can't 13½ million union members win the battle for the perfection of America in the 1970's?

From its earliest days labor has said: "In unity there is strength."

I trust today's younger generation of labor leaders will always remember this and keep it as their guiding principle—their slogan—too.

But as we look at the uncertainties of the future and realize the enormities of our needs and problems, slogans will not be enough.

The times will demand new courage; a vision of new horizons for ourselves and for the nation as a whole.

This new courage will have to come from men in the ranks of organized labor. New courage will be demanded of new leaders in the labor movement. For always there will be adversaries and always there will be developments to challenge our existence and our ability to influence the destiny of our country.

But we need not let these forces—whether foreign or domestic, internal or external—turn our vision inward and knot us into crises-encircled enclaves of institutionalized proletarians.

For today organized labor has the resources—the people, the funds, the expertise and talent, and the experience—to take an unlimited view of the future. We are in that position where our goals of tomorrow are providing us with our work now.

We will soon be dedicating our own Labor Studies Center, for example. That was the dream of the century for many of us and now it's almost with us—tomorrow's goal and we are working on it today.

We are doing our own building for the future. We are no longer simply struggling to survive in the here and now.

We are, in fact, a labor movement blessed with architects of courage, dedication and foresight. We are growing and prospering, and with men soon to be landing on the moon, we might even say "the sky is the limit."

But if we are to continue on this upward path, our own architects will have to have a new courage tailored to the temper of their time. They can learn a lot from the giants who were the founding generation of the labor movement. They can learn too from this current generation, for we have laid the foundation for the future and it is solid.

I'm proud, beyond words, to say that I'm honored that I have had the opportunity to help work on that foundation.

Last but not least on my list of priorities tonight, is a tribute to President Meany. My respect for and confidence in President Meany was always great and these have increased enormously since I came down here in 1953.

And without reservation, I can say the same thing about each individual member—past and present—of the Executive Council. Serving with them has been a true honor and a rare privilege.

And let me pay tribute to the officers of all our affiliated international unions. My regard for them has always been high and it is higher today after so many years of knowing and working with them.

In like manner, I take my hat off to the State and City Central Body officers and delegates around the nation. The union men and women who serve in these vital organizations do so at considerable expense and self-sacrifice. They give that extra effort that often makes the difference between a policy decision announced at the national level and a victory at the state and local level.

Last—but certainly not least—I want to pay a special tribute to the staff of the AFL-CIO—to the directors and their associates, to the secretaries and clerks and all the other people who work in the headquarters building and who never get their name in the paper. They're fine people and I consider each of them my friend.

To President Meany, members of the Executive Council, International Union officers, friends and associates, I want to say thank

you—for this dinner and its opportunity for good fellowship—for years of satisfaction and warmth—for all you have done for the workers of America, for the people we are all so privileged to represent.

I want to take one more moment, to express my confidence in my successor, Lane Kirkland. He is a good man; he will do a good job. And I want to wish him the very best of luck and success.

And now, Mr. President, to all of you and to each of you—thanks for coming out tonight to break bread with an old baker and his dear wife. We'll never forget any of you—or this night.

OUR JOURNEY TO THE MOON

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is more than appropriate that we pause for a moment to reflect upon the wondrous events of the past few days. The success of our journey to the moon is almost beyond our comprehension and realization. And yet we claim with pride, and hopefully with humility, that we did it.

We delight, and rightfully so, in the experience of having achieved a great accomplishment, an effort unsurpassed in this century. We take pride in our technological and scientific expertise that culminated in this successful venture. We applaud the wisdom of those who had the foresight to approve the research and development of our space program. Like children, we are thrilled to have experienced the true spirit of pioneers and adventurers who have dared to enter the unknown. And all of us had the beautiful and simple excitement of actually witnessing through television this remarkable trip.

The truly beautiful and almost inspirational part of this whole effort is that it simply came to be a result of a determination and unity of effort that we rarely see or ever thought possible in this country today.

Yes, we did it. But let us really think about what we have done and about what we are going to do. The impact of the moon flight will be determined by history. Undoubtedly we will and should continue in our conquest of the unknown. But one thing is absolutely certain. If we can successfully conquer the moon, we most certainly have the know-how and wherewithal to settle our problems on this planet, if we just simply put our minds to it.

And that is what we have to do. It is unthinkable and contrary to what we have just accomplished for us to allow conditions of poverty, hunger, and deprivation and disease to continue to exist. We must reaffirm our stance against war and for peace. And we must continue to work to erase attitudes of hate and prejudice that keep our world in a constant state of turmoil and upset.

We have great resources at our command—great knowledge, great minds, great expertise, and great determination. All that we are lacking is the will. And

we have shown that we have that. What we must do is direct it toward this planet.

Mr. Speaker, our responsibilities are tremendous. Let us not lose sight of them in the glory of our most recent national success. Let us rather learn from our victory in space and put this marvelous experience to work for us in a renewed and serious effort to make this world a better place to live in.

UNLAWFUL LAW OF THE LAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming increasingly disturbed at the gross usurpations which are being committed by the other two branches of Government. I speak plainly of the unlawful action of the judiciary, supported by the illegal action of the executive, in undertaking to force mathematical integration—not desegregation, but integration—on the citizens, both white and black, who have repeatedly rejected an artificial system which can only destroy their schools and injure their children.

The law of the land, enacted by the Congress, makes a clear distinction between integration and desegregation, but both the judiciary and the executive continue to ignore that distinction. It is our responsibility to use the power of the purse to check these unlawful activities.

The whole concept of financing education at the Federal level, where the Department of HEW can decree that "guidelines" must be followed or the schools will starve of the funds this body has appropriated, is monstrous. In the currently sought appropriations, over \$15½ billion is requested for that Department. Of that amount the fantastic sum of over \$2,290 million is for Federal education alone, making it one of the highest budgets of all of the Federal agencies.

All over our land our people are frustrated over being mistreated in their efforts to provide a quality education for their children. They blame their problems on Federal judges, guidelines, busing, ratio of races, pairing, and lack of discipline in our schools.

These problems never existed until Federal education was sold to the American people on the premise that it was desperately needed to prepare our children for the lead in technological competition with Russian students because of the threat from international communism. However, the opportunity for a superior public education existed for generations before Federal aid to education was ever heard of.

I think most of our colleagues regard education as a sacred calf and are afraid to vote against any measure which appears to help give a child a chance to become educated. Yet we would be blind not to see what is taking place under the name of education for purely sociological goals. Certainly it is one thing

to help education; another to control education as a means to an end that has never been approved by the people.

Public education in the United States is in a crisis and the crisis is a Federal problem—one to be solved by the Congress inasmuch as it is caused by Congress.

The more disturbances and community unrest that results from Federal interference, the more Federal solutions that are offered, and the more money demanded—but always producing only new problems. This year the Federal education bill is asking over \$2 billion—how much next year? The educational-industrial complex wizards excel in the art of spending money to gain more control over education but it is never their money—always the taxpayers' money.

The only legitimate method to preserve quality public education and halt this bid for raw power is to close the dykes at the Treasury. Education is not a Federal function.

The way to solve the education crisis is at the source—to free education either by repealing the Federal education acts or to cease furnishing taxpayers' dollars which are being lavishly expended contrary to the law.

As I have said time and time again, Mr. Speaker, the people are speaking. Are we listening?

I include an informative article in the Dan Smoot Report for July 21, following my remarks.

The article follows:

UNLAWFUL LAW OF THE LAND

In the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision of May 17, 1954, the Warren Court abandoned the ancient principle that a court should follow its own legal precedents, in order to reverse an 1896 Supreme Court decision, and to rule that racially segregating public schools by law violates the Fourteenth Amendment—though admitting that the Fourteenth Amendment, when written and proclaimed adopted, had nothing to do with public schools.

The Warren Court based its *Brown* decision: (1) on opinions of psychological and sociological "experts" presented by the NAACP—some of whom were officially connected with the NAACP, an interested party in the cases; and (2) on a "Social Science Statement," signed, but not sworn to, by 32 "social scientists," none of whom had any firsthand knowledge of the problems involved in the cases at bar, some of whom were communist-fronters, others of whom were socialists (domestic and foreign).

Brown is of preeminent importance, not because it ended legal segregation in public schools, but because, in it, the Supreme Court illegally asserted itself to be the governing authority in the United States. The Court assumed illegal power to change, ignore or abolish the Constitution, the laws of Congress, and the laws of individual states.

The *Brown* decision was immediately proclaimed the "law of the land"—although no court has authority to make law. Only Congress can make a "law of the land," and even that is not valid unless clearly authorized by some specific provision in the Constitution which is the supreme law of the land.

A court decision is applicable only to the parties specifically involved in the decision. The *Brown* decision involved only four school systems.

Nonetheless, there was insistent demand that all southern schools comply with the Supreme Court's new "law of the land."

Footnotes at end of article.

Most southern states resisted. Eisenhower used the Army to enforce the non-existent "law of the land" at Little Rock in 1957. Five years later, Kennedy used military power to enforce the non-existent "law of the land" in Mississippi.

All of this prompted, and gave pretext for, Martin Luther King's "civil disobedience," which quickly escalated, by design, into the sporadic guerrilla warfare that has ravaged our cities and college campuses for the past five years.

In 1964—ten years after the Warren Court's first school desegregation decision—Congress enacted a "law of the land" dealing with segregation in public schools.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is unconstitutional. The Constitution grants the federal government no power to intervene in educational matters; and the Tenth Amendment specifically reserves to the states, or to the people thereof, all powers not granted to the federal government. Nonetheless, the Act is a law of Congress. The proper recourse of the people is not to disobey the law, but to elect Members of Congress who will repeal it.

Since we are compelled to obey the illegal mandate of the Warren Court's *Brown* decision of 1954; and since our respect for orderly processes of government requires us to obey the illegal mandates of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 until it is repealed, it is important to know what those mandates are.

In *Brown*, the Warren Court remanded the four cases to federal district courts, instructing the lower courts "to enter such orders as are proper to admit to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis, with all deliberate speed, the parties to these cases."

The clearest judicial interpretation of this mandate was made by a U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Briggs vs. Elliott*, on July 15, 1955. The Circuit Court of Appeals said:

"The Supreme Court . . . has not decided that the federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the states. It has not decided that the states must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a state may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. . . . If the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools as they attend different churches. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend."

The intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with regard to public schools, is also merely to order that they be operated on a racially non-discriminatory basis. Like the *Brown* decision of 1954, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not order integration of schools. It orders desegregation, which it defines as meaning "the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin." The Act specifically says that "desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students in order to overcome racial imbalance;" and it declares that nothing in the Act "shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another . . . in order to achieve such racial balance."

Southern schools complied with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adopting freedom-of-choice plans—eliminating racial considerations in school operations, allowing every student, of whatever race, uninhibited free-

dom to attend the public school of his choice.

At first, the Department of HEW and the federal courts approved the freedom-of-choice plans; but, as time went by, they perceived that parents and students in the south were not choosing to please judges and bureaucrats in Washington. Negroes were choosing to attend schools in their own neighborhoods, and so were whites.

In March, 1966, President Johnson's Department of HEW laid down guidelines establishing racial quotas for southern schools—requiring them, on pain of losing federal aid, to force Negro transfers to white schools, whether the Negroes like it or not, to achieve such racial balance as specified by HEW.³ This action is specifically prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Federal compliance teams, some of them using tactics described by one Congressman as brutal and inhuman,⁴ roam the south, forcing school integration to comply with federal guidelines, in defiance of the preference of students and parents, and in violation of the law they claim to be enforcing. Federal courts have supported the illegal activities of HEW agents—with decisions holding that freedom of choice is not acceptable, unless students make the choices that Washington officialdom wants.⁵

Many school systems have been compelled to close schools in Negro neighborhoods and to bus the Negro students to schools in white neighborhoods. The inconvenience to Negro students; the overcrowding of schools they are forced to attend; the emotional disturbance and racial self-consciousness that such treatment creates; the economic waste of closing public schools to force Negroes to attend schools with whites; the additional cost to all taxpayers of providing busing services; switching emphasis from learning to racial integration—none of these considerations matters to the federal bureaucrats.

Nor does it matter to them that, under the pretext of enforcing the Civil Rights Act of 1964, they are violating it. They are also violating the Warren Court dictum, proclaimed in the *Brown* case of 1954, that race must not be a consideration in the operation of public schools. HEW now requires that race must be the primary consideration in the operation of public schools.

Early in 1969, the Warren Court joined the bureaucrats in violating the Court's own 1954 dictum and the 1964 law. The Court ruled that schools in one Alabama county must adopt a racial quota in hiring and assigning teachers.⁶

When campaigning for southern votes last year, Richard Nixon criticized President Johnson's HEW for using federal tax money to force illegal guidelines on schools. President Nixon's HEW secretary continues Johnson's guideline policies intact, and vows he will not change them.⁷

Johnson's HEW fixed September, 1969, as an absolute deadline for all schools to achieve total compliance with HEW's illegal racial-balance requirements, or lose federal aid. On July 3, 1969, Nixon's HEW and Justice Department announced that this deadline would be eased to give a few school systems (about 10 in all)⁸ a little more time. The National Education Association led the legions of totalitarian liberals in denouncing the Nixon administration for yielding to southern pressure and scrapping HEW guidelines, which they called the "law of the land." Some of Nixon's "conservative" supporters in Congress applauded him for keeping his campaign pledge to relax harsh guidelines. But the clamor from both camps was false propaganda. Nixon officials specifically said they "want action by September, 1969," and made it quite clear that Johnson's HEW guidelines will not be altered even slightly.⁹

A typical situation has developed in Austin, Texas. Though it was not involved in the *Brown* decision of 1954, the Austin school

system began, that year, to integrate. Now, 53% of its Negro students are in integrated schools. The remaining 47% of Negro students, exercising their freedom to choose, remain in all-Negro schools.

HEW ordered Austin to abandon freedom of choice, and to take steps that would force all Negro students to attend integrated school. In mid-June, 1969, the Austin school board, under threat of losing federal aid, adopted a plan that would close three schools in Negro neighborhoods and bus the Negro students to schools in white neighborhoods. One of the schools to be closed was the newest and best school facility in the city; the other two were as good as any in white neighborhoods.

On June 23, 1969, 300 Austin citizens (from affected Negro and white neighborhoods) met with the school board and protested. They were angry about the inconvenience and turmoil the new plan would cause; about the closing of expensive facilities and the consequent overcrowding of other facilities; about the additional expense of busing.

The Austin school board rescinded the new plan. Now, President Nixon's HEW says it will stop federal aid to Austin schools, unless the school board can discover some way to force total integration, against the wishes of Austin students and parents.

Informed observers in Austin predict that the next court test may be initiated by Negro parents to retain voluntary segregation.¹⁰

A case of that kind has already been filed in Nashville, Tennessee, by Jack Kershaw, an attorney representing 11,087 whites and 2413 Negroes in Maury County.

Kershaw has filed a Petition to Intervene in the case of *Florence Ella Hatton, et al., vs. County Board of Education of Maury County, Tennessee, et al.*, which was originally initiated on a complaint by civil-rights activists purporting to represent not only the named plaintiffs but all other Maury County Negro children (and parents) in voluntarily segregated schools. A federal judge ordered the defendant (County Board of Education) to abandon freedom of choice and to adopt a plan that will bring about "meaningful integration" of all schools in the county.

The 13,500 parents and students (Negro and white) whom attorney Kershaw represents claim their rights have been ignored. They want to keep, and have freedom to use, their neighborhood schools.

Commenting upon his case, Mr. Kershaw points out that the forced integration ordered in Maury County is illegal and unconstitutional on several counts, and adds:

"Then besides all this, the facts of life are such that forced integration would damage both races.

"Since I represent some blacks along with some whites, and since a good many blacks for various reasons have decided they want their own schools or colleges or 'black studies program' etc., I believe we may be coming to a time when we can cry 'halt' with some chance of success."¹¹

The original sin in all this is federal aid to education. Clearly illegal (unconstitutional), it was fobbed off on the public under the spurious cry of necessity, and with the false promise that it would not bring federal control or meddling.

Federal aid has produced harmful, lawless government-by-guidelines not only in education, but in other fields critically affecting the welfare and fundamental freedoms of the people.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Letter to this Report from Jack Kershaw, attorney, 400 Stahlman Bldg., Nashville, Tennessee 37201, together with copy of Petitioners' Brief prepared by Mr. Kershaw in *Florence Ella Hatton, et al. vs. County Board of Education of Maury County, Tennessee, et al.*

² *The Role of the Social Sciences in De-*

segregation: A Symposium, published by the Anti-Defamation League, 1958.

³ *U.S. News & World Report*, May 2, 1966, pp. 25-7.

⁴ "Browbeating Laid to U.S. Enforcers," *Dallas Morning News*, May 21, 1967, p. A8.

⁵ *Dallas Morning News*, June 28, 1969, p. A16.

⁶ *Time*, July 4, 1969, p. 63.

⁷ *Dallas Times Herald*, July 2, 1969, p. A24.

⁸ *Dallas Morning News*, June 23, 1969, editorial; June 28, 1969, p. A16; June 19, 1969, p. A25.

⁹ *Dallas Morning News*, July 4, 1969, pp. 1, A10; July 5, 1969, p. A18; July 9, 1969, p. D1.

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon departs on a major goodwill mission, it is necessary that the possible developments from this trip be treated in a realistic fashion. This is especially important in analyzing any results of the President's visit to Rumania, a country ruled by a Russian-imposed Communist government.

An extremely knowledgeable observer of the Rumanian situation is Copley News Service foreign correspondent, Dumitru Danielopol, a former member of the Rumanian diplomatic service. Writing in the *Aurora-Beacon*, Ill., News on July 18, Mr. Danielopol offers frank commentary on the present situation in Rumania. The article follows:

[From the *Aurora-Beacon* (Ill.) News, July 18, 1969]

REDS WILL ATTEMPT TO PROFIT FROM NIXON'S VISIT TO RUMANIA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—At a recent press conference, Romanian Ambassador Cornelius Bogdan refused to discuss the agenda of the Bucharest talks between President Nixon and Nicolae Ceausescu.

But it's not difficult to predict Romania's strategy. The Reds will try to get the most out of the visit and give as little as possible.

Ceausescu is likely to tell President Nixon that Romania intends to pursue an independent foreign policy. That it would like to be another Yugoslavia.

To achieve this, he'll say, Romania needs to become economically independent from the Soviet COMECON and the only way this can happen is if it gets help from the West, especially the United States.

There will be hints that Bucharest might honor Romanian treasury bonds owed to American holders and unredeemed since World War II.

Ceausescu will express the hope that the United States will grant Romania "most favored nation" trade status which would permit more Romanian goods to be imported into the U.S.

But Ceausescu will not offer to use his dollars to purchase American goods. He will ask long-term credits with guarantees from the Export-Import Bank.

Romania being an independent country, Ceausescu will say, he cannot accept political strings to such assistance. He will argue that because of its proximity to Russia and its basic Communist tenets, Romania can-

not, in fact, become completely neutral but will have to remain a member of the Warsaw Pact.

No internal liberalization is possible, he will say, because it would give the Russians a chance to subvert his regime. He will point to Czechoslovakia.

What Ceausescu will not tell Mr. Nixon is: (1) How much of the Romanian "independent" attitude has been adopted with the approval and even at the instigation of the Kremlin.

(Some Kremlinologists distrust Ceausescu's "independence." They say that it suits the Russians that Romania, a country of Latin origin, should play such a role with a view of convincing some Latin American countries that under communism, independence is possible.

(2) That Romania is in dire economic straits. Her economy is near bankruptcy—despite glowing reports published in Bucharest and parroted in some Western publications.

(3) That he is head over heels in debt to many Western nations including Western Germany, without any hope of becoming solvent.

(4) That the "most favored nation" clause will make very little difference to the Romanian economy because he has few goods acceptable to the sophisticated American market.

(5) That Romania is already over-industrialized in relation to its shrinking internal market. That she therefore produces mostly for export and her products can't compete. Some are sold at bargain prices as much as 50 per cent below cost.

Ceausescu also will not mention that while Romanian food products are offered for sale abroad the Romanian people go for weeks without eggs, meat, bacon and even onions. He won't remind the President that Romanian canned goods shipped to Canada for the United States have been turned back by American health authorities because they were judged a hazard to public health.

Shoddy textile products shipped to Austria have been refused even by poor peasants in Austrian mountain villages. About 90 per cent of a recent shipment remains unsold.

Nor will Ceausescu mention that the much ballyhooed tourist traffic to Romania is in fact a deficit operation. In order to attract hard cash customers from the West he has to offer bargain prices which in some cases represent a 50 per cent loss per tourist.

Who makes up the deficit? The Romanian people naturally.

One can go on and on.

The President must not lose sight of the fact that Romania—one of the richest countries of Europe before the war—is virtually another Cuba.

If Ceausescu is trying to emulate Yugoslavia politically, he must also do so economically. He must give peasants, workers and entrepreneurs the incentive to produce and the necessary purchasing power to buy the products.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS' McDONALD OBSERVATORY ON VERGE OF BREAKTHROUGH IN MOON EXPERIMENT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. PICKLE, Mr. Speaker, at this very moment a team of scientists at the University of Texas' McDonald Observatory are on the threshold of success in a critical moon experiment. This dedicated

group has become the other end of an experiment initiated on the moon by Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Col. Edwin E. Aldrin.

The scientists are probing the moon's surface with a ruby laser fired through McDonald's new 107-inch telescope. They are searching for the reflector left behind by Armstrong and Aldrin.

It is a difficult job that requires pinpoint accuracy. The logistics are complicated since we have no definite fix on the exact position of Tranquility Base. Hitting the 18-inch by 18-inch reflector with a beam of laser light is no easy task. Hitting a bull's-eye this small at a range of a quarter of a million miles was described by one scientist as something like hitting a dime with a rifle at a distance of 2 miles.

This reflector, which is officially called a laser ranging retro-reflecting prism, weighs 65 earth pounds—the equivalent to 11 pounds on the moon—and consists of a flat, square array of 100 cylindrical cavities. Each cavity contains a prism designed to reflect light back to its source.

Dr. Harlan Smith, chairman of University of Texas' Austin Astronomy Department and director of the astronomy at McDonald, says of the project:

Scientists have long appreciated some of the remarkable things that could be done if a laser beam could range on a specific target on the moon.

In the past, lasers have been fired to the moon only to bounce off the lunar surface in all directions. Scientists were fortunate to get any return beam at all.

Now, a specific target is there, and—once it is found—our knowledge of the moon will be increased. For example, the measurements taken at McDonald, and later by other stations around the world, will help to determine the distance between the earth and moon to an accuracy within 6 inches. We will also learn the extent of lunar librations—the slow swinging of the visible portion of the moon causing areas at the edges to be visible at times—the lunar radius, fluctuations in the earth's rotation rate on its axis, extent of the wobble of the earth's axis, and the intercontinental drift rate—or how fast the United States is drifting from the Eurasian land mass.

The beam, which will be emitted through McDonald's telescope, will take approximately 2.5 seconds to make the round trip. Since the moon's orbit around the earth is not perfectly circular, these measurements are scheduled to be taken twice daily for the next 7 years to determine what that distance is at any given time.

The telescope will be linked with a computer to help keep instruments on earth and the reflector lined up for approximately 30 minutes while the measurements are being lined up.

Obviously, this is one of the key experiments undertaken by the moon landing. I am especially proud that the University of Texas' McDonald Observatory has the equipment and the trained men equal to the task.

Dr. Harlan Smith has been with the University of Texas since 1963. He left Yale University at that time to become astronomy department chairman and professor of astronomy.

Another key man in NASA's lunar-laser ranging experiment is Charles Jenkins, associate director of management for McDonald Observatory.

Mr. Jenkins is a graduate of University of Texas and a faculty member since 1965.

Johnnie E. Floyd, project manager for the University of Texas' part in the Apollo 11 lunar experiment, is also a graduate of the University of Texas. He also served as chief engineer for the installation of the 107-inch telescope.

The overall project is headed by Dr. Carroll O. Alley of the University of Maryland. Coinvestigators include Dr. Henry Plotkin, of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center; Dr. Robert H. Dicke, of Princeton; Dr. Peter Bender, of the National Bureau of Standards; Dr. James Faller, of Wesleyan University; and Dr. Dave Wilkinson, of Princeton.

Although McDonald is administratively a part of the University of Texas, it is located some 400 miles from Austin atop Mount Locke in the Texas Davis Mountain.

I was privileged last fall to attend the impressive ceremonies when they dedicated this outstanding observatory.

Discoveries made at McDonald during its 37-year history include the existence of interstellar polarization and satellites of Uranus and Neptune.

More recently, McDonald astronomers have confirmed the first optical sighting of a pulsar—a dying star that is very small and very dense—and have obtained the first conclusive proof of the existence of water on Mars.

R. E. Nather and Dr. Brian Warner at McDonald were asked by two astronomers from the University of Arizona to verify the January 15 sighting of a flashing star in the Crab Nebula at the same position as a previously reported pulsar.

Nather and Dr. Warner had been working for more than a year in anticipation of an optical sighting of a pulsar, so when the request came, they were ready.

Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, the scientists and equipment at McDonald were ready for the lunar experiment, also. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this team—they play a vital part in the moonshot and I think they represent the host of faceless men who have helped in this "small step for man, a giant leap for mankind."

APOLLO 11

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. Speaker—

I believe this 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.

So spoke President John F. Kennedy on May 25, 1961. The historic Apollo 11 lunar landing has accomplished this goal. The technological challenge of the sixties has been met in more than full measure.

This landing on the moon climaxes a decade during which St. Louis Countians have played a major role in America's manned space flight program. Firms and universities in Metropolitan St. Louis have taken a hand in the space program from the beginning. The culmination of their research, engineering, and production skills was witnessed in the Apollo 11 launch and landing.

Of course, the achievement was national in perspective, continental in magnitude, involving the best efforts of industry and labor across the face of the land. Undoubtedly every contribution will be properly recorded. But it is on behalf of the significant input of the St. Louis area that I as Representative of Missouri's Second District wish to speak today.

McDonnell-Douglas, Emerson Electric, Sverdrup-Parcel and Associates, Washington University, St. Louis University, UMC Industries, Baganoff Associates, Davies Supply & Manufacturing Co., Missouri Research Labs, Monsanto Research, and some 70 other firms in the St. Louis area have made vital contributions to this national effort. Serving as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, I am well aware of the massive, combined efforts the Apollo flight required. St. Louis has been a leader in these efforts. For their past, present, and future work on the space program, the people of St. Louis and St. Louis County deserve the highest praise.

McDonnell-Douglas Corp. has in many ways been responsible for the successes of NASA's Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo projects. The keen foresight and fine judgment of James Smith McDonnell first brought his St. Louis company into the space field. He put 40 engineers to work on space capsules before our Government even embarked on the race to the moon. In 1959 this company won the competition as prime contractor for design, development, and construction of the Mercury spacecraft. His engineers and production technicians built the craft, as well as two procedural trainers, an environmental trainer, seven checkout trainers, and much of the prelaunch operations equipment at Cape Kennedy. In Project Mercury, six manned flights were completed, and much-needed knowledge on spacecraft control, space vision, and human factors was gained. After the success of Friendship 7, Astronaut John Glenn, America's first man in orbit, sent the McDonnell team his regards as a "very satisfied customer."

McDonnell engineers and technicians literally made Project Gemini, the second major phase of our space program. They produced the two-man spacecraft, and provided other necessary services and equipment. They constructed two mission simulator trainers, a docking simulator trainer, five boilerplate spacecraft, and three craft for ground tests in vibration and impact. Under Project Gemini, 10 flights, each with two-man crews, were completed. This amounted to nearly one thousand hours of space flight time. Among the accomplishments of Project Gemini were orbital flights of up to 14 days, rendezvous and docking operations

in the earth's orbit, and controlled re-entry and landing in a target area.

The Gemini performance was so flawless that NASA's Flight Director, Christopher C. Kraft, said, "McDonnell's engineers always seemed to be on top of the problem."

McDonnell Douglas men have also made additional and substantial contributions to the current Project Apollo. Engineers of the firm designed and produced the powerful S-IVB rocket, which served as the top stage of both the Saturn IB and Saturn V launch vehicles. In the Saturn I series the S-IV unit was used as the second stage in five space missions. Three of these flights placed giant Pegasus satellites into orbit. As the third stage of the Saturn V, the S-IVB rocket provided the final thrust to insert the Apollo 11 spacecraft and the crew into earth orbit. This rocket then restarted and sped the spacecraft from its parking orbit toward the moon's surface. But for these dedicated efforts by McDonnell Douglas, man might not have reached the moon as soon or as safely as he did.

Other St. Louis firms and universities have also made substantial contributions to the space program. The researchers of Emerson Electric Co. have produced microwave antenna components and provided products for nearly every one of our manned and unmanned space endeavors. Among this company's earlier contributions were multiplexers for Project Mercury, which made possible simultaneous transmission of two or more signals over a single circuit, and C-band and S-band antennas for Project Gemini. Their experts also produced life support systems for the suited astronauts, and tested radar devices for NASA. For the Apollo program the firm designed and developed S-band antenna feed systems for parabolic reflectors. These were used to track the Apollo during earth orbit and reentry, and to track the spacecraft to and from the moon. Emerson telemetry equipment as well was carried aboard the Saturn V vehicle.

Washington University has provided essential information in areas of cosmic ray physics, economics, aircraft structures, and in general science and engineering. A group of distinguished professors at Washington University developed unique cosmic ray detectors for project Apollo. These techniques will be used in measuring and analyzing the effects of cosmic radiation on the soil samples brought back from the moon. St. Louis University researchers have done work on the physiological effects of weightlessness and space radiation, as well as computer analysis for aeronautical vehicles.

Sverdrup, Parcel & Associates is another St. Louis firm which has played a major role in the Apollo lunar mission. This firm designed the test stand at NASA's Mississippi test facility, in which the booster rocket was tested before it propelled astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins toward the moon. The experts of Baganoff, Inc., in Jennings contributed to the acoustic and aerodynamic design of the Saturn V vehicle. Spools, harnesses, and ducts for the first stage, Saturn

S-IC, were produced by UMC Industries; and Davies Supply & Manufacturing Co. aided in the development of protective treatments for the Saturn V. Much computer work for the orbiting geophysical laboratories was done by Missouri Research Labs, and Monsanto researchers have conducted optical studies of lubricants in aeronautical vehicles.

There are a number of other firms in the St. Louis area whose technicians, engineers, and researchers have helped advance our space effort. Some of these include Seyer-Buckner Tool Co. in Berkeley; Custom Printing Co. in Ferguson; General Electric Co., Rauch Tool & Manufacturing Co., and Robert Shaw Controls in Hazelwood; Missouri Metal Shape Co. in Overland; Conductron Corp. and Lectronix in St. Charles; and Advance Tool & Die Co., Akurate Tool & Die Co., Bendix Corp., Carondelet Foundry, Clevite Corp., Cobak Tool & Manufacturing Co., Comet Tool & Die Co., Consultants & Design Co., County Business Service, Eastern Stainless Steel, Essex Cryogenics of Missouri, Inc., Feth Karl Co., Ford Bill Kellas Co., Genisco Technology, Gulton Industries, Harris Manufacturing Co., Honeywell, Inc., Interco, International Business Machine, Lambert Tool Specialists, Maffitt Tool & Machine, Institute of Electrical Engineering, Mallinckrodt Institute, Marlo Coil Co., Matco Machine & Tool, McGraw-Edison Co., University of Missouri, Morgan Co., Nooter Corp., Nu-Lite Electric Wholesale, Pandjiris Weldment, Pollak & Skan, St. Louis Fire Door, Sorenson Co., Sperry Rand Corp., Stentor Tool & Manufacturing Co., TSI Thermal Systems, G. L. Tarlton Construction, Tech Manufacturing Co., Thermal Systems, Inc., Torquist Machinery, Towell Printing Co., UMC Industries, USAF Aerochart Information, U.S. Army Materiel Command, United States Steel Corp., Universal Corp., Universal Marion Corp., Watlow Electric Manufacturing Co., Western Supplies Co., Westinghouse Electric, and C. J. Zone Manufacturing Co. in St. Louis proper.

The researchers, engineers, management personnel, unions, and production technicians of these firms and universities in St. Louis have contributed their thoughts and abilities to the Apollo program. The results of their labors have impressed all of the world.

Last January, Astronaut Frank Borman addressed a joint session of Congress and described himself and his colleagues as envoys of mankind who "stood on the shoulders of giants." The energies and efforts of the people of Metropolitan St. Louis are worthy inheritors of the giant spirits and intellects of the past which through the ages have propelled man's thoughts, and now man himself, to the moon. The pinnacle of achievement represented by this lunar landing removes from the realm of fantasy the exploration of the entire universe.

Today I am proud to pay tribute to those men and women of the Greater St. Louis area who have contributed so much, and so well, to our space efforts—and who have helped immeasurably to

fulfill the vision of the late President John F. Kennedy:

It will not be one man going to the moon—if we make this judgment affirmatively; it will be the entire nation. For all of us must work to put him there.

AN ABM RESOLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, until a final decision has been reached not to deploy the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, I feel that it is my duty and the duty of every concerned person not to let the matter rest, but instead to keep the issue in the forefront of congressional concern and in the public view.

As I have repeatedly stated, if this system offered the potential of enhancing our national security, I would not oppose it. But the truth of the matter is that it fails to offer this potential. Instead, it stands as a threat to realistic national priorities. In light of this, I am firmly convinced that acceptance of the President's proposal would not be in our national interest.

Recently I received a resolution from the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island which reconfirms my views. Since this group has presented a well-written and concise statement, I would like to extend my remarks to include it in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL PRIORITY AND THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

The Urban Commission of the Department of Missions, at a meeting on May 22, 1969, adopted a Resolution on National Priority and the Anti-Ballistic Missile System, introduced by the Rev. Louis Ferrara, and requested the Department of Missions to submit the same to the Diocesan Council for consideration. The Resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the issue of national priorities is a matter of grave consequence, not only for the future of world society but also for the future of the American city;

Whereas, the 1968 resolution of this Diocese concerning the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders urged that Federal, State and local revenue systems be brought up to date in order to provide the resources to pay for the massive and vital needs of large segments of our people;

Whereas, the American economy, because of inflationary pressures, must carefully weigh its fiscal priorities and expenditures;

Whereas, the deployment of a thin anti-ballistic missile system at an initial estimated cost of five billion dollars has raised serious questions among groups in our society—for example, within the United States Senate, and among a large percentage of scientists;

Whereas, the progress in implementing the recommendations of the Kerner Report has been disappointing;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Diocesan Council urge the United States Senate not to approve the administration's recommendation for the deployment of a thin anti-ballistic missile system.

Further be it resolved, that we reiterate our "commitment to national action on an unprecedented scale" which will alleviate the conditions of poverty, deprivation and disadvantage among large segments of our people.

GARBAGE PROTECTION BY FOURTH AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, under the impetus of the unbelievable distortions of our Constitution by the Warren Supreme Court and the outlandish decisions of the local Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, criminals are carefully protected from law-abiding citizens. To arrest a criminal is difficult, to convict the guilty well nigh impossible, and to have such a conviction sustained on appeal borders on the miraculous.

Americans who believe in the maintenance of law and order simply cannot understand the philosophy of these wild theories of coddling of the guilty, and continually raise the fair question—How did this judicial disorientation come about?

Part of the answer, difficult as it is to accept, is spelled out in a news story in yesterday's local papers, which I insert at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 23, 1969]

PROBE ORDERED OF TRASH-SPYING—"SPECIAL PICK-UPS" HELP INVESTIGATORS

Mayor Walter E. Washington today ordered an immediate investigation into the Sanitary Engineering Department's practice of helping police investigators by making a "special pick-ups" of a suspect's trash.

The mayor ordered a "full review" of the sanitation department's practice after a reporter questioned its co-operation with Navy investigators in preparing a case against Seaman Roger Priest, charged with sedition and desertion in connection with an anti-war newsletter he publishes.

A letter investigators said they found in trash gathered at Mr. Priest's apartment house, was introduced as evidence against him in a preliminary hearing yesterday.

Norman E. Jackson, head of the Sanitary Engineering Department, said he did not know the department was making "special pick-ups" for police. He said he did not believe the department had any formal policy about doing this, and ordered William F. Roeder, head of the sanitation division to investigate.

When asked if the former commissioners had made any policy statements on special pickups, Mr. Roeder said Walter Tobriner, "ordered us not to."

Mr. Roeder estimated the department makes half-a-dozen to a dozen pickups a year for police. He said a regular truck is used "but we keep the trash in a burlap bag. We can't send a separate truck because the people would get suspicious.

"If the police ask us to do this we cooperate with them," he said. "If something like this is publicized, people get into the act and say it interferes with their rights. But we say it's in the interests of law and order."

Mr. Roeder said, "Some years back we used to do it quite frequently for the FBI but we had some difficulty. Some organization with communistic tendencies made a big issue about it a few years ago."

EVIDENCE IN SEDITION CASE CAME FROM TRASH—25 AGENTS INVESTIGATED CASE—AND CANS

Evidence used to bring sedition charges against a D.C.-based seaman was gathered by some 25 investigators who, among other

things, picked through a bag of garbage hauled from his apartment.

Naval Investigator Robert V. Howard Jr. told a hearing officer yesterday the Department of Sanitation co-operated with the agents in preparing charges against Roy L. Priest, 25, publisher of an anti-war newsletter.

Mr. Priest is also charged with soliciting servicemen to desertion in the newsletter, but the sedition charge, which carries a possible 10-year sentence, is the most serious.

Lawyer David Rein said the defense would be "everything he said in his articles is protected by the First Amendment."

The hearing, which continued today, is a preliminary to a decision by naval officers as to whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant court martial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 23, 1969]

SAILOR'S LAWYER BLASTS NAVY'S PROBE METHODS

(By David Holmberg)

A hearing in the case of an apprentice seaman accused of publishing an anti-war newsletter ended today with a slashing attack on the Navy's investigation of the case by the sailor's lawyer.

Washington attorney David Rein, in a 25-minute summation in the pretrial hearing in the case of Seaman Roger Priest, said the Navy's methods of investigation have "done much more to bring discredit on the armed forces than anything Roger Priest has done."

Rein referred to testimony at yesterday's hearing that the Navy had assigned 25 agents to the case, had searched the trash of Priest's apartment house in search of evidence, and had used various ruses to gain evidence against the 25-year-old seaman.

TRASH SEARCHED

Referring to the fact that the trash of three other residents of Priest's apartment house had been searched during the investigation, Rein said, "I wonder if they (the Navy) are tending to their business, or to civilians."

Rein also noted that at an anti-war conference attended by Priest six of 15 persons in one workshop were Naval intelligence agents.

In his summation, Rein also gave a detailed critique of the nine charges filed against Priest for publication of the newsletter which he called "OM."

He said that a charge of soliciting to desert could not be proven because there is not a shred of evidence here that the charge does not refer to the "abstract statements and philosophical ideas" contained in the newsletter.

RELATIONSHIP CITED

Referring to a charge of disrespect toward a superior officer, which he said appeared to be based on remarks in Priest's newsletter about Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Earl B. Wheeler, Rein said there was "no proof that Wheeler is the superior officer of Roger Priest," and that there was not the kind of officer-enlisted man relationship between the two men implied in the statute.

Another charge by the Navy—that Priest did not make clear that the newsletter was an expression of his private opinion—was rebutted by Rein, who said the public could not possibly confuse the views expressed in this paper with those of the U.S. Navy.

A decision on whether to continue the case against Priest with a court-martial will be decided in about 15 days, Navy sources said. If he is court-martialed and convicted, Priest could receive sentences ranging from a dishonorable discharge to 10 years in prison.

The two-day hearing, which was held at the Washington Naval Station, is comparable to a grand jury proceeding in civilian law.

Mr. Speaker, one of these stories quotes a municipal official as saying that

the cooperation of the sanitation department with law enforcement agencies—in segregating trash discarded by suspects, mind you—brought about difficulty because some organization with "communitistic tendencies" made a big thing of it a few years ago.

Lest we question the truth of that statement, I call to the attention of our colleagues the fantastic nature of the situation reported in these news stories. Again a "big issue" is made of the careful manner in which an investigation of an alleged serious felony is conducted. Incriminating evidence which was actually thrown away and discarded in his trash by a suspect was painstakingly recovered. And his attorney loudly complains. And the "mayor" of Washington orders an immediate investigation.

The complaining attorney is one David Rein. This is not a new name in Washington, or to those versed in the identity and tactics of subversives. For the information of our colleagues, I insert the reports on David Rein published by a committee of this House 19 years ago, and again 10 years ago, identifying him as a known Communist, following my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD—LEGAL BULWARK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1950

(Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

The committee is reproducing below a list of National Lawyers Guild members who have represented witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities. In each case, the witnesses have refused to answer questions regarding Communist affiliations propounded by the committee. In a number of cases espionage activities were involved. It should be noted in this connection that it is standard Communist practice to accept as attorneys only those who agree to abide by the party's propaganda and conspirative directives. Cases are known where attorneys who have volunteered their services have been summarily rejected because they would not become partners to the party's ulterior purposes.

Attorneys, witnesses, and dates of appearance:

David Rein, 1105 K St., NW., Washington, D.C.:

Frank Hashmall.....	July 14, 1950.
Charlotte Oram.....	June 28, 1949.
Nathan Gregory Silvermaster	Aug. 4, 1948.
William Ludwig Ullman...	Aug. 10, 1948.

The committee does not dispute the right of witnesses appearing before it to have the benefit of counsel. However, the committee believes that the attorneys mentioned above knowingly or unknowingly function under a directive issued by the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party which prohibits its members from cooperating with the committee when subpoenaed before it. Cases are known where persons subpoenaed before the committee indicated a willingness to cooperate with the committee, but when these persons consulted certain of the attorneys listed above they refused to answer questions put to them by the committee.

COMMUNIST LEGAL SUBVERSION—THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST LAWYER

(Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 86th Congress, first session, February 16, 1959)

DAVID REIN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

David Rein was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Herbert Fuchs and Mortimer Riemer, both former Communists,

in testimony before this committee on December 13, 1955, and December 14, 1955, respectively.

Professor Fuchs testified that Rein was a member of a Communist cell of lawyers operating within the National Labor Relations Board where both men were employed as lawyers in the late 30's and early 40's.

Mortimer Riemer testified that he too knew David Rein in the cell of lawyers at the National Labor Relations Board and further testified that Rein in 1943 had tried to reenlist him in the Communist Party after Riemer had decided that communism was not for him.

David Rein appeared as a witness before this committee on February 21, 1956. When he was questioned by the committee concerning his Communist Party membership he refused to answer, basing his refusal on his constitutional privileges, including the fifth amendment.

After finishing law school in 1935, Mr. Rein held a series of jobs with the New York City Charter Commission, the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, and a Committee To Revise the Constitution of New York State. In 1938 David Rein started to work for the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C., as an attorney. In 1942 he transferred to the legal division of the Office of Price Administration. In 1945, after service in the Marine Corps, he returned to work at the National Labor Relations Board. In 1946 he went into private law practice.

David Rein was retained by the American Committee for protection of Foreign Born to defend various aliens facing deportation because of their Communist activities. In 1956, prior to a Supreme Court hearing on one of these deportation cases, the ACPFB gave a testimonial dinner in honor of David Rein and his law partner, Alec Jones, campaign and educational director of the ACPFB, gave the testimonial speech in which he praised both attorneys and noted that "without their knowledge, guidance, and devotion our cause may well have been set back. * * * There is no way to truly assess the role they have played in our work. * * * If it were not for [them] * * *, we would be lost down there [in Washington]."

Rein has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild since 1938. In 1940 he was a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the guild. He was elected secretary of the Washington, D.C., chapter in 1946 and in 1949 was elected to the guild's national executive board. He was still a member of the board in 1957.

Other Communist fronts in which David Rein has been active are the Washington Book Shop, the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, and the American League for Peace and Democracy. He was a sponsor of the National Nonpartisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist Leaders.

In opposition to anti-Communist legislation, Mr. Rein has been quite vocal. He was one of those who signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill in 1948. In a speech before the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born he condemned "the notorious 'Smith Act' as a repressive measure against foreign born * * * which was passed by Congress * * * without any consideration of really what it meant or what it implied."

YOUR SIGN IS NO MORE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Leo Rennert, Washington staff writer for the

McClatchy newspapers, of Sacramento, Calif., recently shared with his readers the story of Vicki Cole, of Deshler, Ohio—the story that could well be titled "What Happened to Vicki Cole's Dream?"

This 13-year-old miss, obviously with hope in her young heart that the Republican presidential candidate would offer to America a "togetherness" which so many people felt was sorely missing from the American scene, waved a sign saying "Bring Us Together," during a campaign stop in Deshler. It caught candidate Nixon's eye and it became his campaign motto. Upon election, it became the trademark and objective of his administration.

Mr. Rennert, in his commentary, tells Vicki that her sign is no more and that her dream has been shattered.

It would behoove us all, Mr. Speaker, no matter what side of the aisle we occupy, to understand one writer's reasons why young Vicki's sign so quickly became an idle dream.

The commentary follows:

YOUR SIGN IS NO MORE

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—No, Vicki, your sign is no more.

For a while, it lifted the spirits of many people, including presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon as he stumped through Ohio.

The story, with its simple eloquence, flashed across the continent. How 13-year-old Vicki Cole of Deshler, Ohio, waved the sign, "Bring Us Together," and caught Nixon's eye.

The GOP standardbearer found a motto for his drive to the White House. When he was elected, it was your sign which became the trademark of the new administration—the grand objective for the Nixon years.

You attended the inauguration as the President's guest and heard his solemn pledge to bind up old wounds.

But your sign is no more . . .

There were many who believed at the outset that "Bring Us Together" might not be an idle dream. The President inherited a badly divided nation—with a growing gulf between white and black, young and old, rich and poor. But the opportunity for reconciliation, for a new beginning, was there.

YEARNING

Like you, the nation was yearning for leadership which would restore a sense of common purpose and unity. There were even some strong hints that the new occupant at the White House was sensitive to this feeling.

Remember how he publicly confessed that his standing among 22 million Negroes was less than satisfactory but that he was determined to prove by solid deeds that he deserved their respect?

He was going to lead an "open" administration, which would listen with sympathy to the disaffected and the disappointed and then shape its policies on a broad-gauged plane without rancor or politics-as-usual.

All that is part of the distant—and almost forgotten—past.

And your sign is no more . . .

Negro leaders went to The White House and heard soothing words. One of those present got so carried away he later said Nixon would do more for the Negro than any or all of his predecessors. James Farmer, an erstwhile CORE militant, even got named to an assistant secretary post in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

But these, it turned out, were all pleasant preliminaries. Preseason exhibition games, as they say in baseball. When the real ball game began, the strategy and the lineup were suddenly quite different.

ADJUSTMENT

There were "adjustments" in the way the government would handle contracts with firms which refuse to guarantee equal employment opportunities. Over at the Justice Department, officials could not decide whether to support extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and then did their best to torpedo it. And despite some objections from HEW Secretary Robert Finch, school desegregation guidelines were reinterpreted to please Southern segregationists.

As a 13-year-old, Vicki, you were old enough to remember Birmingham, Selma and Montgomery—and the white and black civil rights workers who gave their lives so that an aroused Congress finally would pass long-overdue civil rights legislation. But now a "law and order" president has cast a shadow over these statutes and moderate Negroes—let alone radicals—also are beginning to ask whether it serves any purpose to seek progress within the system.

So your sign is no more. . . . The poor tasted a brief period of hope when White House House adviser Daniel Moynihan and Finch began talking about revolutionary new approaches to welfare to guarantee income security and a basic level of decency for all Americans. But their influence is declining every day. A new coalition of older conservatives and young, hardened public relations professionals now controls the White House. And they are far more concerned with the unblack, the unyoung and the unpoor.

VIETNAM

In the meantime, the Vietnam war—that most troublesome of divisive issues—continues without too much light at the end of that interminable tunnel. The President's assurance he had a plan to end the war has become a bitter joke. So far, he has been more intent on practicing togetherness with Gen. Thieu than with Sen. Fulbright.

The young, observing all this, are confirmed in their cynicism.

And your sign is no more. . . . It is not a case of the President pursuing deliberately a divisive course. Rather, he has turned timid, hesitant, vacillating in the face of great challenges. And that type of chief executive just cannot inspire the kind of national moral drive and sense of great common purpose necessary to "Bring Us Together."

So what finally happened to your sign? According to one unconfirmed report, Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen grabbed it away from the President, used it to bang Secretary Finch on the head, then tossed it into the Potomac, which—as you may have heard—is dangerously polluted.

REAL GOALS OF THE U.S. MISSION TO THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the July 28 issue of U.S. News and World Report contains a brief but excellent summary of the goals of the Apollo 11 manned lunar landing. Because of the significance of this succinct but accurate statement I am including it in the RECORD.

The summary follows:

REAL GOALS OF THE U.S. MISSION TO THE MOON

SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Long before their blast-off to the moon on July 16,

America's astronauts were thoroughly schooled for this important assignment—

Bring home from the moon some substance that may unlock mysteries baffling to mankind through aeons: How was the earth born? When and how will it die?

Other scientific assignments went into space with Apollo 11. Completing them was the real goal of a mission that could keep the earth's scientists occupied for years.

If all went well, from the launching to splashdown in the Pacific—scheduled for July 24—the stage would be set for nine additional American moon landings in the next three years.

Further information will be sought in those later, more complex expeditions, for many scientists believe that imbedded somewhere on the moon—relatively unscoured by winds and rain that eroded away secrets on earth—is evidence of how life began.

The head of the Apollo program, Dr. George E. Mueller, says there is a "reasonable" chance of finding some evidence of life—past or present—on the moon. He told "U.S. News & World Report" that the life could include tiny plant spores and protozoa—perhaps just under the surface of the moon.

Dr. Mueller, differing from the views of many experts, predicts that the discovery of life may be among the chief surprises that American astronauts will find in their lunar exploration.

The key experiment called for the collection of lunar soil. The instructions to the astronauts: Gather up 50 to 130 pounds from the surface, to be brought back in two sealed, airtight containers. About half was wanted in the form of 50 pounds of bulk samples dug at one spot. Also required were 14 documented samples collected from a circle 100 feet away from the ship. Other material was wanted from at least a few inches to a foot below the surface.

ANALYSIS ON EARTH

The plan was for the material—once returned to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory here at Houston—to be fully examined to make sure it could not unleash some strange plague that would devastate life on earth.

Tests, ready at Houston, were as rigorous as plague specialists could devise. Under the plan: Germ-free mice to be exposed to the moon substance for three weeks. Fertilized eggs to be injected with it. Thirty-three kinds of plants to be exposed to it. Creatures including fish, birds, oysters, shrimp, cockroaches, houseflies and protozoa to be placed with the moon material for prolonged periods.

Only after all these tests indicated that the moon's soil was harmless could the material be declared safe for study outside of a sealed atmosphere.

In laboratories from one end of the earth to the other, excitement among scientists was at a peak over the prospect of having pieces of the moon for detailed analysis.

Some scientists were skeptical that moon material from this or any mission would provide any new information at all. Many others hoped that lunar soil will act as a sort of Rosetta stone to unlock fundamental secrets of the universe.

In all, the space agency arranged for 142 investigators and 400 coinvestigators to study moon samples. The original material was to be sliced up, photographed, X-rayed and studied under microscopes by specialists from all over the world. Twenty institutions in nine countries were directly involved.

For the astronauts—Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins—there was this plan: upon return to earth, to be quarantined for 21 days, treated as if they were potential carriers of plague from an alien planet. Although scientists generally agreed that the chance of moon contamination is infinitesimal they nevertheless favored treating the hazard with utmost care.

In the flight plan, at every step back from the moon, any lunar dust was to be either

jettisoned with unwanted equipment, brushed out, vacuumed up, captured in chemical containers or eliminated in some other way.

As the flight plan spelled it out: When Apollo's hatch was opened as it bobbed on the ocean waves, a frogman wearing a protective suit was to toss the astronauts three similar garments for them to don before they emerged. As further protection, when the astronauts tumbled into a waiting life raft, they and the frogmen were to take turns scrubbing one another with a surgical disinfectant while awaiting pickup by a helicopter.

Once aboard the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, instructions were for the moon explorers to be hustled into a Mobile Quarantine Facility the size of a moving van. From there—remaining in the van—the crew was to get a sea voyage to Hawaii, an air trip by giant cargo plane to Texas, and a short ride by truck to the Lunar Receiving Laboratory.

Here—in 8-million-dollar quarters that were planned years in advance—the three lunar travelers were scheduled to be carefully observed for three weeks.

This quarantine period was chosen because it exceeds the time it takes for any epidemic-type disease to develop on earth. "It is the only thing we have as a guide," space officials explain.

Meantime, a crew was in training for the flight of Apollo 12, scheduled for early autumn. If all went the way the planners laid it down, the opening of a "new world" would be well under way.

OBSCENE MAIL

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen the flood of obscene mail as extensive as it is today. My office has been besieged with complaints from parents and businessmen who receive a steady deluge of offensive, perverse, and disgusting mail.

My constituents are angry. They want to know why Congress has not been doing anything about the forces which are eroding the basic, fundamental morality of our young people. They cannot understand why the U.S. mails should be freely available to those who want to corrupt the morals of our young or satisfy the lewd desires of the perverted.

At this point, the only thing I can tell my constituents to do is complete a small, simple form at their local post office stating they do not want to receive such mail. Then what happens? They still receive the mail. They write to me and ask me to have the Post Office Department investigate. I contact the Post Office and learn that they have been investigating a certain firm for years; the offender has possibly had a grand jury indictment returned against him, has appealed the ruling, and awaits further action by the U.S. attorney for that particular geographical jurisdiction. I am then advised that the U.S. attorney must make a decision as to prosecution under the postal obscenity statute, while he keeps in mind recent controlling decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The end result of all this is that my constituent still receives the offender's obscene mail in his mail box. The Post Office has spent a great deal of money investigating the offender, and the offender goes virtually free because of the Supreme Court decisions on obscenity.

The Supreme Court, as we all know, has held the position that nothing is obscene—no printed work, no film, no magazine, no matter how obviously filthy, can be outside the limits of freedom of expression and the protection of the first amendment.

Obviously, the questions to be answered are: "Who is to determine what is obscene?" and "How does Congress get around Supreme Court decisions on pornographic cases?"

I have today introduced legislation that I feel answers both questions.

My bill is designed to permit the receiver of such mail to determine whether or not he wants such mail. If he does not, all he needs to do is sign his name and the names of his family to a list at his post office, which is then forwarded to Washington and included on a master list. All sexually oriented mailers will be required to purchase a copy of the master list and remove all names listed from his mailing list. If the mailer does not immediately do so, and if the person still receives such mail, the mailer is subject to immediate court injunction and prosecution, with a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both, for the first offense, and a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both, for each offense thereafter.

Freedom of speech, the basis of the Supreme Court decisions which have brought about such chaos, is not freedom to poison the minds of our children with books and pictures with no artistic merit or socially redeeming value.

The eminent jurist, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

Freedom of speech is not the right to cry "Fire!" in a crowded theatre.

Why then must freedom of speech give the right to anyone to increase his own personal finances by sending obscene, sexually oriented material through the mail? Why must freedom of speech give this sick person the freedom to break down and destroy the morality of our young people?

If we pass this legislation, we will have taken a step in the right direction toward protecting minors from being mentally contaminated by prohibiting sex-oriented books, magazines, and materials being sent to them through the mails.

A TRIBUTE TO ESSAE MARTHA CULVER AND HER LEADERSHIP FOR LIBRARIES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on

Education, which has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the improvement of local libraries, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding contributions which have been made in this field by Miss Essae Martha Culver.

Miss Culver's name is synonymous with libraries in her own State of Louisiana, where she served as first State librarian and was responsible for establishing a nationally recognized library chain through every one of the 64 parishes in Louisiana.

Miss Culver, the great-aunt of our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Congressman JOHN CULVER, has not limited her talents and expertise to Louisiana, but has served also as president of the American Library Association and the International Library Organization. She has helped develop new concepts and programs, such as the mobile library system, which are being utilized today throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Baton Rouge State-Times recently carried a feature story about Essae Culver, and include it at this point in the RECORD—as a tribute not only to Miss Essae, but to the thousands of other dedicated men and women like her who have helped, through libraries, broaden the horizons of citizens in every part of the country. These are the selfless public servants who we in Congress support when we enact and appropriate funds for programs like the Library Services and Construction Act.

The story follows:

[From the Baton Rouge State-Times (La.), June 27, 1969]

ESSAE MARTHA CULVER'S NAME SUGGESTS LIBRARIES; A GENTLE LADY REMEMBERS

(By Cynthia Woody)

When you think of sky, you think of the color blue; mention of poetry brings to mind rhyme; the suggestion of ham calls for eggs and salt conjures pepper. In free association one image brings immediately to mind another, its complement. Such is the case with Miss Culver . . . when you think of Louisiana libraries the name Essae Martha Culver is a natural association.

A host of "firsts" accrue to her name, so many that you wonder if she is an over-ambitious super star. The list of her accomplishments is staggering and "firsts" for her include leadership as the first Louisiana state librarian, the one responsible for developing today's nationally recognized library system. She was the first woman from Southern libraries to be elected president of the international library organization, one of only two American Library Association presidents to be selected from the South, and the first woman to receive an honorary degree from her alma mater, Pomona College in California. (LSU incidentally followed suit. Personal modesty, however, prohibits use of the title.)

But, a super business woman Miss Essae Martha Culver is not. Poised, soft spoken, Miss Essae is a Southerner by adoption with all the cultivated grace of lady to the plantation born.

FULL CIRCLE

Today this lady expresses pleasure and recognition to all the staff and citizenry who helped her in fulfilling the completion of a dream. Approaching a decade after her retirement, 44 years after her first sleepless July night here, a vision too wide to dare to dream has come full circle. This year the last link of a 64-parish library chain fell into place as Jefferson Davis Parish (the last in

the state) received its full measure of library service.

Now, comfortable and cool in her bungalow off Acadian Thruway, Miss Culver awaits another series of hot July days. Amid a hodge-podge of personal memorabilia from family, friends and fans, she spends part of each day sorting, filing and discarding letters and papers accumulated during a lifetime of "living libraries."

Along with photographs of the family, art pieces, souvenirs acquired in travels from Alaska to Mexico, is a striking antique, a writing stand given to her by Lyle Saxon, who headed the WPA Writers Project in this state at one point administered by the state library. The set had belonged to Mr. Saxon's grandfather, a Mr. Chambers, who long ago had a bookstore on Third Street.

SETTLED HERE

"I am perfectly content here," remarked Miss Culver, "although I originally intended to return to California . . . but why go anywhere now."

"I want you to know," she stated, raising her voice a bit, "how consistently wonderful the response of Louisiana people was to the establishment of libraries."

"Sometimes I would grow discouraged," she noted, "because I didn't know anybody, not one person in Baton Rouge when I came."

This she remarked as she lapsed into a recitation of the state's leading citizens who shared her burden and enthusiasm for the library project. Among many, many others she mentioned the help of the late Dr. Mary Mims and the late Mr. J. O. Modisette of Jennings, both of whom served as library board members.

RURAL ENCOURAGEMENT

"Even with their help I would grow discouraged," she admitted, adding, "but I needed only to visit Richland Parish, site of the first rural library, and the enthusiasm of the people over their library would renew and encourage me."

Today the breadth of the library service extends from the state library building to remote fishing village. In the early days Miss Culver and Mr. Modisette with encouragement from "wonderful citizens of the state" went from parish to parish telling the people and the police juries about demonstration libraries and about how after one was established it would be their responsibility to see to its support and continuation. The demonstration library is a concept in library jargon coined in the development of this state's parish library system, best described as Culverized.

EARLY YEARS

The Culver family, her father was an attorney and her mother taught school before rearing a family, first settled in Illinois. In Miss Culver's formative years, Kansas and later Arizona were home. The family emphasis was on education, considered one of the most important if not the most important thing, one could pursue in life. This was a strong family attitude among the Methodist Culver family of seven of which Essae M. was the youngest of four girls and two boys.

"Kansas was a prohibition state in those days. You see," she noted, "the whole emphasis was on church and education."

Christian ideals were given due attention by the family and Miss Culver carried her respect for learning one step further in insisting that others also have an opportunity to learn.

"My father always said," she recalled, "that we could have all the education we could take. I recall a time when four of us were in college."

Recalling a conversation with her brother in which she was being admonished for not attending church services, Essae Culver, an Episcopalian, replied, "I consider my work of

bringing better living and learning conditions to the rural people of Louisiana practical Christianity." Early patterns of thinking were not lost or hurt.

Ironically Essae Martha knew nothing of libraries until she entered college. Being of a retiring nature, she was captivated by the library itself and the learning resources available. She offered her service without pay to the college library in order to become a part of the organization, to see perhaps if this would be her life's direction.

CONSUMMATE INTEREST

The rest is history and the library challenge was such that it came to be her consummate interest every waking moment for 36 years. She was the right person, at the right time in the right place to spearhead a library development program of outstanding quality and national merit. Being in the right place, accepting the challenge, attributed by Miss Culver to luck was only part of the picture. Miss Culver's modesty should not deceive as it was the vision, the leadership, the hard work and the devotion to a course that brought the dream to fruition.

After Pamona her library learning widened with courses at college in Albany, N.Y. and library assignments in Salem, Oregon and in California.

"When I was asked to come to Louisiana, at first, I said, no, that I understand Louisiana didn't like outsiders and the person for the job should be a Southerner," said she. Finally she agreed to come here on loan from California to carry out Milton Ferguson's library mission with the Carnegie Corporation.

"VALOR OF IGNORANCE"

"I call it the valor of ignorance that brought me here," she chuckled as she added, "because I didn't realize that a whole state had to be organized and that there was no law providing for libraries or funds."

The year was 1925 and it was a stifling July night Miss Culver picked for her arrival. Securing a narrow little room in the former Istroma Hotel, (then called the Alvis) she spent her first night hourly feeding nickels to a small fan on the dresser that offered the only source of moving air.

No quarters had been readied for the librarian, no staff, no desk and what greeted her was an accumulation of 3000 miscellaneous, surplus books (only about half of any value).

The undaunted lonely "pioneer librarian" set about filling the needs of the more than million and a half persons later to become her adopted kinsman from a room made available for her use in the old state capitol by a gesture of goodwill from the then governor, Henry Fuqua.

ANOTHER GOVERNOR SPEAKS

Years later when the Culverized system was well on its way to national recognition in library development another governor, this time Robert Kennon, spoke for the Louisiana people when he said:

"Louisiana is proud of its famous librarian. Your deserved honor reflects credit not only upon yourself and the state library but upon the state as a whole . . ."

Personal observations and insights are hard to isolate in conversation with Miss Culver. Talk inevitably turns to libraries and library development . . . she and they are inseparable.

What interview is complete without the inevitable question about hobbies, which, like one's personal possessions, supposedly serve as guide lines to a personality.

Ask Miss Culver about her hobbies and she hesitately replies something about mountain climbing (wishful thinking in Louisiana). Further questioning reveals the truth, she really does have a consuming hobby . . . Libraries!

MAN PROVING HIS ABILITY TO "TOUCH THE FACE OF GOD"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1969

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

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1969]
MAN PROVING HIS ABILITY TO "TOUCH THE FACE OF GOD"

(By Howard Simons)

It is just conceivable that these past 25 years have been incomparably eventful—not in such obvious matters as assassinations of great men or big and small wars or socioeconomic change, but rather in literally cosmic events with more telling and far-reaching consequences.

Thus it seems possible to argue that the most significant event of the 20th century, perhaps of several centuries, took place at Alamogordo, N.M., in 1945. That was when the first atomic bomb was detonated. Nothing since has happened, on a global scale, outside the shadow of the bomb.

And so, too, it is arguable that the most dramatic event of the 20th century, if all goes well, will take place on the moon in 1969. This will be when the first earthling steps onto another heavenly body. Little ever again can happen that will not somehow reflect man's ability to slip "the surly bonds of earth . . ."

There are similarities between these events. Both were forged in the heat of World War II—in complex and gargantuan crash programs to bring a military victory. The Manhattan Project hidden on one side of the Atlantic; Peenemunde on the other. These were the beginnings of technocracy: antiseptic, secret, near-incomprehensible, scientific, technical, amoral, constructive, and with a voracious appetite for men and material and money.

It is also reasonable to argue that there is still a third event in this time period to rival space and the atom, albeit a less apparent event because it was less visible, less hardware-dependent, less massive in resource commitment and not yet readily televisable as is a mushroom cloud and a Saturn liftoff. This was the cracking of the genetic code in 1953. Now, man has the cutting edge to alter life and to create life.

Historical imagination can serve backward and forward. In the long reaches of future history, the moon landing undoubtedly will be one of its touchstones. Such contemporary disasters as domestic riots and national wars of liberation, though more immediately searing to personal and national psyches, will be less noteworthy in the next century's chronicles.

To escape the earth is to provide an opportunity to soar beyond tribal and cultural, national and ideological stubbornness. It does not, of course, insure against transporting these life-threatening flaws to other worlds.

To be sure, the far meaning of the moon landing may not be immediately apparent. Indeed, it may not be knowable even in the lifetimes of all those now witnessing this seemingly transitional happening.

There is, for example, the expressed hope of many that the liberation of men from earth's shackles will somehow help to bring peace on earth. Alas, it is probably a forlorn hope. There might have been such a chance—if it had been two men from the moon landing upon the earth.

Still, some men are capable of unselfish and far-sighted vision. Donald Hornig is such a man. He helped put the atom bomb together. He helped to fashion American space policy. And he was President Johnson's science adviser. Not too very long ago, Hornig mused about the lunar landing. In effect, this is what he said:

The landing will be a small but significant first premium on an insurance policy against that far, far future date—millions of years away—when the earth's sun begins to overheat in its death throes and to boil away life on earth. It will then be possible for civilization here to uproot itself and travel across space to find a new planet on which to carry on.

There was nothing frivolous in Hornig's view. Too far for the eye to see? Too far for the mind to grasp? Perhaps. Let's foreshorten the perspective and speak not of millions of years but hundreds of thousands; maybe, with bad luck, of just thousands.

What if the planet Earth becomes untenable? There has been no thermonuclear holocaust. Nonetheless, overpopulation and overpollution are beginning to choke humanity, snuffing out life and irreparably altering life forms as well as changing the climate and overwhelming the life-preserving atmosphere. What then?

The nearest star to Earth is Alpha Centauri, only 4.3 years away if a spacecraft could travel at the speed of light, which is not thought physically possible. But Alpha Centauri only marks the edge of the territory to be explored in search of a new homestead. Conceivably, a series of space journeys could take generations to cross vast voids of the cosmos.

Possible? Why not? Even the tentative stirrings of the biological revolution now underway are mind-boggling in their implications.

For example, there is good reason to believe that someday—ten years, hundreds of years from now—man will be able to replicate himself in the test tube and in perpetuity. Generation after generation could be genetically identical: son indistinguishable from father, daughter from mother, brother from brother from brother from how many brothers are desired or needed. The world could have as many Einsteins or John F. Kennedys or Beethovens or Marilyn Monroes as it wanted.

Moreover, it should be possible to tailor these test tube humanoids to include or exclude any trait the human now exhibits. Thus if boredom were a problem on space migrations, the brain's boredom control could be removed. And so one can play this game of biological possibilities to the limit of one's imagination.

In sum, there seems to be no heavenly reason why future mankind cannot wheel and soar and put out its "hand to touch the face of God," save the earthly reason that the 20th century world has to stay pasted together long enough—an uncertainty for which neither physicist nor engineer nor biologist can provide a positive prediction.