EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SALUTE TO STEVE WITTMAN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, S. J. Wittman is one of the authentic aviation leaders of our Nation. Steve has more hours in the air zooming around the pylon in air races than any other pilot in the world. Steve Wittman is an airport manager, flight instructor, test pilot, aeronautics designer and mechanic, holder of a number of patents on aviation devices, experimental aircraft builder, barnstormer, and aviation pioneer.

Steve Wittman retired last week after 45 years of flying, 43 years of air racing, and 38 years as the manager of the Oshkosh Airport. At age 65, Steve is building his seventh airplane. One of his most famous planes, "Buster," hangs in the Smithsonian Institution besides Charles Lindbergh's "Spirit of St. Louis." His first pilot's license was signed by Orville Wright.

Steve Wittman was honored last weekend by people from throughout the Nation when thousands turned out for "Wittman Weekend." The Winnebago County Airport, over which Steve Wittman presided for 38 years, will hereafter be known as Wittman Field. An appropriate tribute to a man who truly had a vision of the future.

I include in the RECORD at this point the following editorials:

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, July 19, 1969]

SALUTE TO STEVE WITTMAN

One of Fond du Lac County's most famous native sons, Steve J. Wittman, will be honored at Oshkosh Friday, Saturday and Sunday, July 25–27, for his many contributions to aviation in the Fox River Valley, for his years as manager of the Winnebago County Airport, for his daring racing exploits in tiny, home-built aircraft and for bringing honor and fame to Oshkosh and to the State of Wisconsin.

During the celebration, the airport at Oshkosh which he managed for 38 years will be renamed S. J. Wittman Field in his honor. Saturday and Sunday Wittman's friends, the City of Oshkosh, Winnebago County and many organizations have planned one of the most outstanding air shows ever to be seen in this region. The show each day will run from noon to 4:30 p.m. and offer every type of skyway thrill from an opening "fly-by" of 40 war-bird aircraft to a flight by Wittman himself in his famed "Bonzo" to aerobatics and an air race.

There also will be parties, dinners and special honors for Steve.

But most important, many of his flying "cronies" from all over the world will be back to help honor him.

Wittman learned to fly at the old Fond du Lac Airport in 1924 and from 1925–27 he operated a small flying service here giving rides, flying at county fairs and doing general barnstorming. In addition, he was a test pilot for the Pheasant Aircraft Co. of Fond du Lac, a pioneer in the business.

In 1931 Wittman went to Oshkosh to take over the airport there and managed it until his retirement this spring.

S. J. Wittman was born in Byron April 5, 1904, and attended grade schools at Byron and Lomira. He was graduated from Fond du Lac High School. So, he has firm roots in Fond du Lac County and has many friends here. Certainly, many a local resident took to the air for the first time in an open cockpit, wooden "prop," strutted biplane with Steve Wittman at the controls.

Steve gained his national reputation piloting aircraft in races all around the country. But, he is an inventor, builder and designer as well. His great little racer, "Buster," is in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., not far from Lindbergh's "Spirit of St. Louis."

The magazine, "Sport Aviation," in its July issue, carries a two-page "Salute to Steve Wittman" and calls him "one of America's great aviation personalities. Steve entered his first race in 1926. Not until he began to design and build his own racing aircraft did he really become established in the game. He participated every year in almost every pylon (tower) race and garnered more wins than perhaps any other race pilot. He never stopped scoring in races and his name has become synonymous with the sport," the article says.

The S. J. Wittman Airport Committee Inc. of Oshkosh has planned a tremendous three-day tribute which will be the highlight of Steve's life. They are calling it "Wittman Weekend" for Steve and Dorothy Wittman because the flyer holds a very special place in the hearts of residents of Winnebagoland.

Steve Wittman is the kind of man and the kind of flyer who deserves this type of tribute.

Fond du Lac joins with its neighboring city, all of the Fox River Valley and all of Wisconsin in saying, "Congratulations, Steve Wittman."

As an added testimonial, 100,000 persons are expected for the two days of the air show. It should be well worth seeing.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Daily Northwestern, June 16, 1969]

HONOR TO CITIZEN

Seldom does a community have the opportunity—or take the opportunity—to honor one of its illustrious citizens during his lifetime.

But Oshkosh will not be remiss this summer, thanks to the hard work of a committee planning the "S. J. Wittman Airport Dedication."

The group unveiled some of its plans last week and the fact that stood out more than anything was that it will truly be a community-wide homage to Steve Wittman.

The committee is headed by Wesley Schneider and Leo Muza, and Richard C. Rutledge is in charge of the promotional end of the planning.

It is Rutledge who graphically presents the case for the opportunity Oshkosh and Winnebago County have in paying due honor to its own aviation pioneer.

The community, he feels, has not fully grasped the stature of Wittman in the aviation world. But it will know through the efforts of this committee between now and July 26–27 when the airport which Wittman nurtured from a pasture-type landing field to a jet-age airport is renamed in his honor.

Behind these prime movers, scores of community leaders are working on various facets of the two-day event, and every civic organization in the country will have a chance to take some part in the program.

Many of the committee members were active in the promotion of air shows here in the 1950's, and some, like Rutledge, are well remembered for the job they did in promoting the 1953 City of Oshkosh centennial celebration.

When they speak, then, of drawing 100,000 spectators to their show, or plan a banquet with an attendance limited to 1,000 persons, it seems to be no wishful thinking.

The renown of Wittman perhaps makes it easier to put on a show of the magnitude the committee envisions. His friends in aviation—who fully appreciate his contributions to their field—have been eager to take part.

Those who have ever gone to the Milwaukee air show may recall that some of the most interesting displays there have been the antique and home-crafted planes, an array of unusual and intriguing machines.

These are from members of the Experimental Aircraft Association. This year, most of the EAA members are forsaking the Milwaukee show (which occurs on the same weekend) to come to Oshkosh. Just one indication of the esteem aviation has for Wittman.

It is an esteem which Oshkosh shares, although not with the full knowledge which they have.

The Daily Northwestern is gratified that its editorial suggestion, when Wittman announced his intention to retire, that the airport be renamed in his honor is bearing such magnificent fruit and pledges to cooperate fully in making it a fitting tribute to the man who made aviation history in Oshkosh.

This community's opportunity to pay Wittman honor is a rare opportunity, a chance to thank him for the honor which, for nearly two score years he has brought to Oshkosh.

BUCKSKIN BILL

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, some 30 years ago a man by the name of Sylvan Hart gave up the comforts of civilization for the solitary life of a mountain man in Idaho's wilderness.

Buckskin Bill, as he is now known, has fashioned a remarkable life for himself in the mountains of our State. He makes his own clothes and his own shelter, grows his own food, and fashions his own dishes, tools, and even guns from the resources of his lonely retreat.

He is altogether a remarkable individual, a hearty adventurer, who has proved once again that man, alone in a vast primitive area, can survive—indeed thrive—on what nature provides.

Buckskin Bill is the subject of a new book entitled. "The Last of the Mountain Men," written by Harold Peterson. A review of the book was published in the Washington Post book supplement, Book World of August 3, 1969. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BOOK REVIEW OF "THE LAST OF THE MOUNTAIN MEN," BY HAROLD PETERSON

(By Richard Rhodes)

(The tale of Buckskin Bill, and his 30 years deep in an Idaho forest, using the technology of long ago to recreate a kind of life America has forgotten.)

Sylvan Hart, of an Old American family, went off to a remote Idaho fastness three decades ago "with a few staples; an ax, a rifle, and a master's degree in engineering" and reconstituted himself as a mountain man. He makes his own deerskin clothes, his own buildings, his guns, his dishes, his tools. He grows his own food, hunts and skins and salts and renders his own meat, and creates his own entertainments—silversmithing, woodcarving, leatherwork. The nearest town is 150 wilderness miles away, and it's a small one. How Hart lives, the stories he tells, and other stories of Idaho mining days, are the subjects of Harold Peterson's book.

For what it reveals of Hart's way of life, *The Last of the Mountain Men* will do. But for its interpretation of the meaning of that life. Peterson's book does Sylvan Hart no service. Buckskin Bill, as Hart calls himself, is not the last of the mountain men, a romantic holdover from an idyllic past, but a thoroughly modern man who has deliberately recreated the style and substance of an earlier way of life: a conscious artist whose medium is the remembered past, particularly its arcane technology.

"Hardly anybody has a really complete set of blacksmith tools anymore," Hart says, "but I do: a hardy, a flatter, all of them." Hart not only make his own tools; he also forges, bores, rifles and tempers his own guns by hand, a feat that requires great skill and great physical strength. Yet his technology is selective: He wears store-bought horn-rimmed glasses, the same as you and me.

Buckskin Bill's door handles are of elk horn. The pink plaster of his adobe buildings is tinted with hematite. His shorts and his jerkin and his summer hats are made of bearskin he shot, skinned and tanned himself. His winter helmets he hammered from copper, and patterned after those the conquistadors wore. They are intended to deflect the rocks that sometimes fall from the cliffs above his homestead; he mined and smelted the copper himself. "Buckskin," says Peterson, "also had homemade bows, 'arrahs,' crossbows pack frames, intricate wicker fishing creels, fly rods, and highly-crafted snowshoes . . ." And a set of cherry-wood dishes he spent a winter carving, because the hint of cherry enhances the flavor of food; and bear grease for pastry and for tempering gun barrels without fracturing them—tastier than Crisco, firmer than water. And books, especially Russian literature; and "small, sweet strawberries obtainable in no city"; and a burdened Queen Anne cherry tree from which Hart and Peterson filled an entire farm wagon; a hammered copper samovar. And a relative who sends him *The Wall Street Journal*, which he ponders, shaking his head. And when he needs money, he pans a little gold.

What led Hart to reenter the wilderness of the American past? This question like so many others that might have given us the mountain man as a usable model, Peterson answers only superficially. The Harts, it seems, had a family tradition that the boys would spend a year alone in the woods upon reaching manhood, and Sylvan liked the woods so much he stayed there. But his self-conscious, self-parodying posture in the several photographs which accompany the text, the fact that he is a lifelong bachelor, the fact that his particular life in the woods is deliberately but selectively eighteenth-century suggest more complicated motives. Hart's creative obsession with tools deserves explanation, as does his choice, despite his friendliness to strangers, of a homestead accessible by land only across a pole bridge slung against the face of a sheer cliff.

Compare William Carlos Williams on the significance of Daniel Boone:

And if it seems always easier to romanticize a thing than to understand it, it is so because very often it is more convenient to do. Especially is this true when to romanticize a thing covers a significance which may be disturbing to a lying conscience. For Boone, at least, was not a romantic, losing himself in the "mystery" of the forest. He was a technical genius of the woods, enjoying, in that respect, the admiration of the most skilled native craftsmen, who remained actually in awe of his sheer abilities and accomplishments.

And Peterson romanticizes. His epilogue the moral of the tale as it were, begins: "As I read the last of Sylvan Hart's letter, sitting high above Manhattan, thoughts of the beauty and deep-rooted peace of the empty Idaho wildernesses . . ." and concludes that "When this true civilization comes (if it comes), an aristocracy of common men will discuss law and letters and arts and philosophy on shady village greens and in spacious wooden-grecian temples of houses and churches, schools and meeting halls." That vision, so patently synthetic, so like a Hollywood movie of the early 1940s, discolors Peterson's entire book.

The tragedy is that such romanticizing should be our first and perhaps only introduction to Sylvan Hart. Hart had the sense and even the genius to direct his work of reconstruction toward the disappearing but authentic culture of this country, which was rooted in the technology necessary to conquer an alien and hostile land. American technology remains America's finest creative gift to the world, but the culture that might have arisen from that technology foundered against the borrowed, secondary culture created by the wealth which technology made possible.

No one can say what that culture might have been, but the clean triumphant innocence of Shaker architecture, the sly, watchful, exuberant literature of Melville and Twain, the somber martial majesty of Lincoln's and Kennedy's funerals, suggest its direction. It would have had, as William Carlos Williams says, "relatedness," and tenacious bond to the local, and it might have been—might still be, for it is not entirely lost, despite its proverty of means—what Whitman called "a Great Average" rather than the work of a few gifted individuals. Meanwhile, throughout the nation, the cultural leadership produces eighteenth-century Italian operas.

New York is crowded, New York is a behavioral sink, Peterson laments, even though America did not invent cities, even though he has just returned from the thousands upon thousands of square miles of open land which still wait in the vast interior of the continent for habitation, and which technology today makes accessible to any who would take the trouble to learn the way in.

Hart has not reconstituted a little bit of Athens in Idaho; he has proved once again that one can live comfortably on American terms in the wild and peaceful interior of the American continent. His message is simple, yet it might be an old Egyptian secret that he alone has unearthed: that it is not necessary to live in cities, nor even in Peterson's idyllic small town. What the Shakers created out of their moil of religious and sexual fanaticism, what the South had despite the blot of slavery, what still exists, partly desiccated, in the central regions of America, is available today to any who want it and can meet its requirements of technical competence and personal integrity, as Sylvan Hart has done. And this Peterson failed to see, as America, to its intensifying agony, has failed to acknowledge.

THE LOG OF MAN'S JOURNEY TO THE MOON AND BACK

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following log of the flight of Apollo 11, from the National Observer of July 28, 1969, is the most gripping and dramatic account I have yet seen of that magnificent journey:

THE LOG OF MAN'S JOURNEY TO THE MOON AND BACK

An observer's log of the flight of Apollo 11, man's first landing on the moon. All times are Eastern Daylight; all miles are statute.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16

9:32 a.m.: "Lift off. We have a lift off." The voice from Launch Control at Cape Kennedy heralds the beginning of Apollo 11's flight to the moon, 250,810 miles away at blast off. Orange-white flames and billows of smoke envelope the spotless white, 363-foot Saturn 5 and its precious astronaut payload: Neil Armstrong, a civilian, and Lieut. Col. Michael Collins and Col. Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, Jr., both of the Air Force.

The Saturn 5's five F-1 first-stage engines, gulping 2,230 gallons of liquid oxygen and kerosene each second, lift the astronauts from Launch Pad 39A.

9:35 a.m.: speed, 6,198 m.p.h. The Saturn 5's first stage separates to tumble into the Atlantic Ocean. The second stage's five J-2 engines ignite.

9:41 a.m.: The second stage separates. Speed, 14,579 m.p.h. The third stage's single J-2 engine ignites.

9:43 a.m.: Apollo 11 enters a nearly circular orbit 118 miles above earth at 17,686 m.p.h.

12:16 p.m.: On the second orbit, over the Gilbert Islands in the Pacific Ocean, the third-stage rocket kicks to life again for 5 minutes, 47 seconds, driving the astronauts towards their rendezvous with the moon.

12:22 p.m.: The J-2 shuts off. Altitude, 204 miles. Speed, 24,256 m.p.h. "Hey, Houston, Apollo 11," says Neil Armstrong, the spaceship commander. "This Saturn gave us a magnificent ride."

2:12 p.m.: A three-second burn of the service module's single, 20,500-pound-thrust engine drives the Apollo crew a safe distance from the third stage. A ground signal sends the third stage rocketing off to eventually soar behind the moon and into solar orbit.

8:04 p.m.: Apollo 11 transmits an unscheduled, 16-minute color-television show from space.

11:57 p.m.: All three astronauts sleep. Apollo 11 is 77,992 miles from earth, traveling at 4,787 m.p.h.

THURSDAY, JULY 17

8:21 a.m.: The day begins without fanfare.

10:33 a.m.: Apollo 11 reaches its midway point, 120,002 miles from the earth and moon.

12:16 p.m.: A three-second rocket burst puts Apollo 11 on a course that will bring it within 69 miles of the moon.

6:23 p.m.: 143,980 miles above earth, Mike Collins works with Apollo 11's sextant. Capsule Communicator Charlie Duke asks if Colonel Collins can pick out Edwards Air Force Base in California.

"I can see a 104 [F-104] taxiing out on the runway."

"Man, that's super."

"The damn ——— almost always have a 104 taxiing out for a take-off," Colonel Collins says.

7:32 p.m.: The crew begins a 35-minute telecast from space, focusing first on earth. At one point, Mike Collins rotates the camera, turning the earth upside down on the television screen.

"I'm making myself seasick," he jokes.

9:41 p.m.: Houston bids the crew good night.

10:53 p.m.: Apollo 11 is 147,802 miles from earth. Speed, 2,817 m.p.h.

FRIDAY, JULY 18

9:41 a.m.: Houston allows the astronauts an extra 69 minutes sleep before awakening them.

4:44 p.m.: Apollo 11, 201,250 miles out, begins a one-hour, 36-minute telecast. The camera follows Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin as they work in the lunar module. The color and the clarity of the pictures are superb.

11:11 p.m.: Apollo 11, traveling at 2,037 m.p.h., reaches the "lunar sphere of influence," 214,402 miles from earth. From this point on, the gravitational pull of the moon is greater than that of earth's and the space craft will pick up speed.

SATURDAY, JULY 19

8:32 a.m.: The crew awakes. Apollo 11 is 14,359 miles from the moon. Speed, 2,787 m.p.h.

10:47 a.m.: "The view of the moon that we've been having recently is really spectacular," Neil Armstrong reports. "It fills about three-quarters of the hatch window . . . It's a view worth the price of the trip."

1:12 p.m.: "Apollo 11 . . . All your systems are looking good going around the corner and we'll see you on the other side."

1:13 p.m.: Apollo 11, 355 miles above the surface, zooms behind the moon at 5,225 m.p.h. and out of contact with earth.

1:21 p.m.: The service module's engine fires for 6 minutes, 2 seconds, slowing Apollo 11 to 3,237 m.p.h. and putting it into an elliptical lunar orbit with a high point of 193.8 miles and a low point of 70.4 miles.

1:47 p.m.: The tracking station near Madrid reports telemetry signals as Apollo 11 swings from behind the moon. Minutes later Neil Armstrong reports: "We're getting this view of the landing approach . . . the pictures and maps brought back by Apollos 8 and 10 give us a very good preview of what to look at here. It looks very much like the pictures, but like the difference between watching a real football game and watching it on TV—no substitute for actually being here."

3:56 p.m.: Apollo 11 begins a 34-minute telecast of the lunar surface, tracing the path that the lunar module will follow on its way to the surface. The astronauts give a running commentary on the craters and hills they pass over.

5:43 p.m.: Again the service module's single engine fires, this time for 17 seconds. The burn puts Apollo 11 into an orbit 75.3 miles by 61.8 miles. Speed, 3,637 m.p.h.

11:04 p.m.: The astronauts continue preparing for the next day's descent.

SUNDAY, JULY 20

1:03 a.m.: The crewmen finally bed down.

7:07 a.m.: The day of man's first landing on the moon begins for the crew of Apollo 11 with a call from Houston. "Oh my, you guys wake up early," one astronaut says.

9:06 a.m.: Apollo 11 flies behind the moon, losing radio contact with Houston. During this period, Buzz Aldrin enters the lunar module, code name Eagle.

9:52 a.m.: Apollo 11 re-establishes radio contact. A short time later Neil Armstrong joins Colonel Aldrin in Eagle. Mike Collins remains in the command module, code name Columbia.

12:57 p.m.: Two minutes before Apollo 11 disappears behind the moon again, Houston radios: "We're go for undocking."

1:47 p.m.: One minute before swinging from behind the moon, Eagle and Columbia undock.

1:50 p.m.: "The Eagle has wings," Neil Armstrong radios, confirming the undocking.

2:11 p.m.: An eight-second burn of the service module's engine moves Columbia away from Eagle at 2 m.p.h.

3:08 p.m.: Behind the moon, Eagle's 9,800-pound thrust descent-stage engine fires for 29.8 seconds, dropping it into an orbit with a low point of 9.8 miles above the moon's surface.

3:46 p.m.: Columbia re-establishes contact with earth two minutes before Eagle. "How did it go?" Houston asks.

"Listen, baby, everything's going just swimmingly," Mike Collins replies. "Beautiful."

3:48 p.m.: Eagle re-establishes radio contact with Houston.

3:57 p.m.: Eagle is 12.3 miles above the moon.

4:00 p.m.: "Eagle, Houston. If you read, you're go for powered descent."

4:05 p.m.: 50,000 feet altitude, 260 miles from the landing site. Eagle's 9,870-pound-thrust engine begins firing to slow the craft and drop it to the lunar surface.

4:06 p.m.: "Everything looking good," Houston says.

4:07 p.m.: 47,000 feet.

4:08 p.m.: "Looking good to us," Houston says. "You're still looking good."

4:09 p.m.: "You are go to continue power descent," Houston says, 40,000 feet. "And the earth right out our front window," Eagle says.

4:10 p.m.: 33,500 feet.

4.11 p.m.: 27,000 feet. "Delta-H (change of altitude) looking good now," Eagle reports.

4:12 p.m.: 21,000 feet. Speed, 818 m.p.h.

4:13 p.m.: 13,500 feet. Speed, 518 m.p.h. 9,200 feet.

4:14 p.m.: 5,200 feet. 4,200 feet. "You're go for landing," Houston says. 2,000 feet. "We're go. Hang tight. We're go." 1,600 feet, 1,400 feet.

4:15 p.m.: 750 feet. Eagle is flying with its windows up, its crew looking into the blackness of space above. Their craft is tilted at a 35-degree angle to the lunar surface. 700 feet. The descent engine continues to burn. Speed, 14.3 m.p.h. 600 feet.

500 feet. Eagle is nearly perpendicular to the surface now and the crew can see the area ahead, 350 feet. Speed, 2.7 m.p.h. 330 feet. "We're pegged on horizontal velocity," Eagle says. Neil Armstrong spots a football-field-sized crater littered with boulders 10 and 15 feet in diameter where Eagle's computer-programmed landing approach is aiming the craft. He quickly switches to semiautomatic controls and instructs the computer to fly Eagle over the danger area.

4:16 p.m.: 220 feet. "Coming down nicely." 200 feet. 160 feet. 75 feet.

4:17 p.m.: 40 feet. Speed, 1.7 m.p.h. "Pick-up some dust." 30 feet. "Faint shadow." "Drifting to the right a little." 10 feet. One of the 68-inch-long sensors jutting down from three of Eagle's four landing pads touches the lunar surface. "Contact light." One second later, the descent engine is shut off.

Eagle settles to the moon in the Sea of Tranquility, coming to rest at a 4.5 degree angle four miles beyond its programed landing site, but still within its general target area.

"Houston, Tranquility Base here," Neil Armstrong reports. "The Eagle has landed." The flight surgeon in Apollo Control notes that Mr. Armstrong's heart reached 156 beats a minute during Eagle's landing.

4:29 p.m.: "Tranquility," the capsule communicator says, "be advised that there are a lot of smiling faces in this room and all over the world."

"There are two of them up here," Eagle replies.

"And don't forget one in the command module," Mike Collins calls from lunar orbit.

4:35 p.m.: "You might be interested to know that I don't think I noticed any difficulty at all in adapting to one-sixth G [gravity]," Neil Armstrong reports.

5:06 p.m.: Eagle's crew continues checking out the craft's equipment before eating and a brief rest.

7:13 p.m.: Apollo Control relays a message to the world from Buzz Aldrin: "I'd like to take this opportunity to ask every person listening in, whoever and wherever they may be, to pause for a moment and contemplate the event of the past few hours, and give thanks in his or her own way."

7:43 p.m.: The astronauts begin preparing for their moon walk, 4 hours and 22 minutes early. This is a time-consuming task in Eagle's cramped cabin. Their bulky equipment weighs 183 pounds. This includes water-cooled space suits, portable life-support systems that provide oxygen, an emergency 30-minute oxygen supply, and bubble helmets.

10:28 p.m.: The two astronauts switch to their portable life-support systems from Eagle's oxygen supply.

10:38 p.m.: "Everything is go here," Neil Armstrong reports. "We're just waiting for the cabin . . . to blow enough pressure to open the hatch."

10:39 p.m.: Eagle's hatch opens, looking west across a barren surface pitted by tiny craters and littered with small rocks, some perhaps billions of years old.

10:48 p.m.: Neil Armstrong begins positioning himself to move out backward through Eagle's hatch. "Relax a little bit," Buzz Aldrin suggests.

10:51 p.m.: "Okay, Houston, I'm on the porch." Mr. Armstrong pauses for a moment on the platform under Eagle's hatch before placing his lunar "overshoe" on the first step.

10:53 p.m.: Neil Armstrong pulls a lanyard that opens the storage area holding a black-and-white television camera.

10:54 p.m.: A giant screen in Apollo Control flickers and a picture appears upside down until engineers right it. Eagle's ladder is bathed in shadow. Beyond, harsh sunlight floods the surface in brilliant contrast. A foot appears. "Okay, Neil, we can see you coming down the ladder now," Houston says.

10:55 p.m.: "I'm at the foot of the ladder. The LM foot pads are only depressed in the surface about one or two inches, although the surface appears to be very, very fine grained. As you get close to it, it's almost like a powder."

10:56 p.m.: Neil Armstrong fulfills one of men's most ancient dreams. "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind," he says as he steps onto the lunar surface.

10:57 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong marvels at the lunar soil. "The surface is fine and powdery. I can pick it up loosely with my toe. It does adhere in fine layers like powdered charcoal to the sole and sides of my boots. I only go in a small fraction of an inch."

11:02 p.m.: The flight surgeon monitoring the astronauts' heart beats and respiration reports they are doing well.

11:03 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong begins photographing the lunar surface.

11:05 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong begins scooping up the first sample of lunar soil.

11:07 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong finishes collecting two to four pounds and jabs the scoop handle six to eight inches in the surface. He seals the sample bag and puts it in a pocket on his leg.

11:12 p.m.: Buzz Aldrin exits from Eagle.

11:13 p.m.: "Now I want to back up and partially close the hatch, making sure not to lock it on my way out," Colonel Aldrin says.

"A good thought," Neil Armstrong agrees.

11:14 p.m.: Buzz Aldrin steps onto the moon.

11:18 p.m.: The astronauts inspect Eagle's descent stage and note that one of the landing probes is broken and bent upward.

11:24 p.m.: Neil Armstrong unveils the plaque attached to one of Eagle's landing legs and reads it. "Here men from the planet earth first set foot upon the moon, July 1969 A.D. We came in peace for all mankind." The plaque, with the signatures of the Apollo 11 crewmen and President Nixon, will remain on the lunar surface.

11:27 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong moves the television camera about 30 feet away from Eagle.

11:31 p.m.: Mr. Armstrong pans the lunar landscape with the television camera.

11:35 p.m.: Buzz Aldrin unrolls the solar-wind experiment and jabs its pole into the surface. The experiment, which resembles a long sheet of aluminum foil, is designed to collect particles of the solar wind that bombards the moon. Scientists hope that the panel will collect one-billionth of an ounce of particles from the sun for them to study.

11:41 p.m.: The astronauts set up an American flag with a spring device that keeps it "waving" on the windless, airless moon.

11:42 p.m.: "I guess you're about the only person around that doesn't have TV coverage of the scene," Houston tells Columbia. "I don't mind a bit. How is the quality of the TV?" Reply: "Oh, it's beautiful, Mike. Really is."

11:46 p.m.: Buzz Aldrin attempts various ways of moving on the moon, including a series of kangaroo hops. "You do have to be rather careful to keep track of where your center of mass is. Sometimes it takes about two or three paces to make sure you've got your feet underneath.

11:48 p.m.: President Nixon, watching the moon walk at the White House with Frank Borman who orbited the moon on Apollo 8, talks directly to the astronauts. "Because of what you have done, the heavens have become part of man's world," Mr. Nixon says.

11:54 p.m.: Neil Armstrong begins collecting bulk samples of the lunar terrain.

11:55 p.m.: "The blue color of my boot has completely disappeared now in this—still don't know exactly what color to describe this other than ash-cocoa color," Buzz Aldrin says.

MONDAY, JULY 21

12:08: a.m.: Neil Armstrong finishes collecting about 50 pounds of lunar soil and rocks. These are stored in one of two aluminum rock boxes for return to earth.

12:18 a.m.: The astronauts are inspecting Eagle again.

12:27 a.m.: The crewmen remove the passive-seismometer and the laser-reflector experiments from a storage bin.

12:31 a.m.: Buzz Aldrin plods out of sight with the experiments, looking a little like a weary salesman toting two heavy sample cases.

12:35 a.m.: Colonel Aldrin reports difficulties leveling the passive-seismometers package about 50 or 60 feet from Eagle.

12:36 a.m.: Neil Armstrong reports the laser reflector set up. Scientists hope to use the device to measure the distance between the earth and moon to within six inches of accuracy and to study the theory that earth's continents are drifting apart.

12:44 a.m.: The two solar panels, which power the passive-seismometer experiment, are unfolded. Minutes later, equipment on earth begins recording the astronauts' foot falls detected by the four seismometers. These instruments are sensitive enough to record a meteoroid the size of a pea landing a half mile away. They will also record moonquakes, if they occur.

12:46 a.m.: Neil Armstrong begins collecting more lunar samples, penetrating up to three inches beneath the surface. Because time is running short, the samples cannot be photographed as he picks them up.

12:47 a.m.: Buzz Aldrin is taking the first of two core samples. He drives the tube into the surface to a depth of eight or nine inches with a hammer. "I hope you're watching how hard I have to hit this into the ground," he says. The seismometer records his pounding, indicating the moon is a good transmitter of shock waves.

12:52 a.m.: Colonel Aldrin takes down the solar-wind experiment. This and the two core tubes go in the rock box with the material Neil Armstrong is collecting.

12:54 a.m.: As the world watches, Mr. Armstrong picks up a moon stone to return to earth.

12:55 a.m.: "We're running a little low on time," Houston says.

"We want to keep a good margin in those portable life-support systems," Apollo Control notes.

12:57 a.m.: Colonel Aldrin climbs into Eagle.

1:03 a.m.: Mr. Armstrong sends the first box of rocks up to Colonel Aldrin by a strap and pulley. His heart beat peaks up 160.

1:07 a.m.: The second rock box goes up.

1:09 a.m.: Neil Armstrong enters Eagle and reports he collected about "20 pounds of carefully selected, if not documented, samples" in the second box.

1:11 a.m.: "Okay, the hatch is closed and latched," Buzz Aldrin reports. "And we're up by it, secure."

3:46 a.m.: After depressurizing Eagle for a second time, the crewmen throw out their portable life-support systems, a lithium hydroxide canister—used to filter their oxygen—and the arm-rests from inside Eagle.

3:57 a.m.: The astronauts turn off the TV camera.

4:25 a.m.: Houston bids Eagle good night.

9:32 a.m.: Houston wakes Mike Collins in Columbia. "We're going to keep you a little busy," the capsule communicator promises.

9:42 a.m.: "Not since Adam has any human known such solitude as Mike Collins is experiencing during the 47 minutes of each lunar revolution when he is behind the moon with no one to talk to except his tape recorder aboard Columbia," Apollo Control comments.

11:12 a.m.: Houston wakes Eagle's crew from a fitful sleep and asks how they slept in the cramped cabin, which has no beds. "Neil has rigged himself a really good hammock and he's been lying on the hatch and engine cover, and I curled up on the floor," Buzz Aldrin reports.

1:44 p.m.: Ten minutes to lift off. "Everything looks good," Houston says. Eagle's descent stage is to serve as launching platform for the ascent stage.

1:54 p.m.: Blast off. Eagle's 3,500-pound-thrust engine fires the top half of the lunar module straight up, leaving the descent stage as a permanent monument to man's first landing.

Eagle rises. 17.7 m.p.h. The astronauts call off their speed in feet per second. 24.5 m.p.h. Ten seconds after launch, the craft angles towards orbit. "Very smooth," Neil Armstrong says. "Very quiet ride. There's that crater down there."

1:55 p.m.: 2,600 feet. "Eagle," Houston says, "one minute and you're looking good." During the lift off, Neil Armstrong's heart rate reaches 90 and Buzz Aldrin's jumps to 120.

2:00 p.m.: One minute to go in the burn. Speed, 3,057 m.p.h.

2:01 p.m.: Eagle's engine shuts off as the craft reaches 3,775 m.p.h. and sails into a lunar orbit 54.3 miles by 10.5 miles.

2:05 p.m.: "Eagle is back in orbit and left Tranquillity Base, and leaving behind a replica from our Apollo 11 launch." Houston answers: "Roger, we copy. The whole world is proud of you." Replies Eagle: "We needed a lot of help."

4:20 p.m.: The seismometers left on the moon record a distant shock. Excited scientists speculate they have detected their first moonquake or a meteoroid slamming into the lunar surface.

5:35 p.m.: After a series of rendezvous maneuvers, Columbia docks with Eagle. "Okay, we're all yours," Buzz Aldrin tells Mike Collins as the two craft lock together after being apart 27 hours, 48 minutes.

7:13 p.m.: Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin rejoin Mike Collins in the command module.

8:02 p.m.: A seven-second burn of the service module's small maneuvering rockets separates Apollo 11 from the unmanned lunar module at a relative speed of 1.4 m.p.h. "There she goes," Columbia says. "It was a good one." Eagle's ascent stage will remain to orbit the moon long after the astronauts return to earth.

TUESDAY, JULY 22

12:55 a.m.: Behind the moon as Apollo 11 begins its 31st revolution, Columbia is 22 miles ahead of Eagle and one mile below. The service module's 20,500-pound-thrust engine fires for 2 minutes, 28 seconds, driving Apollo 11 towards home at 5,904 m.p.h.

1:07 a.m.: Radio contact. "Time to open up the LRL doors (the lunar receiving laboratory where the crew will be quarantined)," Neil Armstrong says. "Roger," Houston replies. "We've got you coming home. It's well stocked."

2:16 a.m.: Apollo 11, 4,278 miles from the moon, its speed slowed to 3,658 m.p.h. by the moon's gravitational tug.

12:32 p.m.: The crew remains asleep after noon. Speed, 2,937 m.p.h.

1:11 p.m.: The astronauts are awake after 10 hours of rest.

1:39 p.m.: Apollo 11, 38,870 miles from the moon, reaches the point where earth's gravitational pull exceeds the moon's. The craft begins to accelerate.

4:02 p.m.: Apollo 11's maneuvering rockets fire 10.5 seconds to slow the craft 3.3 m.p.h. and aim it more accurately toward earth.

10:42 p.m.: 176,042 miles from earth. Speed, 2,982 m.p.h.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23

12:26 p.m.: The Apollo 11 crew is stirring after a 10-hour rest period. They have a relatively easy schedule the day before reentry.

3:15 p.m.: 132,439 miles out. Speed, 3,854 m.p.h. Cabin temperature, 62 degrees Fahrenheit.

7:04 p.m.: Another telecast from space. The astronauts philosophize a bit about the meaning of their historic mission. Buzz Aldrin puts it best: "A verse from Psalms comes to mind to me: 'When I consider the heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon, and the stars which Thou hast ordained, what is man that Thou art mindful of him.' "

11:16 p.m.: Houston notifies Apollo 11 that bad weather is expected at the splashdown target. The craft will maneuver so it enters the atmosphere at a shallower angle. This will give more lift to Apollo 11 and drop it some 247 miles down range.

THURSDAY, JULY 24

7:42 a.m.: Re-entry day. The crew is still asleep. Apollo 11 is 42,499 miles out. Speed, 6,951 m.p.h.

11:22 a.m.: 13,182 miles. Speed, 11,810 m.p.h. and increasing rapidly.

12:20 p.m.: The command module separates from the service module.

12:22 p.m.: "You're looking mighty fine here," Houston says. "You're cleared for landing."

12:28 p.m.: "Guidance reports Apollo 11 is right down the middle of the corridor," Apollo Control advises.

12:35 p.m.: Apollo 11 strikes earth's upper atmosphere at 400,000 feet and 18 seconds later, the high heat of re-entry blacks out all radio contact with the crew. Speed, 24,707 m.p.h., 1,736 miles from splashdown in the Pacific Ocean 912 miles southwest of Hawaii. Earth's atmosphere is rapidly slowing Apollo 11's speed.

12:38 p.m.: One of the recovery aircraft spots the fiery glow of Apollo 11's heat shield as it streaks through the early morning (6:38 a.m. local time) sky.

12:39 p.m.: Radio blackout ends.

12:44 p.m.: At 23,300 feet, two drouge parachutes pop out to slow Apollo 11.

12:45 p.m.: Apollo 11's three main parachutes open.

12:49 p.m.: Apollo 11 is at 1,500 feet, swinging gently beneath its bright orange-and-white canopies.

12:50 p.m.: "Splashdown," a rescue helicopter reports. "Apollo has splashdown." The space craft plunges into the Pacific nose first, 13 miles from the recovery ship U.S.S. Hornet. Man's first flight to walk upon the moon ends upside down.

A.M. & N. PROGRAM AIMS AT ELIMINATING HARD-CORE POVERTY

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Arkansas A.M. & N. College, in Pine Bluff, is currently conducting a program to provide training, and then employment, for unskilled and unemployed people from Lonoke, Desha, and Drew Counties in Arkansas. This program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and administered by the Arkansas Farmers Union, has been very successful and recently was the subject of a fine article in the Pine Bluff Commercial by Miss Janey Joyce.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A.M. & N. PROGRAM AIMS AT ELIMINATING HARD-CORE POVERTY

(By Janey Joyce)

"Hard-core poverty."

This is a phrase used from time to time by sociologists and by government officials as they despair about the steadily rising costs of welfare and the high numbers of unemployed or underemployed people who are not sharing in the current prosperity in the United States.

Who are the "hard-core" poor?

They are the people who have been left behind in this fast-paced technical society. They vary from place to place.

In Southeast Arkansas they are most often displaced farm workers. They are the people who were tenant farmers, sharecroppers or field hands before the mechanical age reached agriculture.

They grew up expecting to chop cotton in the spring and to pick cotton in the fall. That's all they ever expected to need to know how to do.

Now, however, cotton is chopped with herbicides and it is picked by machines. The traditional agricultural jobs are no longer available.

But many of the people who used to do those jobs are still living in the tumble-down paintless shacks that dot the rural areas of Southeast Arkansas. They subsist on welfare and the proceeds from occasional unskilled jobs.

Their children have often grown up assuming that this was the only way of life available to them as well.

Two years ago the Arkansas Farmers Union in Little Rock began a program at Arkansas AM&N College in an attempt to provide training, and then employment, for unskilled and unemployed people living in Lonoke, Desha and Drew Counties.

The program was funded by a grant from the federal Office of Economic Opportunity with in-kind services and facilities provided by the college.

AM&N already had a long established complete vocational arts program which offered training in automobile body repairing and painting, automobile mechanics, brick masonry, carpentry, cosmetology, electronics, appliance repair, practical nursing, secretarial training, tailoring, welding and machine shop.

In addition to this, the training program established basic education courses so that illiterates could be taught to read and write and those who already knew how to read and write could improve their skills in these areas.

Transportation—via school buses—was provided so that the new trainees could get back and forth from their homes to the college.

And a stipend—ranging from $30 to $50 a week—was established so that trainees could afford to attend school.

Then came the first recruiting drive. Recruiters contacted churches, newspapers, city and county officials and went from door-to-door in some instances to find persons who were willing to become trainees in the program.

According to Clinton Hampton, assistant director of the program, recruiters were not deluged with applications from potential trainees at first.

In fact, Richard A. Maxwell, the program counselor, estimated that the majority of the first trainees came into the program because of the stipend.

They enrolled in the program, Maxwell said, but this didn't mean they had any confidence in it. The general attitude of the new trainee was, according to Maxwell: "Well it sounds good, but I have to see it first."

"So," he continued, "it was up to us to really motivate them—to really change their outlook on life. And this is the thing that I feel we have accomplished more than anything else. We have instilled confidence in themselves and in us."

Maxwell noted that the 10-month training program that the trainees went through was "almost like a cram course."

"What they learn here," he said, "the average person gets in 2½ years. And they come out with flying colors."

Maxwell said he was shocked to discover so many people with native ability and intelligence "just doing nothing."

John Kuykendall, placement director for the program, said that learning new skills solved only a part of the trainees' employment problems.

More difficult, he said, is the psychological transition from farm work—"where you could go to work anytime you felt like it and lay off when you felt like it and nobody said a thing"—to industrial work where you have to be on time and schedules have to be met.

Kuykendall is responsible for the final phase of the program—getting the trainees jobs and seeing that they stay with them.

Most of the employers that Kuykendall contacted were skeptical at first, he said. But most decided eventually to give the trainees a try. And, by and large, they have been satisfied with them as employees, he said.

The trainees were skeptical at first, too, Kuykendall said. Most couldn't believe that they could get a job with a company that wouldn't consider employing them before they went back to school.

A familiar refrain, according to Kuykendall, was: "I've been here before. I know I won't get a job here. They'll just send me to the employment office."

"So they were pretty impressed when 30 or 40 minutes later they had the job," he said.

"I have tried to explain," Kuykendall continued, "that companies are looking for trained people now. They aren't looking for people who just walk in off the street and say they can do this and do that without any experience or formal training."

Kuykendall spends a lot of time out in the field talking to potential employers and in keeping up with trainees who have already been placed on jobs, he said.

If he finds out that one of the former trainees has missed a day on the job, he contacts him to find out why. And he is always available to discuss any problems that might arise between employer and employee, he said.

Each trainee who has completed his training and gone on to productive employment is a success story.

Hampton, Kuykendall and Maxwell all have their favorite success stories.

During the routine testing done on all trainees during the 1967-68 training program, Maxwell discovered a 21-year-old woman who he felt definitely belonged in college.

That was Helen Williams of Tillar, who has just successfully completed her first year of college at AM&N.

Miss Williams had done farm labor—off and on—after her graduation from high school in 1965. And she was not too optimistic about the training program when she signed up for it.

"I expected to just end up with a certificate," she said in a recent interview.

She was surprised, she said, when Maxwell strongly urged her to enroll in college because she had never regarded herself particularly as college material.

But enroll in college she did—with the help of a National Student Defense loan, an economic opportunity grant and a summer job doing secretarial work—a skill learned in the training program.

This year Maxwell has recommended that two of the program's trainees go on to college next fall. They are Mrs. Mamie Charleston, 31, of McGehee, and Linda McKinney, 22, of Humnoke. Both just completed courses in secretarial training.

And both hope to attend AM&N next fall with the same sort of assistance that Miss Williams is getting.

Hampton's favorite story concerns a young man who had been a migrant agricultural worker—one who had never seen a brick laid in his life.

He spent four months in 1967 and 1968 in a class for brick masons. Then he was permitted to lay bricks on some faculty houses that were under construction.

According to Hampton, he quickly shaped up into a "cracker jack" brick mason. So he went to work for a private contractor. It didn't take him very long to notice that the contractor was making more money than he was. Hampton said, and so he soon went into business as a brick subcontractor.

Then he was drafted into the armed forces, Hampton said. But this did not end his brick-laying activities.

The last time the man was home on leave, Hampton said, he contracted for a job and then drafted four of this year's brick mason trainees to do some of the work.

As far as Hampton knows, the four new brick masons are still working.

Hampton, Kuykendall and Maxwell feel that the program has been a successful one during its two years of operation. But they are still not satisfied.

"You'd be surprised at the number of people who are still out there in those shacks," Kuykendall said.

THIS UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM AT CHAPEL HILL

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a respected educator from my own district who has just returned from a so-called "Scientific Institute," conducted at the University of North Carolina under the auspices of the National Science Foundation.

I realize that both the scientific and the educational organizations have ways of retaliating against members who seek to give the public a picture of what is going on. I have, therefore, deliberately deleted my constituent's name and his address. I did this of my own volition and not at his request. He put his name on the copy which I received.

This House has just voted billions of dollars for education and I supported the appropriation. I know the need for education. I know the need for scientific advancement, but I cannot believe that it is necessary that we abandon all efforts at what we have historically considered common courtesy or ordinary decency. I am not sure that a little culture is not as important in human relations as is the scientific progress to which this institute was supposedly dedicated. The letter from my constituent is self-explanatory and is included herewith:

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Representative, 11th Texas District, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POAGE: I realize you are busy and have little time for communication, but I feel that I need to inform you of a situation concerning a federally financed education program I observed this summer. I was a participant in a National Science Foundation Summer Institute at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill this summer. As a result of this, we were housed in a dormitory on the campus with a group of upward bound students.

I am a teacher and have completed nineteen years of teaching so I have had an opportunity to observe educational programs and judge their results before. I would like to make the following comments about the upward bound program at Chapel Hill.

First, if there was adult supervision, it was not evident. I was told that there were counselors but the adults I saw with the group more nearly fit my description of a pusher or hippy.

Second, as a result of the first statement, the dorm came to resemble a flop house, evidenced by the fact that they had to move furniture out of the lobby; floors were always littered with trash; walls of elevators were marked up and words usually found only on rest room walls were quite abundant.

Third, it became almost impossible to study in dorm any where except on upper floors. This did not change even after repeated complaints to dorm management.

Fourth, the language used by this group became such that very few people other than these students ever used the snack bar, T.V. room or other facilities in dorm.

Fifth, at least two meetings were held in the dorm with the speaker being a known militant from Durham, N.C. who had been very outspoken in the trouble at Greensboro and Chapel Hill in the spring of the year. After both of these meetings dorm windows and car windows were broken and things stolen from both rooms and cars according to the dorm management.

Sixth, on at least one occasion I observed a gun being passed from person to person in lobby of dorm.

In short, I feel that the program accomplished a very good job of training a group of campus rebels. I feel that if you could check, you will find many of your future trouble makers received their training in this and related programs. I resent any of my tax money being used in such a poorly supervised program and feel that something should be done from a federal level.

There are many other things I would like to tell you about this summer but I realize you are busy and it is difficult to write about all the things I observed. If I can provide additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

____ ____.

THE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT IN CUBA

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, lately we have heard many urge us to look more favorably on the Communist government in Cuba. According to the Castro apologists, the Cuban social experiment is taking form, and the Cuban people are feeling the benefits of the first social revolution in Latin America. The facts as presented in the U.S. News & World Report of August 4 contradict this illusion of social advancement and put the Castro regime in proper context: the Cuban Communist social revolution is taking form, and it has turned out to be a colossal flop.

Fidel Castro is in trouble, and he is turning to his old friend, the Soviet Union, for help. Consequently, it would be in our best interests to stop the talk of loosening the Cuban embargo and showing sympathy for the Cuban dictator. Quite obviously, Cuba's Communist government is failing to meet the needs of the people, and repressive controls are being tightened. This does not sound to me like the work of a social revolution, and the U.S. Government should not be fooled into accepting this false picture. We should do everything in our power to help make the demise of Castro a reality.

To clear the air on the condition of Cuba's Government and to illustrate the need for a tightening of controls within the embargo area, I ask all Senators to consider carefully the article published in U.S. News & World Report. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FOR CASTRO: TIGHTER SOVIET TIES AS POPULARITY EBBS

Fidel Castro—who for a decade has promised the Cuban people a better life—is apparently in so much trouble economically that he is being forced to overhaul his own policies for now.

Along with this, the popularity of the Cuban dictator is at an all-time low, according to U.S. Government sources.

The Russians—whom Castro once courted, then quarreled with—provided one of the most recent signs that policy gears are being shifted in Havana.

On July 20, seven Soviet warships sailed into Havana harbor, cheered by thousands of Cubans brought out to greet the vessels. The week's visit coincided with July 26 celebrations of the sixteenth anniversary of Castro's first armed revolutionary attack.

Little more than a year ago, Havana and Moscow were locked in a bitter name-calling contest. And 18 months ago, Castro kicked out two Russian and three Soviet-bloc diplomats for plotting against him with old-line Cuban Reds.

NEED FOR AID

At this time, in Castro's view, Soviet-Cuban friendship seems the best policy, say the experts. Castro desperately needs continued Russian aid to keep the Cuban economy going.

Though Castro—once the idol of the Cuban people—is not held in such high esteem at the moment, observers point out that he remains in firm control.

Still, work slowdowns, anti-Castro wall signs and low-level sabotage are appearing more frequently.

These things, caused mostly by shortages of food and other items, have resulted in tightened police controls.

From refugees, diplomats, official Cuban statements and various other sources come reports of arrest and unorganized resistance. For example:

Veteran sugar-cane workers are said to be cutting only about 40 per cent of the amount of cane they once cut;

A student says anti-Castro signs appear almost nightly on the walls inside Havana University, with indications that many people are involved;

Theft, robbery, swindling and crimes against property are officially reported to be on the upswing. Many of these crimes are considered to be sabotage;

Houses are being robbed when women leave them to stand in food queues;

Troubles have increased at night, and citizen bicycle patrols are being used.

As further evidence of a revamped policy, diplomatic and other sources noted that—at least up to the time of the July 26 celebrations—Castro had not, for a year or more, called publicly for armed revolution in other Latin-American countries.

Some, including a Castro agent who defected, say the Russians demanded, in exchange for more aid, that Havana halt the campaign. The thinking is that Castro was hurting the Russians' efforts to penetrate the Hemisphere in the role of peace lovers seeking only trade and diplomatic relations.

Just how true this is, of course, is difficult to determine. However, Castro has now declared that there can be a real revolution in Latin America without violence. On July 14, he said the military junta in Peru may be conducting such a revolution.

TURNING POINT

One U.S. expert on Hemisphere affairs described this statement as a true "turning point" in Cuban policy. Basically this switch can be laid to two failures, in the view of several American authorities. These are the economic failure and the failure to export revolution. Says one source:

"Castro was shaken up more than most people realize by the failure of Ernesto ('Ché') Guevara in Bolivia. Personal ties aside, what hurt Castro was that the Guevara effort failed even though all the classic conditions for revolt—in the Castro ideology—were present in Bolivia. But it didn't work, and that shook up Castro."

Another, in commenting on the economic aspects, was careful to point out that, though unrest is widespread in Cuba, "as yet, resistance is passive, not active or organized."

MORE PLEDGES

Despite all the troubles, Castro is making new promises of plenty for the Cuban people.

Recently he pledged anew that 10 million tons of sugar would be produced in 1970, and said this would solve Cuba's economic problems. On July 14, he helped get the sugar harvest under way. This is called the 1970 harvest because the traditional starting date of January has gradually been pushed up by six months. More eggs, rice were also promised.

American experts are certain these promises cannot be fulfilled—just as Castro has failed to fulfill his "better life" pledges of the last 10 years.

And they say, with things getting worse, that another year of unkept pledges could spell real political trouble for Castro by next summer.

Those watching developments believe that latent resistance in Cuba could become active, organized opposition in the not-too-distant future.

COMMISSION ON BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development. This measure is a companion proposal to House Joint Resolution 168, introduced earlier in this Congress by Congressman PHILIP E. RUPPE, of Michigan.

Congress daily is becoming more aware of the pressure which is being placed upon our earth resources by the expanding population of the United States. Illustrative of this concern is the series of hearings now being held by the Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of the Republican Research Committee, of which I am a member.

Unquestionably, the urbanization and suburbanization processes have created much strain upon our resources. It is not only appropriate but also very timely that we should undertake a comprehensive study of the means by which we might achieve a greater geographic balance in the ongoing economic development of the United States.

The Commission which we propose would be made up of 20 persons to be appointed by the President. Four of the members would come from cities of at least 1 million persons; four would come from cities having populations between 100,000 and a million; four would come from cities whose populations ranged between 10,000 and 100,000; four others would come from small towns and villages. No more than half of the persons from any one of these classes would be from the same political party. In addition to these members, four other persons would be appointed to the Commission without regard to political or geographic criteria, but upon the basis of their exceptional training, experience, and competence in the subject of the investigation.

The Commission would be charged with submitting a report to the President and the Congress within 2 years after its establishment. It is our hope that the information gained through this study will enable the United States to achieve a better geographic balance in its economic development, which is expected to proceed at a rapid pace over the next 30 years.

During the remainder of this century America will be experiencing a profound shaping of its pattern of population distribution. Already, people are speaking of huge, identifiable urban belts such as San-San—San Francisco-San Diego—Chi-Pitts—Chicago-Pittsburgh—and Bos-Wash—Boston-Washington. I believe that America will be a healthier place to live, work, and raise a family if other viable alternatives also exist for our people. Indicative of the opposition to an America totally dominated by such megalopolises is the current discussion of the potential development of new cities.

Perhaps the creation of new cities is part of the answer to our problem. Certainly, the strengthening of the economic life of many of our existing outlying communities is also vital. But clearly one of the important, indeed fundamental, objectives which we should endeavor to fulfill is the dispersion of our population in a manner which will enable us to efficiently utilize our earth resources in support of our human resources.

The formation of this study commission is one vital step toward the achievement of that element of a state of national health and well-being.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, early last month the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their 14-State Southern Conference in Norfolk, Va. Mr. Richard Homan, commander in chief of the VFW, made several splendid statements regarding our national security.

Believing as I do that his views deserve the attention of this House, I insert in the RECORD the comments of Mr. Homan as reported in the Norfolk Ledger-Star and Norfolk Virginian-Pilot:

VFW CHIEF'S VIEW: MILITARY-INDUSTRY COMPLEX PRAISED

NORFOLK.—The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars brought to a close a weekend southern conference of the VFW with praise not only for the "military-industrial complex" but also the "military-educational complex."

Richard Homan told 800 delegates from 14 states that in praising the former he was not singling out any group, "for no such group exists."

"I am pointing to those on call 24 hours of each day around the globe, and to those in industry who are giving the best years of their natural life to build second-to-none defense forces," he said.

It was the builders of Polaris submarines and Minutemen missiles "who now believe they can build a Safeguard defense against missile attack and contribute still more to our security," he said.

"Both our military servants and our industial leaders have been irresponsibly criticized for building weapons systems which have never been used," he said. "They have been criticized when the aim for building such weapons systems was to make them so awesome they would not be used."

As far as the "military-educational complex," was concerned, Homan said he could "think of no asset which contributes more to the national sinew."

In Tidewater, he said, tens of thousands of young men are taught specialized skills, self-discipline and the responsibility of citizenship.

"I say without hesitation that the military-educational complex represents one of America's valuable assets," he said. "The secondary benefits to our civic institutions and to our civilian economy are plain to see."

During the conference it was announced that Virginia was one of four Southern states to win "All-American" honors for its VFW posts' involvement with community programs and membership growths.

VFW HEAD SPEAKS OUT: HO'S MEDDLING IN UNITED STATES HIT

NORFOLK.—The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has accused Ho Chi Minh of "meddling and peddling" in this Nation's internal affairs.

At a press conference here Friday afternoon, Richard Homan said that the latest instance of this was his invitation to David Dellinger to represent the United States in the release of three prisoners of war now held in North Vietnam.

"Dellinger, at the time of Ho Chi Minh's cordial invitation, was under federal indictment stemming from the violent demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago," he said.

"Presumably, Ho Chi Minh wanted to practice his own expertise in U.S. domestic affairs."

Homan said that "the U.S. State Department has regrettably recommended that Dellinger be free to travel abroad and to represent America's national interest in this matter."

Homan, in Norfolk to attend a 14-state southern conference of the VFW, also took a swing at South Dakota Sen. George McGovern who recently announced that he had held private discussion in Paris with the North Vietnamese.

"Senator McGovern was not elected to the U.S. Senate for that purpose," he said. "He does not share with the President of the United States the responsibility of dealing with hostile nations. The role of the U.S. Senate is clearly defined by our Constitution. It is to advise and consent to treaties and commitments made by the President."

Homan said that the visit by eight Russian naval vessels to Cuba should be looked on as "the beginning of a new expansionist phase in Soviet naval and maritime diplomacy and influence."

He said that the Russian Navy had progressed from "the basics" of a proponderantly underseas Navy to guided missile cruisers and might well be expected to continue into the field of attack aircraft carriers.

The VFW conference here is expected to draw between 500 and 600 members. A banquet and dance is planned for tonight.

NO RECIPROCATION: VFW LEADER CRITICAL OF TROOP WITHDRAWAL

NORFOLK.—The national leader of the Veterans of Foreign Wars said Friday that the United States should not have withdrawn any troops from Vietnam without reciprocal action on the part of the North Vietnamese.

Richard Homan, commander-in-chief of the VFW, said the United States has been limiting its operations in Vietnam, hoping the North Vietnamese would also limit their operations.

Homan cited the bombing pause in the spring of 1968 and the withdrawal of troops as examples of this country's operational cutback.

Homan, here for the 14-state Southern conference of the VFW which began Friday at the Golden Triangle, charged that idealists in the United States have supported the limitations on operations in Southeast Asia and thus assisted the North Vietnamese.

Homan refered to recent private contacts with the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris. Homan charged that Sen. George S. McGovern, D-S.D. should not have undertaken a private mission to Paris for discussion with hostile agents.

"McGovern was not elected to the U.S. Senate for that purpose. The role of the U.S. Senate is clearly defined by our Constitution," said Homan.

Homan said that idealists of this type are dupes of the Communists because they undermine America's position.

"If the North Vietnamese don't begin to negotiate, we should review our operations and consider those alternatives available to us," he said.

Homan said the options to the United States include blockading the North Vietnamese ports, removal of bombing limitations, and increased military activity within South Vietnam.

"The people of this country don't want to put up with political generals. The day-to-day operations in military areas should be left to the Pentagon.

"When we contribute to this, we contribute to prolonging the war," he said, referring to those who make private contacts with the North Vietnamese.

"These political generals have assumed responsibilities outside their elected authority," said the 46-year-old commander.

"As soon as limitations are placed on us, the North Vietnamese tell their people they are winning," said Homan, "and the people believe them."

Homan said the United States should remain in Southeast Asia to prevent the entire area from going Communist.

SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY MAKES SENSE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a much deserved tribute was recently paid to the distinguished senior Senator from California, my good friend and colleague, GEORGE MURPHY, by the editor of the Santa Rosa, Calif., Press Democrat.

Because of his distinguished service in the U.S. Senate and his valuable service to the people of the State of California, I am taking the privilege of including this tribute to a great human being and an outstanding legislator in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SENATOR MURPHY

Doing part of his homework in Sacramento the other day, U.S. Sen. George Murphy was asked for the umpteenth time if he was going to run for re-election next year. And for the umpteenth time, he said he most certainly was.

Why there should be any question about it is one of the irrationalities of politics. George Murphy has proved to be an energetic Senator, a highly capable one, and a compassionate lawmaker. On his record, he should be unbeatable, so some of the questions raised as to whether he will again be a candidate may spring from wishful thinking among those who might have a chance if only Sen. Murphy would be obliging enough to call it quits.

A successful operation to remove a throat cancer left him with a voice that is soft, or as the Senator puts it, "I can't shout as loud as I used to."

But when Mr. Murphy talks, his colleagues listen, and what he says makes sense. That, it seems to The Press Democrat, is a decided asset to California in a legislative chamber so endowed with members who are long on oratory and short on reason that it has for decades been known as "the cave of the winds."

A CEILING ON FEDERAL SPENDING

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the virtue of consistency has been sorely missing in the House of Representatives in the last few days and I fear we are creating some very difficult problems for ourselves and for the country.

Ten days ago the President signed into law a bill in which the Congress included a ceiling on Federal spending in the current fiscal year. That ceiling was set at $191.9 billion—$1 billion below the total recommended by the President in April.

During the last 3 days the House has voted to increase spending for the programs of the Labor Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department by $1.1 billion over the amount recommended by the President and $922,563,000 more than recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

It is appropriate and timely today to examine the implications of this action in the light of the budget limitaton.

The budget ceiling that Congress has imposed is flexible in two respects. First, we exempted increases of up to $2 billion above the April budget in certain programs for which spending is unpredictable. Second, we provided that the ceiling will be adjusted by the net increase or decrease voted by the Congress in the April budget estimates of the President.

Events since April make it virtually certain that outlays for interest and other hard to predict programs will be higher than was estimated in April, perhaps by the full $2 billion, thereby raising the statutory ceiling to $193.9 billion.

President Nixon, in his July 22 statement, made a strong commitment on the part of his administration to live within a ceiling of $192.9 billion. His message said, in part:

I know the Congress shares my determination to make the budget an effective instrument against the inflation that has wrought so much damage to the income and savings of millions of Americans. If the Congress did not share that commitment it would not have imposed this spending ceiling. However, this general expression of support for fiscal restraint must now be matched by specific acts of the Congress.

We should understand clearly what the President means. If the Congress increases one of the President's budget requests, whether it be in reclamation or hospital construction, agriculture, or education, then the President will act either to avoid use of those increases or to cut other budget items an equal amount. If we refuse to be responsible—if we refuse to make this choice—then the President will make it. And some of us may not like the results.

In his statement, the President said he would prefer that the Congress make these cuts. So would I. I had hoped that most of the House also would so prefer. If we wish to hold down spending, we must demonstrate this desire not only in voting for an overall spending ceiling but also in each specific budget action that comes before us.

No one can say that the House demonstrated that desire during the past 3 days. Instead, we demonstrated that while it is easy to vote for a general, overall reduction in spending, it is much more difficult to resist voting for increases in the face of blandishments from the supporters of individual programs.

We now have a heavy responsibility to find the means of reducing other appropriation items to compensate for the billion dollar increase in education.

This we must do if we are to demonstrate that we truly agree with the President's view that inflation must be restrained. We said we did when we voted for the ceiling as a major weapon against inflation. I hope we meant it.

We have a clear duty to apply restraint in our future appropriations activities. I hope the Appropriations Committee recognizes that obligation and will do its utmost. The general welfare requires that we have the support of the House. The extra billion voted for education will buy very little if we allow inflation to run rampant in our Nation.

STAND UP FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address entitled "Stand Up for Academic Freedom." This address was presented to the La Jolla Kiwanis Club of La Jolla, Calif., by Assemblyman John Stull who represents that portion of San Diego County in my congressional district. It is an outstanding address by one of the most outstanding legislators in the United States. I hope it will receive wide circulation. The address follows:

STAND UP FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Sweeping up and down our broad land is a growing sense of dismay and unease. We are aware of this in every facet of our lives, but nowhere is it more deeply felt than in regard to the campuses of our country. Tragically, that which once gave us confidence and hope is now a source of confusion and despair. "The black flag of anarchy" and "the red flag of revolution"have been raised on once peaceful quads. We see students with upraised fists clenched in a brutal alien salute and to our astonishment, we hear nineteen year olds announce grimly that they have reached the end of their patience with society. Here, in La Jolla, the enemy ensign has flown on the hill above, even as American men have been dying in a bitter war across the sea. And here, too, a notorious nihilist touts his discredited philosophical views. To the north, the mother campus of California's whole university system has recently been under a state of siege and the City of Berkeley continues to rock with repercussions. It is almost as though a huge question mark hovers over our country, and we ask ourselves, "Is what CAN'T happen here, happening?"

Our general feeling of unrest is compounded by the disturbing realization that many time-honored words and phrases no longer fit the situations to which they are applied. It is almost as though, sometime between the dark and the daylight, a number of important labels were switched and stuck indiscriminately onto whatever was at hand. Nowhere is this more apparent than as it concerns something called "academic freedom."

This once honored phrase—academic freedom—used to mean something, something specific. Now, tragically, it has come to be a sort of umbrella, which has been stretched to cover everything from an alleged "right to riot" to the ruthless use of the classroom for the most overt form of idealogical brainwashing. This current concept of academic freedom has developed what can best be described as burgeoning intellectual ghettos. And, it is in these intellectual ghettos, where to the rythm of ritualistic incantations about academic freedom, its substance is being destroyed.

In my opinion, the grotesque current interpretations of this term with the inevitable consequences in action, is the greatest factor threatening our whole state system of higher education and menacing society itself. Ironically, of course, *true* academic freedom is an early casualty in such a state of affairs. Consequently, as we care about constructive values and the orderly continuation of higher education within this republic, we must probe for an accurate meaning of the term and, in the context of today's meeting, decide if, in fact, we should stand up for academic freedom.

Over two thousand years ago, the Greeks started a tradition of free inquiry in western civilization which has been continued intermittantly ever since. When the first universities, in the modern sense, were created in the Middle Ages, scholars of powerful intellect were produced, and these men were accorded a great deal more freedom for their pursuits than the generally erroneous picture of that time would suggest. Although history holds examples of scholars persecuted for belief or research, there is a thread of the continuity of academic freedom running through the past few hundred years. In its ideal conception, according to Richard M. Weaver (in his essay, "Academic Freedom: The Principle and The Problems") "academic freedom is a limited immunity accorded to those who have been considered worthy of guarding society's oracle." It is the prerogative of a special group. It is an earned prerogative. It does not apply to irresponsible spouters of opinion or to opinion at all but to demonstrable knowledge. Most certainly, it should not be used as a tool for the "democratizing" of universities by turning control of them over to students. "It is the freedom of scholars and researchers in institutions of higher learning to teach and to publish the results of their scholarship without interference from the institution itself or from outside interests," but the whole concept is based on a sense of responsibility. Academic freedom *cannot* be discussed ever without the word responsibility. It is inherent in the concept.

This idea is extended in a statement made by the President of the University of California, Robert G. Sproul, in 1934:

". . . the freedom of the university is the freedom of competent persons in the classroom. In order to protect this freedom, the university assumes the right to prevent exploitation of its prestige by unqualified persons or by those who would use it as a platform for propaganda. It therefore takes great care in the appointment of its teachers; it must take corresponding care with respect to others who wish to speak in its name."

And this brave statement continues:

". . . the University of California is the creature of the State and its loyalty to the State will never waiver. It will not aid nor will it condone action contrary to the laws of the State. Its high function—and its high privilege—the University will steadily continue to fulfill, serving the people by providing facilities for investigation and teaching free from domination by parties, sects, or selfish interests. The University expects the State, in return, and to its own great gain, to protect this indispensable freedom, a freedom like freedom of the press, that is the heritage and right of a free people."

This is what academic freedom should mean, but how has it been perverted? Let us count some of the ways.

Last May, the American Association of University Professors met in convention at Minneapolis. Eight hundred delegates representing about 90,000 members attended. What blows did this impressive assembly strike for freedom, academic or otherwise? Well, according to news reports, they denounced President Nixon for his get-tough position on college riots, and they indicated deep concern about United States Attorney General John Mitchell's announcement that "violence-prone militants" will be prosecuted to "the fullest extent" under provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That AAUP also resolved that both Nixon's and Mitchell's plans constituted a threat to what they conceive to be academic freedom.

But don't think all of their actions were critical. Not at all. They granted the Alexander Meiklejohn Award to President George W. Starcher of the University of North Dakota for insisting that Gus Hall, General Secretary of the U.S. Communist Party be allowed to address his student body; for resisting pressure to fire the student editor who wrote an editorial denouncing the university for accepting a gift to support prizes for essays on patriotism; and for Starcher's noble posture in a "dirty-word" controversy.

All this is a little hard to believe, isn't it? And, if it did not bode so ill for American higher education, it would be downright funny. But, of course, it is just the reverse of funny and is some indication of the depth and degree of our current academic dilemma. Certainly it underwrites the words of San Francisco State President S. I. Hayakawa who compared certain professors to the World War II defenses of Singapore—"all their guns point in the wrong direction."

Having set the stage at this high level, let's proceed to the recent People's Park confrontation at Berkeley. After a noon rally at Sproul Hall Plaza on May 15, 1969, and after a rousing speech by UC Berkeley Student Body President-Elect Daniel Siegel, a group of assorted students, street people, and you name it, marched off the campus into the city. Some of Siegel's ringing words bear repeating: ". . . people be careful. Don't let those pigs beat the s--- out of you, don't let yourselves get arrested on felonies. . . ." And, according to the *Los Angeles Times*, he ended with the shout, "Let's go down and take over the park!" The resultant bloodshed and disorder are well known.

How did the UC system academic community respond to these events?

The academic community responded with a blithe disregard of facts and almost total irresponsibility. Among other things, flags were brought to half-staff with the permission of some administrators on campuses throughout the system in honor of James Rector, who died as a result of injuries received in the melee; numerous classes were cancelled; and throughout the state, faculty and student groups were shrill in their condemnation of steps taken to quell the rioting. A large contingent even marched on Sacramento.

Then a group of alleged Berkeley faculty members and their sympathizers bought full-page ads in leading newspapers throughout the state and presented a completely distorted account of what had happened. In passing, it is interesting to note the ad contained some names, already familiar from Berkeley Free Speech and Vietnam Day Committee times.

To the best of my knowledge, only one faculty member on any UC campus has spoken out loud and clear, indicating that there is another point of view. Dr. Hardin B. Jones, Professor of Medical Physics and Physiology and Assistant Director of the Donner Laboratory at Berkeley, has virtually stood alone in condemning the excesses of some of his fellows, and, in attempting to refute the ad, Dr. Jones's words bear emphasis. Let me read them to you:

"The failure of a significant number of professors to be responsibly objective and honest about issues of this importance serves to condone and thus abet the prevalent resort to violence on the part of those college youths who look to them for guidance. Unless the public and its elected and appointed representatives understand the situation and act firmly to defend the public interest, there is real danger that we will go down the bloody path to revolution and tyranny. And unless the great majority of moderate, well-meaning but inert faculty members exert their power to discipline their revolutionary colleagues for their unprofessional acts, they will have to accept a large share of the ultimate blame."

I applaud Dr. Jones, but he is obviously a voice crying in the wilderness or, to be more accurate, the intellectual ghetto. It is sadly and abundantly clear that most of his colleagues belong to what the *San Francisco Examiner* has characterized as ". . . a fat cat faculty that with notable exceptions, has been more interested in its cozy prerogatives than in defending the integrity of the university."

Dr. Jones's call for honesty and objectivity among his fellows brings to mind a personal experience. I am Chairman of the Assembly Education Sub-Committee on Educational Environment, and Robert C. Donaldson, Chairman of the Academic Senate at Sacramento State College accepted our invitation to appear. In the course of reading a prepared statement on the campus situation, Donaldson said that "tragically, when such individuals [citizens from minority and economically disadvantaged groups] attempt to improve themselves and achieve gains, the state government, through legal repression and inadequate financial provisions withholds the means for these individuals to attain self-sufficiency."

I asked Donaldson if he could substantiate this blanket indictment of all of us in Sacramento. He *could* not. I asked him if he would like to delete the allegation from his statement. He *would* not. Whereupon, I asked him to step down as obviously, the testimony of an individual of such a temper of mind could contribute little. The incident does provide another example of lack of faculty integrity and a gross inability to relate realistically to the problems facing us.

At the outset of my remarks, I stated that under the cloak of Academic Freedom, the classroom has been ruthlessly used for the most overt form of ideological brainwashing. It's a strong charge but easily proved. And I have a particularly flagrant example. A teacher of physics at Chico State College gave a final this year in which he converted Physics II questions into a propaganda form and loaded them with pyrotechnic emotional content. Let me read you how some of the questions begin:

"If one ounce of botulism toxin will exterminate 60 million people, how much total energy would be required to orbit a single bomb which could theoretically eliminate the human race, with a factor of 10 overkill . . . ?

"A helicopter is flying in a straight horizontal path, macing the people of Berkeley . . .

"A student absorbs inelastically 2 buckshot (not bird shot)" (This question goes on about the pool of blood in which he lies).

"Suppose the Navy is dropping untreated human feces in San Francisco Bay . . ."

Question 6 commences "An Air Force plane is so loaded with pacifying napalm . . ."

And so it goes. (Incidentally, I have had copies made of this test and some other things I've mentioned. When I'm through you're welcome to copies of them.) At any rate, my colleague Assemblyman Ray Johnson who serves the area where Chico State is located, informs me that a fact-finding committee of the Chico State Faculty Senate investigated this test and found it excellent in content although they did concede it might be a little politically biased. However, they recommended that no action be taken. Ray Johnson says that this teacher, under the protection of his tenured position is constantly participating in disturbances and abetting radical causes.

Another example of the flagrant misuse and corruption of the purposes of the classroom occurred recently at Los Angeles Valley College when a teacher named Mrs. Deena P. Metzger distributed to her class and discussed her incredibly vile and disgusting poem "Jehovah's Child." As far as I know, nothing has been done about this, either. The president is waiting for the Academic Senate to act.

For a final example of a perverted interpretation of what constitutes academic freedom, let's discuss briefly the recent hiring and granting of lifetime tenure at the University of California at Santa Barbara to Richard Flacks, sometime co-founder of the SDS and general all-time radical. Now, as you have probably heard, in response to cries of popular indignation, the explanation has provided that Flacks is no longer active in SDS leadership and one is invited to infer that his militant days are over. Somehow, it has all struck me as strangely reminiscent of the case of one Leon Wofsy, of the Berkeley Bacteriology Department, who, having given up his communist affiliations, amuses himself with such quaint pleasures as Free Speech movements and People's Parks.

At any rate, I've been attempting to find out if the new and the old Flacks differ. This has involved reading ("Ordeal by Flacks" is my private term) and lest I be accused of condemning Flacks out of the past, let's number and date my condemnation Volume 5, Number 2, April/May/June 1969 of the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. In this publication, I found a 23-page Flacks article entitled "Protest or conform: Some Social Psychological Perspectives of Legitimacy." In this article, Flacks combines the lingo of social science with the jargon of New Left and, among other things, he speaks with considerable pleasure of the fact that there is some active disobedience in the armed forces and that, in his opinion, there have developed some cracks in what he calls "the institutional support of American national authority." The examples he cites are among university and church officials. He gives the opposite of draft resister as cheerful robot and the opposite of Black Panther as black bourgeois.

California's new lifetime tenured employee concludes with the words, "Yet the mergent characterological and cultural trends, and the revolutionary movements they have spawned, promise a new social system, in which militarism, racism, narrow nationalism, dignity, individual conscience and collective paritcipation become the primary basis for legitimate authority. This promise makes the risks worthwhile for many of us."

Shades of Marcuse! Shades of the Old Left! Shades of the New Left!

For putting the author of this in a university classroom the citizens of California will be paying $12,300, a year, starting July 1, 1969.

It is a disgrace. The University of California administration and the Board of Regents are derelict in their duty for underwriting this outrage. The after-the-fact rationalization of the UC hierarchy don't satisfy me. What this university needs is *not* Richard Flacks. Flacks is just another example of what one of my constituents calls "over paid under Americans" Any person who calls this country "imperialist" or any segment of the population, "bourgeois," or the members of our armed forces "cheerful robots" is certainly suspect. And if all this flack about academic rights has gotten a little old, it's only because my right as a citizen *not* to salary people who hate my type and my way of life has gotten plowed under in all the verbiage. I think the people of California are willing to support the University of California if it behaves itself, but I believe they've had it supporting ideological clowns in a left-of-center circus.

The examples I have given you, great and small, are compounded daily on every state university and college campus in California. Some campuses are better than others but on all, the dread syndrome is present. There can be no doubt whatsoever that many of those who should be keenest on preserving academic freedom are systematically undermining that sense of academic responsibility on which this freedom must inevitably rest. The public cannot trust the radical elements of the faculties to preserve the most modest civilized amenities, let alone to make any attempt to protect the society which has built the institutions in which they teach. The faculty-power complex is a law unto itself and an example of the many being controlled by the few.

The grab for faculty power began a long time ago, about the same time the effort was launched to convert higher learning into an instrument of crash social reconstruction. It is significant that the takeover continues to be heralded by such people as Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, who has said he has "no doubt that the modern (university) governing board has a certain ceremonial role. It can best be converted to an instrument of faculty administration by having faculties elect a suitable majority of members to it." So much for your Board of Regents! So much for your trustees! So much for the representatives of the people who foot the bill!

After watching the UCSD chancellor squirm through various crises, from his action in rehiring Marcuse to his inaction in student disorders, I am convinced that William McGill is a captive of his Faculty Senate and a creature of the faculty/power combine and it seems to me that the UCSD situation is typical of the entire system. I also believe that unless a concentrated effort is made to break this unhealthy type of faculty power, the whole back of California's higher education will be broken. It is bending dangerously already.

I am not going to apologize for this opinion as being that of a mere politician. For two and a half years, I have served on the Assembly Education Committee with six months of this time as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Educational Environment. I have spent literally months in hearings and years in research. The evidence points inconvertibly in the direction I have indicated. However, I am not alone in my opinion.

Those voices from the campus itself which have been raised in defense of true academic freedom have emphasized these same sentiments. I read you the recent words of Dr. Hardin Jones. It is also the opinion of La Jolla's own courageous John Geddes, who has said the authorities on campus have presented almost solely a single point of view, brooking no opposition. Dr. Geddes concludes that "this is a fatal error. It can destroy the university." Dr. John Gilbaugh of San Jose State is another, who disregarding persecution and calumny, has issued a clarion call for faculty responsibility.

There are other encouraging signs.

An organization called University Centers for Rational Alternatives (UCRA) has been organized. The far from right-wing philosopher Sidney Hook of New York University is the national chairman and stated recently that this group of 1200 anti-extremist professors on 200 campuses have organized to fight campus chaos and "to defend academic freedom against extremism." Hook says, "The faculty has been responsible for permitting disruption and violence on campus because up until now they have refused to wield the power of discipline they possess." Professor Miro Todorovich, executive secretary of UCRA says, "We are a non-political organization, and our members cover the full spectrum from left to conservative. What unites us is our opposition to violence and desire to save the university." It is interesting to note here that in 1964, after the faculty at Berkeley refused to condemn the student seizure of Sproul Hall, Dr. Hook predicted American higher education would never be the same again.

Added to this are the prophetic words of Dr. Kramer Rohfleisch, a San Diego State history professor, who last November told the American Association of State Colleges and Universities that "the phrase 'All power to the Faculty' becomes a myth because power once grasped tends to destroy a faculty," and Dr. Rohfleisch warned that "faculty power" can destroy the historic teaching mission of colleges and universities.

There are other breaks in the walls of the intellectual ghettos, and I think there is cause for great hope. However, we have come to the point where reaction is not enough. The times demand action. As a legislator, I pledge to you that I will continue my efforts to "tell it like it is" and work towards those legislative goals which promise help for this deplorable state of affairs. This fall, my committee will hold extensive hearings, and I guarantee you that such items as lifetime tenure, hiring and firing, are high on the agenda for investigation. And I don't consider the interest of the legislature either political interference or punitive. Administrative and faculty irresponsibility have forced us into the picture.

To you as citizens, I offer the challenge of involving yourselves in this problem, and I ask your support. Understand the limits of what I can do and realize I'm trying within the system. Sometimes I think that if I get another letter that says "all it take is to throw the bad guys off the campus," I'll head for the moon myself. You here can help by backing those elected and appointed officials, whose efforts you approve, with understanding, and if solutions seem slow, remember Sacramento is full of people pulling in other directions. You can keep your feelings known by letters to the Regents, the College Trustees, and administrators and through your support of emerging responsible campus groups and of such organizations as "Citizens to End Campus Anarchy" headquartered in La Jolla and chairmaned by Vice Admiral Albert Jarrell, and you can realize that every small step takes a Titanic effort. In the end, I think we can bring about a much more healthy climate on the campus. But this is not all that is needed.

Consequently, and in conclusion, I call upon these members of the faculty whose souls are not so calloused that they fail to see the problem. We are told repeatedly that fine people compose the great silent majority. While there is still time, these members of the faculties must wake up, put their own house in order, and take back control of their own destinies. The faculty/power combine must be broken. We have the physical capacity for a great modern system of higher education, but if its control is left in the spiritual backwaters where it exists now, we will enter upon another dark age of learning.

As citizens outside the University, we can and should stand up for true academic freedom. However, it can only be saved from within. The faculties which let this situation develop are the only ones who can change it. Let's pray they do!

"THE BRIDGE AT REMAGEN"

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the capture of the Remagen Bridge on the Rhine River in March of 1945, while it was still intact, was most instrumental in bringing World War II to an earlier close, and in saving the lives of many American soldiers. One of my colleagues, KEN HECHLER, was there at the time, and has written a book, entitled "The Bridge at Remagen," which now has been made into a movie. I have requested that anyone involved in the capture, crossing, and holding of this bridge, who now resides in the immediate area of my congressional district, contact me, and I am pleased and proud to present the names, here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of those who have responded to my request:

Arthur P. Bickford, 10762 Holly Drive, Garden Grove, Calif.

George Crocker, Post Office Box 616, Balboa, Calif.

James E. Cumstay, 903 West 17th Street, Space 64, Costa Mesa, Calif.

Sidney F. Dunn, colonel, U.S.A., retired, 4379 Highland Drive, Carlsbad, Calif.

William E. Elliott, 1005 Bonita Drive, Encinitas, Calif.

Walton T. Farrar, 900 Sandcastle Drive, Corona Del Mar, Calif.

William J. Fucik, 1503 Clay Street, Newport Beach.

John F. Pullo, Jr., 25172 Vespucci Road, Laguna Hills, Calif.

George O. Short, 32841 Coronation Drive, South Laguna, Calif.

Ralph Siegers, Post Office Box 429, Corona Del Mar, Calif.

Joseph P. Veach, 2773 Albatross Drive, Costa Mesa, Calif.

CHANGE OF COMMAND

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a change of command occurred last week in the U.S. Air Force in the retirement of Gen. John P. McConnell and the promotion to Chief of Staff U.S. Air Force Gen. John D. Ryan. General Ryan was an outstanding member of the West Point football team in his college years and as he becomes the seventh commander of the U.S. Air Force his scoring know-how was perhaps never more needed. No man, at least not since Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg was Chief of Staff, has faced a tour as leader of the global USAF with more serious or complex problems to solve. On the gridiron, General Ryan won laurels for doing his best when under pressure. In this respect, he has not changed in the years since West Point.

I believe because of General Ryan's outstanding record in the military service to his country, the article which appeared in the Air Force Journal of August 1969 to be of special interest for insertion in the RECORD:

GEN. JOHN D. RYAN—NEW CHIEF OF STAFF TAKES OVER

(By Claude Witze)

Senior Editor, Air Force/Space Digest

"Ryan of Army" now is Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

In 1938, according to *The Howitzer*, West Point's yearbook, Jack Ryan was known to football buffs as one of the outstanding players from the Military Academy on the bank of the Hudson River. The fans who remember those days say he was always ready in the clinch. He recovered the fumble that turned the score, caught the pass that set up a touchdown, or kicked the extra point that broke the tie. In the tough games, against Notre Dame and Navy, he was a sixty-minute man. At his best under pressure, he always played as part of the team, often for the duration.

Things have not changed. Gen. John D. Ryan, as the seventh USAF Chief of Staff, replacing Gen. John P. McConnell, is sure to find out what makes things run. A few years back, when he was Director of Materiel for the Strategic Air Command, he had a reputation for getting into the nitty-gritty details of the job. It was a trait that sticks with him. In those days, he would question the sergeant in charge of maintenance about how he did his job and would personally probe into the problems that beset the units in the field.

In the Head Shed, where he now sits, General Ryan says there is no substitute for performance, and he is determined to improve USAF management at all levels. That goes for the sergeant, every man below him, and every man above. At the top, General Ryan feels that today's atmosphere demands that USAF must justify each of its programs in greater detail than in the past. He is prepared to do this before Congress.

General Ryan was born in Cherokee, Iowa, on December 10, 1915. The son of E. T. Ryan and Mabel C. Ryan, he graduated from the local high school and spent two years at Cherokee Junior College before entering West Point, where he was a member of the class of 1938. He completed pilot training at Randolph and Kelly Fields in 1939, the year Hitler invaded Poland.

The first few years were spent as an instructor at Kelly, followed by a stint as Director of Training at Midland Army Air Field, Tex. Here General Ryan helped set up an advanced bombardier training school. Next, he was operations officer for the Second Air Force at Colorado Springs until his transfer to Italy in early 1944. There, he commanded the 2d Bombardment Group and then became operations officer for the 5th Bombardment Wing, Fifteenth Air Force. General Ryan flew fifty-eight missions in B-17 bombers and was awarded the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Purple Heart. He held the rank of colonel when the war was over, and is the first USAF Chief of Staff to become a general officer in his postwar career. He was given the temporary rank of brigadier general in 1952.

After the war, General Ryan advanced from a SAC wing, where he took part in the Bikini atomic weapons tests and later became a commander, to division commander, then SAC Director of Materiel, and to command of the Sixteenth and Second Air Forces. After a tour as Inspector General of the USAF, he returned to SAC as Vice Commander and replaced Gen. Thomas Power as SAC Commander in Chief in December 1964. From this post, he became Commander in Chief, Pacific Air Forces, and then USAF's Vice Chief of Staff, a job he has held since last August.

General Ryan is characteristically reticent about discussing his career and his outlook as he assumes the top command. Looking elsewhere, it is possible to find these illuminating observations:

A former SAC wing and division commander: "After his first visit to a wing, every commander in SAC would realize that General Ryan knew more about the details of our operations than we did ourselves. This had a salutary effect all down the line."

A materiel officer: "He's probably the best materiel man in the Air Force. His detailed knowledge of Air Force problems is astounding."

A PACAF officer: "When General Ryan came to PACAF after many years in SAC, some of us wondered. After sixty days on the job, no one questioned his knowledge of tactical air. Most of us began to learn from him."

A staff officer: "The most thorough and intellectually honest man I know. He simply doesn't understand—and won't tolerate—dishonesty, deception, or hedging. If you make a mistake, don't try to cover up or make excuses. That's not his way of doing business. Admit you goofed, learn from it, and don't repeat."

A former executive officer: "General Ryan absorbs and synthesizes information faster than anyone I've worked for before. He has both a passion for facts and respect for theory. He's decisive. You know where he stands and where you stand."

A long-time associate: "He has two lives—the Air Force and his family. He's completely devoted to both. He's mentally and physically tough, but in some ways almost a shy man. His factual bent and superb, self-discipline are tempered by an Irish wit, and the relaxed intensity of a fine athlete."

Probably the most important thing to say about General Ryan's family, on this occasion, is that he has two sons, John Dale, Jr., and Michael Edward, both in Air Force blue. They are twenty-nine and twenty-eight years old, respectively, and graduated together from the Air Force Academy in 1965. Their father, then a four-star general and Commander of SAC, attended the Colorado ceremonies but took no part in them. A SAC officer who was present reports that General Ryan, in mufti, sat with all the other proud fathers of Cadets and shared in the glory as they felt it.

The two sons, now captains, are F-4 pilots based at Holloman AFB, N.M. Both have served in Southeast Asia, flying their F-4 Phantoms from bases in Thailand. They have one sister, Patricia Jo Ryan. Their mother, the former Jo Carolyn Guidera of San Antonio, Tex., is active in distaff side activities in Washington's USAF colony.

General Ryan assumes command of USAF at a time when he faces more internal and external stresses than any Chief of Staff, at least since the time of the late Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg. Fully aware of the problems, the General expresses confidence that USAF will meet the challenge and continue its key role in maintaining the peace.

MORE GUN CONTROL NONSENSE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most balanced and rational gun control editorials yet to appear in a major metropolitan daily was published in the July 30 Washington Evening Star.

Headlined "More Gun Control Nonsense," this editorial labeled "blithering nonsense" the recommendation of the President's Violence Commission—the Johnson Violence Commission—that all America should be required to surrender handguns they own to the Government.

At the same time the editorial correctly identified the most effective potential solution to the commission of crimes with guns:

The establishment of tough, really tough mandatory penalties for criminals who use guns in the commission of a felony such as rape, robbery or burglary.

I insert this editorial in the RECORD as a contribution to a more balanced dialog on gun control:

MORE GUN CONTROL NONSENSE

As an introductory note to this editorial comment, an item in the crime news is worthy of attention. On Monday there were 22 armed robberies in Washington. This brought the July total as of that date to 450, compared to 332 armed robberies in all of July of 1968.

In the face of this a task force of the President's Violence Commission (appointed by President Johnson) comes forward with a wacky recommendation. Its proposal is, except in a very small number of cases, that all Americans should be required to surrender any hand guns they own to the government.

Here is the task force's reasoning: This is the only way in which the United States can break "the vicious circle of Americans arming to protect themselves from other armed Americans." Now what does this really come down to? Even the task force, we suppose, would concede that criminals are not going to surrender their hand guns. So what they are saying is that no homeowner, to cite one example, should be permitted to keep a hand gun in his own house to protect himself, his wife, and his children against the night when some armed criminal might break into his home. Their argument is that home owners "may" seriously overrate firearms as a method of self-defense against crime. The "loaded gun in the home creates more danger than security."

This strikes us as blithering nonsense. How many members of this task force have been awakened in the middle of the night by a scream for help by some member of his family? Probably not one. But thousands of Americans are exposed to this dreadful experience every year. And in such a situation what is an unarmed householder supposed to do against an armed intruder?

The major thrust of this soft-in-the-head report is that the requirement to surrender your hand gun, of which there are an estimated 24 million in the country, would reduce crime. This is absurd, for the criminals are not going to surrender their guns. A better and much more realistic way to deal with this problem will be found in legislation now being considered in Congress.

The intent of this legislation is to provide tough, really tough, mandatory penalties for criminals who use guns in the commission of a felony, such as rape, robbery or burglary. For a first offense the penalty generally favored would be a mandatory jail sentence in Washington, of from one to 10 years. A judge would be forbidden to suspend this sentence or to make it run concurrently with the sentence for the primary offense. In case of a second offense, much stiffer jail sentences are proposed, and they should be written into law.

A similar bill passed the House last year, but was watered down in the Senate before becoming law. The argument then was that mandatory sentences deprive judges of discretion in imposing penalties. And so they would. But in one week at the time the watered-down bill was passed 17 criminals in this city were found guilty of crimes in which guns were used. In six of these cases, the judge imposed suspended sentences, which means that no jail terms were served for using a gun.

So we say let's make the sentences mandatory. And let's not deprive the law-abiding citizen of hand guns in his own home while the criminal element will remain armed to the teeth.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the task of bringing black Americans into the mainstream of American society is urgent. Especially in the urban areas, our black citizens must be given every opportunity to be encouraged and to be aided in their efforts to become full and equal partners in enjoying their rightful share of our growing economy.

Business, after too many years of passivity in its responsibilities to the black citizens of the communities they serve, has begun to respond with meaningful programs. In many cases, businesses are cooperating with Government agencies in programs that afford opportunity to black Americans for education and jobs.

I think this "challenge of change" is exemplified best by a speech given by a young banker on June 11, 1969. J. Lester Blocker is assistant vice president for public affairs of the First Pennsylvania Bank in Philadelphia, Pa. His speech was presented to the Bankers Conference on Urban Problems.

Although Mr. Blocker's talk was directed to the banking community, I believe the significance of his remarks should be recognized by all who are concerned with improving opportunity for black Americans and for improving the racial climate in our Nation today.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Blocker's speech on "The Challenge of Change":

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

It is certain that change must occur at a rate well above our current scale and that bankers across this nation must be an integral part of the change. I hope that each of you will return home with a new perspective . . . a new dimension of understanding of how your bank can "do its own thing" in urban involvement.

The Challenge of change must touch every facet of American life. We must change how we look at other people. We must change how we speak of other people. For years, the term *black* carried the most negative connotations. For us, black no longer means soiled, dirty, wicked, harmful, disgraceful, sad, dismal, sullen, without hope . . . and so forth, as found in Webster's *New World Dictionary*. We are developing positive images of black and such images are being developed by brown people as well. You have to learn to be sensitive about the words you use if you want to communicate with minority people. I believe we should discontinue the use of such terms as non-white. You know what I am talking about: non-white, non-being, non-entity—negative images. A large part of how a man—a people—sees himself is a reflection of the views of others. We must change the verbal expressions we use in referring to other people.

This change of verbal expressions is as much a part of the changes we need as anything I can think of. Until we eliminate the barriers to progress facing the minorities of this nation, the very existence of American Business is threatened by some people who would tear down our systems *just to do something*. If we eliminate the potential ally among the disadvantaged, the poor, the so-called hard-core unemployed, we can still save our nation. If we redefine what America is all about "and then begin to sell America to Americans," we can still save our nation. When over half of a sample survey of American college kids reject capitalism and Democracy, we are in deep trouble. Look at our college campuses today. Most of these kids appear to know little about what's right with America today. In his play *Winterset*, Maxwell Anderson said, "People damn what they don't understand;" so it appears to be with our way of life. We all know our way is not perfect, but look around the world for the perfect system. All Americans need to understand our system as we try to help it change. For those who would destroy our system we must show them as firmly as necessary that we will not see that happen! But we must change to meet the needs of all our people.

You know, as I think about it, we have a lot of work to do here at home. We've spent billions on Radio Free Europe. When did you last hear a little propaganda about patriotism in America! Surely, if we can get the people of this land to respond to some idiot riding around on a white horse in white armor gouging people with a staff . . . we can make America really mean something . . . anything for most Americans. We need to change our ways and then sell America to Americans.

Now . . . we have come to Chicago to exchange ideas, methods and approaches. I believe, in large part, we have made a beginning of the kind of exchange which is necessary if the pace is to be quickened—as surely it must. With all the programs and projects which you can devise or establish, it will all be for naught, unless we do some things as individuals. Frequently, as I travel, I am asked by white Americans, "What Can I Do?" I want to suggest the following things as a beginning for white bankers:

WHAT WHITE BANKERS CAN DO

As responsible, aware, bankers, it is absolutely imperative that you be tuned in to "what's happening" today. First, you will have to realize that your role as a patron for black folks and other minorities is over. A patron is defined as "one who stands to another or others in relations analogous to those of a father." You must now assume the role of a partner, however uncomfortable it may be! The role of a partner assumes rights and responsibilities on both sides. I will not have you doing for me, not after you have done on me and to me for these many years. No, we will do together, for the salvation of our country! We need to redefine America and sell America to Americans.

As I said a minute ago, as I have moved about the country, it's amazing how many white people ask the same question, "What can I do to help?" Well, I am going to attempt to tell you a few things you can do right now:

1. Find a black or brown person whom you consider your equal—highly trained white people should be talking with (not to) highly trained black and brown people. Equals should talk with equals and listen to equals.

2. Use whatever influence you have within your corporate community to see that minority employees are not misused, put in insignificant "show jobs" only! The misuse of employed black men and women is a major cause of black anger and rage today. Tokenism as a beginning can be tolerated only where sincere efforts follow-up immediately to get significant employment changes implemented.

3. Try to relate to the educational crisis facing most black communities. Have company letters sent to black employees urging them to attend P.T.A. and other education related meetings. You should make sure that the education system is trying to relate to the kinds of educational requirements industry and business needs *today*. There are over 3,500,000 drop-outs in the 16–21 age bracket today and, at a time when education is, perhaps, the single most important asset a worker or job applicant can have.

4. Face up to white racism. Your companies have been hiring black "executives" for at least five years. Do you have any black or brown in a decision-making job? Not enough time, huh . . .? How many black and brown people are on the boards of directors of your companies—are members of your social and golf clubs? Well, you asked what could you do . . . now I'm trying to tell you. Has your church, civic group ever discussed the role of the black man in this society?

5. Recognize that the present economic circumstances offer *no* basis for equality:

"A G.N.P. of $890 billion of which black people contribute—at most $46 billion. A personal income of $675 billion of which black people receive—at best—$33 billion!! You don't respect an underproducer . . . and that's what most black people are in this society."

6. Recognize that the future of this nation and cities are inextricably tied together. Get your company involved in thinking about ways it can relate to the inner city, the ghetto areas of your city!

7. Don't be afraid of Black Power! For us, you and I, to ever to be equal, I must have a power base! You have a power base already. Equals can be partners, talking and working together.

8. Work through your church and fraternal organizations to help whites realize that *our futures* are all tied together. If the economic growth of this nation is important to you, it must also become important to black and brown people.

9. Read the history of slavery in America and understand that there *was* nothing good about it! When Frederick Douglass talked about being taken from his mother *before* he was yet 12 months of age, it was not with love that he spoke!!

10. And finally, try to look at life through the eyes of a black man. Brother Malcolm X once said "Look at yourself and decide what you would do if you was in the fix I'm in and then realize that I will do the same thing." That's about where I am!

WHAT BLACK BANKERS CAN DO

I think that black bankers have a few items on their agenda in the days and months ahead:

1. Learn as much as you can about banking. Spend your weekends reading AIB booklets on installment lending, even though you are a personnel man. Get some understanding of commercial lending, if only by reading.

2. Develop all your skills as a banker, so that your market value continues to increase.

3. Try to maintain your ties with the black community as you move up and on. We need positive images of black men and women for our children to see. Sacrifice at least one weekend per month in a direct involvement with "people on the corner."

4. Be sure to tell your senior management "like it is." For years, our fathers had to prostrate themselves for our survival. We will dishonor their names and their memories if we do not stand up for the truth and for justice in our time.

5. Try to encourage your white banker associates to read some black thoughts as part of their *continuing education*.

6. Don't be afraid for your job! If you are producing, "the man" cannot afford to fire you for standing for the truth. Get your own mind and heart in order. Recognize that it is just an accident of fortune that we are where we are today. When over half of the kids in *our* elementary classes have failed to achieve some modicum of success, our achievements must be somewhat accidental. Yes, we are good, but there were others who were good who couldn't hold on long enough.

7. Work hard to stabilize the community in which you live. Your skills are desperately needed in the community. Some people will not appreciate your value, but stay in the battle and win the full support of the community.

8. Recognize that being black will continue to be a disadvantage in your quest for promotion and career development. As I look around the banks in our nation, it is hard to find a black man in a major white bank with any decision-making capacity. But there is a brighter day ahead. Business in other fields is just as bad. Less than 1% of all business executives are black in 1969.

9. Use your experience and any resources available to you to help black people and brown people who want to establish banks. Use your evening hours to look at the interests of the community, if your day-to-day responsibilities prevent day involvement.

10. And finally, keep the faith. I believe that capitalism and democracy can accommodate all Americans who want to be a part of this society. We have the capacity and potential to truly be the greatest country in the world!

The late Langston Hughes wrote a poem entitled "Let America be America." All Americans should read this work some time soon. The hour is late. Black and white must move together . . . now. If we can feed half the world with food they claim they don't want from us, if we can send people to other worlds at a cost of billions of dollars, if we can spend over $50 billion for bombs and things, if we can spend $5 billion for payments to farmers for *not* planting, if we are concerned about saving our nation, we must leave Chicago with a new zeal to get our expertise and resources involved in solving our urban problems. Whether we have even five years is open to question. We must work together, what choice do we have. I might choose to not be together . . . but neither you nor I have a choice. We are both Americans. This is my country too!

Together . . . we can solve this thing. All of us must be willing to share our resources and experiences after we have returned home. You can call me at anytime, if you think I can be helpful. Thank you for coming and I hope that one day soon we can truly sing, arm-in-arm, "My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty."

Keep the Faith!

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

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

STATEMENT CONCERNING GUIDELINES ON SEX DISCRIMINATION

This is my 15th year as Congresswoman from the 17th District of Michigan, in Detroit, representing over 415,000 constituents. For many years I have worked to eliminate the discrimination to which women are subjected. I was one of the principal supporters of the amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit sex discrimination in employment. I was also one of those who repeatedly urged that the Executive Order which prohibits race discrimination in employment by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by Federally assisted construction contractors and subcontractors, should be broadened to also prohibit sex discrimination.

My views and attacks on sex discrimination, whether against women or against men, are well known and have been widely discussed amongst the voters of my District. The fact that I am for fair employment practices has never been a detriment to my career. Large numbers of men have fully supported my views, sometimes more vigorously even than women. Therefore, I speak today, not merely for myself, but to express the views and positions of my constituents, and, I am sure, the many millions of fair minded men and women throughout the country who deplore the continuing forms of sex discrimination which still besmirch the employment practices of our country.

We should set this hearing in its full context. There are nearly 30 million women in the labor force, constituting almost 2 of every 5 workers, and their number is rising steadily. Nine out of 10 women will work some time during their lives. Over 5 million families—one out of 9 households—are headed by women.

The plain and simple fact is that women are an integral part of the work force of this country. As workers, they want to have equal opportunity and a fair chance to do what they are capable of doing, to get fair compensation for their work, and to share in the promise of America. Women work because they need to eat—they need to live.

Unfortunately, women are still subject to many substantial discriminations in their employment and job opportunities in this country. Recent surveys by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Civil Service Commission clearly indicate that most working women remain relegated to lower-level and clerical positions, and are largely excluded from policy-making, managerial and professional positions.

Their earnings are much less than those of men. In 1966, women workers 14 years of age and over, and employed full time year around, had median wages and salaries of $3,973, as compared to $6,848 for men. Negro women are at the bottom of the heap—their unemployment rates are higher than those of white men, white women, and Negro men, and their earnings are least of all. Nearly two-fifths of all families headed by women had family incomes of less than $3,000. Less than one percent of women workers earn $10,000 per year or more, whereas almost 20 times as many men workers have such annual earnings. And almost two-fifths of all women workers in 1967 were mothers of children under 18 years of age. Thus, an employer who refuses to employ these mothers, or employs them at levels below their abilities, frequently condemns to poverty or subsistence level not only these women but also their children.

The Guidelines on Sex Discrimination, on which these hearings are being held, will apply to the vast number of businesses and employers who partake of the Federal dollar. Hence, they can be of tremendous importance in eliminating many of the sex discriminations which impede the full utilization of women workers, and deny them fair compensation for their labor.

Equal job opportunity for women will also be good for business. Women are good and faithful workers. Studies by the Public Health Service for Fiscal Year 1967 show that both men and women lose about 5 days a year for disability—and that includes the time which women take for pregnancy and childbirth. Furthermore, statistics on labor turnover of men and women in the same occupations demonstrate that it is the job and the pay, not the sex, which determines the rate of turnover. Thus, when women have responsible and well-paying jobs, they, like men, do not abandon them because of family responsibilities.

Most of the objections raised by employers and employer associations against full equality of job opportunity for women are largely based on out-moded attitudes toward women which refuse to recognize the realities of 20th Century life and economics. They refuse to recognize that sex discrimination in employment, like discrimination based on race and national origin, is a serious national problem and represents a tragic waste to our national economy. They refuse to recognize that, like it or not, women are in the work force to stay, and therefore the American standard of fair play requires that they receive equality of opportunity and working conditions.

It is significant that in the statements which several large employers and associations of employers previously submitted on these Guidelines, many of them vigorously endorsed the principle of equality without regard to sex. It is sad, however, that several then proceeded to oppose every provision which would give meaning and life to the principle.

At the outset, I want to say that most of the provisions of the proposed Guidelines are excellent. They tackle the problems of sex discrimination in employment in a forthright manner. They seek equal opportunity for women in recruitment, in job advertisements, in work conditions, age requirements, wages and salaries, hours of employment, work facilities, seniority lists, training, retirement age, etc. I endorse these guidelines, subject to some amendments I shall propose to make them more effective. If these Guidelines are complied with, they will undoubtedly help to remove some of the pervasive sex discrimination patterns that have disfigured and undermined the nation's economy.

Particularly I endorse the fact that the proposed Guidelines incorporate and are based on the experience and rulings of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as well as those of the Department of Labor, which have for over 4 years devoted intensive consideration to the problems of sex discrimination in employment. This is the way it ought to be. There should be maximum coordination and similarity of approach by the agencies of government in setting forth the employment policies and practices to be followed by business and industry.

The most important feature of the proposed Guidelines is the affirmative action program which is required under the Executive Order. Government contractors and subcontractors who want to receive public moneys can be required to follow the national policy of no sex discrimination. In this respect, the Guidelines will accomplish what the Equal Pay Act is too limited to do—what the E.E.O.C. now lacks power to do—and what the Attorney General fails to do.

Now I shall discuss the few amendments I propose in order to accomplish the purpose of the Executive Order and to make the Guidelines consistent with principles already enunciated by the E.E.O.C. and the courts under Title VII.

"JUSTIFIABLE OCCUPATIONAL QUALIFICATION" VERSUS "BONA FIDE OCCUPATIONAL QUALIFICATION" (BFOQ)

The proposed Guidelines state that employers may engage in discriminatory practices on the basis of "justifiable occupational qualifications." There is nothing in the Guidelines to indicate that this phrase is intended to cover anything different than the phrase "bona fide occupational qualification" (BFOQ) which is used in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—in the Sex Discrimination Guidelines of the E.E.O.C.—in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967—and in many state anti-discrimination laws. The phrase "BFOQ" has come to have a well-understood meaning, and the use of a different phrase to express the same concept would simply create confusion and be detrimental to employers, employees, and the administrative agencies. I therefore urge that the phrase "justifiable occupational qualification" be changed to read "bona fide occupational qualification."

STATE "PROTECTIVE" LAWS

Several paragraphs of the proposed Guidelines refer to "valid state laws" which impose various types of restrictions on the employment of women—such as the hours they may work, the weights they may lift, and the jobs they may hold. These Guideline paragraphs then indicate that sex discrimination by employers in conformity with such state laws would be acceptable under the Guidelines.

It is a mistake for the Guidelines to say this. The recent court decisions in *Rosenfeld v. Southern Pacific Co.*, ——— F. Supp. ———, and *Richards v. Griffith Rubber Mills*, ——— F. Supp. ———, which invalidated similar state restrictive laws, demonstrate that many—indeed, I believe, virtually all—of the state restrictive laws are invalid because they conflict with Title VII, at least, and I also believe, because they are unconstitutionally invidious discriminations.

Certainly, I support laws to protect the worker from unhealthful or unsafe working conditions, to prevent unfair and inhumane treatment of workers, and to balance the odds between employers and workers, particularly the unorganized workers.

However, as I pointed out on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, "most of the so-called protective legislation has really been to protect men's rights in better paying jobs" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 2, p. 2580). They do not really protect women, but only limit their opportunities for holding or being promoted in many types of jobs. For example, Utah has a law prohibiting women from lifting more than 15 pounds, and several states prohibit women from working more than 8 hours per day. It is ridiculous to allow employers to refuse to hire women for jobs which may involve exceeding these silly limits. The national economy and the working conditions of employees are no longer those of the 1890's. Today's women, with increased education and increased economic independence, are working, and are competently performing, in almost all kinds of jobs.

There is a vast amount of ignorance about this. For example, in February one employers' association filed a statement with your Office concerning these guidelines on Sex Discrimination, in which the association said that "the truck driver occupation has always been male dominated and the law should not upset such tradition by forcing an employer to hire qualified females." This archaic attitude simply disregards, or is unaware, that there are over 8,000 women in this country who are full-time working truck drivers.

In my judgment, every state law which impairs equal employment opportunity and compensation for any qualified woman is invalid. I recognize that it may take some time to obtain judicial rulings on the validity of every state law restricting the employment of women, and this is also recognized in subparagraph (4) of sec. 60–20.3(e). For this reason, you should delete the second sentence of paragraph (e), which appears to imply that state laws prohibiting women from working as barmaids, or more than certain hours, or lifting more than certain weights, are somehow valid. In addition, you should add a sentence to subparagraph (4) to state that sex discrimination issues involving the possibility of a conflict with a state restrictive law should be forwarded to your Washington headquarters. There you can resolve the particular issue in light of the specific facts, including the impairment of equal employment opportunity resulting from the state law, and also assemble the factual information you will need to develop the Federal position on the extent to which the requirement of nondiscrimination has displaced the various state restrictive laws.

SENIORITY LISTS

Subparagraph (6) of section 60–20.3(e) provides that seniority lists should not be based on sex. That is a good provision. However, it then goes on to endorse a triple line system developed in the meatpacking industry, which has "A" jobs (primarily of interest to males); "B" jobs (primarily of interest to females); and "C" jobs (those of interest to both males and females). Although subparagraph (6) states that both men and women should be allowed to try for jobs designated as primarily of interest to the other sex, the effect of this A–B–C system is to set up a system tainted with sex discrimination. Its legality is questionable, and it is difficult to administer. If special problems or marked unfairness would result from the merger of men's and women's seniority lists in a particular company, I suggest that the jobs should be categorized functionally, e.g., those involving "heavy," "moderate" and "light" lifting, with each category open to both men and women according to their desires and qualifications. The E.E.O.C. has recently approved this type of seniority system and I recommend that your Office follow it.

PENSION BENEFITS

Although the proposed Guidelines say there must be no sex discrimination in many specified conditions of employment, including facilities, wages, seniority lines, training, mandatory and optional retirement ages, and other conditions, they do not refer to sex discrimination in a variety of other job-based benefits, such as hospital, accident, and life insurance, pension benefits, etc. I suppose that such omission is because the E.E.O.C. has not yet issued its guidelines on sex discrimination in insurance and pension benefits. Nevertheless, your guidelines should at least contain a statement that the prohibition of sex discrimination in conditions of employment also applies to insurance and pension benefits for employees. The precise details as to how that policy will apply to the various aspects of insurance and pension benefits can be outlined later. (At this point, I express the hope that the E.E.O.C., which has been considering this matter since its hearings of May 1967, will soon issue its guidelines on insurance and pension benefits.)

RETIREMENT AGES

Your proposed guidelines incorporate the EEOC's ruling that the law prohibits sex discrimination in both mandatory and optional retirement ages. I think this is right. It is in accord with the Social Security Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act, both of which specify mandatory and optional retirement ages which are the same for men and for women. However, last year, when various employers sought to rescind that ruling by a rider on the so-called "Christmas tree tax bill" (H.R. 2767, 90th Cong.), the EEOC's General Counsel tried to temper the opposition by proposing a 10-year phasing-out program permitting women within 10 years of retirement after October 13, 1968, to retire at the earlier optional retirement age available under existing pension plans. I think it is too long a period. However, if your office believes that the need for uniformity in EEOC and OFCC guidelines requires some phasing-out period, then I hope that both EEOC and OFCC will try, after these guidelines are adopted, to work out a compromise to permit earlier voluntary retirement by those women who could retire within, let's say, five years after October 13, 1968.

COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORTS

The second sentence of Section 60–20.8, which deals with compliance review reports, states that the Compliance Officer shall not discuss with the employer any possible violations of Federal laws prohibiting sex discrimination. Perhaps the purpose here is to leave such violations to be handled by other agencies, such as the EEOC. However, a simple discussion with the employer might quickly eliminate a sex discrimination situation. Therefore, I suggest that the second sentence of this section be deleted.

I hope that you will resist the importunities of those who, while giving lip service to the principle of nondiscrimination, would undermine it by gutting the specifics of the guidelines. I hope you will also not be diverted by the straw-man arguments of industry representatives who are confusing sex discrimination with job qualifications or job requirements. For example, one airline filed a statement arguing it doesn't want to recruit women for jobs as pilots because most of its classes are "filled by pilots with many hours of jet flying experience." Since I fly almost every week between Washington and my district in Detroit, I want the best pilots to fly my plane. If a woman hasn't got the qualifications, including the "many hours of jet flying experience" mentioned by that airline, I don't want her to pilot my plane. But if she is qualified in every respect, I will feel just as safe in a plane piloted by a woman as in one piloted by an equally qualified man.

One employers association conjured up the fear that under the recruitment provision employers of architects will have to recruit them at women's colleges which have no architectural courses. That is ridiculous. Of course you don't recruit architects where there aren't any. Similarly, there is no merit in the objection that the provision concerning part-time work will require employers to redesign their work shifts and work hours. That provision merely asks employers to examine carefully their work needs, and suggests that such examination might enable them to more fully utilize the important labor source of part-time workers and thus increase both the employers' profits and the job opportunities of women who are more often in the part-time labor market than men. That guideline certainly doesn't compel the employer to adopt hours or practices contrary to his work needs and profit objectives.

The Federal Government has been woefully slow in ending sex discrimination in employment. Even though Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 clearly stated the nation's policy, it took another 3 years before Executive Order 11375 of October 1967 added the word "sex" to the Executive Orders which since 1941 have prohibited discrimination in employment by those who get the benefits of Federal Government contracts. Even then, its effective date was deferred for another year—to October 13, 1968. Since then, almost another year has elapsed, and we are only now having hearings on these sex discrimination guidelines.

How long—how long—must American women wait for fairness and justice to them as breadwinners? How long—how long—must business and industry, which are getting Federal money derived from taxes paid by women as well as men, be allowed to perpetuate discriminatory job practices that not only harm both women workers and the nation's economy, but also inevitably result in less efficient and more wasteful use of our national labor resources, and consequently higher costs to both industry and government?

These guidelines are long overdue. I urge that they be adopted promptly, with only such amendments as will strengthen—not weaken—their ability to accomplish the objective of full and equal job opportunity without regard to sex.

Thank you for listening to me.

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
Member of Congress,
17th District of Michigan.

PROF. PAUL TAYLOR GIVES FOREWARNING TO THE VOTERS OF TEXAS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul S. Taylor of the University of California at Berkeley has published an article in the July 18, 1969, issue of the Texas Observer warning Texas voters of the consequences of passage of constitutional amendment proposal 2, providing for a massive State water project. I commend this article to the people of Texas and to anyone interested in large-scale State water projects:

VOTERS OF TEXAS: LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP

(NOTE.—In a couple of weeks Texas will make a decision about water that California made several years ago. In 1960 Californians committed themselves in a public election to pay for a state water program, despite the availability of an interest-free federal water program. From California's experience, it is not too late for Texans to learn—much as a member of a family watches his brother make a mistake and learns.

(The Texas and California situations are strikingly similar in other respects. There is a surplus of water in East Texas and a shortage of it in West and South Texas. In California, there is an abundance of water in the north; in the south the state is a desert. The water plans in both states simply move the surplus water to the dry areas.

(California's politics, too, have become increasingly like the politics of Texas. In both states big business interests control the Legislature and the major cities and agribusiness is squeezing the smaller farmers off the land. The California water plan was conceived in the midst of a fight over the abolition of the federal law which limits the land that may be watered by federally funded projects to 160 acres per person, and the champions of the Texas water plan have declared this same purpose—the abolition of the water sharing law in the "state water program."

(The Californian who best understands this subject from the viewpoint of the public interest is undoubtedly Paul S. Taylor, professor emeritus of economics at the University of California at Berkeley. He was consultant to the office of the secretary of interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, successively, during the Democrats' period in Washington between 1943 and 1952. It was his knowledge which powered the battle in the U.S. Senate in 1959 by which Sens. Paul Douglas and Wayne Morse prevented the 160-acre law from being abandoned in the California water program. Professor Taylor has written many articles on the 160-acre law and the California water plan for law journals and scholarly periodicals and has testified at many congressional hearings on these subjects. He wrote the following explanation of the California water plan especially for The Texas Observer.)

BERKELEY, CALIF.—On August 5 Texas voters will decide at the polls whether to approve or disapprove a $3.5 billion state water project bond issue. Before marking their ballots it may be worth their while to examine California's nine-year experience with a similar state water project and bond issue. A water project can cost a lot of money and be a big undertaking for a state, even for states as wealthy as Texas and California. California's voters and taxpayers are finding out that the cost of their project is a whole lot more than they were led to expect when they gave it original approval.

Californians narrowly approved a $1.75 billion bond issue to finance a state water project in 1960. The public relations pill that helped it to go down was sugar-coated; everything was made to appear rosy. The argument for the bond issue placed in the hands of every voter assured blandly that "The program will not be a burden on the taxpayer; no new state taxes are involved; the bonds are repaid from the project revenues, through the sale of water and power. In other words, it will pay for itself." (The underscoring was in the voters' guide.) The taxpayer, it was made to appear, would feel nothing.

Although the project would take northern California water and deliver it to southern California, the argument for made it appear that both regions would gain, and neither would suffer. The south was assured that "The tap will be open, and no amount of political maneuvering can shut it off." The north was assured equally that "the water rights of northern California will remain securely protected." Everybody was assured that the state water project would "nourish tremendous industrial and farm and urban expansion which will develop an ever-growing source of employment and economic propserity." The climax of the argument for the bond issue was an alliterative attraction—"water for people, for progress, for prosperity." Tucked in between arguments were threats that a "no" vote would "slow to a halt" the development of the San Joaquin Valley and "by 1965" begin the "return of [its] cultivated areas to wasteland"; and southern California development "must wholly cease"; northern California would lack "desperately needed flood control."

To be sure, there was also argument against the bond issue. Temperate and analytical in tone, it cautioned that the interest carrying charge on the $1.75 billion bond issue "could impair the credit of the entire state of California." It warned that the state project "fails to insure enough water for the north," that the funds provided might prove insufficient for acknowledged needs, and that "it might very well be less costly" to develop the state's waters in other ways. The 'other' ways were unspecified, but certainly did not exclude the precedent established by two huge federal reclamation projects—Colorado River and Central Valley—of which California already was the beneficiary. An evaluation of the state's water plans by Charles T. Main, Inc. contained the caution—phrased mildly—that "In deciding whether to undertake construction of this project, the state must be prepared to assume the risk that it might not be completely reimbursed during the bond repayment period, which runs to the year 2040." This caution reached the State Department of Water Resources barely five or six weeks prior to the balloting, and its message never really reached the voters.

The California Labor Federation and State Grange, among others, opposed the water project and bond issue, and their efforts held the majority needed for approval of the bond issue to a narrow margin. Perhaps the billboards saying simply that "California Needs Water," and the bare symbol of the drip from a household faucet sufficed to by-pass analysis and debate, and so to carry the day.

Now, nearly nine years later, the truth is emerging to public view. California has been unable to complete the marketing of the $1.75 billion water bond issue. There are no takers, notwithstanding that the full credit of the state stands behind it. On June 18, 1969, the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported under the headline "Bond Snag in Huge Water Project" that "Work on California's huge billion dollar water project may be abruptly halted in September because the state can't find a market for its voter-approved 5% bonds."

When the state water project was 'sold' to the voter in 1960, the interest charge on bonds was estimated at 4%. In June, 1969, State Sen. Gordon Cologne was seeking legal authorization to raise the interest rate on state general obligation bonds to 7%, and to issue "anticipatory notes" at 7% "to meet the immediate financial crisis of the north-south water project."

Awareness of the fiscal defects in the state water plan has been growing for some time. Under the title "There Goes Another $1 Billion, Calif. Water Project Costs Soar Beyond Original Estimate," the *Daily Commercial News* of San Francisco on July 17, 1968, exposed the fact that the original $1.75 billion figure was a very misleading measure of cost. Revenues from tidelands oil, some of these earmarked for building construction for higher education, have been diverted to feed the water project; the budgets of the state college system and the University of California have been sharply cut—the latter by $46 million in a single year; and the programs in mental health and medical care of the poor have been similarly reduced to speed construction of the water project. Proposals are being pressed currently to impose tuition charges upon students in the state university system to offset in part the legislative cuts favoring water development above education.

The validity of assurances given California voters in 1960 that northern water rights would be "securely protected" is now being challenged. The *Daily Commercial News* opened one of its 1968 series of articles on the water project with this assertion: "The blank check the voters handed the California water project by approving the $1.75 billion bond issue in 1960 to upset nature in northern California for the benefit of promoters in the Los Angeles area will go up at least another billion. Project officials have just figured that the cost of diverting water south now stands at $2.78 billion." Apparently to this day nobody has yet carried the news to Californians that in 1958 and 1959 three Califonia Senators and a governor promised Congress (yes, it's printed in the *Congressional Record*) that the people of California will pay $11 billion or more to build the state water project!

This project, says the *Commercial News*, is "not only out of money but it is out of water, the Contra Costa County water agency contends and others declare that contamination of San Francisco Bay and the Delta are certainties with northern California water being exported for the benefit of land developers and others in the Los Angeles area." The damage done to the environment by the state water project evidently is having enough political impact to worry those who may have overlooked this in their preoccupation with other aspects of the state water project. Under the title "The Water Raiders" the *San Francisco Chronicle* editorialized on June 12, 1969: "So the raiders from across the Tehachapi are moaning low about the 'increased influence of so-called environmentalists' in the area of 'water development.' "

Remember how back in 1960 an argument was made against the $1.75 billion bond issue, that "it might very well be less costly" to develop the state's waters in other ways? The argument was not spelled out to the voters, but clearly it was an understatement. One way less costly to Californians is development through federal reclamation. Federal reclamation brings heavy federal subsidies in the form of interest-free money on irrigation benefits. State projects must make up the difference on their own. This simple fact is a primary reason why the proposed California state water project remained in cold storage from the mid-forties until 1960. Cong. (later Sen.) Clair Engle made the point in 1952. The question of building a state project, he said, is "whether it is necessary or wise to cut ourselves completely off from desperately needed interest-free federal funds." The price of doing so would be "the sacrifice of" other state programs "such as schools and roads."

Naturally no attempt was made in the argument for the bonds in 1960 to convince California voters that it was well worth trimming education budgets to get a state project *without* interest-free money, in preference to a federal project *with* interest-free money. The point simply was buried in silence.

What reason, then, is there for a state rather than a federal water project? The main reason is swept under the rug. It is this: federal reclamation law controls monopoly and speculation by limiting water deliveries to 160 acres per individual private landowner. Associate Justice Tom Clark, speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court in 1958, stated the purpose of the 160-acre law clearly: "That benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals. The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large landholdings. Moreover, it prevents the use of the federal reclamation service for speculative purposes." Large landholders wish to escape this limitation.

As far back as May 13, 1944, *Business Week* put its finger on the real reason why giant landowners ultimately might resort to the device of a state water project in California. "If the big landowners in the valley lose out in this . . . fight [to exempt Central Valley Project from the excess lands, or 160-acre provision]," it said, "they have several other proposals to accomplish their end. One of them . . . said to have originated among the big landowners of Fresno County, is for the state of California to take over the Central Valley Project, paying the entire bill. This . . . would side-step the 160-acre limitation."

The meaning of the Supreme Court's phrase "a few individuals with large landholdings," can be clothed with statistics. Government figures have shown 34 landholders owning three-quarters of a million acres in the southern and western San Joaquin Valley, lying largely in the path of the state water project. An estimate of the financial subsidy given to these landholders, along with the public water, can be placed at $1,000 an acre. Naturally a corporate landowner of 79,000 acres resists a ceiling on public subsidy of $160,000, and would prefer one of $79 million, or no ceiling at all. Besides, giant landholders want the incremental land values that the coming of water will add.

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes made this reason for a state water project crystal clear. "It is," he said, "the age-old battle over who is to cash in on the unearned increment in land values created by a public investment. . . . Their principal objective is to avoid . . . the long-established reclamation policy of the Congress which provides for the distribution of the benefits of great irrigation projects among the many and which prevents speculation in lands by the few."

Are the motives behind the Texas state water project and bond issue perhaps the same as those behind the California state water project?

DIRECT FLIGHTS FROM PHILADELPHIA MAKE TRAVEL TO VIRGIN ISLANDS EASIER AND FASTER

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to learn that Pan American World Airways is continuing to expand on its great service to the city of Philadelphia by instituting new daily service from Philadelphia International Airport to San Juan, P.R. and St. Thomas and St. Croix, in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Hoffman, the very capable travel editor of the Philadelphia Inquirer, recently wrote an article on his experiences connected with Pan American's inaugural from Philadelphia to the Virgin Islands and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

DIRECT FLIGHTS FROM PHILADELPHIA MAKE TRAVEL TO VIRGIN ISLANDS EASIER AND FASTER

(By Harry Hoffman)

There's good news for Delaware Valley travelers who contemplate a visit to the Virgin Islands. Pan American World Airways is making the going easier with its recently started direct flights to the islands. A jet leaves every morning at 9:30 a.m. from Philadelphia International Airport. Its route is Washington, San Juan, Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and St. Croix. You get to St. Thomas at 3:45 p.m., at St. Croix at 4:50.

We had the pleasure recently of making the inaugural flight aboard a Boeing 727

Clipper named—appropriately enough—First Edition. Aboard were a number of newspaper, radio, TV and magazine people. It took off from Philadelphia following a relatively short delay and after that it was a breeze.

The takeoff came almost on the 40th anniversary of the first scheduled flight to St. Thomas on Sept. 22, 1929. On that day a Pan Am S-28 amphibian Clipper circled over the island and landed in Charlotte Amalie harbor. At the controls was Charles A. Lindbergh, who two years before had thrilled the world by his "Lone Eagle" flight across the Atlantic from New York to Paris.

FIRST-RATE HOTELS

The Virgins have long been one of our favorite places, and this trip was even more pleasant than most. The weather was perfect, the water in the pools and beaches was just great, the food a few steps above passable and the rum drinks easy to take, especially a pina colada that was like mother's milk.

All the hotels we stayed at or visited were first rate and we can recommend them. They included the Virgin Isle Hilton, Caribbean Beach Hotel, Pineapple Beach Club and Bluebeard's Castle Hotel, on St. Thomas; Caneel Bay Plantation, on St. John, and Saint Croix-by-the-Sea, Estate Carlton and Hotel on the bay in Croix.

The most memorable dinner was at Bluebeard's Castle, where the dining room has a simply magnificent view of St. Thomas' waterfront and the food draws the same encomiums.

The best swimming was at Trunk Bay in St. John's. A beautiful, beautiful beach with the Caribbean Sea lapping in gently and the salt water so buoyant that you just float about in a state of ecstasy.

BUILDING PLANS

Almost as good was the sun and surf at Pineapple Beach, which is operated by Main Liners Mr. and Mrs. James Pepperdine. At present they are undergoing building pangs, with a number of condominiums being erected. Incidentally, all have been sold and were taken practically from the plans.

And let's not forget the 150-foot salt water pool at St. Croix-by-the-Sea. Super!

Our return flight (on a jet called Davy Crockett for some unfathomable reason) left St. Croix at 1:30 P.M. We disembarked at San Juan, had lunch and then piled on to Flight 215 at 5 P.M., arriving in Philadelphia about 8:30. You have to get off at San Juan in order to go through U.S. Customs.

BAN ON PESTICIDES URGED IN CONGRESS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the long and growing line of victims of DDT and other pesticide poisoning is well known to conservationists, scientists, and concerned citizens who have been interested in the hazards of pesticides for many years. The robin, osprey, bald eagle, and Bermuda petrel are just a few such victims.

Scientific evidence that pesticides pose a definite danger to man has come more recently and reports are being read more frequently at medical and scientific conferences indicating for example, that pesticides can cause cancer in mice and mutations in man.

The latest evidence of this kind was presented to the Congress last week when Mr. Jerome Gordon, president of Delphic Systems and Research, told a Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor that pesticides were spreading death among migrant laborers and ought to be banned.

Since this matter is of such importance to the Congress and the American people, I include the following two articles on Mr. Gordon's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BAN ON PESTICIDES URGED IN CONGRESS—RESEARCHER SAYS CHEMICAL IS LINKED TO NERVE GAS

WASHINGTON, August 1.—A private New York researcher asked Congress today to ban pesticides that he said were chemically related to nerve gas and were spreading death and injury among farmer and suburban gardeners.

Jerome Gordon, president of Delphic Systems and Research, Inc., which has Government research contracts, identified the pesticides as organic phosphors, distributed under such trade names as Parathion, Methyl Parathion, Tepp and Malathion.

"Fifty million pounds of a pesticide originally developed in World War II as a German nerve gas are being spread unchecked on America's farms and gardens," Mr. Gordon told the Senate subcommittee on migratory labor.

"The result is that uncounted thousands of the nation's migrant farm workers, farmers and suburban homeowners have been fatally overcome or seriously disabled."

DESCRIBES GAS DERIVATIVES

The pesticides, he said, "are first cousins, chemically, to the nerve agents GB and VX involved in the current chemical and biological warfare controversy."

Mr. Gordon said the nerve gas derivatives, odorless and colorless, were so powerful that "a minute amount, less than .00424 of an ounce, swallowed by a human is fatal in less than five minutes." Even under ideal conditions, he said, cumulative exposure can result in disabling partial paralysis and mental debility.

He testified before the Senate subcommittee on migratory labor that migrant farm workers were the major victims of pesticide poisoning.

"These people are prey to the most unspeakable of occupational health hazards—death through nerve gas asphyxiation—and yet they are unprotected by safety legislation in all states save California," Mr. Gordon said.

EIGHT DEATHS LISTED

"They have no recourse to workmen's compensation medical and income benefits in almost two-thirds of the country. They can't even inspect public records in states where they exist, like California, to ascertain whether existing pesticide rules have been violated."

An Agriculture Department spokesman said its incomplete list of incidents involving organic phosphors showed 15 accidents and eight deaths in 1968 and 1969 because of misuse of Parathion and Methyl Parathion.

Officials said they knew of no documented deaths resulting from "normal" use of these pesticides on crops. Many reported accidents result from aerial drift of spray onto workers, one official said. And in most cases the effects of Parathion can be cured by prompt medical treatment, he said.

Besides a ban on organic phosphors, Mr. Gordon urged Federal subsidies for development of less toxic pesticides, workmen's compensation benefits for farm workers poisoned by pesticides and use of Defense Department research funds for defenses against chemical agents to develop protection for farmers.

Jerome Cohen, a lawyer for the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, said that lacking Government action, farm workers would seek to outlaw use of toxic pesticides in their union contracts.

The union won pesticide restrictions in a contract with California wine grape growers, but negotiations with table grape growers broke down over the issue.

Dr. Samuel Simmons of the Food and Drug Administration's Produce Safety Office said his agency had documented reports of 150 to 200 deaths a year from pesticide poisoning. Injuries are 100 times as great, he said.

GROUP OF PESTICIDES CALLED PERIL TO HUMANS

A private New York researcher told a Senate subcommittee on migratory labor yesterday that pesticides originally developed as a German nerve gas in World War II are spreading death and injury among farm workers and suburban gardeners.

Jerome Gordon, president of Delphic Systems and Research, Inc., which has government research contracts, identified the pesticides as organic phosphors, distributed under such trade names as Parathion, Methyl Parathion, Tepp and Malathion.

The pesticides, he said, "are first cousins, chemically, to the nerve agents GB and VX involved in the current chemical and biological warfare controversy."

Gordon said that cumulative exposure can result in disabling partial paralysis and mental debility. Migrant farm workers, he said, are the major victims of pesticide poisoning.

But Charles C. Johnson Jr., administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said studies indicate that in general workers using pesticides are exposed to relatively small fractions of what is considered toxic dosages.

Dr. Samuel Simmons of the Food and Drug Administration told the senators that 150 to 200 persons may be killed by pesticides each year and an estimated 100 times that number may be injured.

TRIBUTE TO SINFOROSO APARIS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Mr. Sinforoso Aparis of Vallejo, Calif., who, after 44 years of meritorious service to his community and Nation, will soon return to his native homeland with his wife to spend his remaining retirement years.

Mr. Aparis, with his wife Conchita Magracia-Aparis, immigrated to Vallejo from the Philippines in 1925. Enlisting in the U.S. Navy the same year, he served until 1946 when he retired as chief petty officer. Utilizing the provisions of the GI bill of rights, Mr. Aparis graduated from the University of San Carlos at Cebu, Philippines with a bachelor of science degree in education. After teaching high school for over a year in the Philippines, he returned to Vallejo where he was employed as a civilian at Travis Air Force Base until his retirement in 1967. All of Mr. and Mrs. Aparis' four children have served in the U.S. Armed Forces, including their daughter.

Mr. Aparis has been a well-known and highly respected activist in civic and veteran affairs. He has just completed a term as post commander of Manuel C. Quezon Post 603, American Legion. He is a past president of the Filipino Retired Armed Forces and of the Ormoc Fiesta Club of California for 4 years. He is an active member of the Fleet Reserve Association and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. As a member of the Knights of Columbus since 1941, he taught catechism for CCD at St. Vincent Church in Vallejo. Mr. Aparis was one of the organizers and the first membership director of the Filipino-American Political Association (FAPA).

The departure of the Aparises will be a loss to their many friends in California. I wish Mr. Aparis and his wife well and remind them of their promise to vacation periodically in Vallejo.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the attached excerpt from the Vallejo Times-Herald of July 23, 1969, concerning the Aparises in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SINFOROSO APARIS AND WIFE TO RETURN TO PHILIPPINES

Sinforoso Aparis of 837 Fifth Street, who immigrated to Vallejo in 1925, and his wife, Conchita Magracia-Aparis, have announced plans to return to the Philippines in August—"where we will spend the rest of our retirement years in leisure."

Aparis, who is widely known in Vallejo civic and veterans affairs, is the immediate past commander of Manuel Quezon Post No. 603 of the American Legion.

He said his decision to return to his native land culminates many months of planning which includes a decision and that he and Mrs. Aparis will make future vacation trips to Vallejo. They plan to reside in the historic Mactan Hotel in Cebu City.

NAVY VETERAN

Aparis served in the U.S. Navy for 21 years, retiring in 1946. He returned to Cebu in 1947 to attend the University of San Carlos under the G.I. Bill of Rights. After obtaining a Bachelor of Science degree in education, he taught for a while at Western Leyte College. He returned here in the early 1950s and has been a resident of Vallejo since then.

All of Mr. and Mrs. Aparis' four children have served in the United States Armed Forces. Richard, the eldest son, is a U.S. Army veteran and now on the staff of Boeing Aircraft in Seattle, Edward, a former U.S. Army sergeant, works in Honolulu, Bert, a U.S. Air Force sergeant stationed at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines, plans to return to Vallejo and reside in the family's Fifth Street home. Norma, the only daughter, also served in the U.S. Air Force. She now resides in Oklahoma.

EX-BARTENDER

Now 62, Aparis worked as bartender-manager of the old U.S. Naval Cafe on lower Georgia Street following his retirement from the Navy. There he had his first exposure to and knowledge of a Vallejoan's way of life and the growth of the local Filipino population.

He later returned to U.S. Government service as a civilian employe at Travis Air Force Base, retiring from that work in 1967.

As commander of Quezon Post during this Golden Anniversary year of the American Legion, Aparis has participated in numerous civic activities and events—among them the planting of a memorial lemon eucalyptus tree which now towers above the Greater Vallejo Recreations District's administration building on Amador Street.

He recently completed a term as membership director of the Filipino-American Political Association (FAPA), which he helped organize more than a year ago to orient, stimulate and counsel Filipinos on public issues and community affairs.

HARD WORKER

A two-term president of the Filipino Community of Solano County, he led the group of Filipinos who negotiated the purchase of the organization's center at 820 Sonoma Blvd.

Later, with the help of Primitivo Mario, financial secretary, and a handful of others—including Mr. and Mrs. Julian Tobias, Luis Lopez, Librado Largo, Esther Banez, Ben Mariano and Mr. and Mrs. Eligio Aliga—Aparis was able to enlist communitywide support under the leadership of James Coakley, field representative of Rep. Robert L. Leggett, D-Vallejo.

This group completed a successful annual building fund drive and established a pattern for subsequent drives to keep the center open and solvent.

Aparis also served for four years, from 1965 through 1968 as president of the Ormoc City Club of California, which annually sponsors a fiesta reliving the ethnic culture of that Philippine city.

CHURCH WORKER

A member of the Knights of Columbus since 1948, he taught catechism at St. Vincent's Church for the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. He also was vice president of the Filipino-American Catholic Club.

Other veterans organizations in which Aparis, along with his wife has been active are the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Fleet Reserve Association and the Filipino Retired U.S. Armed Forces Association. He is a past president of the latter group.

Manuel L. Quezon Auxiliary Unit No. 603 will honor Mr. and Mrs. Aparis at a civic dinner Aug. 23. Details are to be announced later.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS GIVEN BY MISS ROANN COSTIN, PRESIDENT OF 1969 GIRLS' NATION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding of all programs to teach American youth the meaning of their country and of their Government is found in the Girls' State program. Sponsored and directed by the American Legion Auxiliary, it is held annually in the Nation's Capital, and brings together 100 girls, two girls from each State.

Girls' Nation 1969 was held last week at American University. There were comments in some quarters, made by those who did not know any better, that those in attendance at Girls' Nation were not living up to the high standards that this project has always known.

To prove how wrong these charges were, and to make available to my colleagues one of the finest statements I have ever read on our country and what it means, I include the inaugural address given by the Girls' Nation president, Miss RoAnn Costin:

Many stories have been told of how Benjamin Franklin would always tip his hat when he would pass by a young person on the street. Puzzled by this a friend of Franklin's asked him why. His reply was: "In the youth of today I see the leaders of tomorrow and the fate of our nation. The success of our nation has not occurred by mere chance. It has been secured by a constant and enlightened effort, marked by many sacrifices, and extending over many generations. We cannot continue on a road of improvement unless we continue to learn from the past and look toward the future. It is necessary to keep the former experiences of our country both at home and abroad before us, if we are to have any true understanding of freedom.

If we wish to erect new structures, we must have a definite knowledge of the foundation. If we examine carefully what has been done, we can determine more accurately what we can do. Let us accept the challenge but at the same time let us not fear to challenge the accepted. Because of what America is, and what America has done, a firmer courage and a higher hope must inspire the hearts of our generation.

A love of liberty means the guarding of every resource that makes freedom possible. The task before us is not an easy one. It will be a long and arduous struggle before we reach a fulfillment of our beliefs. But let us start now. No nation, however old or great, escapes the tempest of change. Let us accept this challenge of change. But may the revolution of our generation yield to a true time of peace when man and nation shall share a life that honors the dignity of each and the brotherhood of all.

Earlier this week a young girl challenged America and asked "Are we free?" This is my answer: "This is my country, land that I love. I pledge thee my allegiance, America the bold. For this is my country, to have and to hold."

ADDRESS BY GEN. EARLE G. WHEELER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 26, the Polish American Congress held its 25th anniversary in conjunction with 2-day meeting of that nationwide organization here in Washington.

The main address at the banquet was delivered by Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, USA, Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff. The address was an eloquent historic commentary as related to the realities of today. I was pleased to note the overwhelming response to General Wheeler's address and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEN. EARLE G. WHEELER

My natural habitat, as I suspect you know, is the Pentagon Building across the Potomac River.

That building, and the challenges that face all who work there, add up to a stern taskmaster.

So, when I say to you—as I do now—that it is a pleasure for me to be here with you, I am also confessing to the shortlived happiness that comes to every Pentagon resident when the clear call of duty—plus good company and an excellent dinner—summon him elsewhere.

In 1976, we shall celebrate America's 200th "Birthday".

In 1966, members of this Congress, and Polish patriots around the world, observed the 1000th anniversary of the Polish State.

I believe that this long, and often bitterly difficult, Polish historical experience has given to Americans of Polish descent an understanding of events, particularly of events in Central Europe, which has not been fully grasped by many of our fellow Americans.

In saying this, I am not imprudent enough to attempt to lecture this audience on the history of Poland.

I shall, on the other hand, draw certain lessons from Poland's proud and difficult past—particularly from military operations during World War II—which, to me, clearly illuminate certain strategic dangers and opportunities confronting the United States today.

Before setting forth on this task, I must recall that moment in time when the intertwining of Polish and American fortunes was first impressed upon me.

Just over forty-one years ago, I entered the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

There is at West Point one particular view of the Hudson River—from what is called Trophy Point—which is close to the hearts of all West Pointers. From this vantage point, one can see the River as it turns northward towards Newburgh and Albany beyond. It was at this inspiring spot in July of 1928 that I saw, for the first time, the heroic statues of General Washington and his brilliant Polish Adjutant General Kosciuszko, together in peace over the long years, as they had served together from 1776 through the battle of Yorktown.

My earliest impression, then, of the Polish soldier was deeply favorable. The years since 1928—particularly the World War II years—have strengthened that first impression.

Certainly, in all three wars of this century, Americans of Polish descent have led the way in their bravery and devotion to duty. The roll call of your—and I am happy to add "our"—fighting men, and the honors they have earned, stand in the shadow of no group. I have found particularly inspiring the return to aerial combat in Korea of our top World War II ace, Colonel Francis Gabrewski. By becoming a double ace in Korea, Colonel Gabrewski became the top fighter pilot in American history.

But in a real sense, the important, and often somber, lessons for today's policy makers arise from Poland's national experience in the years before, during, and after the Second World War. Sometimes it seems to me that the only lesson we learn from history is that we don't learn from history.

Following the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia at Munich in 1938, Poland became the unmistakable target of Hitler's Germany. The Soviet Union's role was crucial. For months following Munich, Britain and France sought to draw Russia into a common front against any future Hitlerian design against the European order. Some progress seemed to be achieved when, on the 23d of August 1939, there burst upon the world the announcement of the Non-Aggression Pact between Hitler and Stalin.

Let no one ever forget that it was this cynical agreement—which the Western Democracies lacked the military capacity to challenge effectively—that set into irreversible motion forces which very soon culminated in World War II.

Poland, a nation then of 35,000,000, could have elected not to fight. There was, after all, the mechanized might of 80,000,000 Germans on the Western frontier, and the armed forces of Russia's 175,000,000 people coiled to the East.

But fight Poland did, and, in so doing, became the first country of World War II to stand up and fight to save herself from Hitler's tyranny.

You well know the story. For seventeen days Poland stood up to, and was even beginning to contain, Hitler's powerful thrusts.

On 17 September 1939, however, the full perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin Pact became clear for all to see. Twelve powerful Soviet columns entered Poland from the East. Valor was not enough. The Polish Armed Forces were caught in a gigantic pincer. The sad end soon came.

Now, surely, even the Poles would accept their fate, lay down their arms, and passively await eventual liberation.

It is to the eternal credit of Poles that you and your forebears did no such thing.

By an incredible pattern of unit and individual odysseys, Poles by the thousands took their stand with the Western Allies. Not all made the trip successfully—as the horror of Katyn Forest will always remind us—but soon we in the United States again saw the "White Eagle flying over proud Polish land, sea, and air formations.

Polish fighting men were there in the dark days—the invasion of Norway, the fall of France, the Battle of Britain, and Tobruk. They not only witnessed the turn of the tide; they helped in turning it.

Slowly, but inexorably, defeat turned into victory.

Under the overall command of General Sikorski, Lieutenant General Andres' Second Polish Corps took a central part in the bloody Italian battles of Cassino, Acona, and Bologna.

Other Polish formations battled in Normandy, Belgium, and with great distinction, at Arnheim.

Poised in the Polish homeland, were thousands of Polish patriots ready to join in the liberation of their country. I shall return to this part of your story in a few moments.

Certainly, for friend and foe alike, the record of the Polish Third and Fifth Divisions at Cassino in May of 1944 is, perhaps, the most enduring legacy of Polish wartime valor and combat success.

From 11 to 18 May 1944, these splendid units persisted in the attack and finally achieved a success that had eluded the brave men of all the other allied formations. Cassino, the symbol of an impregnable defense, fell to Polish arms.

One can read today, on the slopes of Point 593, just below "Phantom Ridge", the following poignant words on the Polish War Memorial:

> "We Polish Soldiers,
> For your freedom and ours,
> Have given our Souls to God,
> Our bodies to the Soil of Italy,
> And our hearts to Poland."

If the Battle of Cassino, now twenty-five years in the past, may be viewed as the undying wartime symbol of Polish arms abroad, the August 1944 Warsaw Uprising, from the same vantage point of time, can only be viewed as the timeless symbol of Communist perfidy and callousness.

For nearly five months, Marshal Rokossovsky, the Soviet Commander, resting within artillery range of Warsaw along the Vistula, refused to come to the aid of General Bor's partisans who initiated their brave 63-day struggle at Soviet instigation.

In a very real sense, the post-war Communist regime in Poland came to power over the bodies of 250,000 of their fellow countrymen permitted to be slain in furtherance of Soviet post-war goals.

Those who profess to see little difference between the Communists and free men might do well to contrast the fate of Warsaw in August 1944 with the liberation of Paris in the same month.

I shall not attempt to review for this Congress the events of the past twenty-five years in post-war Poland. You know the record well and follow with deep and compassionate concern the fortunes of the land of your forebears. I shared your sense of outrage at the massacre of the striking workers of Poznan in June 1956—perhaps the clearest guide to the indomitable spirit of Poland which persists despite the postures of the leadership.

As I remarked earlier, I have drawn certain lessons from Poland's proud and bitter past which illuminate some of the strategic dangers and opportunities confronting the United States today.

The first lesson is quite simple.

We must always focus upon Soviet capabilities and not upon the will-of-the-wisp of Soviet intentions.

No one will ever know at what point in time Stalin decided to invade Poland in September 1939—perhaps even Stalin didn't know his own intentions until the moment of perfidy was close at hand. In any event, as the world was soon to see, Stalin chose to exercise the brutal capability he did possess.

Those who choose to believe that this assessment is "ancient history," quite unrelated to today's more hopeful scene, need travel only as far as Prague for a vivid lesson on the brutal nature of Soviet "friendship" today.

The second lesson I draw is related to the first and focuses upon the danger we face.

There are some who have read, at least in part, President Eisenhower's "Farewell Address" of January 1961 in which our late President warned, among other perceptions, against what he termed "The Military-Industrial Complex."

As I have stated on an earlier public occasion, I have read President Eisenhower's January 1961 address in its entirety and I again suggest that, taken as a whole, the address was a wise, prudent, and balanced assessment of the dangers and opportunities confronting the American people at the close of General Eisenhower's eight years as our President. I would urge you all to read President Eisenhower's address if you have not done so.

I have also read, and call to your attention, a message to his fellow citizens delivered by this great American on 5 August 1968. In this short piece entitled, "Communist Danger—Lasting Solutions." President Eisenhower gave us the clearest possible warning of the nature of the opponent we face—a more recent reinforcement of the warning against Communism set forth in his 1961 address.

I now would like to recall pertinent sections from the 1968 message:

"Abroad, in every major sector, we confront a formidable foe—an expansionist tyranny which respects only toughness and strength and still displays little interest in travelling the pathways to peace, with honor and justice.

"Remember, it is not by a tyrant's words, but only by his deeds that we can know him.

"There is nothing particularly new in this. . . . But what is new is a growing disposition among some of us to ignore these aggressive moves, to discount the blatant threats, to seek, in effect, for surface accommodations rather than to insist upon mutual acceptance in practice or principle. This is wishful thinking at its worst.

"Of course, all of us yearn for universal peace with honor and tonight our prayers are both with our representatives in Paris and our brave men in Vietnam. But once we begin to compete over how best to contrive an American retreat in such a struggle—then we are heading for trouble. But I (President Eisenhower) must offer this thought:

"It is one thing to call for a peaceful settlement of this struggle. It is quite another to call for a retreat by America. The latter is the best way I know to stockpile tragedy for our children."

No one could possibly wish more for a durable peace in Vietnam than the person occupying my position.

Early Tuesday morning I returned from a trip to Vietnam which took me again from the DMZ to the Mekong Delta.

I was favorably impressed by the real desire of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam to extend their already wide share of the combat role to permit progressive American redeployments. In consonance with progress in the Paris talks and the level of battlefield violence, we may expect even more "Vietnamization" of the war. All see the need; all agree with it.

I will not, however, forecast when American redeployments can be substantially completed, nor will I forecast the size of any additional redeploying increments over either the short run or long term future.

It cannot be said too often that the land, sea, and air forces we have deployed to Vietnam are the best we have ever fielded. They deserve well of the Republic.

It has been said that the current generation of young Americans is the best generation we have ever produced. If this thought is true, in fact, I suggest that the "best" portion of our "best" generation is represented by the skilled, compassionate, young professionals who serve our country's interests in Vietnam. I am proud to serve in the Armed Forces with them.

As I said earlier, the proud and difficult history of the Polish nation has given to Polish-Americans a more informed view of the real nature of the dangers we face together than is given to others.

In this regard, I have heard, particularly over the past year or so, that our Armed Forces cost a lot of money. As a fellow taxpayer, I quickly agree. They most certainly do.

I need not remind this audience, however, that there are far higher costs we would inevitably have to bear if we choose to dismiss, by decree, the very real strategic threat which exists to our nation and its interests. Make no mistake about this point. While our military expenditures are large, they are brought about by very real forces and events beyond our borders. These dollar costs are not, as some would have our people believe, a form of national self-inflicted wound which causes our undeniably real domestic needs to be ignored in favor of a manipulated view of a non-existent threat to our safety and security.

I deeply appreciate, Mr. Mazewski, this opportunity to meet with the Polish-American Congress during its 25th Anniversary Year. Yours has been a voice of realism and responsibility for more than a quarter of a century. I congratulate you, and through you, the nearly ten million law-abiding Americans of Polish descent in our beloved land who stand up to their country's foes, pay their country's taxes, and offer massive dissent to those who would smother liberty in Poland and elsewhere in the world.

Thank you.

THE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST GOVERNMENT IN AMERICA

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday at historic Jamestown, Va., the 350th anniversary of the first government in America was celebrated.

The Jamestown Foundation under the able chairmanship of the Honorable Lewis A. McMurran of Newport News, Va., sponsored the event which attracted a large crowd of distinguished notables including our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, speaker of the house of delegates, State senators, and members of the house of delegates. President Nixon, unable to attend, expressed his good wishes by letter.

Adding to the historic significance of this occasion was the guest speaker, the Right Honorable Horace King, M.P. and Speaker of the British House of Commons. Speaker King's Jamestown address will be long remembered by his distinguished audience. He spoke eloquent words of history laced with great wisdom and delightful British humor.

I believe his remarks will be interesting to my colleagues and I include them at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DRAFT OF SPEECH OF RT. HON. HORACE KING, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, SPEAKER OF THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS AT JAMESTOWN, VA., AUGUST 2, 1969

It is indeed for me, both as myself and as Speaker of the British House of Commons, an historic and moving day today.

We are inclined in the prosperous and easy world in which we live, to take so much for granted. I flew here speedily and in comfort. The men and women to whom you owe everything faced a sea-voyage under conditions hard to be imagined. When they landed they faced an even greater unknown than the ocean. Before honouring those who survived, let us honour those who all perished . . . One such group vanished entirely but for a single word, Croatan, cut on a tree.

Then came the great and successful adventurers, who landed in Chesapeake Bay in 1607.

In August of that year one wrote in a letter home:

"The adventurers cannot yet be at peace with the natives but have fortified themselves and built a small town which they call Jamestown."

The going was grim. By 1610 only 50 survived out of 500 souls.

Newcomers found "famine in Jamestown." "Every living thing had been eaten and some had fed on snakes or adders." It is even reported that one man ate his dead wife.

These were terrible times . . . in the words of Tom Paine, "the times that try men's souls." Fortunately for history the great leader emerged . . . Captain John Smith.

Smith had to recreate morale, had to fight adversity, famine and disease, but also had to fight against enemies inside the infant colony and back in England. His was indeed a wonderful achievement, including as it did an almost miraculous escape from death at the hands of the Indians. But for his courage and skill—and his endeavours here and at home in England the infant colony at Jamestown might have not taken root.

He rightly boasted that he had given his own small fortune as well as his energies to Virginia and said (I quote):

"In neither of these two countries have I one foot of land nor the very house I builded nor the ground I digged with my own hands."

Wherever on this continent the English language is spoken, his deeds should be recounted and his memory hallowed.

At home Englishmen didn't care much for the infant colony. Indeed in 1614, when the Virginians sent over one of the Council, Dick Martin, himself a former Member of Parliament, to plead their cause before the House of Commons, he got into trouble for pleading too eloquently. And Mr. Speaker was instructed to reprimand him and he was told to sin no more . . . So, after the centuries, comes Mr. Speaker to make atonement to the descendants of Smith, Dick Martin and the rest of the early heroes.

Perhaps the blackest of many black early years was 1623, when a plague followed a massacre and some 300 were left out of 5000.

It is against that background that we turn to Jamestown 1619, July 30, 350 years ago.

The pioneers had brought with them from England—a love of God, a belief in education, and a passionate love of freedom. This latter they were to show through the years and with it enkindle the whole of young America with the ideals of democracy. They at once built a church. And almost at once they tried to set up schools. By 1618 a thousand acres were set aside for a University. And in 1635 one Benjamin Syms bequeathed in his will two acres of land, proceeds from the sale of milk and the increase of eight cows; for free education in Elizabeth City County.

And they built a Parliament House. At first they used the church. Each little group sent two burgesses, two congressmen. They sat in the choir of the Church. They elected a Speaker, the first in the New World, a Clerk, and a Sergeant at Arms, the first in the New World.

350 years later Mr. Speaker from the Old World, salutes on the very spot where they met, your historically illustrious forebears.

They taxed everybody over the age of 16 one pound of tobacco, and this was shared between Mr. Speaker and the other officers. Tobacco is now so expensive in Britain that I am almost tempted to exchange my salary for a few pounds of Virginia tobacco. This first Parliament received a petition for the setting up of a University and College.

They were as cruel as the times, and punished Thomas Garnett, a servant of Captain Powell, to stand four days in the pillory, with his ears nailed to the pillory, for abusing his master.

They met for five days and made immortal history. Soon they drew up what they called the Great Charter.

One of my colleagues in the British Parliament is the Rt. Hon. Duncan Sandys. His ancester, Sir Edwin Sandys, was also a Member of Parliament, and an outspoken Member in the reign of James I. He was largely responsible for the idea of a Parliament for Virginia. The colony had been tyrannically governed, and it was Sandys who on his appointment set up a committee to examine the best form of internal government—and the Jamestown House of Burgesses was the result. And so I bring you warm personal greetings from my friend Duncan Sandys, whose ancestry illustrates the blood bonds that tie together Britain and the Old Dominion.

It was Sir Edwin Sandys too, who suggested a missionary college at Henrico, in answer to the petition for a University.

The King didn't like Parliament, didn't like Virginia and didn't like Sandys. When the time for his re-election came, James forbade it, and said that the Virginia Company was a "seminary for a seditious parliament", that Sandys was his greatest enemy, and he said "Chose the devil if you will, but not Sir Edwin Sandys".

For his support of Virginia and of democracy at home Sandys was persecuted by the King and several times imprisoned.

His noble services to the Colony are some atonement for the less happy services of others.

I see from the records that soon a Parliament House—a House of Burgesses—was built. Then tragically, House after House, four in all, were burnt down . . . the last one about the time that Jamestown was abandoned for Williamsburg.

I refrain from recounting the whole of your political history—one of the great stories in the world's fight for political liberty. It had first to be won inside Virginia. It then had to be won, with the rest of the young American States, from Britain. I am not a little sentimental, and when years ago I first visited Virginia, and came to Jamestown, Williamsburg, Norfolk, and Portsmouth, the British Counsul at Norfolk took me to Yorktown—and we looked at each other with sadness and with resignation.

But I would remind you that in the Revolutionary War the House of Commons was largely on your side. I know that the great Dr. Johnson said, "I am willing to love all mankind—except an American". But great House of Commons Men, among them the mighty orator Burke, spoke as eloquently as did Patrick Henry on behalf of the liberties of the American people.

It is idle to speculate on what might have happened if George III, Shelley's "old, mad, blind, despised King" had not reigned when he did. We went our several ways—and it took a long time before we came back to each other.

But we have come back. The British-American friendship is real. It is based on common sacrifice in two World Wars. We share common cultural and political traditions. Shakespeare and Milton and Churchill are yours—as Lincoln and Jefferson and Eisenhower are ours. The Bible belongs to both of us. We are all and each free to speak, free to choose governments—nationally and locally, federally, state-wise and county-wise. I have often said that in Britain we have a Prime Minister. We also have a Leader of the Opposition, and we pay him a salary for opposing the Government and for trying to destroy it by every means short of violence.

Freedom is the right of the other man to have an opinion that you do not like. This is our kind of world. We would not change it for any other.

When your Parliament was founded, British people were engaged in a century of struggle for freedom. The House of Commons had won some power, was losing it under King James I and had to regain and extend it by a Civil War. It was fortunate that some seeds of the idea of free men governing themselves had reached Virginia before that Civil War began. The same struggle had to be waged in your country and in mine.

My visit is a precious one. Mr. Speaker is 600 years old. When the Commons were first called over 700 years ago they had less power than even your first House of Burgesses. The King and the Barons were all powerful. The Commons hit upon three ideas with which they were to shape over the centuries—political democracy. For many years they met in secret—and once they had voted on a matter the decision became unanimous. And they said, Let us choose one of our number, surround him with all the power and dignity we can. Then when we have made a decision that the Great Ones will not like, Mr. Speaker in full Parliament, will declare it to the King and the Barons. They said, a King may punish some burgesses—he will never dare to touch Mr. Speaker, for Mr. Speaker is the whole House of Commons.

It was a wonderful theory. Nine Speakers were executed in the Middle Ages . . . a sobering thought for this one.

First Mr. Speaker was a tribune of the people. Then for many years he became a King's man, chosen by Parliament but really selected by the King's friends. Then he became a Government appointee—chosen by the Majority Party. Then, for at least the last hundred years, he has become truly a Parliament man as the first Speakers had been. He is chosen by the House itself, often, as I was, unanimously elected. He at once forswears for all time party politics . . . both in the House and in the country.

His powers are tremendous, but politically he has no power at all. Even his casting vote, when such a vote is necessary, is made according to precedent and not by a political decision.

And so, when I bring greetings to you today it is the whole of Parliament that is speaking to you—all the Members of all the Parties—Majority and Minority. And on their behalf I make some reaffirmations.

Freedom is precious. It had to be won by bitter struggle and by countless sacrifices. These are not just words. Every one of us has lost dear ones in the wars of this century.

One such sacrifice was made by a Virginian, the son of a dear friend of mine.

He wrote:

"I'm proud to serve my country. I am proud to wear on the right sleeve of my uniform the patch of an American unit. I'm proud to say that I've helped to defend the freedom that our fathers and forefathers fought and died for. I am proud to say that I was there. Maybe not where the heaviest fighting took place".

Some months later his father wrote:

"Jeff would have been 21 on January 30, at which time it will have been two months since his death. There is still an aching void in our hearts. I suspect it will be always there . . ."

He lies buried in Virginia.

Some time ago I made a State visit to Italy. And there near Anzio Beachhead, I had the sad but proud privilege of visiting the British War Graves Cemetery, and the American Cemetery nearby, both beautifully kept. And there I laid a wreath in honour of the men of your country and of mine who lie buried in Italy that you and I might be free today.

This is not mere sentiment. Freedom is not enough. It is what we do with it that matters.

We must use parliamentary democracy to create an efficient and a prosperous society. This means work—intelligent work. Harnessing the abilities of our youngsters and training scientists, engineers, craftsmen, and providing the host of skilled manpower to match the demands of a technological age. And this in a world where other systems of society—totalitarian in structure, challenge us in every field of human endeavour.

But we seek also to create a *good* society—one in which the strong help the weak, the middle-aged, the very old and the very young. And this again means education—teaching and inspiring our youngsters to give to society as well as to take from it.

I have often said that the Britain I know and love would collapse overnight if it were not for the hundreds and thousands of citizens who give to Britain as well as take from it. That is true of Virginia, of America, of any free country.

All this means finding out leaders of men in every field. Democracy will survive to some extent by the quality of the men and women whom it chooses to lead.

But it depends as much—perhaps in the long run, even more, on the quality of the average citizen. Lincoln said God must have loved the average man. He made so many of them.

When the great Churchill was 80 years old, we Members of Parliament gave him a portrait. The man who presented him with it said, "In the War, Churchill was the British Lion." In his reply Churchill said, "I was not the British Lion. The British people were the Lion. I just happened to be around to give the roar."

I bring you the warm and deep congratulations of the House of Commons on the high achievements of your astronauts, and on the historical event for which it is impossible to find adequate words—the landing on the Moon. We pay tribute, with you, to the courage of your young intrepid space explorers, whose courage matches that of the first settlers at Jamestown. But we also pay tribute to the huge and devoted body of men and women—scientists, mathematicians, precision engineers, whose combined efforts make your space-achievements possible. Those who came first to find Virginia had no such technical assistance.

Mr. Speaker then comes to this historic gathering bearing greetings from one Parliament to another. The founding fathers of the British House of Commons had no conception of the way in which parliamentary democracy would grow, not only in Britain, but throughout the English-speaking world. We have shaped our Parliaments differently. In Britain practically all power has passed to one House, the House of Commons, and the Administration is drawn from Parliament and sits in Parliament. Your own parliamentary structure has taken a different form.

Each country in the world, rightly, shapes its own political institutions. But yours and ours, and Canada and Australia and New Zealand . . . and indeed all countries of the free world, are based on truths which your Constitution holds to be "self-evident".

And deepest of those truths is the worth of the single human person.

Today seven hundred years of parliamentary democracy speaks to 350 years of parliamentary democracy. We have both come a long way. In these last years we have come that way together.

I congratulate you on all that has been achieved, and all that is yet to be.

And in my last words I remind myself, as I remind you, of some brave souls who met one day in a little wooden chapel, chose a Speaker and a Clerk and a Sergeant and set about making a free New World.

May we always remember how many paid so much in sacrifices of limb and life that we might inherit freedom and be worthy of it.

Perhaps I might recall some words spoken here in Virginia by one of the greatest of all Englishmen, Sir Winston Churchill. It was here that he said in 1946—

"In the last years of my life there is a message of which I conceive myself to be the bearer. It is a very simple message that can be understood by the people of both our countries. It is that we should stand together. We should stand together in malice to none in greed for nothing but in defence of those causes which we hold dear, not only for our own benefit but because we believe they mean the honour and the happiness of long generations of men."

"We ought, as I said to the Congress of the United States in a dark hour in 1941, to walk together in majesty and peace . . ."

2500 years ago Pericles, speaking of Greeks as brave as the first Virginians said:

"Heroes have the whole world as their tomb. These take as your model. For it is only the love of honor that never grows old".

SOME FIRST STEPS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has been holding some hearings into the problem of decentralized Federal planning and support activity in the field of teaching and research in science.

One of its recent witnesses was a distinguished constituent of mine, Dr. Franklin Long, of Cornell University. Dr. Long—whose name you may remember from earlier this year—is not only extremely competent in his chosen field, but is also a gracious and thoughtful man, upon whose advice I am often pleased to lean. He is also blessed with a high degree of commonsense, as is exhibited by his remarks to the committee in this instance, and I am pleased under permission granted to share those remarks now with my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY F. A. LONG, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, JULY 28, 1969

I am exceedingly grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee and to discuss the kinds of centralization which may be desirable for federal consideration of programs of teaching and research in science. Before mentioning my general views, I should perhaps tell you enough of my background to let you appreciate from what standpoints I shall be concerned. A first point is that I am a professor of Chemistry. A second is that for several years I have been Vice President for Research and Advanced Studies at Cornell University, and from this vantage point, have been deeply interested in the broad problems which relate to teaching and research of science in universities. I have also been extensively involved with the affairs of a consortium of universities, the one which goes by the name of Associated Universities, Inc. and which operates the Brookhaven National Laboratory for the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Radio Astronomy Observatory for the National Science Foundation. As a consequence of this last I have been concerned with the role of assemblies of universities and with the ways in which they can work with the government in the management of large science facilities.

Let me now turn to the particular subject of this Committee's study and outline in a general way the positions which I hold. First, I believe that the federal government, does need additional centralized arrangements for handling its programs in basic and applied science and therefore commend the Committee's investigations in this area. I shall point to one or two specific areas where I think centralized efforts are needed. At the same time, I am doubtful whether it is yet time to take the full step of setting up either a Department of Science or a major National Institutes of Science. Instead I think the government should move toward greater centralization in this area but do it at a somewhat slower pace, learning as it goes. In supporting these positions, I will discuss a few topics in which there is great federal interest and give you my views and my feelings as to where a more centralized activity could usefully contribute.

1. PROBLEMS OF FEDERAL SUPPORT OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH OF SCIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITIES

It is well known that federal funds have assumed a major role in the support of teaching and research of the natural sciences in the colleges and universities of the United States. This support has principally come to the universities under the Robric Research although small amounts of funds have come for fellowships from the Office of Education. An important point is that this support has come from a number of federal agencies. Several of these, including DOD and HEW, have explicit missions; only the National Science Foundation and perhaps the Office of Education can be thought of as agencies which support the university programs for their own sake.

There is no question but that United States science has grown and flourished under this federal support. At the same time one must admit that there are some awkward aspects, aspects which will continue to concern such Congressional committees as this one. One problem is the occasional awkwardness that comes from having a large fraction of the university effort supported by mission-oriented agenices. There is the danger that the various mission-oriented agencies will not be willing to support all of the important fields of science and there is the danger of undue support of and emphasis on research as compared with teaching. Finally there is the danger of fluctuating support depending upon the needs of the federal agencies.

These comments should not, however, be taken to imply that universities do not want or should not accept research grants from mission-oriented agencies. On the contrary, support from such agencies as HEW, Interior, DOD and Agriculture has been of great consequence to universities and will surely remain so. The role of the university in the national planning and decision-making has been large in the past and I hope and believe it will continue to be so in the future. The problem then is not one of withdrawal but rather of program balance, of program continuity and of integration of the efforts of the various agencies.

A potentially important answer to many of these problems is increasingly to turn the support of university programs of research and teaching over to the National Science Foundation. It is of great significance to basic science that this Foundation has grown and flourished over the past decade. A large share of the credit for this growth must go to your committee and the scientists of the nation are grateful. Because of NSF's unique charge to support all of science, it is of the greatest importance that this agency continue to flourish and grow and I strongly hope that this will be a general federal policy. I have read Dr. Bridges' testimony of last week to this Committee and am glad to be able strongly to second his great emphasis on the special role of NSF.

However, it is hard to be optimistic that the federal situation will, in the near future, change so sharply that the majority of university support will come from NSF. Certainly many of the mission-oriented federal agencies will wish some fraction of their basic research to be done in universities, and I for one hope that this can continue even as NSF grows.

If pluralistic federal support of science in universities does continue, it seems to me that the need for improved coordination at the federal level can only increase. There already exist coordinating mechanisms for the activities of various federal science-oriented agencies, notably the Federal Council for Science and Technology. However, I am not persuaded that this committee has either the time or the capability to take on the large and continuing job of indepth coordination which I think is needed for support of science programs in the universities. One point is that the coordinating entity should assume responsibility for both the research and teaching aspects of federally supported programs. They should also consider the question of the necessary facilities and equipment. They should have responsibility to deal with such questions as commonality in contract writing, in reporting mechanisms, and patent policies, to name only a few items. Without being certain of what shape the coordinating activity might take, I hope this Committee continues to give this a priority in their consideration of centralized activities.

I should note that the National Science Foundation has formal responsibility for this kind of coordination. However this has not been effectively done in the past and I am presently doubtful whether it will be in the future. Hence my belief that some additional mechanism is probably needed.

2. THE PROBLEM OF A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR BASIC AND APPLIED SCIENCE

The research in basic and applied science in the United States is performed by a very large number of institutions that can probably be thought of as falling within three major groups: private industry; the universities; the federal laboratories. Only by considering the activities of these three groups can one properly say that one is considering the national science program. My own belief is that in a very broad sense the ingredients of this national program should be a concern of the federal government.

Furthermore, I believe that if the federal government is to respond to this concern it will need a centralized activity which either does not now exist or exists in too limited a state to be useful. The essential problem is that of program balance and especially of response to new national needs. At any given time, the total national science effort is a mixture of programs, some of which historically relate to the older research institutions and others of which represent a developing response to new problems as they arise in industry or in government or as basic science brings them forth in its own way. Many of the new needs for applied science will arise from new awareness of socially related national problems, pollution and the like. Conceivably the federal government could adopt an almost entirely "stand-offish" attitude and permit the national science program simply to be that which developed by the multiple responses of all of the relevant research groups and agencies. However, even if attempted I doubt whether this would work with applied science. As technology is increasingly needed and applied in our civilization the pressures for new programs and for modifications of ongoing programs will continue to impact on the federal government. There will be vigorous proponents of expanded space exploration programs or of new programs in oceanography or of new studies of the environment. In one way or another the federal government will be forced to respond to these pressures. Even within the field of basic sciences some federal response will be needed, if for no other reason than that the available funds are limited so that the funding of any given expensive basic science effort will necessarily impact on others. Conceivably, the questions of program balance in basic science could be handled by the basic scientists themselves, but historically, this has not happened and there seems to be no reason to think it will. In applied science the combination of national needs and outside pressures will simply not permit any casual abdication of federal responsibility.

Some mechanisms for responding to this problem of program balance already exist. Hearings before Congressional committees respond to some degree. Considerations of the Bureau of the Budget constitute another kind of response. Finally, OST and PSAC both study this problem and make recommendations. The question is whether this set of responses is sufficient. In my judgment it is not. I am persuaded that a more professional, more continuing and more directly responsible analytical and planning procedure is needed. A possible mechanism is the establishment within the federal government of a Planning Bureau for Federal Science Programs, when the word science explicitly includes both basic and applied science. This new Bureau could be sufficiently well funded to permit extensive analysis of ongoing programs as well as of proposed new programs. It should probably be located within the Executive Branch of the government, but it should be charged to be responsive to requests from Congress. It is entirely possible that the correct home for such a group is within the National Science Foundation, but if so, it should be established in such a way so that it carries a separate budget item and is explicitly given a very large degree of autonomy and independence.

I am conscious that an organization of this type contains within it some potential dangers. Unimaginative analysis and planning could work to delay needed new programs and could work toward the preservation of obsolete ones. Pressures from important groups or agencies could distort the analyses. On the other hand these sorts of things need not happen and the potential for positive good is so great that I strongly feel that the overall result would be of immense benefit. It is even possible that the existence of a vigorous group within the government would catalyze the appearance of parallel groups outside the government which could do for this national program something of the same sort that the Brookings Institute has done in the analysis of the impact of federal programs on the national economy. This development would be wholly desirable.

3. PROBLEMS WITHIN THE DIRECT FEDERALLY MANAGED SCIENCE PROGRAMS

The Federal Government itself is a major producer of science. There now exist literally hundreds of in-house federally supported laboratories responsible to a large number of different federal agencies. If one adds to this group, as one should, the large Federal contract laboratories such as the AEC National Laboratories, the total activity is impressive indeed.

The need for such in-house laboratories is obvious enough. The technically oriented agencies require groups of scientists and engineers who can respond directly and rapidly to agency needs. Furthermore, the area of applied science and development particularly calls for strong in-house groups. One can argue that private industry could take over these applied research functions. In actual fact, the very management of industrial R&D contracts virtually requires that there be significant in-house capability within an agency. For these reasons and many others we do have a very substantial federal in-house program of research in applied science.

These in-house laboratories which give strong support to the Federal Agencies also raise some serious problems. There is the problem of keeping these laboratories operating at a high-level efficiency, particularly in classified areas where interactions with outside professional groups are necessarily restricted. More often than not, these laboratories have neither the spur of profit-oriented effectiveness and relevance which goes with laboratories in private industry nor the almost automatic renewing effect which universities receive from the steady flow of new students. Furthermore the missions of the supporting agencies change considerably over time and requirements for new kinds of research build up. Hence the dangers of obsolescence and irrelevance are constantly with the federal laboratories. So also is the danger of undue overlap among the laboratories of the several supporting agencies. Finally there is a tendency, which clearly must be resisted, to establish a new Federal laboratory as a response to each new national need.

Here then is another area where a centralized federal activity can be of immense help. The essential tasks are coordination; integration; mission-analysis; forward planning. Two other tasks are important however. One is development of ways to enhance the interactions of federal laboratories with each other and with universities. A second is to encourage multiple agency use of ongoing laboratories. A fine example of the first is the JILA program whereby the National Bureau of Standards and the Physics Department of the University of Colorado have developed a collaborative, mutually beneficial program. In the second category the broadening of the programs of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory to extend beyond AEC tasks into such fields as desalination and civil defense is wholly admirable and points the way for other federal laboratories. A centralized activity could examine these and similar arrangements, report on their effectiveness and encourage comparable innovative programs in other federal laboratories.

4. MECHANISMS FOR CENTRALIZED FEDERAL CONSIDERATION OF SCIENCE PROGRAMS

As I complete my discussion of this broad topic I am conscious that I have been less than explicit in my considerations of specific organizational changes. This is primarily because the organizational aspects are not areas where I feel very knowledgeable. Furthermore, I am persuaded that there are a number of possible directions which if followed thoughtfully could lead to substantial improvement in the federal response. However, I would be remiss if I did not point out that the one *conceivable* possibility is an expansion and modification of the already existing Office of Science and Technology.

As it now operates OST has neither the size nor perhaps the structure to take on these added centralizing responsibilities. But supposing the following changes were made: (a) OST is permitted to grow in size: (b) provision is made for two or three presidentially appointed deputy directors; (c) arrangements are made for more formal OST participation in the preparation of budgets for science support; (d) provisions for closer and continuing liaison with Congress are established; (e) OST is formally charged by Congress to carry out a number of these federal analysis, planning and coordination functions. Then OST would be capable of making a most substantial contribution.

There is however a concerning aspect to this proposal, a concern which is of sufficient seriousness that, if it cannot be minimized in a modified scheme for OST, then perhaps the whole proposal may not be desirable. The danger is that OST, as currently operated, with a director who is also the President's chief science advisor, and at the same time, chairman of PSAC, is simply too much a direct branch to the White House and too little an independent federal agency for science. Hopefully the modifications which I have been proposing could decouple these affiliations to the point where OST could truly be thought of as an independent federal agency. If not, then there may be serious doubt as to whether this otherwise attractive possibility should be followed.

The committee's own proposed structure of a National Institute of Research and Advanced Studies certainly contains many of the ideas which I have been supporting. I would personally be reluctant to see the full proposal established immediately and full-blown, i.e., establishment of a body which promptly becomes the overseeing body to the National Science Foundation, takes on the operation of national laboratories, etc. On the other hand I can quite imagine that as a first step, a central planning and coordinating federal agency could be established promptly to undertake many of the tasks which the committee itself has discussed and which I have discussed today. It would be wholly appropriate if such a new federal agency were designed to fit comfortably into an ultimate, more ambitious structure such as the one the committee has been considering. Is perhaps one possibility to establish the office envisaged in the committee report of May 1969 entitled "Administrative Staff and planning Office" and modify it to be the first federal unit for overall consideration of these several problems? If this or some similar central body were established it would give the Federal Government the kind of planning and coordinating capability which I believe it needs. If, as time went on, this new arrangement pointed toward the need for a still more centralized effort, perhaps by way of a Department of Science or by way of a group of Science Institutes, the Congress could then take a next step with more confidence and less concern than if it tried to go the whole way now. But the fact remains that some first steps toward a more centralized federal responsibility should be made. In reopening this topic for further serious consideration this committee is doing a service both to the federal government and to the nation's science.

MINIMUM WAGE DOES NOT CURTAIL JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AS CLAIMED BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a number of newspapers have printed editorials this spring regarding allegedly adverse effects of the minimum wage law on youth employment. Each of them has cited as their authority a news release issued by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., on April 29, 1969, reporting a survey of its membership. Mr. President, this survey is biased, contrary to fact, and misleading. In my opinion it is important that the true facts be known on a matter as significant as the effect of the minimum wage on unemployment. I, therefore, want to present the following analysis of this survey for the RECORD.

The conclusions of the NFIB are based upon insufficient statistical data and a series of conjectures and broad assumptions that are without any factual foundation. The NFIB, as a part of a continuous survey, mailed to a selected number of its members a questionnaire which included questions regarding the employment of teenagers in 1966 and at the present time. The findings, according to the federation's own data, are based on answers from 26,331 members, less than 10 percent of the total membership of the organization, who responded during the first quarter of 1969.

What are the characteristics of the members who have so far responded to the NFIB survey? Based on the responses to date—two out of every three businesses were primarily engaged in retail trade or were in a service industry. About seven out of 10 of the respondents had annual gross receipts of under $200,000 and only about one out of seven had receipts in excess of $500,000. Congress very carefully considered the small businessman in enacting the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; and generally only those retail and service enterprises with sales of at least $500,000 annually—$250,000 as of February 1, 1969—were brought under the minimum wage. Therefore, most of the respondents are not even affected by the minimum wage law. Unemployment of youth in such establishments obviously cannot be attributed to the Federal minimum wage.

Even when all of the respondents are taken into account—both those covered and those not covered by the Federal minimum wage law—only 10,532 of the 26,331 respondents, or 40 percent, reported that they had employed teenagers during 1966—a period prior to the changes in the Federal statute. More than half of the 10,532—55 percent—reported no change in the number of teenagers employed in 1966 and in the first quarter of 1969. Of those who reported a decline in the number of teenagers employed, more than 60 percent attributed the decline to factors other than the minimum wage.

The federation's "survey" then proceeds to expand the loss of some 5,213 teenage jobs reported by those employers showing declines to an estimated loss of over 1 million teenage jobs.

In order to arrive at its projected figures, the federation assumed that the 26,331 members who have so far returned completed mailed questionnaires—less than 10 percent of its 264,942 members—were representative of its entire membership. A further assumption was that the membership is representative of the 5 million independent businesses in the United States. Both assumptions are highly questionable.

How do the federation's conclusions compare with the actual facts? The drastic decrease in teenage employment shown by the federation's projections is not supported by recent statistics on the employment of teenagers. During the period from March 1966 through March 1969, the latest date for which such information is available, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the number of employed persons in the 16- to 19-year-age group increased by 538,000. During this same period, the unemployment rate for this age group did not rise as the NFIB news release implied, but instead dropped from 12.9 to 12.7 percent. All of this occurred during a period when, as a result of the postwar "baby boom," the number of young people entering the labor force had been increasing very substantially.

The elimination of employment opportunities in the magnitude projected by the NFIB would have greatly increased the unemployment rate, since the projected number of lost jobs—over 1 million—is almost 40 percent higher than the total number of unemployed teenagers shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The Wall Street Journal criticized the survey techniques of the NFIB in an article on the "Growing Use of Polling To Buttress Ad Claims" published on September 25, 1967. The article deplores the growing use of rigged self-serving surveys for propaganda purposes. The article pointed out that organizations tend to attract members who are in some way different from nonmembers and that the NFIB membership is not a representative sample of the 5 million small businesses in the United States as the organization claims. The article explained how the outcome of a survey can be influenced markedly by such things as the way questions are phrased or by the population segments which are sampled. It might be noted that the NFIB, since its founding in 1943, has consistently lobbied against the passage of any minimum wage rise.

The questionnaire used by the NFIB asked the following questions relating to teenage employment:

Looking back to 1966, did you employ teenagers at that time?

No.

Yes—About how many?

How does your employment of teenagers today compare with 1966?

Same.

More—By how many?

Less—By how many?

(If less) Is this because of:

Lack of teenage job seekers.

A change in your business operations.

The Minimum Wage Law.

Other (please explain).

The introductory statement to the questionnaire was worded in such a manner that the results are bound to be biased. For example, the cover sheet states "Arm your federation with facts that are needed to battle for you at Washington and the State level." A partial listing of the federation's lobbying accomplishments made possible as a result of these special surveys is also included at the beginning of the questionnaire. It is clearly apparent to the respondent that the survey is designed to serve the vested interests of the members and that he should answer the questions with this thought in mind.

There is a great deal of concern in the country today about the problem of teenage unemployment. One of the questions that has been raised by Secretary of Labor Shultz, among others, concerns what effect the minimum wage has on youth unemployment. It seems quite obvious that the conclusions drawn by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., can only serve to obscure the facts. What is needed is an objective study of the subject—such as the one Secretary Shultz has recently directed the Bureau of Labor Statistics to undertake. Only the results of an impartial, statistically valid study will be useful in shaping public policy.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with a sincere hope that timely action by Congress can preserve the unspoiled beauty of the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan, I join again in sponsoring legislation to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. Bills have been pending before Congress for 8 years to achieve this.

A recent article by Virginia Prentice, which appears in the June 1969 Sierra Club Bulletin details how each year that we delay lessens our chance to preserve this area in its natural state.

The article follows:

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES: A NATIONAL LAKESHORE FOR MICHIGAN

(By Virginia Prentice)

Sleeping Bear Dunes came to national attention a decade ago when the Department of the Interior made a survey of the Great Lakes shorelines. That survey termed the Sleeping Bear region, which stretches along the eastern shore of northern Lake Michigan, "one of the outstanding recreation and natural areas on the Great Lakes," and recommended that it be considered for inclusion in the National Park System. Since 1961 this recommendation has been under consideration, but the process of getting legislation through Congress has been painfully slow. These legislative delays have taken their toll in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area. And now time is running out.

What are the Sleeping Bear Dunes, and why are they worth the continued concerned of conservationists and the support of interested congressmen? The area is not isolated or especially extensive. Of the 61,000 acres in the proposed lakeshore, 19,000 are on North and South Manitou Islands. Inland from the shoreline, which lies where Lake Michigan begins to curve eastward to form the top of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, average relief is 200 feet. (The highest elevation is just over 1,000 feet.) The Bear itself is a mound of sand that looks, when viewed from a distance, like the profile of a bear at rest. It is barely two acres in extent and the immediate dunes over which it reigns comprise only 3,000 acres. An additional 1,000 or 2,000 acres of exposed dunes can be found elsewhere in the area for a total of 4,000 to 5,000 acres. There are, then, 56,000 to 57,000 acres of "something else." The "something else" is as diverse as a chaotic glacial heritage could leave it.

Old beach ridges, remnants of a more extensive Lake Michigan, are gentle features that might go unnoticed but for the almost unnatural regularity with which they occur and support a cover of conifers. The swales between the ridges are moist, often boggy, and harbor plant communities that include the skunk cabbage, a number of delicate orchids and the insectivorous sundew and pitcher plant. These beach ridge-swale features are located in what were once large embayments of Lake Michigan or its predecessor. Low dunes have developed between the present shore and the ancient beach ridges and a veritable vegetation profile can be traced from the shore inland. Beachgrass and bunchgrass predominate near the shore; next inland are creeping juniper, bearberry, and wholly beachheather; then, in order, jack pine and health, jack pine with red pine, jack pine with eastern white pine; white pine and hemlock follow; eventually yellow birch and beech-maple forests cover the slopes of the moraines. Behind the old beach ridges remnants of the embayments are in the form of lakes; cedar and tamarack swamps and spruce and leatherleaf bogs have covered low-lying former embayments.

Shorelines between embayments are steep bluffs that rise to elevations of 200 to 400 feet above the lake. They are morainic hills that have been truncated by the erosive power of wind and waves. The face of each bluff is generally barren of vegetation or tinged with the light green of a sparse cover of beach-grass. Extending inland, the bluffs offer a variety of landscapes and ecosystems in accordance wtih their post-glacial genesis and present erosional condition. Sleeping Bear guards one such bluff and presides over the active dune field that has come to symbolize the region. The Bear is a perched dune—perched atop the moraines—and it is a migrating dune as well. As the sand moves on, excavated by the wind, a once buried "ghost" cedar forest is being exhumed. New dunes are constantly forming and may become temporarily stabilized. Grass will sprout, thrive, and hold the sand awhile; perhaps a cottonwood will take root, grow apace with sand accumulation and send up more shoots until an ethereal corpse is created.

Moraines, particularly interlobate moraines such as are found here, are humpy and bumpy with patternless ups and downs, sometimes minute, sometimes immense. They provide countless opportunities for unexpected vistas, surprise hidden ponds, and sudden changes in plant communities. Mixed hardwood forests have developed on those moraines not covered with dunes. Maples and beech predominate, but there are also oaks and other species; they all proclaim their vigor each fall in a most flamboyant panorama of color. In the spring, when sunlight reaches the forest floor unfiltered by a canopy of leaves, wild flowers bloom in profusion.

Thus, old beaches and new beaches, low dunes and perched dunes, moraines, ancient glacial waterways and embayments form the physical complex that is Sleeping Bear. It is a young landscape, geologically, and a fragile one, ecologically. Sterile sands, rugged hills, and poorly drained bottomlands have discouraged intensive agricultural development. Until recent years it has been treated rather gently by civilization. Today, however, the dunes already bear the scars of impending danger.

On Memorial Day 1968 the mouth of the Platte River, which traverses the southern section of the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, was a lovely place to picnic. By Christmas a bulldozed boat-ramp and black-topped parking lot provided the backdrop for a partially completed concrete block motel, gas pumps, and hastily constructed docks. The beach area was littered with debris—the usual beer and motor-oil cans, styrofoam and foil, stray items of clothing, and partially decomposed fish—all left behind at the close of the Coho salmon season. A new and imposing chain link fence prohibited access to the beach.

On the Fourth of July 1968 a short trek from the end of a quiet country road across warm and fragrant puccoon-freckled dunes brought one unexpectedly to the mouth of Otter Creek. Its tranquility, and that of a pair of resident loons, was protected by an ever-shifting bar. By Columbus Day a bulldozer had leveled the dunes from the end of the road to the lake, forming a ramp for launching boats. Puccoons and loons had disappeared.

On Easter 1968 trillium and trout lily were bursting from beneath the last snows of winter in the undisturbed woods at North Bar Lake. By Labor Day the woods had been sliced down the middle by a road forming the spine of a 41-lot subdivision. Today quality homes are going up on what was once a quality natural area.

Population pressures from the two poles of the developing Great Lakes megalopolis, Chicago and Detroit, are noticeable. Prime property all along Lake Michigan's shoreline has been acquired and developed by private interests. In the Sleeping Bear Dunes area alone real estate prices have skyrocketed in less than a year. More and more undeveloped areas have been surveyed for subdivisions and trailer parks. Construction crews and utility lines are moving in and will soon desecrate some of the choicest niches left in the Sleeping Bear region.

Prior to the 1957–58 Department of the Interior survey of the Great Lakes shorelines, Michigan had two state parks and considerable state forest acreage in the area. D. H. Day State Park, established in 1920 as the first park in the present system, consisted of 32 acres. The state has since added almost 2,000 acres to the park including the active dunes that encompass Sleeping Bear. Benzie State Park was established in the Platte embayment area in 1922. Neither park experienced heavy usage through the 1950's. and as late as 1965 all campsites were seldom occupied.

Thus, when legislation was first introduced in Congress by Senator Philip A. Hart in 1961, local residents (both permanent and seasonal) were reluctant to acknowledge the need for protection and organized planning at the federal level. They staunchly clung to the belief that a horde of city-bred transients would invade the area only if the Park Service lured them in with carousels and cotton candy. This attitude was exploited by opponents of the park; it has continued to be a major factor in the lack of local support for a national lakeshore.

Response to attempts by conservationists and legislators to protect the area has been alarmingly slow. But the Coho salmon may have accomplished what lakeshore status proponents have thus far failed to do. In 1965 Coho were planted in streams in the area on an experimental basis. On coming of age in 1967, the Coho returned to these streams to spawn. The size and quantity of these fish far exceeded the most optimistic predictions. Thus, with the salmon runs in 1967 and 1968 came an influx of sportsmen and tourists, the likes of which was previously unimaginable. Changes have been rapid and disruptive. Many different observers, particularly area residents, became concerned individuals overnight.

Bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate in each successive Congress since 1961. Following extensive hearings in 1963, Senator Hart's bill was passed by the Senate, but no action was taken by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The Senate again passed a Sleeping Bear bill in the 89th Congress, and this, in turn, was reported favorably by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee but was never brought to the floor by the Rules Committee. When the 90th Congress convened, Senator Hart again introduced a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill, but the Senate elected to await passage of a bill by the House. Michigan Congressman James G. O'Hara, a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, introduced a bill identical to Senator Hart's and to the one passed by the committee during the previous session. Following passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Amendments in 1968, prospects looked hopeful. House committee hearings were held in July and the committee appeared to be ready to move—then Congress adjourned. The Hart and O'Hara bills, S. 1023 and H.R. 11829 respectively, have been introduced unchanged in this the 91st Congress, again calling for a 61,000-acre lakeshore.

A third and perhaps more extensive bill is expected to be introduced in Congress soon by Michigan Representative Guy Vander Jagt. It is hoped that his bill will resolve some of the objections to earlier bills, among them being the loss of tax base for local units of government. In a position paper circulated last fall on Sleeping Bear, Mr. Vander Jagt suggested the state of Michigan accept fiscal responsibility for some of the tax loss. If such support appears feasible the lakeshore may gain additional support from local governments.

Another objection to earlier bills was the unpopular provision for protection of and payment for private property. The Hart and O'Hara bills contain (hopefully Mr. Vander Jagt's bill will, too) provisions for protection of present property owners within the lakeshore. Upon compliance with zoning standards specified in the bill, owners of improved property are guaranteed protection against condemnation. Thus, property owners are becoming less resistant to the bills as they comprehend their protective implications; the image of a honky-tonk, carnival-type development expected to accompany the arrival of the National Park Service is rapidly disappearing.

Attitudes and resistance to change are more difficult to alter than the provisions of a bill. A "Save Sleeping Bear Dunes Committee" was formed by citizens of Benzie and Leelenau counties early in 1968. After struggling along for many months, it is now receiving much support. Co-chaired by the Benzie County chairmen of the Democratic and Republican parties, this committee's increasing support is assumed to be indicative of changing local attitudes. On both state and federal level there is general agreement that something must be done to save the dunes, and that the "something" must involve federal funding. Lakeshore status is needed immediately so that zoning regulations can be implemented to place—at the very least—a moratorium on construction and development.

THE FARMER IN THE TILL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues who share my concern about the scandal of giant farm subsidy payments I am inserting in today's RECORD a copy of a recent excellent article, "The Farmer in the Till" by Dr. John A. Schnittker, in the August 1969 issue of the Atlantic.

The article was written before the failure of the other body to sustain my amendment placing a $20,000 limit on total farm payments to a single producer. I am sure those of my colleagues who supported that amendment join me in urging our conferees to insist on the House amendment.

But, whether or not we prevail on this issue this year, the Congress still must concern itself with long-term farm legislation. My colleagues will note that Dr. Schnittker recommends in this article a ceiling of $5,000 per crop, thus enabling savings of $500 million or more.

After consultations with Dr. Schnittker and other agricultural experts, this is the position I have taken in a recent statement to the House Agriculture Committee, a copy of which I inserted in the RECORD on July 21, 1969, at page 20190.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider this excellent article.

The article follows:

THE FARMER IN THE TILL

(By John A. Schnittker)

John F. Kennedy is reported to have remarked that he didn't want to hear about agriculture from anyone except John Kenneth Galbraith, and didn't want to hear about it from him either. As President, Lyndon Johnson nursed an incurable longing for the rustic pleasures of the LBJ Ranch, but he avoided farm-policy questions when he could. Public officials are alternately wary and weary of agricultural policy. There is ample reason for both attitudes. Farm voters are notoriously hard to please, and farm-policy debates are seldom stimulating. Yet the need for agricultural policy will not go away simply because frustrated politicians wish it. Advanced technology on the farm assures plenty of food for consumers. It also requires stable prices, and there are far too many farmers to arrange such a result without federal help.

Official lethargy on this score was shattered late in May this year when the House of Representatives, reacting against million-dollar payments to big farms, overwhelmingly approved a ceiling of $20,000 on direct subsidy payments to any farm. This revolt against the old order in farm policy was a replay of a surprising House action in 1968, an action later reversed by the Senate.

Congressional advocates of a farm-payment ceiling have some good things going for them. Farm-program costs, at $4 to $5 billion a year, are high and moving higher. In a careful survey made late in 1968, 85 percent of the farmers favored limiting farm benefits. City people are nearly unanimous in objecting to the big budget drain for farm programs when other priority needs beg for funds. Most important, advocates of farm-program reform in the House of Representatives and the Poor People's Lobby have skillfully contrasted giant federal payments to a few farms with the hand-to-mouth budget granted federal food programs by Southern-dominated Agriculture Committees in both houses of Congress, despite evidence of widespread malnutrition. Congressman Paul Findley (R., Ill.) has reported to the House that the cotton and wheat areas with the largest number of big farm payments were doing least about hunger and malnutrition. Finally, a study prepared last year at the request of President Johnson has destroyed the claim of the agricultural establishment in both political parties that surpluses and economic chaos would inevitably accompany a ceiling on farm benefits. Budget savings of $250 million per year are now anticipated by those who favor payment reform, and the savings could be doubled if the payment ceiling were set at $10,000 instead of the $20,000 that was proposed.

Those members of the Congress who opposed the ceiling on farm benefits claimed that such a plan could not be administered, that it was unworkable and unfair, and that it would not save money. Fortunately for the public, none of this is believed any more, at least not in the House of Representatives.

PARITY, PARITY, PARITY

It helps to know some of the words and symbols, if one is to understand the need for change in farm programs. Parity, price supports, and direct payments are the key words.

Parity has been the battle cry of farmers since the 1920s. Public discussion of farm policy, however, has been clouded by three parity doctrines. Parity in the abstract is hard to argue with; it is essentially a fairness doctrine. The effort to find out what is fair for farmers, however, has spawned two competing statistical measures of farm parity.

Parity prices originated a generation ago out of what seemed to be a sensible notion: that farm-product prices should increase in step with the general price level; this would maintain the farmer's purchasing power. Conceived before the new technology revolutionized farming, the parity-price system has failed to account for recent rapid gains in productivity. If farmers were guaranteed 100 percent parity prices in 1969 (instead of the present 65 to 70 percent of parity), wheat, corn, and cotton prices would increase by about 50 percent. Crop surpluses would be inevitable, and the Agriculture Department budget would soon rival the Defense budget. Clearly, the parity-price doctrine is obsolete, although not quite dead.

Parity income is a more recent standard. Simply put, the parity-income doctrine says that a good farmer investing his capital in an operation large enough to employ him more or less fully should be able to earn as much farming as he would earn operating any other small business. A recent Department of Agriculture study showed that a half million of the biggest farmers producing two thirds of our farm products are meeting this standard, at least on the average if not on every farm every year. Net incomes on the largest farms, thanks partly to big payments, are generally far above parity; rapid land-price escalation as farms are enlarged is a clear sign of this. In contrast, the smallest and poorest two million farms could not earn parity incomes on the farm even if market prices were doubled or tripled.

PRICE SUPPORTS AND PAYMENTS

Farm prices left to themselves are notoriously unstable. Price support programs, begun in 1933, grew out of that fact and out of the general economic depression. The new programs were supposed to raise prices by reducing crop production and by removing surpluses from the market. But neither the farm programs nor pump-priming expenditures in the rest of the economy brought real recovery in the 1930s. World War II did that, pushing farm prices so high that price ceilings and consumer food subsidies were applied. After the war, the farm bloc in Congress succeeded for a time in maintaining the high wartime prices under peacetime conditions, even though agricultural prices around the world were declining as Europe recovered and began producing again. The results were predictable. By the late 1950s high market-price guarantees and half-hearted production control were creating huge surpluses. More than that, farmers were gearing their expectations to high prices and buying their land at inflated values. Thus they were generating their own cost increases to justify future demands for even higher prices. By 1960, every grain- and butter-storage structure in the United States was filled. The annual cost of simply owning and storing the $9 billion farm surplus reached $1 billion in 1961. "How to let go of the bear's tail" became the principal preoccupation of reform-minded farm officials and economists.

The answer was a system of direct payments to farmers in place of high price supports. In the early 1960s, payments became the key instrument of farm-policy reform, cushioning the impact of an abrupt shift from high to lower price guarantees for wheat and cotton, and providing farmers the cash incentives required to reduce acreages and limit farm output. Big farmers, who had profited handsomely from high market-price guarantees in the 1950s, became identified in the 1960s as the recipients of huge government checks. The stage was set for the present struggle to reduce the size of those checks.

Recent developments in farming have also helped to focus public attention on farm-program benefits. When farm programs were introduced in 1933, there were 7 million farms in the United States. A few were huge holdings, but most were small, one-family enterprises. Benefits were geared to production, and so farm aid was spread fairly evenly. By 1968, more than half of those farms had disappeared. Today there are 3 million farms, but 2 million of them are small, part-time, residential, or hobby farms. One million top farmers produce nearly all of the farm products marketed, and they get most of the money spent on farm programs. A new study just published by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, for example, shows that the largest 5 percent of sugarcane and cotton growers get 63 and 41 percent respectively of all the direct benefits from those programs. The largest one percent of cotton growers in California and Mississippi get 25 percent of all the direct federal benefits in those states. Under such circumstances, public concern is certainly understandable.

Clearly, the large payments are not going to the traditional American farm, still typically a one-family enterprise. Instead, they help ensure financial security for such well-heeled enterprises as the J. G. Boswell Company of King's County, California, which collected direct farm payments of $3 million in 1968 and $4.1 million in 1967. The Boswell Company is a multimillion-dollar diversified cotton operation with good connections in Washington. Senators and congressmen are not excluded from farming, nor do they always disqualify themselves when the Congress votes on big farm payments. Family interests of Senator James Eastland of Mississippi (the Eastland Plantation, Inc., and H. C. Eastland) collected payments totaling $142,078 in 1968, down from $189,050 in 1967. In October, 1968, Senator Eastland voted against the payment ceiling which would have to cut the Eastland farm payments to $60,000, or $20,000 on each of three farms. Campbell Farming of Big Horn County, Montana, often cited as the model of a modern wheat-farming operation, got $162,897 in 1968. Garst Farms, run by Roswell Garst, the international seed-corn figure and one-time host in Iowa to Premier Khrushchev, got $70,923 in 1966, but only $45,212 in 1968.

Nearly two and a half million farmers get federal payments, but only 10,000 farmers get over $20,000 per year. Most of the big payments go to cotton farmers in California, Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Arizona. When Congressman Findley placed the names of all recipients of $25,000 or more in the *Congressional Record* this year, the list from the five biggest cotton states filled twenty-one pages. Five leading grain states required only four pages. Concentration of federal payments in a few cotton states makes them really ripe for reform, although sugar and wool, with powerful political support, are also involved.

Late this spring, when the House of Representatives voted a $20,000 ceiling on farm payments, the Majority and Minority Leaders were opposed, as were most committee chairmen. Understandably, the bulk of the opposing votes were from Texas, California, Mississippi, Arkansas, Kansas—the states with the biggest payments. The Senate could vote a ceiling this summer, if urban senators and the leadership take the initiative. If the Senate fails, final action may have to wait until the farm program is reviewed in 1970.

The White House does not seem to have learned anything from President Johnson's 1968 experience in this matter. When the House voted a payment ceiling last year despite intense Administration opposition, President Johnson began to have second thoughts about supporting his own farm bill, which continued the increasingly vulnerable big payments in a year when most budgets were being cut. Official embarrassment mounted after the Poor People's March when the Administration's expected assault on hunger fell before the tax surcharge, the $6 billion budget retrenchment, and higher Vietnam spending. When the Senate-House conferees on the farm bill dropped the payment-limiting amendments, last year's official White House strategy was designed to get the conference report stalled or rejected, so that the entire farm issue would have to be reviewed in 1969. That failed in a parliamentary maneuver designed without the President's knowledge by the Administration's own lobbyists. After that, President Johnson reluctantly signed the farm bill and directed "the Department of Agriculture to study the effect of a payment limitation on programs which require voluntary diversion of productive land."

That study was conducted in the Department of Agriculture and became public after President Johnson left office. Its findings flatly contradicted the principal argument the Administration and farm congressmen had made in recent years: that payment limits would destroy the production-control programs and would lead to new farm surpluses. The study also documented the potential budget savings associated with a payment ceiling. All this, even the potential budget savings, seems to have been lost on the new Administration.

The advocates of unlimited payments are now left without any sensible arguments for their position. Previous opposition to the ceiling rested on the argument that big payments are needed *to prevent too much corn and wheat production*. This spurious claim had a limited validity in the 1961–1964 period of heavy surplus removal, but it has none in 1969 when grain surpluses are down. The Department of Agriculture simply did not know the distribution of payments by size of farm until around 1965. Acting on faulty information, Department officials took an early stand against a payment ceiling, and never found a way to change their position. Now we know that only 2 percent of all feed grains and 4 percent of all wheat would be affected by a $20,000 limit. Even a $5,000 ceiling would not materially affect the stability of the feed-grain economy.

Cotton is more concentrated; one third of the crop is grown on some 5000 big farms (out of more than half a million cotton farms) which would be affected by a $20,000 ceiling. Legislative leaders who had insisted that a payment ceiling would cause a grain *surplus*, now said it would cause a cotton *shortage*, an argument so symmetrical it seemed plausible. Senator Holland said last year that the prospect of lower payments made "it appear very unlikely that such producers could continue to supply the mills with low priced cotton. . . ." This is a proposition that ought to be tested: if American cotton growers cannot compete on even terms in world fiber markets without unconscionably high federal payments, it is not too early to discover it. Major changes in addition to a payment ceiling are required in the cotton program. The most important is to remove a provision of the 1965 act which ingeniously exempted cotton from any future payment ceiling. This must be repealed before the ceiling can be effective for the crop and the areas with most of the huge payments.

WHAT TO DO

No firm principles have emerged to direct the Congress toward a particular maximum level for farm payments. Budget savings are the best guide. By that test the $20,000 ceiling is too generous; the figure should be no higher than $5,000 per crop or $10,000 per farm, in order to save more money. Reduced payments will not undermine farm-price stability as long as top payments are not forced below those levels. Inevitably, the maximum payment level will be set somewhat arbitrarily: a $20,000 limit will save $200 to $300 million a year; a maximum of $5,000 per crop or $10,000 per farm would save $500 million or more. If farms are allowed to split up to circumvent the new policy, however, some of these savings will be lost. This will bear watching; Congress should give the Department of Agriculture firm directions against farm splitting.

These reforms will not silence the sharpest critics of farm programs, who have never accepted the policy of limiting farm production to stabilize prices while anyone anywhere is hungry. So long as the agricultural economy remains inherently unstable, with too many producers to combine effectively to set their own prices the way industrial combines do, the opponents of any farm stabilization effort will probably be disappointed. We need a farm policy as well as a responsive fiscal policy and a compassionate food policy. But a sensible farm policy does not require giant payments.

Farm payments and food programs will inevitably be paired off in the coming debate, although ending big payments will not automatically ensure more food for the poor. The public can't help seeing tragic irony in Congress' tight-fisted approach to hunger, in contrast to its open-handed financing of farm programs. Budget pressures alone ought to encourage the Administration to sense its interest in this matter, if principle does not, although White House help may never materialize, given Mr. Nixon's dependence on the South. Political advantage seems assured for those members who help drive farm-payment reform through the Congress. Big payments lack any legitimacy in real program objectives. It is right, therefore, to end them. Only the most twisted sense of priorities will let us continue to pay millions every year to a few big farms while we procrastinate about ghetto reconstruction, postpone remedial education, close Job Corps Camps, and let poor people starve.

SERMON BY REV. R. W. JABLONOWSKI, JR.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a semon delivered to the worshippers in St. Stephen Presbyterian Church, Fort Worth, Tex., June 29, 1969, by the minister, R. W. Jablonowski, Jr. The message in this sermon is for all Americans and I commend it to your reading:

The sermon follows:

THE SERMON

Fifth Sunday After Epiphany, 29 June 1969.

The Old Testament Lesson: Joshua 1:1–9.

The Epistle Lesson: I Thessalonians 5:12–24.

The Gospel Lesson: St. Matthew 7:21–23.

On this Friday, the Fourth of July, we will, as a nation, celebrate the one hundred ninety-third anniversary of our independence, as decalred by our forebears under conditions far less propitious than those which are ours in our own time. In the progress of the search for freedom, which is the inherent right of every human being who is a child of God—and all human beings are!—there have been many vicissitudes, there have been more disappointments than fulfillments, there have been far greater numbers of denials than those granting to mankind the potential of achieving its true destiny.

Denials of freedom to mankind have been the result of many things, but usually the abscence of freedom has been caused by the fact that folk really do not believe, essentially, in freedom. Too many people want to be, and to ramain, dependent. A great many folk are unwilling to assume the responsibility which is inherent in being a free person, *because a person who is free is responsible for what he is and what he does!* We are always willing to claim our privileges, but we are not always as willing to accept, much less understand, what our claims to privilege mean for us and for all others with whom we come in contact.

In the pericope in which we read the brief statement of Our Lord in *The Gospel* he is speaking to us of the consequences of our Christian freedom. We are able glibly to call upon the name of God whenever we wish buttressing for our opinions, or when we need strength in times of weakness or doubt, or when we desire the attainment of particular goal. But, in times of our prosperity, in our moments of withdrawal from reality, or when we are addicted stubbornly to the rightness of our own opinions, we resent the claims of God upon us as Christians. ". . . many will say to me, 'Lord, . . . did we not prophesy in your name . . ." (Yes, we do!) ". . . and do many mighty works in your name? . . ." (Yes, we even undertake these!) But do we really believe ourselves, as Christian men and women, to be wholly subject to the will of God? Of course, none of us is! *And do we even accept the principle of what it means to be subject to God's sovereignty?*

There are many folks, for example, who cry out for and state they believe wholeheartedly in the rule of justice, but how many of these persons are willing to accept equally the rule of mercy? Large numbers of our citizens speak out on behalf of and say that they believe whole-heartedly in the capitalistic system of economy as best for the human family, but how many of us really believe in the free operation of the market when it affects adversely our economic well-being?

You see, we cannot have it in part; we must either accept all of it or none of it. *Were God to deal with us as we deserve there would be none of us who survives, but he doesn't do this.* He does not treat us as we treat him. He does not seek vengeance and visit retribution upon us, as often we try to do in our dealings with other people. And this is why the judgment of God, ultimately, has to come upon those who will not accept the same principles as being applicable to their dealings with other humans which they accept so readily in God's dealings with them.

These eternal principles apply equally in our national life. The writer of the *Book of Joshua*, in attempting to offer a basis by which the nation of Israel could prosper, by which it could dwell securely within the borders of its land, by which it could expand and become a greater land, proposed that strength and courage are ingredients for the foundation of any successful commonwealth, and, secondly, that they should never become frightened or discouraged in their search for the principles of rectitude, *with the particular admonition to turn neither to the right nor the left* . . . . . in other words, to avoid extremes in any positions.

Now to conditions in our own country. Everybody has suddenly decided, citizen and politician, old and young, that this is a good time to jump on the bandwagon and be against the further dissemination of pornography. My, what a laudable spiritual end! Who in the world ever would be *publicly for* the dissemination of pornography? But what do the adults do in our society? They make a best-seller out of Jacqueline Susann's *The Love Machine*, which is more sheerly pornographic than any of the paperback books under the counters of any newsstand in this town. There is not one vestige of literary merit in anything Jacqueline Susann ever wrote, by her own admission. There is no validity in any adult having anything to say about distribution of pornography who has even read *The Love Machine.*

In the disturbances affecting our country, those on the 'left' now seek the realization of an anarchial situation in which it is supposed that every man "doing his own thing" at his own time "on his own turf" in his own way is a proper way for people to live. *No society can survive this.* Anarchy is intolerable in any situation of interpersonal relationships, no matter how large or how small. The ability of folk to dwell together is dependent always upon their willingness to recognize the rights of others, never seeking to gain an advantage at the expense of another's being deprived of such advantage. *Freedom never means license.* There is no way that any person may claim, etymologically or through any other structure, that the right to be free means the right to act as you please.

Equally detrimental to us are those who would deny the exercise of freedom to all, *and who propose in answer to the excesses of others suppression, repression, denial.* The difficulties arising from the anarchists in our midst are because those of us who do possess the power have been unwilling to extend *to all the citizens of this nation their just rights under law.*

So, this is the negative side. But Christians are not negative, free people are not negative, when they are true to themselves. The positive side is so much greater. Here is a nation, the most powerful, the greatest yet existing on this planet, a nation endowed with tremendous resources of people, in addition to its resources of the material. *And it is the resource of human personality which is our real wealth.* We possess people of competence in every field, people of vision who are able to lead those of us with lesser capacities into greater kinds of fulfillment. This nation which we love is not yet doomed. There is unlimited achievement awaiting us all, if only we believe the principles upon which our commonwealth was founded, and live in accord with these.

What we need is the reawakening within us of *true patriotism*—not the kind which merely drapes itself in the flag, and adds to it "God" and "Mother"—but the kind of patriotism which says that *every human being is deserving of what I have; he has the right to receive all the education his mind can absorb, he has the right to work where he pleases and live where he pleases, he has the right to participate fully in every political decision.* And along with these go the obligations which are commensurate with the claim of these privileges.

It was with these ethics, though often lacking unfairly in application to some, that this nation began its expansion and how it has prospered. It is the only way that it will from this day forward do the same. You see, we are the folk, we in this room, who bear the chief responsibility. We are better educated than the majority, we have a higher standard of living than the majority, we have a heritage of freedom for longer than the majority. *Therefore we have a greater obligation, not a lesser one. No one ever has lesser obligation when he has greater privilege. This is the confusion of people who do not understand the meaning of freedom.*

The Biblical writer sums it up succinctly when he says, *"From those to whom much has been given much is expected."*

DILUTING DEMOCRACY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, last week the Wall Street Journal clearly set down, in one of its editorials, the clear and present damage embedded in a bill sent to the Congress by the Nixon administration in an effort to improve law-enforcement methods. The editorial quite properly concludes with a statement:

If fear of crime is justified, the tendency to let it dilute democracy should be resisted as strenuously as possible.

I submit the column for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1969]

DILUTING DEMOCRACY

Certain provisions of the Nixon Administration's bill to fight crime in the nation's capital, coming soon after the Justice Department's attempts to expand its wiretapping powers, suggest a disturbing conclusion: That the Administration considers the downgrading of traditions designed to protect individual rights a valid weapon against crime.

The most controversial aspect of the proposed new legislation calls for amending the 1966 Bail Reform Act to provide for "preventive detention" of suspects accused of certain violent noncapital crimes. A judge might refuse to release such suspects pending trial if in his opinion they would pose a danger to the community.

The Bail Reform Act, the first major bail reform legislation since 1789, established a couple of basic principles for Federal Courts. A suspect accused of a noncapital offense should be released pending trial, unless authorities believe he might attempt to flee, and his ability to pay a bond should not be a factor in his release. The intent of the act was to rectify the existing situation which often discriminated against indigent suspects who could not raise bail money. Judges were authorized to hold only suspects accused of capital offenses, or convicted suspects awaiting sentencing or appeal because of their potential danger to the community.

Two apparent conditions encourage the Justice Department to press for expanded judicial power to hold untried suspects for "preventive" reasons as well as to insure their trial appearance.

First, in the District of Columbia, where Federal courts deal with crimes handled by state and local courts elsewhere, crimes committed by some suspects released before trial are on the increase—narcotics addicts who turn to robbery to support their habits, for example.

Second, despite the Bail Reform Act, some judges continue to set high bonds for suspects they consider dangerous, even with little reason to believe they might flee to escape trial. The Justice Department thus contends the sanctioning of "preventive detention" might serve the dual purpose of reducing crime in the District and rationalizing the often arbitrary existing situation.

If expanding the preventive detention concept to some lesser crimes in the District of Columbia seems a small step, it involves a major principle. By requiring the judge to make what must amount to a pretrial ruling on a suspect's criminality, it violates the tradition that the accused must be considered innocent until proved guilty. The decision to violate it can only be uncomfortable for a judge conscious of democratic legal traditions. The fact that some judges routinely violate the tradition by setting unsanctioned high bail is hardly an argument for writing the violated tradition into law.

For if the strains created for the police and the courts by the increasing crime rate dramatize the need for more effective law enforcement, they also heighten the need for continued attention to traditions designed to protect individual rights. Overworked police and courts that result in unfair treatment of the guilty may result in unfair treatment of the innocent as well.

Thus a careful distinction should be made between measures to improve the structure and mechanics of the judicial process (also included in the Administration's Washington, D.C., proposals) and those which threaten long protected individual rights.

For the moment, crime may well be reduced more effectively by more policemen, better trained, paid and equipped, and by more courtrooms and judges to insure speedy trials and convictions of the guilty, than by giving the current number of police and judges new powers to violate individual rights to privacy and freedom.

The day may arrive when the threat of crime grows so serious as to require reduced protection of individual freedom for both the law abiding and the criminal, but conditions are not that bad now. As matters stand today, we would feel better if the Justice Department showed a greater sensitivity to the significance of plans to give judges and police questionable new powers. If fear of crime is justified, the tendency to let it dilute democracy should be resisted as strenuously as possible.

FLORIDA CONGRATULATES APOLLO ASTRONAUTS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Florida is justifiably proud that our great State is the launchsite for our space program and as such it was from our State that the first men to walk on the moon were launched.

Speaking for all Floridians, the Governor and State cabinet recently passed a resolution paying tribute to the three brave men who made this historic journey and to all those who have made this, the greatest scientific achievement in the history of man, a reality.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Florida has been the "home base" of this nation's ambitious, historic spaceship launching program for many years; and

Whereas, these Florida shores at Cape Kennedy, originally known as the historic Cape Canaveral, continues to be the focal point for space shots of today as well as yesterday; and

Whereas, Cape Kennedy was the blast-off point for the most ambitious and most historic of all the space shots of all nations in the history of the earth; to wit, the flight of Apollo 11 to the surface of the moon, and

Whereas, three American heroes; Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin and Michael Collins, rocketed off from Florida shores in Apollo 11 into far space on this daring venture which put two of these Americans walking on the surface of the moon; and

Whereas, these United States spacemen now have returned safely to our earth after giving mankind an entire new planet for exploration, and new horizons to seek; and

Whereas, the success of this mission has paved the way for a second moon trip from Cape Kennedy this Fall; and

Whereas, Florida will continue to be the lift-off location for still more enterprising voyages into other areas of the Universe; and

Whereas, this achievement has resulted in a unanimous expression of pride and gratitude from the citizens of Florida;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Governor and Cabinet of the State of Florida, speaking on behalf of the citizens of our State, do hereby express our warmest congratulations and our heartfelt thanks to the crew of the Apollo 11 and to the many hundreds and hundreds of workers and technicians daring venture which put two Americans walking on the surface of the moon; and

Whereas, these United States spacemen now have returned safely to our earth after giving mankind an entire new planet for exploration, and new horizons to seek; and

Whereas, the success of this mission has paved the way for a second moon trip from Cape Kennedy this Fall; and

Whereas, Florida will continue to be the lift-off location for still more enterprising voyages into other areas of the Universe; and

Whereas, this achievement has resulted in a unanimous expression of pride and gratitude from the citizens of Florida;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Governor and Cabinet of the State of Florida, speaking on behalf of the citizens of our State, do hereby express our warmest congratulations and our heartfelt thanks to the crew of the Apollo 11 and to the many hundreds and hundreds of workers and technicians in Florida and elsewhere who have made this unparalleled accomplishment possible, and that we salute them individually and collectively.

Adopted this 29th day of July, 1969, at Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Jr.,
Governor.
TOM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.
FRED O. DICKINSON, Jr.,
Comptroller.
BROWARD WILLIAMS,
Treasurer.
FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN,
Commissioner of Education.
DOYLE CONNER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
EARL FAIRCLOTH,
Attorney General.

IN HAILING HEROES DO NOT FORGET THE MEN WHO LAID THE PATTERN FOR SPACE SUCCESSES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our triumphant feat of putting man on the moon a few days ago is one that staggers the imagination of all of us.

In so doing—and I am one of the proudest of our achievements— I believe it also is important to try if we can to put the pattern of development that led to Apollo 11 into proper perspective.

Where did the space race originate, who were the pioneers? There were many of course, indeed thousands who took part.

A recent article has recalled some of the early figures in the Nation's space effort. The July 28 article as follows is by Nat S. Finney, former Washington bureau chief for the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, who was closely associated with the scientific community during his years in Washington.

The article follows:

FORGOTTEN INDIVIDUALS MARK TRAIL TO MOON

(By Nat S. Finney)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—American industry and technology have beaten Russia to the moon but the feat has left the record of its accomplishment in tatters.

Who remembers now that the origin of space exploration was the International Geophysical Year, or that the conquest of space fell into the same time span as the mastery of intercontinental ballistic missiles in a deadly race with Soviet Union?

Indeed, who remembers that staying ahead of the Russians was what kept Congress pouring on the money?

The bitterness of the internal struggles that marked the sometimes halting progress of the drive to "put a man on the moon" during the 1960s has melted away although some of the leaders who were hurt in those struggles are still around.

DR. GLENNAN ILL

For instance, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, first administrator of the National Aeronautics & Space Agency during the Eisenhower administration, is an ailing and almost forgotten man in the hour of triumph.

Yet it was he who approved the specifications and placed the order for the Saturn-5 booster that supplied the thrust to send Apollo-11 thundering to the moon. It was Dr. Glennan who drew up the initial cost computation. And Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, the father of the International Geophysical Year, who pulled his heart out to get funding for project Vanguard, at the Martin Co. in Baltimore, is dead and apparently forgotten by reporters writing about the triumphs of his ideas.

And President Eisenhower, who sternly watched over the national security while others yakked about how the U.S. had been "sputnik-ed," is not mentioned except as an unperceptive obstructionist.

WEBB WENT AHEAD

There has been little appreciation of the role that Dr. Hugh Dryden, the grandfather of aeronautical research, played in the early days of NASA, when, at the insistence of the scientific community, he was teamed with Dr. Glennan. Dr. Dryden's great savvy about aeronautical research kept NASA out of trouble with visionary schemes.

Perhaps most poignantly, James E. Webb, the diligent and effective public administrator who served three Presidents and who boldly carried the Apollo project to success, is dismissed with a phrase.

This was the man who had the administrative guts to throw an inadequate computer system out of the NASA window and spend $2 billion on the systems that later worked so miraculously.

It was Jim Webb who stood up to Dr. Jerome Wiesner, chief science adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and to Dr. Wherner Von Braun, head of the Marshall Space Flight Center, to back the idea of launching a moon-landing module from a space capsule orbiting the moon.

UNITED STATES CHOSE BETTER

There is the best of reasons to believe that the Soviets went off on the wrong track and tried directly for the moon with their latest Luna, only to crash in futility almost at the moment when the American way was proving out.

This concept of "how to do it" had come from a relatively minor space technologist and was initially scorned by the senior scientists of the project who carried their objections to President Kennedy.

The supreme irony of all this is that James Webb was in effect fired by President Johnson after three astronauts died in an Apollo capsule fire.

Now that the newest astronauts are safely back on earth the effort will be to derive "lessons" from their exploit. Will the small, still voices of those who have kept the true record in mind be heard in reading those lessons.?

As I said earlier there are thousands who could be mentioned, but two Buffalo names which might well have been included in Mr. Finney's excellent commentary are Dr. Walter D. Dornberger, a former associate of Dr. von Braun, and the late Dr. Clifford D. Furnas, one-time head of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, one-time Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, educator, and eminent scientist.

EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENTS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill which would authorize an educational travel allowance for dependents of military personnel serving outside of the United States. The bill would also authorize payment for room and board expenses at Department of Defense dormitory schools and one round trip a year for Department of Defense dependents to go to the United States to obtain an undergraduate college education.

This bill was introduced as H.R. 2082 in the 90th Congress and passed the House on June 29, 1967. It was not acted upon by the Senate. However, by amendment to appropriations before the Senate, provision was made for payment of dormitory costs.

It is my feeling that payment of dormitory costs, as well as transportation costs should be provided for by a specific law so that authorizations and appropriations for such costs can be dealt with in a routine fashion on a permanent basis.

Travel allowances are necessary when there is no suitable school where parents are stationed overseas and dependents must attend the nearest Department of Defense dormitory school. Payment of dormitory costs is necessary. The fortuitous circumstances of the location of a military man's assignment should not deny his children access to a free public education which is available to other military and civilian Government employee dependents stationed abroad. Travel allowances for one trip stateside to attend an undergraduate college is necessary. It is not fair to make access to a college education more difficult for dependents of military stationed overseas than it is for civilian Government personnel also stationed abroad.

Certainly it must be recognized that we are not now dealing fairly with the hundreds of military dependents who are attending the same schools as civilian Government employee dependents. Travel allowances are available to the civilian dependents while military must pay for the transportation of their dependents to and from school.

The Investigating Committee of the General Committee on Labor, chaired by Mr. DENT, while making on the spot investigations of overseas schools saw this problem first hand. The committee had repeated opportunity to see situations where Department of Defense dependents and civilian Government dependents were attending the same school. These children went to the same classes and often shared the same room. However, when it came time to return to their families the civilian Government employee's dependents boarded planes to make their way home while Department of Defense families were left to get their dependents home as best they could, often driving hundreds of miles to pick up their children at school. This situation is detailed in all the reports of the Investigating Committee.

This bill would remedy an inequity by extending the benefits now available to civilian Government employees to those who are serving their country in the armed services.

SERVICEMAN ASKS CIVILIANS FOR SUPPORT OF U.S. EFFORT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each of us in Congress receives many letters from many sources with regard to the war in Vietnam.

There are complaints from those and their families who do not want to serve their country. There are complaints from those who claim the Government is not making an honest effort toward obtaining peace. There are seemingly endless gripes.

The other day I received a letter from a serviceman in Vietnam which gives a different view of the situation than we usually hear. He has been there only 7 months, but he has seen a lot in that short time.

His letter is so interesting that I am including with my remarks the full text word for word exactly as he sent it to me:

JULY 18, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will have to excuse my means of addressing you but under the circumstances I can assure you I am doing my best.

The reason I am writing to you is not to complain about my situation or ridicule the people who seemed it adviseable to send me here. I just wanted to let you know my feelings about todays unrest amoung the youth of America conserning our commintment in Viet Nam.

As far as I am concerned all this dissent and unrest amoung the people of the U.S. is ill found and a little enlightenment for them would change their point of view.

I have been here for 7 mo now, by the way, I am in the infantry, and I have yet to see a civilian killed, or a village bombed or any other of the autrocities these people get word of. The military here goes to all ends to make sure no civilians get hurt. We don't bomb villages or ravage towns.

What we do do is send in PY 50 P teams and medical teams to help these people get back on their feet. They don't want war any more than we do. Nobody wants a war and after 30 some odd years of it, it can get very tireing.

I doubt that these demonstrators know what is really going on over here. If they want to be so opinionated then why don't they come over here and stay for a year? Maybe then they will begin to realize what we are trying to accomplish if we don't stop these people here then you and I both realize, I am sure, that we will eventualy wind up with Communist putting bobby-traps on our own front lawn.

I don't condone war. I hate it. It is ugly and dirty and the worst thing that man can get himself involved in. However, we have been left no alternative but to do what has to be done.

Maybe someday men will be able to live in peace and harmony—maybe. If these people would show some support for us rather than abuse and ridicule it would help us alot. When a G I comes home from here he doesn't expect that, but a man who has fought for his country and gone through the trials and tribulations that we have deserves more than a protest against what he jepordized his life for. Would a welcome home and a job well done be too much for a country to extend to its protector?

I am not a big patriot. As a matter of fact I have a passionate dislike for the Army. However I am not so selfish as to burn my draft card and refuse to fight for what so many good men have died for. I am proud that I am serving here, helping to stop communism as best I can.

I will close now. I just wanted to drop you a line and give you my feelings, of which I am not alone with, so that you won't walk into a session thinking you are alone in your gruesome decisions of war.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our merchant marine is known as our fourth line of defense, and it has performed exemplary service whenever there has been a call to arms. Unfortunately, this important element of our defenses has been allowed to deteriorate and dwindle while the Soviet Union is placing a high priority on the building of their merchant marine. Further details on this subject are to be found in the series of three articles now appearing in the Washington Evening Star, which I commend for reading by Members of Congress. Also, I wish to add that more than a year ago the Labor-Management Committee on Maritime Affairs stated:

There is no dispute that our Merchant Marine is woefully inadequate. We are now carrying—and this is a startling figure—under 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. The United States has dropped to 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. While the world fleet increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by 24.5 percent.

This deplorable condition must be corrected immediately. We must revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. Our national security, as well as our pressing domestic problems, characterized by the balance of payments situation, cry for action now.

The Star article follows:

U.S. MERCHANT FLEET AT LOW EBB

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The nation's once proud merchant marine has fallen on hard times.

Maritime experts agree that unless the Nixon administration establishes a broad ship replacement program, the United States will be down to about one-third of its present thousand-ship merchant fleet in a couple of years.

Many of the Liberty and Victory ships that slid down the ways in a fantastic show of wartime mass production are still around several wars later. Right now, in fact, World War II ships make up almost two-thirds of our merchant fleet.

How much longer can these ships last? Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson warns: "We are three or four years away from disaster."

And Undersecretary of Commerce Rocco C. Siciliano told a convention of that AFL–CIO Seafarers' International Union here last week: "We feel that the merchant marine has to go back up. If the merchant marine goes down any further, it will go down the drain."

For years, congressional committees have been declaring that the nation is running out of time to save the merchant marine. And for years, Congress has voted more for the merchant marine than the administration has spent. More than $101 million appropriated to replace rust buckets is still unused.

Despite repeated bipartisan demands from Capitol Hill and repeated presidential promises, the past two administrations have failed to come up with any positive program to maintain the United States as a first-rate seafaring nation.

The last such program came in the Eisenhower administration, when a building program of some 30 ships a year was projected to overcome the block obsolescence of the World War II merchant ships. Currently, that program is some 100 ships behind schedule.

The lack of a long-range program brings other grief to a troubled industry. Uncertain of how much government support to expect, shipping interests tangle in abrasive argument and labor is reluctant to make concessions for fear there won't be enough jobs to go around.

Matching this thread of self-interest are the diverse concerns of various government agencies often operating at cross-purposes in maritime affairs.

For example, under the law, half of the government's "food-for-peace" and foreign aid cargo is supposed to be carried in American ships. But shipping industry officials claim it doesn't always work out that way. They say the Agriculture Department wants the cheap rates of foreign shipping and the State Department and the Agency for International Development want to score points with foreign governments by using their ships.

Recently, the General Accounting Office told the Agriculture Department it had found that ocean transportation costs amounting to over $416,000 were paid to foreign carriers when U.S. carriers were available at the same rate.

U.S. flag ships carry only 5.6 percent of this country's total foreign trade. In sharp contrast, Soviet ships carry 50 percent of the USSR's international seaborne trade and the Soviets expect to increase this to 75 percent by 1975.

Nowhere does the absence of a program show itself more forcibly than in actual shipbuilding. Shipyards kept alive only by naval ship orders have lacked the incentive to modernize and expand. Only in very recent years have they started to improve their facilities—prompted by the conviction that a positive merchant shipbuilding program must be forthcoming. Meanwhile, foreign shipyards are booming.

More than national pride is at stake. The Navy is now seriously concerned about future sealift of supplies to armed forces in Vietnam and around the world.

FACING FACTS

Here are some of the facts facing those dealing with the problem today:

The United States has to import 66 commodities classed as strategic and critical, but it has to rely on foreign flag ships to carry 95 percent of those imports. Warns Vice Admiral L. P. Rumage, commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service: "We are a nautical dependent in an era when we should be commercially and militarily standing on our own feet."

This increased dependence on foreign flag shipping is adding to our balance of payments deficit. A maritime industry study shows that if the percentage of U.S. trade carried in American ships from 1960 to 1967 had been as high as existed before World War II (30 to 35 percent), the country would have had a positive balance of some $5 billion instead of a $23.5 billion deficit.

SOVIET GROWTH ALARMING

To many, the most disturbing aspect of the American maritime decline is the growth of the Soviet fleet. In 1950, Russia was rated 21st among maritime nations, with only 432 major merchant vessels totaling 1.8 million deadweight tons. Today, the Russians have an estimated 1,442 ships with a total of 12 million tons and by next year they hope to have 2,600 ships.

The Soviet merchant fleet also has an age advantage. Four out of five Soviet merchant ships are less than 10 years old. Four out of five U.S. ships are 20 years old or older.

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chief of naval operations, believes that following the Suez Canal crisis, the USSR shifted its concept of maritime strategy from a defensive to an offensive, worldwide one.

"What they are doing," Moorer says, "is using their maritime power—merchant ships, oceanographic ships, their fishing fleet—as an instrument of foreign policy."

GOODWILL AMBASSADORS

Soviet merchant seamen are specially trained to stay out of trouble and avoid notoriety in liberty ports while extolling the Soviet way of life.

Legislators like Sen. Warren G. Magnuson, D-Wash., chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, preach the importance of American seamen as goodwill ambassadors around the world and the vital role of American ships in bringing Western ideology to developing nations.

Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, in a recent report on Soviet sea power, noted that "in the ports of developing countries, the ships can reinforce the Soviet claims to scientific and technological supremacy and enhance the appeal of the Soviet system as the route to national development."

Along with the Soviet economic penetration of new nations, Admiral Moorer cited the intelligence-gathering potential of Soviet trawlers—"a potential which Russia exploits in many ways, including surveillance of our missile range operations and our fleet operations."

Pointing out that more than 500 ships of the American merchant fleet currently are being used to carry supplies to Vietnam and other U.S. armed forces outposts and to transport food and other aid to hungry nations, the men responsible for maintaining our logistic lifelines pose these questions:

What would we do if another Vietnam-type conflict began now, requiring another 200 to 300 ships as well as additional sealift to bolster our flanks in Europe? What will we do five or 10 years from now when none of these ships will be around?

RESERVE FLEET AT 144

Much was once made of America's reserve fleet with a grand total of more than a thousand ships. Recently, Maritime Administrator Gibson told the House Merchant Marine Committee that "the only real reserve fleet we have now, in my judgment, are those ships which have been reconditioned for the Vietnam war and are in operating status."

That, he reported, amounts to 144 ships. The average cost of putting them in operating shape for Vietnam was $700,000.

Rep. William S. Mailliard, R-Calif., ranking minority member of the committee, commenting on an estimate of 1,165 in the reserve fleet, said, "we are constantly given these over-all figures of ships in the reserve fleet and I think it gives everyone a false sense of security to seriously consider that those ships have any real value as a reserve."

More than 15 million deadweight tons of American-owned ships flying the flags of Liberia, Panama or Honduras are classified as available to the United States in an emergency, but critics question the value of this setup.

CAN ALLIES HELP?

They contend that the concept that the United States has "effective control" over those ships is a "fallacy" because they are foreign ships in foreign waters manned by foreign seamen who owe no loyalty to the United States.

Another question: How much can this nation count on the ships of its allies in situations where there are major policy differences? There have been several instances where ships of a friendly nation refused to haul cargo to Vietnam. In other cases, the issue was avoided by a sounding before the ship was actually loaded. Commented Mailliard: "Vietnam has shown us that where allies are not in sympathy with what we're doing, we can't rely on them for sealift."

In the past three years there have been some 35 studies of merchant marine, its problems and its future. Typical of the conclusions was this one from the Senate Commerce Committee: "The clear lesson gleaned from our committee's study is beyond dispute: The U.S. merchant fleet is in a critical condition, its future is in doubt and remedial action of a major nature is essential if the United States is to remain a leading seafaring nation."

NIXON'S PROMISE

Less than two months after that report was printed last year, Richard M. Nixon promised a revitalized merchant marine if he became president.

"The maritime industry of the United States has been permitted to decline to a point at which the nation's defense and economic welfare are imperiled," he warned.

Rep. Edward A. Garmatz, D-Md., chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, is hopeful that the administration will soon come through with the program Congress has been awaiting. "There's no question about it" Garmatz says. "It's a different climate now. We didn't get through to the last administration."

Undersecretary Siciliano, in his speech last week, promised that the program probably would go to Congress within 60 days.

THE COAST GUARD—179 YEARS YOUNG

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 179th anniversary of a proud service—the U.S. Coast Guard, an administration of the Department of Transportation.

This smallest member of our Armed Forces was founded on August 4, 1790, to suppress smuggling. Today the U.S. Coast Guard is represented around the world.

Coast Guard ships are plying the waters off Vietnam in Operation Market Time. Ice breakers explore the Arctic and Antarctic. In this regard the Cutter *Northwind* will arrive at Thule, Greenland, today after transmitting the famed Northwest Passage across the top of North America, preparatory to escorting supertanker *Manhattan* through these historic waters.

This service answers some 35,000 calls for assistance each year from mariners and boaters regardless of nationality. Last year the total value of ships and aircraft including cargo they saved was estimated at more than $3.5 billion—nearly six times the Coast Guard budget.

Coast Guardsmen also maintain some 45,000 marine aids to navigation and their merchant marine safety program is one of the reasons that the American Merchant Marine has the world's best safety record.

I am well aware of the Coast Guard's fine record in my own home State of Texas where they help thousands of people in trouble every year. Their Texas based rescue helicopters and ships have been a welcome sight to many Texans needing help. It is a pleasure to recognize these gallant men on the occasion of their 179th anniversary.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS 1969

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently compiled the results of my 1969 congressional questionnaire, which was sent into every home in the 33d District of California.

I found the responses to the questions very interesting and most helpful to me. The results on the question regarding the Post Office was of special interest.

Because I think my colleagues, to, will find the results both interesting and helpful, with your permission, I hereby insert the compilation of responses in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a government-owned corporation as a self-supporting operation?

Yes	77
No	16
Undecided	7

2. Do you favor dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity and transferring its functions to various departments?

Yes	70
No	16
Undecided	14

3. Do you favor the requirement Congress voted last year that all able-bodied persons over 16 years of age, receiving welfare under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, must participate in a work-training program as a condition to receiving aid?

Yes	92
No	3
Undecided	5

4. Electoral College—Do you favor: a. Abolish it and elect the president by a direct popular vote?

Yes	69
No	10
Undecided	21

b. Apportion the electoral votes of each state on the basis of the candidates vote in that state?

Yes	18
No	24
Undecided	58

c. Award electoral votes by Congressional district?

Yes	10
No	27
Undecided	63

5. Do you favor an all volunteer Armed Force?

Yes	42
No	48
Undecided	10

6. Vietnam—Do you favor:

(a) Renewed bombing of North Vietnam if the Paris peace talks fail?

Yes	62
No	15
Undecided	23

(b) A gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops regardless of the outcome of the Paris negotiations?

Yes	33
No	34
Undecided	33

(c) A coalition government in Saigon, including the Viet Cong?

Yes	17
No	44
Undecided	39

(d) An agreement between the United States and Hanoi to withdraw all outside forces and leave the fighting to the South Vietnamese?

Yes	53
No	33
Undecided	14

(e) Continued military aid to the Vietnamese government?

Yes	44
No	20
Undecided	36

7. Do you favor legislation limiting the number and type of questions to be asked in taking the 1970 Census?

Yes	66
No	22
Undecided	12

8. Would you favor extending the 10% Surtax if a portion of it were returned to the state and local governments?

Yes	26
No	66
Undecided	8

VILLAGE OF CHATEAUGAY, N.Y., CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 2 through 9, 1969, Chateaugay, N.Y., will observe its 100th year of being incorporated as a village. The week-long ceremonies will be capped by a colorful parade and appropriate ceremonies marking this significant occasion on August 9.

Chateaugay is a lovely village. Located in northern New York in the St. Lawrence Valley, at the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains just a short distance from Canada, it is surrounded by much natural beauty and unlimited recreational resources for those of all ages. It was incorporated as a village by a special act of incorporation passed by the New York State legislature on May 3, 1869.

It has been blessed with a hearty, devoted, and industrious population. Chateaugay is justifiably proud of its citizens and the contributions they have made to their community, State, and Nation.

The people of Chateaugay have always sought the best education they could afford for their children, beginning with the construction of the Chateaugay Academy, which opened in 1879 and climaxed by the opening of the new Chateaugay Central School building in 1954. They are proud of this well equipped, modern building which presents a complete curriculum taught by a faculty of dedicated men and women and served by an equally dedicated staff and board of education.

The young men of the village of Chateaugay have served their country in every war since the Spanish-American War up to and including the war in South Vietnam. Many of them gave their lives in these conflicts. Chateaugay shares this grief with many other small towns across the country whose sons have paid the supreme sacrifice.

The Chateaugay Record has been the newspaper of "record" since 1878. It is faithfully read by the natives of Chateaugay, many of whom no longer reside there, but who want to be kept informed of the happenings in their home town. This weekly has reported major events in the history of the village from the fire of 1893, which destroyed nearly all of the north side of Main Street, to the coverage of the ceremonies marking this 100th anniversary including the publishing of a special centennial issue.

Chateaugay's citizens have always been a religious people. The village is presently served by Methodist, Presbyterian, and Catholic Churches, all of which have devoted pastors and congregations. These various parishes were serving their followers even before Chateaugay was incorporated as a village.

I extend to the village fathers and all the people of Chateaugay my best wishes for a joyous happy birthday and my sincerest congratulations. I also join with these wonderful and friendly people in looking toward a prosperous future for this village which has had such a notable past.

THERE'S GOT TO BE MORE TO IT THAN THAT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the thoughtful editorial in the August 1969 issue of Pace magazine points to our national space program as being a new departure in the evolution of mankind. The profound thought in this editorial speaks for itself and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues and the general public:

THERE'S GOT TO BE MORE TO IT THAN THAT

The going question seems to be that it's fine for a couple of guys to go up and walk around on the moon for 45 minutes, but they're three guys up there and we're six billion minus three guys down here, and many of us are sick, starving, and killing each other, and with all that money it just doesn't make sense, does it?

Well, of course, there are all the spin-offs: some (not enough!) jobs in the ghetto, technology that will revolutionize areas of life right across the board, a communications network that will pull the world together like never before, electronically at least.

Yet, somehow, if it's really worth it, there's got to be more.

Back in the 1800s Darwin shook up people considerably when he said that MAN (pompous capitals) had really evolved from various lower forms of animal life. Freud kept things going by writing that most of us lived our lives according to inherited drives and instincts lurking in the depths of a subconscious we never knew existed. Then Einstein dealt the final blow and said that matter isn't really matter but a state of energy, and vice versa, and that the really important things in the universe can't be visualized or conceived by the human mind at all, except in mathematical symbols that most people can't understand.

When it comes to things like this, there just isn't a silent majority! Critics asked Darwin why he had no faith, Freud how something so patently obvious as another level of consciousness hadn't been discovered by Aristotle (obviously a superior mind), and Einstein why his non-matter Earth didn't swallow him up on the spot.

The reason for confusion was that when a man steps into another dimension he can't be expected to defend himself within the assumptions and regulations of the dimension he has just left. Each of these men in his own way rose a step higher in perspective and each was able to see more of the mysterious interplay between inertia and initiative in life.

Space, whether we like it or not, means the introduction of Man into a new dimension.

Up until this point in history we have always lived within a closed system, on a single planet. It has been a dimension of limitation: only so much room, so many resources, so much time. This limited dimension has been the basis of our political and economic systems, and more importantly of our thinking, the basic assumptions of our lives—even our belief in what was possible and what was not.

Space means the end of limitation. As we discover means of propelling ourselves close to the speed of light, old time-limitations will vanish. The development of a self-regenerative life-support system, a "little earth" good for generations, will mean we can go as far into the universe as we want to. Even simple things like mineral resource exploitation will no longer be confined to Earth.

For the first time, limitlessness is not confined hopelessly to imagination.

In the next few years we may witness the most fundamental recasting of our attitudes toward life in the entire history of our race. For many years we've had the adequate capability to conquer war, poverty, hunger, prejudice—what we seem to have lacked is the adequate will.

This will is the biggest spin-off of the space program—something which practical men have always called intangible but which is, in reality, the most tangible imperative of our time.

It's a new dimension: we see Earth as a tiny gravitational disturbance in a limitless expanse of nothing. The perspective gives a meaning and an urgency to fine words and noble sentiments that have lost significance in the pedestrian current of history. The reach into space is nothing less than a departure point in evolution from which for the first time we can look at all the stumblings of the past and say honestly, "We can begin again."

REPRESENTATIVE McCARTHY SPEAKS ON USE OF GAS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we have all read and heard a lot about gas warfare in the past few months. I think we all owe some thanks to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), for bringing this most important matter into the public light.

I joined about 100 of my colleagues in H. Res. 444 which calls upon the President to resubmit the Geneva Protocol to the Senate for ratification. This action is, of course, very long overdue.

Many of the facts and figures that have been revealed from only this year about chemical and biological warfare are simply astounding. In a speech to the Medical Committee for Human Rights-Physicians for Social Responsibility, Representative RICHARD McCARTHY outlined very well where we are and where we are going in terms of controlling the use of gas. These remarks were made on July 18 in Boston, Mass. Because of the significance of this subject, I include these remarks in the RECORD at this time:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD D. McCARTHY—BOSTON, MASS., JULY 18, 1969

When I began my review of our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices last February, I found that the United States has gradually been slipping away from its traditional policy of not using these abhorrent forms of warfare. Our policy was gradually being eroded with practices that were justified with what appeared to me to be legalistic arguments based on semantics.

Part of this change in United States policy had come because of pressures from the military who were faced with a most difficult war in Vietnam. Another part came because top Administration officials had not considered the policy governing this area of warfare important enough to receive attention at the White House level. And part of the change in policy resulted from a lack of information available to the public. There was—and still is—more secrecy surrounding our practices and policies in the CBW field than in almost any other area of defense. As a result, the change was taking place without any serious opposition from the American public. A few groups—notably in the scientific field—had warned of the dangers inherent in our practices in Vietnam. A few Administration officials were fighting to stem a tide which they could not control. But Congress and the American people were not concerned about this issue.

The traditional United States policy on chemical and biological warfare is perhaps best exemplified by President Roosevelt's statement that "Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies". To appreciate the change that has taken place in that policy since the late 1950's, let me review a few of the practices that we have used, weapons that we have come close to using, and policies which some of our military are urging our Government to use.

We have used tear gas as an offensive weapon on a massive scale in Vietnam. It is used to drive the enemy from bunkers and tunnels so that they can be shot. It is used to drive the enemy into the open so that artillery shells and bombs will wound and kill him. It is applied on a massive scale to the countryside to deny the enemy the use of trails and roads.

We have used defoliants and herbicides—chemical weapons that strip the leaves off trees and brush and kill food crops on a massive scale in Vietnam.

I have been told that at least once we came very close to using biological warfare weapons against Cuba. Apparently it was only a last minute reversal that prevented the United States from being the first to use this inhuman form of warfare in modern history. I believe that the facts in this case deserve to be explored fully by the White House during its current review of CBW policy and by appropriate committees of Congress so that this can never happen again.

There has been much pressure exerted by part of the military for a change in our policy that would permit the first-use of incapacitating chemical and biological weapons. Under this policy the U.S. would be the first to use weapons such as the incapacitating gas BZ which produces an effect on a man similar to that of LSD for twelve hours. It would also allow us to use so-called incapacitating biological weapons such as Venezuelan Equine Encephalomyletis or *staphylococcus enterotoxin* to make the population of a country sick for several days while we send in our troops. I should point out that most physicians do not believe that there is such a weapon. Any disease affects different people in different ways. What may be incapacitating for one will be fatal for another. And to continue the main point, there has even been pressure to adopt a policy that would allow the first-use of lethal gas in certain cases.

In my opinion the use of tear gas as an offensive weapon in Vietnam is a clear violation of the Geneva Protocol banning first-use of gas warfare—a treaty which we stated that we fully supported in principle in the UN in 1966. I also believe that use of defoliants and herbicides is a clear violation of the spirit of the Geneva Protocol even though these chemical weapons had not been invented at the time the Protocol was first adopted. And in my opinion the United States should abandon a policy that involves the use of biological weapons and should state unequivocally that we will not be the first to use chemical warfare.

My beliefs on chemical and biological warfare policy have led me to seek ratification of the Geneva Protocol, United States support of the proposal before the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference now meeting in Geneva that would ban the development, production or use of biological warfare weapons, and a review of our chemical and biological warfare at the White House level and by the Congress. With these objectives in mind, I urge President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol to the United States for ratification. I also urged President Nixon to support the proposal banning biological warfare before the Geneva Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference. And I have contacted a number of colleagues in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to urge that they support a thorough Congressional review of our CBW policies and practices.

There has been some progress towards these objectives. The following events in Congress have both educated the public on some of the issues involved and show the concern of members of Congress over the policy gap.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing on chemical and biological warfare. One result of this hearing was Senator Fulbright's endorsement of my proposals that the Geneva Protocol be resubmitted to the Senate. He said that he hoped that the Treaty would be resubmitted and that if it was, comprehensive hearings would be held on the subject.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on the Army's plans for moving by rail and dumping in the Atlantic large quantities of nerve gas. These hearings led to the recommendation by a Committee of the National Academy of Science that the gas be disposed of at the arsenals rather than moving it by rail to the sea.

The House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on open-air testing of chemical and biological warfare weapons. These hearings finally brought out the full story about the nerve gas incident at Skull Valley, Utah where 6,400 sheep were killed in a test accident.

Senator Tydings has announced that he will hold hearings on the safety of open testing of nerve gas, particularly at Edgewood Arsenal which is fairly close to major East Coast cities.

The Executive Branch has also taken several important steps towards a what I hope will be a more rational CBW policy.

On June 17, 1969 President Nixon announced that he had ordered a full-scale Executive Branch review of our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices. This is the first top-level review of this policy in quite a few years. At the same time he announced that he was considering the question of resubmission of the Geneva Protocol to the Senate for ratification.

The Department of Defense accepted the National Academy of Science Committee recommendations on the disposal of gas.

President Nixon has asked the U.S. delegation at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference now meeting in Geneva to work with the other nations to seek effective ways to control chemical and biological warfare weapons.

President Nixon praised the report on chemical and biological warfare issued by United Nations Secretary General U Thant in early July.

These are all steps that offer the prospects for a reaffirmation of sound and rational CBW policy.

There are, however, continued pressures to change our traditional policy governing chemical and biological warfare. The evidence of this pressure can be found in a number of instances.

First, perhaps the most disturbing example of this pressure occurred on July 3, 1969, early this month. President Nixon issued a message to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee from Key Biscayne, Florida. In that statement he said that, "The specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world." I read this statement in the newspaper and was particularly pleased that President Nixon had stated, as President Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower had before him, the abhorrence with which the American people regard chemical and biological warfare. On July 16, 1969 I called the White House Press Office in Washington to get a copy of the text of President Nixon's message. You can imagine my surprise when the text arrived the next day with these words—"the specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world"—crossed out in black ink. I subsequently obtained a copy of the original release from Key Biscayne in which this key sentence of President Nixon's message is *not* crossed out.

My question is, who changed President Nixon's message? Was it someone else in the White House? I have heard that the strong objections of a member of the Armed Forces in Secretary Laird's office led to the change. I wonder if President Nixon approved the change of his original message.

Second, another example of the pressure for the adoption of a new policy involving the use of chemical and biological warfare weapons involved in the UN report on CBW. The representative coming from the United States appointed by Secretary General U Thant was Dr. Ivan Bennett of New York University Medical Center. Dr. Bennett was assisted by representatives from the various Executive Departments in preparing the draft of his chapter of the report. The representatives of the Defense Department supplied him with a draft of the chapter that reflected their particular policies in the chemical and biological warfare field.

The draft, for example, used the definition, "incapacitating biological agent" a term that as I mentioned before, most medical men would not accept as a valid term. The draft also included toxins produced from biological agents under the definition of chemicals, presumably so that if biological warfare is banned, the ban will not apply to toxins. Fortunately, Dr. Bennett and the other members of the UN Committee conditioned or changed these approaches—although not as much as I would prefer—before it reported to U Thant.

Third, Another example is the pressure that is now being exerted by the military in the Executive Branch review of CBW to exclude incapacitating chemical and biological agents and even in some cases lethal gas from the Geneva Protocol or any other treaty that we might sign. I believe that every effort must be made to resist this pressure. I believe that tear gas clearly falls under the ban included in the Geneva Protocol. Secretary General U Thant's report emphasized this and he recommended that all nations clearly reaffirm this point.

Tear gas deserves special mention because it poses problems for the ratification of the Geneva Protocol. The United States has been using it on a wide-scale as an offensive weapon in Vietnam. In the minds of some, this might pose an obstacle to frank discussion of the issue in Congressional hearings. Others have confused the use of tear gas in civil disturbances with the use of tear gas in war. This is a confusion that those familiar with the Geneva Protocol do not share. When the Protocol was drafted, the words "use in war" were specifically included to insure that the Protocol did not interfere with the legitimate use of tear gas to handle riots and other disturbances. The use of tear gas by civil authorities involves many considerations, but these clearly do not involve the ban included in the Geneva Protocol and should not be used as an obstacle to ratification.

Use of tear gas in combat operations in Vietnam is in my mind a violation of the Geneva Protocol. The amount of tear gas in its more modern forms, CS–1 and CS–2, that we have procured for use in Southeast Asia, 9,871,000 pounds, is enough when used with a helicopter dispenser to cover 80,000 square miles, more than the 66,000 square mile area of South Vietnam. The total amount of tear gas procured for Southeast Asia use, 13,736,000 pounds through 1969, is more than half the amount of mustard gas used by both sides in World War I.

When the use of tear gas in Vietnam was first revealed in early 1965 it aroused considerable opposition. Secretary McNamara acknowledged that three types of gas, CN, CS and DM had been used. But the use was defended as being humanitarian only. Civilians and Vietcong in caves together were gassed rather than blown up to save the lives of the civilians. Civilians used as shields by Vietcong were also gassed to make it unnecessary to hurt the innocent. These were the humanitarian examples that were cited. Presidential Press Secretary George Reedy, when asked about this, said it "was not the sort of thing" which would come up for high level approval. He said this despite a national policy which says only the President can decide to use gas.

At the policy level, Secretary Rusk said, "We do not expect that gas will be used in ordinary military operations." "The anticipation is, of course, that these weapons be used only in those situations involving riot control or situations analogous to riot control." This was subsequently repeated with

US Ambassador to the UN Nabrit's statement in 1966 that, "It would be unreasonable to contend that any rule of international law prohibits the use in combat against an enemy, *for humanitarian purposes*, of agents that Governments around the world commonly use to control riots by their own people." (My emphasis added.)

There apparently was an order issued at the top level of Government against further use of gas in Vietnam following the incident in early 1965. But in the fall of 1965 we learned that a Marine Lt. Colonel had ordered the use of gas to drive civilians and Viet Cong from a cave. Perhaps because it was a humanitarian move, this incident did not arouse the same public reaction that had occurred in the spring. At about that time, apparently the White House issued orders to the Department of Defense stating that the tear gases CS and CN could be used in Vietnam. This order was apparently given verbally because a number of people who have tried to get a copy have been unable to do so. There also is some question as to what standards were issued by the Defense Department to the field commanders in Vietnam for the use of these tear gases. I have written to Secretary Laird today asking for the directions that were issued governing use of tear gas in Vietnam.

Between the incident involving use of tear gas on a humanitarian basis in the fall of 1695, the earlier defense of use of tear gas on humanitarian grounds, and subsequent reports of use of tear gas in Vietnam, we can see how use of chemical weapons can change. In February 1966, we learned that the tear gas CS was dropped over a large area in preparation for a B-52 raid. The Defense Department said the gas was used to drive the enemy out of their bunkers so that they could be killed in the bombing. In May 1968 we learned that several tons of CS were dropped on enemy positions before beginning an infantry assault. In September 1968 we learned that CS was routinely used to drive the enemy into the open before bombing and artillery attacks. The Army Digest in November 1968 stated that "Entrenched areas that have successfully resisted both aerial and artillery fire have been reduced in an hour or two by combining the use of CS with maneuver and firepower." This can hardly be described as a humanitarian use.

Tear gas has been improved by technology. It has been made moisture proof so that it works better in Vietnam. It has been reduced in particle size so that it is much more effective. A man is immediately forced to seek fresh air. These changes amount to almost a change in type. And tons of tear gas are dumped on the Vietnamese countryside where it remains effective for some time. Enemy troops walking along paths and trails crush tear gas granules with their feet and forced to seek fresh air.

The policy implications of this use of tear gas as an offensive weapon are crucial. In using tear gas in this way we chance the possibility that the enemy will use gas. For example, Newsweek reported in its July 7, 1969 edition that a cache of nerve gas had been found in Vietnam, apparently stored by the North Vietnamese. I was gravely concerned about this and asked the editor to find out more about it. In a wire from his correspondent in Vietnam, he learned that the Green Berets that had found the cache had mistaken old tear gas in new bottles for nerve gas. Fortunately there was no escalation. But the possibility always exists.

Any use of gas poses problems of escalation. And if we authorize use of tear gas as an exception, do we have to state the chemical formula and particle size and method of delivery to insure that it is not changed into an entirely different gas. If tear gas is used as an offensive weapon—to help kill—why shouldn't other gases be used.

I believe that tear gas should be banned, as it is in the Geneva Protocol in the opinion of many countries. If the Geneva Protocol is resubmitted to the United States Senate for ratification, I strongly urge that the United States *not* attempt to exclude tear gas from the coverage of the Protocol. I believe that this would weaken the only reasonably successful arms control agreement adopted by modern man. The present Administration under President Nixon has not considered this question in the past and hence is not bound by the policies of its predecessors. I hope that they will reaffirm our traditional policy of no first-use of gas or germ warfare. And that means gas of any type.

Should the Administration believe that it is necessary to ask for an exclusion of tear gas—a step that I personally think would be wrong—I would hope that the Administration would first agree to check with the other 62 signatory nations to determine whether they would accept this exclusion. If a majority of the nations objected to the exclusion, I would hope that the Administration would abondon its attempt to obtain an exclusion for any gas.

I have discussed the problems involving tear gas at some length because, along with herbicides and defoliants, I believe they pose the most difficult problems for those considering the question of ratification of the Geneva Protocol. There are of course other problems, the pressures from the proponents of gas and germ warfare to exclude incapacitating weapons from any ban, but I believe that no Administration would seriously consider adopting a policy involving their use.

Progress has been made this year toward the adoption of a sane and rational United States policy in the chemical and biological warfare area. Almost 100 Members of the House of Representatives have joined me in sponsoring a resolution urging President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol for ratification. We are in the process of evolving what I believe can be a forward step in man's quest for a halt to inhumanity. I hope that you will join me in working toward this objective.

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY: ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH LOCAL EFFORT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Fla., began its first classes in September of 1964 and has, in the past 5 years, established an excellent rapport with the community and has demonstrated that it has the stamina and ability to achieve academic excellence and service to others through programs established within its curriculum.

One such program was begun in the College of Education of Florida Atlantic University in 1965, less than a year after the school began its classes, to train teachers to work with disadvantaged elementary and secondary students. That program was conducted without specific funding, but was effective because of the interest and dedication of the faculty in the college of education.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, a summary of the local effort accomplished by Florida Atlantic University since 1965 in dealing with underprivileged and disadvantaged students:

LOCAL EFFORT BY FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY'S COLLEGE OF EDUCATION RELATED TO GRANT REQUESTS AND PROJECTS FUNDED FROM FEDERAL SOURCES

1. In the Summer of 1965 Florida Atlantic University's College of Education requested funds for an institute to train teachers to work with disadvantaged elementary and secondary students, especially those from migrant areas near FAU. The project was not funded. However, the professional staff felt that leadership was needed in this area and the College of Education proceeded on its own initiative to conduct such an institute on a limited basis. Three courses with methodology for the disadvantaged were added to the curriculum for this institute.

The institute was successful in training 15 graduate students who did work effectively with the disadvantaged in public school programs. The success of the courses insured their retention in the curriculum. It is interesting to note that during a period of considerable national criticism about work with disadvantaged, FAU has not received any negative comment about this aspect of this training program.

2. Partially as a result of the preceding institute and also because of the continuing interest of the faculty in the training of teachers who are prepared to meet the realities of life, FAU has maintained a continuous pattern of observation and teacher aide experience during the junior undergraduate year and the senior year prior to student teaching. A large percentage of students in these field experiences are assigned to public schools with a heavy percentage of disadvantaged children enrolled. Our experience at this level is probably the most extensive of any university in the Florida System. This program was established without outside funding. It stands in marked contrast to institutions that have received reasonably large grants and some national publicity for similar programs involving fewer students than those being trained to teach the disadvantaged at Florida Atlantic University.

3. During the Summer of 1967, Florida Atlantic University conducted a program for Training of Counselors To Serve Children of Migrant Farm Laborers Through the Use of TV Taping and Other Media, funded under Title I of the Higher Education Act. It set the pattern for use of "TV Micro-Teaching" which became a regular part of our teaching training curricula. Six TV trainers are now in use for the University as a result of this experience. This method was adapted for use in the next outlined project.

4. In the summer of 1968, Florida Atlantic University conducted the Media Institute for Guided Studies Teachers, funded by title VI, B, Higher Education Act of 1965. A report of that Guided Studies Media Institute, entitled Guided Studies Program Begun for Junior College Teachers, appeared in the February 1969 issue of Junior College Journal, published by the American Association of Junior Colleges.

5. A follow-up Media Institute was proposed under EPDA for the Summer of 1969 to be conducted by Florida Atlantic University. The program was not funded. However, because of the successful 1968 Institute it was decided to repeat the program on a limited basis. Consequently, FAU invited participants only from the southeastern junior colleges. Since no funds were available for support, *all staff volunteered to handle this project on an overload assignment in order to continue to test the program initiated in 1968.* At the time of this writing, the 1969 Institute is fully underway and we have more than a dozen participants who are primarily from our surrounding junior colleges. The best techniques, including TV productions, slides, tapes, etc., which were developed in the 1968 Institute are being used.

Results: As a result of the previous programs and this present Institute, Florida Atlantic University has made a significant contribution to the education of disadvantaged youth, both black and white, in the South Florida area through the training of junior college teachers whose skills and attitudes focus on such students. This has been achieved with minimal funding, careful local planning and hard work—no riots and no protest. With adequate funding the impact of our previous effort will be made greater and will lead to real breakthroughs in teaching disadvantaged youth in junior colleges.

6. Another project which is self-explanatory is a center being developed almost entirely at the grass roots for training of teachers to work with retarded children. Some outside funding would be money well spent on this project which stands again in contrast to the usual riot act.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of our ablest and most dynamic colleagues is the new Representative of New York's 24th District, the Honorable MARIO BIAGGI. Coming from a long and distinguished career as one of New York's finest, MARIO has embarked on his congressional service with the same dedication and concern for his fellow man that made his prior record so noteworthy.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the following article which appeared in January in the New York Sunday News, and I know that MARIO BIAGGI will continue to merit the esteem and admiration of his constituents and his fellow Members.

The article follows:

[From the New York Sunday News, Jan. 19, 1969]

FORMER COP HERO PROMISES ACTION AS CONGRESSMAN FROM BRONX 24TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(By Bert Shanas)

He shot a man dead who pulled an ice pick on him.

He was dragged 60 feet over hard pavement while trying to stop a runaway horse.

He chose to shoot it out with an ex-con who was holding a gun to his head.

But last week, retired hero cop Mario Biaggi, said his "stomach was doing flip-flops on the day he was sworn into Congress." Speaking in New York after his first week as Representative of the 24th CD in the Northeast Bronx, the 51-year-old Congressman vowed to be "as strong a fighter in Congress as I was as a policeman."

Biaggi, the first New York policeman ever to serve in Congress, said that as an ex-cop he would have a keen insight into the needs of the people, since he had spent so much time on the streets with them.

"I'm a fighting policeman and I'll always be a fighter—even in Congress," said the freshman politico. "I know seniority is important, but I'm not the type to remain quiet. If something needs saying, I'll say it. And I've discovered if you say something worth hearing, other Congressmen will listen."

After 23 years on the police force, the ex-lieutenant feels that he has "something to say."

Among his major concerns in the 91st Congress will be the city's law and order and welfare problems.

He said the 24th CD includes people from several socio-economic and philosophic levels. There will be minority and middle class groups, with a heavy sprinkling of small homeowners and businessmen among his constituents. Biaggi says the problems of his Bronx district are really the problems of the whole city: "To help the 24th is to help New York.

"More and more the people are coming to their congressmen with problems the city administration can't handle. So I find I'm really a spokesman for the city in Congress.

"Let's face it, the people made law and order an issue, I didn't. But I was talking law and order when it wasn't popular—25 years ago. And I know law and order in only one way, as a professional policeman. If you're right, you're right, and I don't care if you're white, pink or black."

He said Mayor Lindsay was the "architect of chaos in the streets," and that Lindsay "is ruining the police department because he won't leave it alone," to do the job it's supposed to do.

Biaggi admitted he had seen cases of police brutality. He said he realizes it exists, but it's better to remove the offenders, while supporting the police, than to knock down the whole police system.

As a Congressman, Biaggi said, he would be in a good position to support the police by trying to raise funds for more men, better equipment and a harder fight against narcotics, which are responsible for 50% of the city's crimes.

Charging the people of New York have been "hoodwinked" into thinking they are getting protection they're actually not getting, owing to shortages of men and equipment, Biaggi said he would use his new office to pressure "police administrators."

Biaggi walked away with the election last November, defeating his Republican and Liberal opponents for the $30,000 a year post by better than 2 to 1. Along the way he picked up the support of the Conservative Party. It was the first time Bronx Conservatives had ever backed a Democrat.

A key issue in his campaign was the welfare problem—principally because conservative homeowners in the 24th were beginning to complain about the welfare burden.

Now that the election's over, Biaggi has vowed to carry the fight into the House of Representatives.

"The purpose of Welfare is to help people in need, and I'm for that," said Biaggi. "But I won't tolerate frauds and undeserving people getting welfare."

While insisting he isn't married to any one answer at this time, he does suggest federal takeover as a possible solution. "The least we should have is more federal investigations and guidelines where federal money is involved," he says.

Among the other ideas on the welfare problem that will go to Washington with Biaggi are centers to watch children while mothers work. He would also deny welfare aid to anyone who can work but refuses to, regardless of the job.

Although his proposals sometimes sound hard to the more "liberal" politicians, Biaggi says he knows what it's like to be a member of a minority group, to be poor and even "to be bounced around by the police."

Born in Harlem and raised there during the Depression, he remembers being forced to "move on" by policemen just because he was standing around with a bunch of friends.

"Where was I supposed to go?" he now asks himself.

One of three sons of a marble setter who couldn't find work, Biaggi shined shoes after school, carried packages, or helped his mother clean offices for $8 a week.

After graduation from Haaren High School in Manhattan, he took a job as a Harlem letter carrier with the Post Office, but decided "there were things going on that I didn't know about, and the way to find out what they were was to become a cop."

In 1942 he took the police exam, placing 174th out of 20,000. That began a career that comes close to matching Dick Tracy's for color. Wounded 11 times in the course of duty, Biaggi holds 28 department awards and THE NEWS Hero of the month Award, and is the only cop in the state to be selected to the National Police Hall of Fame.

When he retired from the police force, Biaggi entered New York Law School. He became a lawyer without previous college training. The American Bar Association passed a special resolution, waiving the undergraduate requirement in his case.

Biaggi has only one regret about being a Congressman. He won't see his wife, Marie, and three children as often as he'd like. They're remaining at the family's Mosholu Parkway, apartment while he lives in Washington. (A fourth child is a nurse in Puerto Rico.)

But Biaggi gets home on weekends and other odd times. He can still be seen Saturday and Sunday morning, jogging or bicycling through the Mosholu area, trying to stay in shape.

"One real problem of being a Congressman is with all those meetings, you sit too much," he said.

In spite of his criticism of the present city administration, Biaggi maintains New York is still governable, but won't say if he thinks he's the man who can get the top job some day.

Running his fingers through his thick, black hair, Biaggi commented that "almost everyone in politics thinks of New York City."

POPULATION GROWTH AND ITS FUTURE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican task force on earth resources and population, of which I am chairman, is continuing its efforts to learn what is going on in Government and private organization to combat our pressing population growth and its future social consequences, as well as the rapid utilization of our resources and our concern for an environment of quality.

I offer for the RECORD the highlights of our most recent hearings:

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1969—POPULATION REFERENCE BUREAU

Dr. William Moran, President, Population Reference Bureau. Members Present: Bush, Horton, McCloskey, Pollock, Smith, Taft, Wold. Staff From: Vander Jagt.

Dr. Moran, President of the Population Reference Bureau expressed considerable concern over projected resource consumption rates. In 1900 the United States used 40.9 billion gallons of water. In 1960 that amount had increased to 322 billion gallons of water annually. Furthermore, these growing consumption rates apply to almost all of our resources.

One of the major problems the United States has in resource management is attitudinal. Dr. Moran feels that we have adopted a "frontiersman" attitude and seem to believe that there will always be new resources available. The fact is that we are already failing to replenish some of our most essential resources. For instance, in the Southwestern United States we are tapping fossil water, or water left from the last ice age.

In this country today we produce only 60% of the oxygen we consume. We have introduced into our atmosphere more carbon dioxide than our plants can absorb and convert to meet our oxygen requirements.

We have in the United States, 6% of the world's population, but we are presently using ¼ to ½ of the world's resources. If the world is to someday manage its resources better, the U.S. must assume an important leadership role.

Dr. Moran believes that our efforts should be spent convincing young couples that their family will be happier and that their children will have a better chance for an education if family planning is practiced. Finding a way to convince and motivate the general public should be our first priority.

The Population Reference Bureau concentrates a great deal of its resources in both Latin and South America. Dr. Moran explained that the influence Catholicism has over national family planning programs varies with each country. Nationalism in countries like Brazil also limits the extent to which family planning services may be introduced. Brazil allows only 15% of those women who are considered fertile to receive any family planning services or information.

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1969, FORD FOUNDATION

Mr. Oscar Harkavy, Program Officer in Charge.

Members Present: Bush, McCloskey, Mosher, Wold.

Staff From: Anderson, Taft, Vander Jagt.

Current research in reproductive biology has given us many new ideas as to how the fertility cycle can be controlled. Mr. Harkavy explained that if mankind hopes to some day control the world's population, we must continue to develop new methods of contraception and to extensively examine these new research areas. $30 million will be spent this year on specific contraceptive research. Mr. Harkavy stated that we should increase these efforts to a $150 million level of expenditure over the next several years.

The population explosion is commonly recognized as one of the most serious problems now facing the nation and the world. Mr. Harkavy suggested, therefore, that we more adequately fund population research. It seems inconsistent that cancer research funds total $250–275 million annually, more than 8 times the amount spent on reproductive biology research.

Mr. Harkavy explained that finding solutions to the population problem is a long-term project. Grants given on an annual basis allow only short-term research plans. If these grants were distributed over a period of there years, it would be possible to thoroughly staff the projects and to plan the necessary long-term research programs.

Mr. Harkavy stated that often U.S. motives are questioned when foreign countries receive AID funds for family planning. It does not seem to matter how humanitarian our own motives may be. Mr. Harkavy agreed with the Presidential statement emphasizing the importance of unilateral funding through the United Nations.

By the year 2000, experts have predicted that we will have a population of 7 billion. Even more astounding is the fact that by 2025 that figure will have doubled to 14 billion.

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, THURSDAY, JULY 31, 1969, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Dr. William D. McElroy, Director; Dr. Louis Levin, Executive Associate Director.

Members Present: Bush, Fulton, Horton, Mosher, Pettis, Pollock, Ruppe, Wold.

Staff From: McCloskey, Taft, Vander Jagt.

Dr. McElroy explained that in order to return an ecological system to its original condition, the ecologist must enlist the assistance of experts in almost every science. No mechanism presently exists to coordinate these individual efforts. The National Science Foundation is funding an ecological analysis project in Jamaica which involves a complete examination of the food chain in bays and estuaries. It is hoped that from this study scientists will learn more about how to manage estuary resources.

Scientists are now learning to use waste heat from energy plants to actually improve ecological systems. Organisms have a faster growth rate in warm weather, and if properly planned, an energy plant can actually speed the recovery process of a polluted area.

Dr. McElroy suggested that family planning projects rely more heavily upon paramedical personnel, particularly in foreign countries. In India an expenditure of $700 million to train midwives and to make family planning services available would result in the direct contact of 25 million Indian women. Dr. McElroy considers this personal contact during periods of pregnancy to be vastly more effective than national information programs.

One of the crises the world will face as a result of present population growth rate is that assuming the world population increases 2% annually, urban population will increase by 6% and ghetto population will increase by 12%.

Dr. McElroy acknowledged the national population problem but urged that we not forget our neighbors. In a country like Jamaica which is "heading for trouble" in terms of population and available living space, Dr. McElroy feels that a modest investment of $2 million would significantly affect the future of Jamaica.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress, I introduced the first legislation to provide for a guaranteed annual income—the Income Maintenance Act. On the opening day of the 91st Congress, I again introduced it as H.R. 586.

The Income Maintenance Act is designed to replace the existing welfare system with a program of income maintenance. The concept of income maintenance, which has been extensively debated, in broad outline means providing to people who have no income a minimum level of assistance, and reducing that assistance as they increase their income. Under H.R. 586, assistance is reduced by 50 cents for every dollar the recipient earns.

The plan is thus aimed at closing the poverty gap in the most direct and efficient way—by providing benefits as a matter of right, payable upon simple application, similar to application for social security benefits. At the same time, recipients are provided with a financial incentive to seek employment.

Our Nation's finest economists, sociologists, and experts on public welfare have endorsed this concept. Well-informed public discussion of income maintenance is increasing, as the American people, rich and poor alike, seek alternatives to the present welfare system. A vital contribution to this discussion has been made by Paul A. Samuelson, of MIT, in his article, "Lifting the Curse of the Poor," which appeared in Think magazine, published by IBM. It provides an excellent summary of the concept of income maintenance and of several proposals to implement the concept.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it their attention:

LIFTING THE CURSE OF THE POOR

Just prior to his assassination, President Kennedy received a memorandum from Robert J. Lampman who was on leave from the University of Wisconsin serving a tour of duty on the New Frontier. Dr. Lampman was well known among professional economists as one of the best-informed experts on problems connected with the distribution of wealth and income in the United States.

In his 1963 memorandum, he pointed out that our high employment and vigorous economic growth served to emphasize, by contrast, the problems of poverty in America. President Kennedy was much impressed by Lampman's sober recital: Human suffering in Appalachia and in city ghettos were mere dramatizations of the continuing inequalities of income distribution and economic opportunity reported by the Census and other objective surveys.

Although the American per capita national income far exceeds, in real terms, that reported by any other nation, it is still true that children and grownups go to bed hungry at night. If, in the words of Hobbes, American life cannot be called "nasty, brutish, and short," any insurance company actuary can testify that malnutrition still figures as an important factor in premature death; and although the U.S. standard of living tops the list of major industrial nations, students of vital statistics have long known that America does not rank even in the top 10 where low infant mortality is concerned.

One of the decisions made by President Kennedy before his Dallas trip was to launch the War on Poverty. One of the first successful programs of the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, was to implement that commitment by recommending the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the spending of billions of dollars by the Federal Government to fight poverty.

At about the same time, a number of economists began independently to explore quite a different approach—under the general name of "a Negative Income Tax." And as the years since 1964 revealed a number of difficulties with parts of the poverty program, additional support among economists has been recruited for the new approach. By the summer of 1968, what had begun as an academic possibility began to take on the dimensions of a feasible new social program.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Specifically, late in May more than 1,200 economists from more than 150 colleges and universities signed a public petition calling upon the nation to take this next step forward on the agenda of progress. Considerable bipartisan support was developed: Republican Congressman Melvin Laird of Wisconsin has introduced such a bill; Democratic Congressman William Ryan of New York has introduced a similar bill. Most of the leading candidates for the presidency have expressed favorable interest in income maintenance programs of this kind. Such business leaders as Joseph Wilson of Xerox and Arjay Miller of Ford endorsed this new approach at a conference called by Governor Rockefeller.

What exactly is the negative income tax?

Everyone understands the positive graduated income tax: when a family reports its income it must, according to a formula that depends on family size (exemptions), pay a positive tax geared to the level of its income. Those with very low income are not, under the present system, subject to tax. Indeed, their tax exemptions of $600 per person are completely wasted. Under the negative tax, no matter what your income is, it would be reported along with family size. If income is below some defined poverty line, instead of paying a positive tax a family automatically receives as a matter of right a nationally uniform income supplement. The size of this payment, and this is a crucial feature of the program, is geared to the level of family earnings in such a way as to give everyone a definite incentive to increase his private earnings.

Thus, in one of the possible variants of the plan, a family of four with no earnings at all might automatically receive from the government a $1,500 payment. If by its own initiative it raises its earnings from zero up to $1,000 instead of having all of that taken away from it, as under present welfare assistance or under proposals to guarantee everybody a $3,000 income whatever he does, the family would be permitted under the negative income tax to keep, say, 50 percent of its extra earnings. The other 50 percent goes to the government to reduce its supplementary payment by $500. The same would be true if it earned a second $1,000 of income: the formula is always arranged to provide an incentive for the poor to cure their own poverty.

ALL THE VIRTUES

If, perhaps, through successful manpower retaining programs, the family is able by its own efforts to move out of poverty completely, the negative income tax will change over smoothly into a positive income tax. It should be noted that the payments given here for a family of four would have to be raised in cases where the couple had more than two children; and for single-individual families the formula would show a lower schedule of payments. This demonstrates that the negative income tax has all the virtues of a children's allowance program, plus the virtue of recognizing that adults are not able, in many cases, to escape the blight of poverty.

I have given, purely as an example, one possible schedule of payments that could be feasible for a program beginning in the next year or two. Some experts would favor a more generous schedule. As in the case of Social Security. If the new program turned out to work well in practice, one could expect its scope and coverage to expand with the passing years.

How much would a modest initial program cost?

Could our Gross National Product and fiscal system stand this cost?

Professor Lampman has estimated the price tag such a program to be about $7½ billion gross. But he also estimates that it would save about $2½ billion on present welfare assistance. Hence, the net cost would be about $5 billion. With the Gross National Product currently running at an $850 billion annual rate and the consolidated federal budget running at $180 billion annual rate, an extra $5 billion for a new vital program is hardly beyond the fiscal capacity of an affluent society. Many experts would argue that we can already afford a program of this kind that costs several times as much, if we have the will to pay for it.

In this connection it is worth emphasizing that our international balance of payments deficit is one of the most important constraints upon our present-day economy. Any of the extra billions of dollars spent in our urban and rural areas for income maintenance go almost completely for home-produced products; and those are in marked contrast to an equivalent number of extra billion spent on Vietnam or other offshore security programs, and which do seriously impinge on our deteriorating trade deficit.

Let me now review the merits and demerits of this new program. First, the merits. The great advantage to this new plan is that it cuts through a mass of heterogeneous local and state administrative devices to strike at the heart of the problem on poverty. F. Scott Fitzgerald is supposed to have said to Ernest Hemingway, "Ernest, you know the rich are different from us." To which Hemingway replied, "Yes, they have more money than we do." The curse of the poor is literally their poverty. Give them more income, and not only they but their progeny as well can break through the vicious circle. In a society devoted to personal freedom and the dignity of the individual, much can be said for more income in the form of abstract purchasing power, without a demeaning ritual for the people getting it. We know from experience with the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security System that such even-handed programs are comparatively easy to administer. (Needless to say, this does not rule out the provision of certain social services *in kind*—as, for example, subsidized public hospitals and clinics, or even family counseling by social service workers. Nor should we be so naive as to expect that there will be no wasteful and misguided expenditure of income supplements by some of the recipients.)

MORE THAN A HANDOUT

Second, in our cultural traditions income has tended to be associated with work and effort. We are all taught in school the words of Captain John Smith to the Virginia Colony, "He who does not work shall not eat." Still, 17th century mottoes will not dispose of 20th century problems. One of the beauties of the negative income tax is precisely that it combines humanity with incentives. It does not merely provide a handout to ameliorate poverty, but, in contrast to alternative programs soon to be discussed, it conduces toward the ending of that poverty. Just as people soon become accustomed to an existing tax schedule or to the dividends from inherited wealth, people in a mixed society will soon come to take for granted their rights in an established system of income supplements.

Third, the negative income tax dovetails well with complementary programs. It is not at all competitive with labor manpower programs designed to qualify the unemployed for the new kinds of jobs becoming available in our evolving society. It integrates beautifully with our old-age system of pensions provided by private and public agencies; a significant number of the poor people are elderly.

Now let us consider the demerits of the plan.

First, "negative income tax" is a very bad name. Obviously it has a negative ring. Perhaps a better name would be "Incentive Income Supplement" or "Incentive Payment Plan." They not only sound better, but are more accurate.

Second, there is definitely a problem of achieving consensus on any measure that gives people any kind of income they do not have to "work" for. In a recent Gallup poll, for example, a majority could not be mustered for a "guaranteed income" proposal. There was, however, more than a majority in favor of "guaranteed jobs for all." Not only do many in the affluent class resent the subsidization of idleness, but so also do many members of the lower middle class who have pulled themselves by painful effort out of poverty. If, therefore, it were really feasible to choose between (1) an effective government program that could provide useful employment and (2) a negative income tax payable to able-bodied persons, few would prefer the latter. However, I do not see this as a matter of mutually exclusive choice. There are grave doubts, upon which I cannot elaborate here, that the government can serve effectively as an employer of last resort. In any case, if these doubts were resolved, it would be quite possible to integrate a guaranteed-job program with a negative-tax program.

Third, the negative income tax would call for a monthly reckoning, since the poor would need monthly payments (in contrast and in addition to our system of quarterly or yearly tax collections).

Fourth, it would be somewhat complex to determine the amount of money for each family. And add to this the handling of modifications incurred by job loss or change, pay raises, more children being born.

Consider another problem that might not at first glance seem to be closely related to the negative income tax, namely government aids to agriculture. Our farm price-support programs are costly and yet too often they accomplish little toward their ultimate goal of succoring human need. According to a recent poll of economists, more than 95 percent disapprove of these programs. Marginal farm families—those whom our agricultural problems ostensibly were designed most to aid, but who in fact receive relatively little—would benefit enormously from the negative income tax system. If such a system were provided for them, many economists would, in good conscience, recommend that billions of dollars be lopped off existing agricultural aid programs.

WHAT POLITICAL THINKERS PROPOSE

To appraise the worth of the plan for incentive income supplements, let me compare it with some alternative proposals.

Michael Harrington and a considerable number of political thinkers have advocated an outright guaranteed minimum income for all. Thus, if the poverty line in 1968 is drawn at an income level of $3,000 for a family of four, they advocate guaranteeing that whole amount to every such family. In my judgment, such a program would be costly. Referring once again to Dr. Lampman's estimates, the net cost of an outright minimum income guarantee would probably run in the neighborhood of $28 billion. At least $10 billion of this would be required to fill the gap between what people now earn and the minimum. But that is not even half the story. An outright guarantee plan would have powerful adverse effects. Why? The majority of the families defined as poor are actually headed by wage earners, albeit their income levels are inadequate. An outright guarantee in effect places them in a marginal tax bracket of 100 percent. Why should a person earn extra income, or even his existing income, if every dollar he brings in automatically subtracts a dollar from his government supplement? Alleviating poverty by this plan has the unfortunate effect of perpetuating the evil.

This brings us to the present system of welfare assistance. Some proponents of the negative income tax favor this device as a complete substitute for existing relief measures. I do not go so far: for a long time to come we shall need such programs. But much of their cost could be reduced and, what is more important, much of their evil. In the words of Professor James Tobin of Yale, "The present welfare system is a disaster." It is uneven. New York pays five times as much to each poor family as Mississippi, and there is no comparable difference in the purchasing power of money. Too often, existing welfare programs humiliate those in need and kill off their incentives. When the breadwinner in a family accepts a temporary job involving a few hundred dollars, he runs the risk of jeopardizing his eligibility for relief and sacrificing financial aids running into thousands of dollars. In 28 of our states the regulations are so perverted as to give the husband a financial incentive to leave home—as the best financial boon he can bestow upon his family.

Some experts, as for example Daniel P. Moynihan, advocate a children's allowance program rather than incentive income maintenance programs. A Moynihan program that pays $8 to $12 per month per child to rich and poor alike can be very costly and yet makes scarcely a dent on poverty. Moreover, a negative income tax formula which includes family size as one of its variables is in the truest sense a family allowance system, even though not merely a children's allowance system. And it has the great advantage of not giving to the affluent what they do not need, and of not having to tax back from such affluent families what has been indiscriminately handed to them.

CARICATURES FROM THE THIRTIES

Finally, some social observers have discounted the merits of income maintenance plans, preferring rather to espouse programs that guarantee jobs for all. Full employment, I would agree, is indeed a basic social goal. And structural unemployment, particularly in connection with the woefully high rates prevailing among unskilled white and nonwhite youths is a problem that does demand vigorous federal action. However, I do not see why incentive income supplements should be regarded as competitive with Job Corps and other manpower programs. And I am not yet ready to throw in the sponge and despair that structural unemployment is an incurable American disease. I can understand and sympathize with the recommendation made by the 1966 U.S. Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, which advocated that the Government become, if necessary, the employer of last resort. Yet it is not an easy task for any agency, public or private, to find useful work to be performed by that part of the labor force which has the least amount of skills and habits of work. A makework program, reminiscent of some of the caricatures of the WPA programs of the 1930s, could involve formidable problems of organization and morale. Yes, it is better for a man to earn an income at a useful task than to receive a handout. But assembling numbers of people to make them go through a ritual work they themselves can see to be a mockery of useful effort, could be worse for morale than an even-handed system of income supplements. Even if my apprehensions are unfounded, there is no necessity to regard the choice between the negative income tax and employment programs as an either/or choice among mutually incompatible alternatives.

I have tried to set forth the main outlines of an approach to poverty that is new to the American system. Since the approach is new, discussion should not freeze around one hard and fast detailed plan. (Actually, a well planned experiment is now being undertaken in New Jersey by the Institute for Research on Poverty, to test the empirical effects upon work incentives of various formula plans—with incentive factors varying between 30 and 70 percent.)

However, in my judgment, the time is ripe for national consideration of, and debate on what the economic historian of the future may perhaps record as one of the significant social inventions of the last third of the 20th century.

FUTURE AGRICULTURAL POLICY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture has been holding hearings over the country to obtain the viewpoint of agriculture interests and in this connection Mr. Peter E. Marble, a rancher from Nevada, who is a regional vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, made a presentation which I believe will be of general interest to the Members of the House. Mr. Marble has pointed out that 50 percent of U.S. agriculture income is derived through meat production. This important segment of agriculture is not subsidized. Cattlemen are receiving about the same for their products that they received 20 years ago, while consumer per capita income is up 150 percent since 1951. Mr. Marble warns of the disaster that will result if the administration embarks on a massive land retirement program and permits the retired cropland to be converted to beef production. The text of Mr. Marble's statement follows:

FUTURE AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. Secretary, I appear before you in behalf of the beef cattle producer and feeder interests, organizations and industry of the far west. While I cannot, nor do I presume to, speak for every individual or each organization, I am sure the majority of livestock producers generally if not specifically agree with what I will have to say today. With respect to future agricultural policy of the United States, I wish to make it crystal clear that in general we actively and aggressively support a policy of free private enterprise in American agriculture. To be very clear about this we do not favor or believe in Federal regulatory, price supporting, production limiting programs.

Now to back up a moment, the Far West Beef Industry supports the policy statement presented by Bill House, ANCA President, presented to you in Lincoln on April 12. I do not wish to repeat him, but would underscore the following:

A. The beef industry-producing over 20% and the meat industry over 50% of the total U.S. Agricultural income represent by far the largest land users and producers on the American Scene.

B. The prosperity of U.S. animal-livestock agriculture is the key to total U.S. farm and crop prosperity.

C. Export of U.S. beef and all other agricultural commodities must be developed on a truly *reciprocal* basis with dumping or glutting restrictions in any market—foreign or domestic.

D. We are unalterably opposed to the government payment of any kind for grazing or production of beef. I refer especially here to the increasingly frequent suggestion of permitting grazing on retired or deferred acreages. Such would be simply another act of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is not to say we oppose retirement of crop land per se although many of our livestock producers would argue strongly for the curtailment of subsidy to anyone at any time—and certainly the history of payment-retirement-production control is repeated failure. If land retirement is politically necessary then we *strongly, unequivocally* recommend that all payments, controls and obligations of the Federal Government cease when and if a land owner elects to use the land in any way for livestock.

Now for a minute let me recommend certain specific policy action.

1. The U.S.D.A. should assist in the develepont of a quasi-government private beef industry board for the limited but specific purpose of developing export markets for U.S. beef and greater foreign consumption of beef—all beef—particularly U.S., but also foreign. Generally, the program should be financed and controlled by existing U.S. state and national beef promotion groups in proportion to their individual financial support with these funds being matched by the Federal Government—perhaps somewhat logically—out of collections levied against tariffs on imports.

2. The U.S.D.A. should select responsible, *full time* operator ranchers and farmers (producers) to meet and deliberate quietly and without publicity in the formulating of future Agricultural Policy. These men should be *representatives* of national commodity organizations in *proportion* to the gross dollar value of the major commodities to the U.S. total. Specifically those commodity groups such as livestock, tree and row crops, and the other free market, unsupported commodities, which represent the great majority of U.S. agricultural production, should have an appropriately weighted influence in the ultimate determination of "Production" Policy. It's time for the tail to cease wagging the dog. While there may well be merit and justification for field sampling of individual opinion as is being done today, the vast majority of Western agricultural producers of any commodity are very ably represented in person and in policy development through their existing grower organizations, such as the cattlemen's and feeder groups or Farm Bureau in the case of beef production.

3. A minute ago I referred to Agricultural "Production" Policy—My personal feeling is that the U.S.D.A. should in the future limit its activities to the maximum or optimum servicing of agricultural producers, processors and facilities, including inspection, research, standardization, etc. (regulations) for the benefit of consumers but as distinct from direct consumer servicing and welfare.

Specifically of late there has been much ado concerning U.S.D.A. hunger, malnutrition, poverty programing. In recent years there has been an increasing trend to encourage urban oriented programing through the extension service and the like. No doubt such programing will at least temporarily draw greater popular and political support to U.S.D.A. and farmers. Nevertheless, recognizing that the industry of agriculture is still the largest in the U.S. and promises forever to be vastly important as an economic if not political entity, it deserves undivided, undiluted attention. This is not to say the agriculturalist does not have great concern, great empathy, a great desire to eliminate the problems of human need and deprivation wherever it exists. It is to say that most deprivation and consumer-agricultural deficiencies in the U.S. relate principally to inadequacies in consumer job, education, earning and living deficiencies which as far as the Federal Government is concerned are already served or should be better served through other departments specifically created to represent these needs, i.e. H.E.W., Labor, etc.

4. Future policy with respect to usage of Federal lands for any purpose, but especially grazing, should forthrightly recognize continued multiple usage, development and sale when appropriate. The Federal Government should quit trying to make goats out of western users—whether they be skiers, grazers, sportsmen, or whoever—the government should stop trying to make the very last nickle off the Federal lands and instead

vigorously promote the kind of resource development—through private capital—that has occurred almost without exception wherever private agriculture is to be found throughout the U.S.

As is not so well known, about one half of the land area west of the Rockies continues in federal ownership. An equivalent of about a third on the continental U.S. belongs to the Federal Government. In the wake of disastrous slum, poverty and other dislocations emanating from fantastic population growth in the West, in the great eastern metropolitan centers, etc. better Federal land resource utilization is needed. For instance why not exchange through sale some of the relatively unproductive, recreationless western federal lands for areas closer and more useful to the large population centers of the east and elsewhere.

5. The U.S.D.A. should vigorously support the tax proposals of the National Livestock Tax Committee. Livestock operators are concerned about abuse and weakening of the industry by investors attracted solely by so-called tax advantages. It is for this reason the "Tax Committee" has proposed changes. On the other hand every evidence indicates that 1) agricultural investment for purposes of tax escapement is not only used most unsuccessfully but is insignificant in the aggregate and 2) motivated principally because of confiscatory unrealistic income tax rates affecting earners and investors outside of agriculture. Otherwise and generally there is no justification for not according agriculture the same tax treatment accorded others. The U.S.D.A. should speak up for and in behalf of the livestock industry in this matter.

6. In closing it is suggested that the most direct, responsible, correct solution to elimination of production control and payments programing is to buy these allotment, quota, payment, etc. entitlements back at full current market value and be done with it.

Next for the record—I should like to offer some background information on Livestock and Agricultural conditions generally—

FACTS BEARING ON BEEF AND MEAT PRODUCTION IN NEVADA, UTAH, ARIZONA, AND CALIFORNIA—1948–68 AND CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(A) Four state production of cattle and calves more than doubled, sheep and lamb production down 13% and swine production more than cut in half. For the 48 states, the production of cattle and calves has about doubled; the price of cattle has increased only 5% and calves 13%, which results in cash receipts only slightly more than doubled. The production of the other two species has been cut 20%. *The total red meat production* in the 48 states during 1948 to 1968 period has *increased 55%* with the *cash receipts* for the 20-year period up *65%*.

(B) Four state crop production of wheat, barley, grain sorghums and cotton has increased 75% with a 35% increase in value of production. For the 48 states, *production* of the above *supported commodities* is *up 47%*, while the *value* of production is down *18%*.

(C) Four state government subsidy payments (1967) equaled 3.3% of total farm marketing receipts. Forty-eight state payments equaled 6.3%.

(D) 1967 PRODUCTION VALUE

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	4-State		United States	
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
All commodities	$4,654	100.0	$42,788	100
Livestock and products	1,978	42.5	24,405	57
Crops	2,676	57.5	18,383	43

[Dollar amounts in millions]

(E)	1947	1967
Realizing U.S. net income	$17,114	$14,241
Purchasing power of above income	$20,619	$12,603
Farm disposable income as percent of total	11.8	4
Personal disposable income of farm population	$22,257	$22,037
Per capita farm disposable income as percent of nonfarm disposable income (1955 48.2 percent)	61.1	73.2
Cash market value of livestock and products	$16,527	$24,405
Cash market value of cattle and calves	$4,967	$10,551
Cash market value of crops	$13,093	$18,383
Cash market value of feed crops	$2,265	$4,306
Cash market value of oil crops	$917	$2,773
Total U.S. farm production expense	$16,995	$34,525
Total U.S. gross farm income	$32,072	$46,385
Government payments by program:		
ACP	$277	$225
Great Plains		12
Soil Bank		29
Sugar Act	37	70
Wool		29
Feed grain		865
Wheat		731
Cotton		932
Subtotal		2,528
Crop land adjustment		85
Total	314	3,079

(F) The impact of the foregoing figures is this:

(1) All agriculture for the past 20 years has been under a terrific price squeeze. Livestock and other unsupported commodities have weathered this critical period in better shape than governmentally controlled, subsidized production of some crops.

(2) Beef producers, ranchers and feeders, and the *80 percent plus* of U.S. agricultural production that operates on the basis of *free-private* enterprise has in effect been *subsidizing* the American consumer by supplying an ever-increasing supply of improved products at less than cost. How has this happened? In the case of beef producers their production for 20 years has consistently out-run demand by just enough to keep a lid on prices. Beef production has increased at the rate of about 4% a year while the population was only growing at a 2% rate. At the beginning of the 50's every man, woman and child ate about 50 pounds of beef a year. Today consumption has doubled to over 100 pounds per capita. And with the production increase has come great, almost fantastic improvements in quality, grade, production and servicing. Fortunately, perhaps, the value of land and production facilities has more than doubled during this period, in sympathy with the unfortunate inflationary trend of the period. This has enabled free agriculture and beef producers particularly to borrow increasingly to finance the deficit in their operations, while barely maintaining a shrinking equity. It will take many years of higher prices in the beef industry to liquidate the accumulated debt and finance the type of efficient quality production demanded of current and future generations of American and foreign consumers.

Again for a moment let us look at some consumer—beef producer facts:

(1) Current retail beef prices about the same as in *1951*.

(2) Consumer-per capita-income is up over 150% since 1951.

(3) The consumer spends a third less of his pay check to buy twice as much higher quality beef as he did 20 years ago.

(4) It takes just half as long for a worker to earn a pound of beef as it did 20 years ago.

Now the foregoing is not offered with the hope of fooling anybody. Every family spends more total dollars on meat and beef than they did 20 years ago and naturally, a housewife should be concerned about prices of anything in her budget. More is spent on beef purchased today because Americans are vastly better off financially than they were. Many can afford to eat beef today that had to eat potatoes or grits 20 years ago. Beef is by its very nature as an animal product more expensive to produce than fish, cereals or chicken. It is the greater complexity and cost of production, even though beef is more healthful, nutritious and palatable (desirable) than any other food substance, that explains why most of the world's 3 billion people don't eat it.

Statistically, the *average family* is now eating about a pound and a half of beef a day and the bread winner seldom averages much less than $2 an hour. Millions of unionized trade workers earn from $5 to $10 an hour. Most of the meat out of a beef animal is merchandized as hamburger or lesser but nevertheless, very delicious and acceptable cuts at from $.60 to $.80 a pound. Is it unreasonable for a breadwinner to spend just a portion of an hour daily to acquire the most universally accepted quality food ever produced?

On the other side of the coin elements of the agricultural industry have increased their production of goods from 50% to 100% during the past 20 years and not only net less than they did twenty years ago but have lost about half the purchasing power of that reduced income. For 20 years per capita farmer income has run between 60% to 70% of that of his city counterpart and in some of those years it has dropped as low as 48%. Wages for farm workers are as inadequate as employer earnings. Even in 1969 cattle prices are still running 10% to 15% below parity, which indicates the continuing economic lag of the beef industry behind the more than 190 million U.S. citizens living and working off the farm.

Most important in considering future farm policy and especially beef agriculture is the very long time span of the production cycle (3 to 5 years) and period of inventory turnover. Price, production and profit circumstances for beef producers have been adverse for a long time. It will take many years of prosperity to repair the deprivations of this past 20 years.

The foregoing suggests to us in the beef industry that:

(A) All agricultural commodities should be produced on a free production—marketing basis.

(B) Withdrawal of the Federal Government from subsidization principally of feed grains, wheat and cotton should be done without impairment or risk to free agriculture.

(C) The U.S.D.A. should concentrate on strengthening the economic, social and productive circumstance of a free agriculture and let the multiplicity of other departments and agencies render the same service for a better society outside of agriculture.

(D) Curtailment of the 3½ billion spent for subsidies while an important concern should, however, be secondary to quickly adopting a program that will speedily put all producers and land on their own. As long as production subsidies are paid they should be offered without discrimination as to size, income, etc. and other criteria that can and will be so easily circumvented.

RANCHER—GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Any discussion of future farm policy would be lacking without reference to both the credibility, producer, livestock expertise and liaison gaps that exist between the Ranch and the Potomac. The current administration campaigned on a platform that promised: (1) Reasonable safeguards against dumping of Foreign Agricultural Production; (2) Multiple use—including grazing—on Federal Lands within the spirit and obvious intention of the Taylor and other pertinent Acts, and under economic terms; (3) A priority for private agriculture and an expectancy that Livestock Producers would be more directly represented within the U.S.D.A. and other such matters.

Ranchers are bi-partisan or perhaps even non-partisan in their attitude toward government. They are aware of the many political verities and practicalities that affect and surround our Government. We are not easily disheartened except by ineptness, inexperience and deception. We—no less than citizens generally—have experienced an alienation not only from the understanding of an urban dominated society but discouragingly and surprisingly enough from those in government whose original function was to represent and communicate the needs and circumstances of Agriculture.

Mr. Secretary, the fee increases recently applied by the Departments against Forest and Interior permittees is a rotten travesty on intellectual, economic and political honesty. It is also bad resource policy.

The failure of the U.S.D.A. to recognize and actively support the National Livestock Tax Committee recommendations with respect to desirable changes in our tax laws is disappointing.

The absence of support for our Industry's amendments to the Meat Import Act and advocacy of its generous principals to all foreign agricultural trade on a reciprocal basis is of continuing concern.

Ever-increasing appropriations and personnel allocated to recreation and urban oriented programming which has curtailed and reduced livestock industry and natural resource development is simply not reasonable or acceptable.

Ranchers, livestock operators and farmers who produce and operate without subsidy continue to find it simply incredible that instead of appointing, hirings, appropriating in proportion to each commodity's agricultural contribution, the tax eaters, the unsuccessful, the nonagriculturalist, the inexperienced, the loser gets first consideration.

Recently there has been much ado about the fat and chicken content of hot dogs. It's an agricultural issue typical of the obfuscation and disservice to both consumer and producer that lead to distrust in every quarter. (Other subjects in past periods handled to the confusion and possible detriment of both consumer and producer alike, have been hide exports, use of antibiotics and insecticides, user versus wilderness interests, etc. Of course the fat content of a meat product should be limited to the minimum consistent with production criteria. Of course packaged food products should be clearly and specifically labeled as to what they are.

And where has the U.S.D.A. been in the matter of restrictions on and disenfranchisement of some students from summertime farm employment—Why is it that exchange students and other young foreign nationals visiting the U.S. can't be hired on farms or ranches. When it's mid-winter and the cows haven't been fed or mid-summer and the hay not cut all for lack of help; when every personal and employment service effort has been made to locate help and when literally everyone—government and private—agree there is no qualified help available—Why—Why—Why—shouldn't a rancher—at least on some reasonable temporary basis—be allowed to recruit foreign nationals? Why doesn't the U.S.D.A. have the backbone—honesty and good judgment to help out in this increasingly critical situation.

Where has the U.S.D.A. been when various of the sensation-seeking media has grossly misrepresented the substandard working and wage conditions of a minority of farm workers as, or to be, the condition of all farm labor. Of course wages, earnings and investment return should be higher in agriculture. But the majority of workers live about as well as their employers. We eat in the same kitchen.

Why—in sounding out agriculture on future farm policy—haven't the national or regional commodity organizations (in proportion to their share of total production) been selected as the principal spokesman. Ranchers noting the invitation of selected individuals through or from the universities can only wonder whether this sampling is politics or business.—The invitation of over 20 men to present their recommendations on the future of their industry in eight minutes or less within a one-day hearing is something less than inspiring.—

Mr. Secretary: In closing, I should strongly underscore that, while this presentation is, in many respects critical of the past, the present, and this procedure of policy development, we do appreciate any opportunity affording an exchange of views. We respect our government, its procedures, and your office, though from time to time, we do not agree with governmental policy; and I should also like to add that among the deficiencies of the past, there have been many contributions and successful program developments from the department and especially dedicated service, ability, and interest among many who work for the U.S.D.A.

We appreciate and thank you for this invitation today.

A NEW COMMITMENT TO UNDERSTANDING THE ROCHESTER PLAN GROWS IN THE WAKE OF 1964 RIOT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, the city of Rochester, N.Y., found itself in the midst of one of the first riots which have since plagued many of our metropolitan areas.

That riot forced a lot of people to take a real look at what was happening around them. It made them take stock of the situation and with the tremendous resources available the people of Rochester started to solve the problem.

Today Rochester has taken the lead in job training, in minority businesses, in urban development and innovative school programs. I would like to share with my colleagues an article from U.S. News & World Report detailing what has been accomplished in Rochester. I am sure that all of you join with me in praising these efforts and offering encouragement for the future.

The article follows:

ANSWER TO RIOTS—THE ROCHESTER PLAN

ROCHESTER, N.Y.—When Negro rioting ripped this city in 1964, nearly everyone was surprised.

In that rioting, four persons were killed, 350 were injured. Stores were looted and burned. The National Guard had to be called in to restore order.

It was then that this city of 300,000 suddenly realized for the first time that it had racial problems—and it went to work on them.

Today, five years later, Rochester is hopeful that it is on the way to solving those racial problems—and finding the answer to riots.

The test here is widely regarded as crucial—for the entire nation.

"If Rochester cannot solve these problems, then no city can," says an official of Rochester's biggest business, the Eastman Kodak Company.

Progress is rated as remarkable when measured against that in many other riot-scarred cities.

Biracial work. Lines of communication between whites and blacks have been opened. Business leaders, city officials and representatives of the black community have worked together to create bold new programs. Some of these programs have been so successful that they were copied by the U.S. Government and by other cities.

With federal aid, much has been done to train and hire Negro workers and to open up new opportunities for blacks to own businesses. Housing and urban-renewal projects are under way. School innovations are being tried.

Nobody claims that Rochester is now a "model" city, or that new racial violence cannot break out. City officials are finding that jobs, while important, are not the complete answer. Housing and educational problems are proving even tougher to solve than the job problem. Some Negro discontent remains.

But there is quiet optimism that this city is on the right track and has the tools to finish the job.

Rochester has some advantages over many other cities. That is partly why the riot of July 24 and 25, 1964, was so unexpected.

Few jobless. The unemployment rate in Rochester has been consistently one of the lowest in the nation. The city has little heavy industry. Local firms turn out highly specialized products such as film, office equipment, instruments and optical goods.

Rochester's major employers are hometown industries with a long history of active participation in community affairs. People long have taken pride in solving their own problems and not turning to the State or Federal Government for help.

The Negro population in Rochester has been growing, but is still relatively small. It was during the 1950s that Negroes began arriving in large numbers. By 1960, the nonwhite population had reached 25,000. Most estimates put the present number of nonwhites at around 50,000—about one sixth of the city's total population.

In the last five years, Puerto Ricans have increased even faster than Negroes—from 2,000 to almost 10,000.

Race relations here were considered good—until the riot. But City Manager Seymour Scher admits "we had our heads in the sand in 1964."

Most of the Negroes who migrated to Rochester had come from the South—some to pick fruits and vegetables on nearby farms, some lured by word that, for Negroes, this was a good city, with well-paying jobs.

Problems of newcomers. Many arriving Negroes were disappointed. Few had the skill and education required for the jobs available in local industries. Housing, scarce and aging before the migration, deteriorated rapidly. Schools in Negro neighborhoods became overcrowded.

The result was what some people term an "instant ghetto"—which exploded.

The riot did not set off an immediate, massive program of change. There was a "cooling off" period when civic leaders were unable to find anybody to speak for the black community.

Change began in 1965, when the Council of Churches brought in Saul Alinsky, head of a Chicago-based group called the Industrial Areas Foundation. He organized "FIGHT"—"Freedom, Independence, God, Honor, Today."

FIGHT won broad support in the Negro community. Although militant and often abrasive, it also won somewhat grudging respect and co-operation from white business and civic leaders.

Start of a drive. A major goal of FIGHT was more jobs for Negroes. A major target was Eastman Kodak, the city's biggest employer. The immediate result was a long and heated dispute. But in its wake, instead of lasting bitterness, came a host of new ideas for solving Rochester's problems.

One FIGHT demand was that Eastman hire 600 hard-core unemployed within 18 months—with FIGHT picking the new workers. Eastman proposed, instead, a community-wide quota of 1,500 hard-core jobs in 18 months, with participation by all Rochester's employers and agencies that deal with the poor.

After months of discussion, a new organization was set up, called "Rochester Jobs Incorporated."

This organization serves as a central clearinghouse for jobs for the hard-core unemployed. Companies list employment that they have available for inexperienced workers, and the list is distributed to all agencies that have contact with potential applicants.

In two years, more than 2,600 hard-core unemployed were hired. About 85 per cent of them started at rates of $2 or more an hour.

Says Ed Croft, director of Rochester Jobs Incorporated:

"We can offer a job to any male over 18 years of age who walks in here. If we do not have a job listed, we pick up the phone and develop one.

"Finding jobs for women is a little harder, since many cannot take shift work at odd hours or can work only part time."

The National Alliance of Businessmen picked up the idea of Rochester Jobs Incorporated and set up a nationwide program of providing jobs for the hardcore jobless—with individual firms being asked to pledge to hire a certain number.

But Rochester's Mr. Croft says:

"We are opposed to individual quotas for firms. We have community quotas and just ask each company to do what it can."

The biggest factor in the success of the Rochester plan is a revision of hiring standards by businessmen. Mr. Croft explains:

"Back in 1962, employers hired only high-school graduates. By 1965 they would accept applicants who had completed government training programs. Now, they no longer ask about an applicant's education."

Both of Rochester's major employers, Eastman and Xerox Corp., have nationally recognized systems to train hardcore workers.

Basic education. Xerox offers "step-up" training to those unable to pass the usual entry tests.

Training classes teach such things as writing, reading, safety, use of hand tools, personal budgeting, legal aid and income tax preparation.

Eastman's course goes back to 1963. It offers basic education as well as skills for production work, laboratory work and trades.

These programs stimulated the flow of job applications by Negroes.

Many who applied actually did not need the special training and were hired immediately for regular jobs. They had not applied previously because they believed they were not wanted.

Some idea of how the companies in Rochester are trying to hire Negroes is given by this statement from Xerox's vice president for manufacturing, Horace Becker:

"I put out an edict stating that in new employment we should shoot for 50 per cent black.

"Sure, this is reverse discrimination. But if we do not face up to this problem, the day could come when we have black guns on one side of the street and white guns on the other, and this would destroy America. I owe my children a better future than that.

"We have not achieved the 50 per cent level in new hiring. But we have pulled our percentage of black employees up to about 11 per cent of the total."

Another demand made by FIGHT was that Eastman build a plant in the Negro section of town that would be managed by blacks and would employ blacks.

New industries. Eastman already had several plants easily accessible to "ghetto" workers. So as a counterproposal it offered to set up four new industries to be owned and operated by Negroes and to supply products or services needed by Eastman.

The result was another new agency, "Rochester Business Opportunities Corporation" (RBOC), designed to mobilize community resources for setting up businesses owned and operated by blacks.

RBOC has been one of the most successful efforts in the nation to develop "black capitalism." In less than 18 months, 50 black businesses have been established in Rochester.

The RBOC board of directors includes 13 corporation presidents. It is often criticized by militant Negroes for having too many rich, white businessmen on its board—and not enough blacks. Its Negro director, Jim Blow, answers:

"The average guy on the street does not know enough about fund raising or how to start a new business."

More than financial help is provided to Negroes starting new businesses. They are taught practical aspects of running a business. A team of instructors is assigned to each new firm.

Many new firms are also helped by purchasing contracts with Rochester companies—arranged by RBOC. When the new firm is ready to branch out and seek customers, RBOC helps in that, too.

Among black-owned businesses that have been started here are a laundry and dry-cleaning firm, an employment agency, a trucking firm, a commercial-sign company and a camera-repair shop.

Help from Xerox. FIGHT's demand for locating a black-owned business in the Negro neighborhood became a reality with the help of Xerox. Officials of the two organizations set up a plant to produce metal stampings and low-voltage transformers.

The new firm, called the Fighton Corporation, is wholly owned by FIGHT, with Xerox agreeing to purchase $400,000 in equipment from it this year and $700,000 in 1970. Xerox also provides management aid.

Fighton is now almost in full operation, and will soon employ 100 workers. Eventually it plans to step out from under the Xerox purchasing umbrella and seek wider markets.

While experience with firms set up in "ghettos" elsewhere in the country has not been very encouraging, officials here think Fighton will be different because it is wholly black-owned and black-managed—not, as in many cases, a white-owned subsidiary.

It is considered important that Fighton succeed. Says FIGHT's newly elected president, Bernard Gifford:

"Many of our young people say it can't be done—that a corporation can't be both a social and an economic success. If we can make it work here, maybe we can change that thinking."

Added up, Rochester's efforts to find jobs for Negroes have been impressive.

Housing has turned out to be considerably harder to provide than jobs. Rochester has a severe shortage which affects the middle-income as well as the low-income families.

There appears to be no lack of effort for housing. Some 60 agencies are working on the problem. However, many lack both capital and know-how. There has been a lack of co-ordination and some political bickering over the roles of local and State agencies.

Part of the reason for the housing shortage, some officials say, is that for years Rochester avoided turning to the Federal Government for financial aid. From 1950 to 1962, almost no low-rent housing was built.

Now Rochester has a number of urban-renewal projects. But progress seems slow. Says City Manager Scher:

"We are faced with trying to telescope into 3 or 5 years things that needed to be done in 20 years. But every blighted area in this city is now under treatment of some kind."

Building: slow. The trouble is that results of these programs are not yet visible to Negroes. About 1,000 housing units for low-income families have been completed, but they are scattered widely over the city.

Only one of the urban-renewal projects has reached the rebuilding stage—and Negroes note that office buildings and a motel have been built, but no low-income housing.

Explanations about delays in getting federal approval fall on deaf ears in the black community. Says one Negro leader:

"The people in city hall seem to have their priorities mixed up. I do not believe what I read about plans to build low-income housing."

Officials hope that attitudes will change as projects take shape.

Private agencies are making a contribution to housing.

The Metropolitan Rochester Foundation has a membership of 20 to 25 major firms and builds homes for families of middle or low-middle incomes. It is trying, without much success, to get suburban areas to change zoning regulations to permit building of lower-priced homes.

FIGHT plans to enter the housing field with a 16-million-dollar project called "Fight Square," which will include commercial buildings as well as apartments and houses.

Another organization, "Better Rochester Living," was started by a young man on a shoestring. Buyers contribute labor as down payment on their homes.

There is still serious concern about Rochester's housing outlook. Schools are also a center of Negro discontent. The black community, led by FIGHT, has recently trained its guns on inner-city schools, charging failure to improve the quality of education they offer.

Integration has been pushed by the city's superintendent of schools, Herman Goldberg. Under an open-enrollment plan, schools in outlying sections of the city were opened to Negroes from the inner city. Even the suburbs are taking some black students.

In all, some 2,400 Negro youngsters are being bused to predominantly white schools.

This is one of the few cities which also use "reverse busing." Some 350 white students are bused to inner-city classes on a voluntary basis.

Superintendent Goldberg believes that school integration will help promote housing integration.

The busing issue. Some white people have opposed the busing. But the key problem now is that the black community is losing some of its interest in school integration.

Says FIGHT director Bernard Gifford:

"We can't get away from the fact that most black children will be educated in virtually all-black schools."

So he and some other Negro leaders here see busing as a side issue. They want better schools in Negro areas.

To beef up those schools, several programs are under way.

Rochester has been recruiting black teachers from the South. Two of the city's nine high schools will have black principals next year.

About a third of Rochester's Negro immigrants have come from one area of central Florida—around Orlando and Sanford. So Superintendent Goldberg promoted a bi-State arrangement between New York and Florida to improve opportunities for Negroes in both areas. Teachers and ideas are exchanged. More kindergartens and vocational training are being provided in the Sanford schools.

"We want people to come to Rochester," says Mr. Goldberg, "but we want them to come prepared."

There is also an idea that the migration of Negroes might be checked by improved opportunities in the South.

New ways to teach. Rochester is testing new methods of teaching. A special "World of Inquiry" school in an old factory building draws a cross section of pupils from all parts of the city. A "Downtown Satellite School," set up in a department store, permits shoppers to observe classes. One idea behind both schools is to show that integrated education can be excellent education.

Rochester has many special programs for youngsters during the summer months.

One, called T.O.P.—for "Teens on Patrol" has 100 teen-agers working with the police department. Other youngsters work with the fire department and the University of Rochester.

Some Rochester residents describe these programs as "riot prevention."

Many people here think this summer will be an important test. If Rochester can avoid major racial trouble, hopes will grow that this city may have found the answer to riots.

EXTENSION OF NDEA LOAN FORGIVENESS PROVISIONS TO TEACHERS IN OVERSEAS STATE DEPARTMENT OR AID-SUPPORTED SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This amendment would extend cancellation of such loans at the rate of 10 percent a year—up to a 50 percent cancellation—to teachers in American schools abroad that are supported by the State Department or AID. Such cancellation provisions now apply for loans made prior to July 1, 1970, to students who become teachers in nonprofit State elementary or secondary schools, institutions of higher education or overseas elementary and secondary schools of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Having served as a member of the investigating committee that looked into the educational opportunities for dependents of American personnel on overseas assignment, I had opportunity to observe the serious problems faced by the American parents, the teachers, and the overseas schools who are struggling to provide American children with decent educations.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage highly qualified American teachers to accept foreign teaching assignments. Students receiving NDEA loans are often the brightest and the best prepared teachers from among our recent graduates. A student who now graduates with NDEA loan repayments to make is reluctant to accept a foreign teaching assignment in an American or international school. To teach in such a school would, in effect, cost him 50 percent of his loan repayment—when compared to teaching in a stateside or Department of Defense school. Since the mission of all these schools is basically the same, this discrimination should not continue.

INAUGURATION OF PAN AMERICAN SERVICE FROM FRIENDSHIP TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Friendship Airport grows with a new flight by a major airline almost every week and I am happy to report that the pioneer in international service from Friendship, Pan American World Airways, is continuing to give the Greater Baltimore area direct service with some of the most intriguing vacation spots in the Western Hemisphere.

Just recently Pan Am inaugurated service between Baltimore and St. Thomas and St. Croix in the Virgin Islands, service which will be daily in character and which will certainly be looked forward to with great anticipation by Baltimoreans next winter.

Mr. Speaker, aboard Pan American's inaugural flight was the excellent columnist for the Baltimore News American, Roy Gregory, and I include his story on his experiences on the flight in the RECORD:

WHAT GOES ON AROUND HERE

(By Roy Gregory)

JET SETTERS

I said it never could be done and now I've done it.

This little old country boy from southern Anne Arundel County is a bona-fide member of the jet set, that more than mythical group of the now generation which fly more miles for a cocktail than their grandparents would drive in a year for victuals.

I'll admit that I must be relegated to the role of an apprentice in the jet set union because I have only made what might be called a baptismal jaunt.

Fran and I were invited to participate in what the Pan American World Airlines called their inaugural flight to the Virgin Islands from these parts. At first glance, it seemed sort of foolish to fly nearly 2,000 miles for four days under the same sun that shines in Anne Arundel County.

However, upon reflection, why not? If President Nixon can shuttle back and forth from Florida, why can't the Gregory's get up and go him a few miles better at least for one weekend?

Pan Am really made the flying great and in less time than it takes to have a cocktail full course dinner and a digestive drink, we were ready to land at St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands.

REAL SWINGERS

A sort of reception committee from the Virgin Island Department of Commerce greeted us at the Harry S. Truman Airport there. We were zipped off to the Virgin Island Hilton Hotel, given time to change socks and then were launched on a two-day tour that seriously challenged our Anne Arundel County reputation for swinging.

Our training on Prim Rose Path, known to outsiders as Ritchie Highway, stood us in good stead and I managed to stay vertical throughout the entire torrid tour.

The hosts were anxious that we see all the fine spots on the St. Thomas scene and we did. Vacation paradise after paradise was peeled off in almost machine-gun like fashion.

We traveled up and down the mountain side and at one point became eligible for flight pay when we rode a tram more than 1,000 feet up the highest peak on the island. The people who run the tram have the right idea.

Upon reaching the top, one does not only have the chance to take in a 360 degree breath-taking view but there is a real live drink dispensing bar. Gives a guy a chance to renew his courage for the flight down because at that point you are up and what goes up, you know.

NO 'RUNDEL BERRIES

They have a magnificent custom on St. Thomas. Every hotel we visited has what they call their "speciality drink." Of course, rum is the most predominant ingredient and after due deliberation, a strawberry daiquiri was voted tops of the day.

Please don't request the recipe. All I know is that the bartender dazzled me with hand work but I do recollect that he used honest to goodness strawberries, not Anny Rundel berries, I suspect.

It didn't take very long for us to realize that there is a tremendous competition for the tourist dollar between the islands of St. Thomas and St. Croix. No knives or bats, just psychological warfare. Like the St. Thomas booster club member who described St. Croix as "a place for newlyweds and nearly deads."

At the end of two days on St. Thomas, Pan Am jetted us on a flight which took less time than it takes to get over the Bay Bridge when there is no traffic, to St. Croix.

We stayed at the most peaceful St. Croix By The Sea hotel which housed a few of the "nearly deads" but was predominantly occupied by the June brides and grooms. I could spot them because they held hands, even in the swimming pool.

DRY SPELL

St. Croix, perhaps because we weren't enringed by people from the Department of Commerce extolling its virtues, was by comparison to St. Thomas, relatively quiet. At one point we went more than 20 minutes without being offered a drink. I intend to go back to the islands some day so I'll be darned if I'll make a recommendation.

Let it suffice to say that both are beauty spots and in this jet age are closer, timewise than our own Atlantic Ocean.

It seemed hard to realize as the huge Pan Am fly bird touched down at Friendship in good old Anne Arundel County that we had been so far and done so much in so few days.

I would gladly give up my apprentice ranking and join the professional jet setters who think nothing of whisking to England just for a spot of tea. Wish we could afford to live like that.

We shall now put our nose to the grindstone, keep tossing pennies into the jar on the shelf and by next year we once again will venture to the Caribbean land to see what Columbus came onto in the early 1400's.

PATIENCE AND ASIAN POLICY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, of all human virtue the most demanding is that of patience. When the exercise of such virtue requires persistence in the face of unpleasant and costly consequences, rationalizations for an alternative to patience come easy. That is not to say that such alternatives would be correct.

The harsh and unkindly light that comes from the 20-20 vision of hindsight can in any troublesome decision uncover judgments that are subject to serious question. Policies, the pursuit of which are obviously costly and the benefits of which are indirect are never popular and most readily scotched. Accepting all this and accepting equally the responsibilities that lie in the place in which we find ourselves and accepting also, the burdens the situation we helped create has developed, nothing serves more admirably the long term of history like the virtue of patience. However, this does not portend stagnation nor rule out improvement, rather it recalls the tempering admonitions of the credo: "Give me the strength and the courage to change the things which can be changed; the strength to endure those things which cannot be changed; and the wisdom to know the difference."

In recent years, there has been heard the voice of disillusion in some quarters of the United States on our Asian policy. This may be attributed to the unpopular results of the war in Vietnam. It seems to me, however, that the Vietnam policy does not symbolize Asian policy as a whole. Nevertheless, it may be necessary to review, at this moment, our past policy, to enable us to cope with possible future challenges by Communist power in this region.

Our Asian policy, I believe, has contributed a great deal to stabilizing this area; not to the extent we had hoped but enough so that we can say it has been successful.

Communists, including the Soviets, keep saying that their every move is for the sake of Communist ideology and will finally bring the utmost welfare for the people of the world. But the world today knows, and actions of both Russia and China demonstrate, what the real meaning is of the ideological dispute between Russia and China who appear headed for physical struggle on a large scale. The world today realizes that there is no "Communist ideology" but only "national interest." This interest to expanding influences over vulnerable countries, utilizing all ways and means available according to tactical requirements. Therefore, both coexistence by Russia or intransigency and belligerency by Red China are policies produced by each of these Communist regimes to face the world situation today according to calculated tactics. Neither has given up their goal of eventual domination of the world on their terms.

Fortunately, since the Khrushchev era, Russia has appeared to moderate its aggressive policy toward European countries as a result of our determined countermeasures through the cold war period. Russia has been forced to shift to a policy of coexistence. This has lightened the American burden in Europe to a great extent. However, we face in Asia a Communist China which reminds us of Soviet Russia in the past.

In fact, political unrest in Asia has its origin in aggressions or subversive activities launched by Communist elements fully backed by the Chinese Communist regime. The world has already witnessed China's aggressive expansionist policy as symbolized in the so-called people's liberation war and overt armed aggression, whenever possible, against its border countries, including Korea, Tibet, India, and Vietnam. Most of the countries in this area have suffered from intrigues of the Chinese Communist regime since its establishment. The abortive coup d'etat by Communists in Indonesia in 1965 was a remarkable example of this kind of intrigue by Red China.

Still we see no evidence that Red China will renounce its aggressiveness in the foreseeable future. In fact, it appears likely to intensify it. Many have predicted that after Vietnam, Communists will surely spread their destructive activities over such countries as Laos, Cambodia, or Thailand. Many have said that the Vietnam war is being fought not only for the Vietnamese people but for the other peoples in this region as well. Actually, our efforts in Vietnam are accepted by the Asians as a test of American determination to protect this area from Communist aggression in the future.

We should keep this area in favor of our side not simply because of the democratic idealism and moral obligation but also because of the economic potentials and relative demographic importance of this region, which is essential in maintaining the global balance of power and ultimately is connected to our national interest and security. It is obvious that if we appease communism in Vietnam our objective of containing Red China along its border will not work out as we projected. If this Communist giant is left unchecked, there will never be a stable and peaceful Asia and world. Communist aggression in Asia should be met and contained, and I think the United States has acted in time and is on the right road.

Look at such countries as South Korea, Japan, and the Philippines.

Nobody can think of postwar prosperity in Japan whose GNP last year reached over $140 billion, next only to the United States and Soviet Russia, without considering the American role in Japan's quick rehabilitation since the day of the Japanese surrender. Despite some difficulties in dealing with Japan at this particular moment, for example revision of the American-Japanese mutual treaty, reversion of Okinawa and import limitations on the part of the United States, we do not think Japan will separate from the free nations and go to the Communist side. The more prosperous Japan becomes the closer she will stay to the free side.

The Republic of Korea survived open Communist aggression with the aid of free nations, especially the United States. As we see today, her national potential has started to explode into energy. She has had a high degree of political stability as well as amazingly successful economic development. The GNP growth rate has gone from 4.2 percent in 1961 to 13.3 percent last year. This is one of the highest rates in the world. If we had failed in helping the Korean people in and after the Korean war, today we would not be able to have Korea as one of our most reliable allies, who is fighting with us in Vietnam to deter the Communist aggression. Yet, Korea is far from being self-sufficient and she still needs our aid and protection as long as there are indications of Communist aggression. Especially, recent increased challenges by North Korea along the armistice line and inside South Korea warn us of the graveness of the situation in the area. We cannot afford to let our efforts in the past and present be in vain as a result of our carelessness, because we know someday in the near future the diligent and energetic people of Korea will be able to enjoy a day when no help from abroad will be needed. Koreans are people who help themselves.

As to the Philippines, since they became independent both the American people and the Filipinos know that they have been the closest friends and allies of each other. As a matter of fact, the Philippines have enjoyed continued peace and tranquillity behind the protection of the United States. Recently, however, the Philippines have felt the pressure from mainland China by Communist-oriented Huks who have resumed their subversive activities, and also there are various agitations for the purpose of eliminating American military bases in the Philippines, mainly from a so-called awakened spirit of nationalism which has no alternatives to American protection except to leave the country to the mercy of the Communists. With their own armed forces alone, the defense of the Philippines is haplessly inadequate. Given this situation, I think it is unwise to withdraw or reduce our military presence from the Philippines. There must be some way to further strengthen mutual relationships without harming our defensive capability as it has been while accommodating the nationalistic sentiment which appears to be occupying a small portion of public opinion in that country. We all know that this also matches American interest in this area.

After all, the clear demonstration of U.S. power stabilized the situation in the entire region and prevented a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. U.S. objectives were not offensive from the beginning and its objectives have largely been achieved. Besides those countries mentioned above, without the U.S. show of determination of power, it is doubtful if Cambodia could maintain its long-professed neutrality and independence; if present quietness along the Indian and Burmese boundaries with Red China would remain; if the Communist insurgents in northern Thailand and Laos could be stopped; if political reorientation of Indonesia were possible.

We should keep constant inventory of the positive progress between the nations of free Asia as well as the benefits and stabilities within. The past 10 years have been rich in the birth and growth of intercountry, multinational institutions which would not exist today except for our policy and position in Asia. This progress is reflected in the loans and technical assistance that has been approved by the World Bank in 1968, which is shown as follows:

LOANS APPROVED DURING 1968

Borrower: Industrial Finance Corporation of Thailand. Project: Financing industrial enterprises. Amount, U.S. $: $5 million. Date approved: 23 Jan. Term: 12 years.

Borrower: Central Bank of Ceylon. Project: Modernization of tea factories. Amount, U.S. $: $2 million. Date approved: 2 July. Term: 15 years. Interest: 6⅞%.

Borrower: Republic of Korea. Project: Seoul-Inchon Expressway. Amount, U.S. $: $6.8 million. Date approved: 3 Sept. Term: 15 years. Interest 6⅞%.

Borrower: Malaysia. Project: Penang Water Supply. Amount U.S. $: $7.2 million. Date approved: 19 Sept. Term: 20 years. Interest 6⅞%.

Borrower: Republic of China. Project: Feasibility Study of North-South Freeway ‡. Amount, U.S. $: $0.4 million. Date approved: 19 Nov. Term: 10 years. Interest 6⅞%.

Borrower: Industrial Development Bank of Pakistan. Project: Financing small and medium-scale industries in private sector. Amount, U.S. $: $10 million. Date approved: 12 Dec. Term: 15 years.

Borrower: Chinese Petroleum Corporation. Project: Dimethyl terephthalate (DMT) manufacture. Amount, U.S. $: $10.2 million. Date approved: 19 Dec. Term: 12 years. Interest: 6⅞%.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE APPROACHED DURING 1968

PROJECT PREPARATION

Country: Republic of China. Project: Feasibility Study of North-South Freeway. Amount, US $: $100,000. Date approved: 19 Nov.

Country: Nepal. Project: Air Transport System Development. Amount, US $: $66,000. Date approved: 21 Nov.

Country: Philippines. Project: Fisheries Port Construction in Manila Bay. Amount, US $: $225,000. Date approved: 25 July.

ADVISORY AND OPERATIONAL

Country: Indonesia. Project: Advisors to Ministry of Agriculture Amount, US $: $170,000. Date approved: 30 July.

Country: Indonesia. Project: Rural Credit Survey. Amount, US $: $60,000. Date approved: 30 July.

Country: Republic of Korea. Project: Agriculture & Fishery Development Corporation*. Amount, US $: $66,000. Date approved: 6 Feb.

Country: Laos. Project: Integrated Agricultural Development Program for Vientiane Plain. Amount, US $: $221,000. Date approved: 15 Oct.

Country: Nepal. Project: Advisors to Agricultural Development Bank of Nepal. Amount, US $: $35,000. Date approved 3 Sept.

Country: Philippines. Project: Water Management. Amount, US $: $105,000. Date approved: 20 June.

Country: Republic of Viet-Nam. Project: Development Financing Institutions. Amount, US $: (a) Technical Assistance Mission, $19,000 (b) Assignment of Advisors, $70,000. Date approved: 2 July.

TEACHING THE "UNTEACHABLE" CHILD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today more than 30 of my colleagues and I introduced legislation to provide assistance to children with specific learning disabilities. This legislation grew out of hearings conducted by the General Subcommittee on Education, which I serve as chairman. These hearings demonstrated beyond doubt the insistent need for special programs, teachers, training methods to assist the special needs of these learning disabled children.

The article I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today describes some of the optimistic and highly effective work being done in the learning disabilities field by the Institute for Language Disorders at Northwestern University in Illinois. Programs such as those described below should be encouraged, fostered, and expanded to meet the needs of a growing segment of our school-age population with learning disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Bonnie Kohn Remsberg of the Institute of Language Disorders follows:

TEACHING THE "UNTEACHABLE" CHILD

(By Bonnie Kohn Remsberg)

As a baby, Keith began to talk early and his parents were delighted with their alert little boy. He spoke unusually well, looked forward to kindergarten, and related with enthusiasm to the other children.

Then tiny hints of trouble began to occur. He had difficulty mastering the reading readiness exercises in school. When the children were asked to pick out their name cards and pin them on, he never could identify his. He showed no signs of remembering the visual symbols that made up words he was expected to read. Perhaps, the teacher thought, he just isn't ready for reading.

In first grade, Keith continued to have trouble with the mysterious shapes that make up written language. In reading group, he memorized stories that other children read, and recited them. Whenever the teacher held up a flash card and asked him to read a word, he was stumped. Yet he continued to be outstanding at telling stories, reciting in class, and demonstrating his creative imagination. Clearly, he was a bright child, well-coordinated and personable, but something was definitely wrong.

The puzzled first grade teacher consulted the principal about Keith's erratic performance. Together they reviewed his early tests and history; his scores gave the picture of an intelligent child, who displayed no disturbance or behavior problems at home.

They decided to track down the mystery. Why couldn't Keith learn to read?

His parents were consulted and they took Keith to the family pediatrician. Thorough tests revealed no physical disability. His vision and hearing were normal. It was then that the doctor began to suspect the source of Keith's trouble. He consulted with school officials and together they made their recommendation.

With a phone call to the Institute for Language Disorders on Northwestern's Evanston campus, Keith and his family began a journey that would take him through more testing, diagnosis, and remediation until he learned to overcome his puzzling problem—a learning disability. A detailed teaching program would be custom-designed for his specific trouble in remembering visual symbols. He would slowly and patiently be taught letter sounds which he would later learn to blend into the words he found so elusive. He would attend private teaching sessions in rooms adjoining those where other children with similar problems would be receiving help tailored specifically for them. Eventually he would escape the repeated pattern of failure that plagues so many children with specific learning disabilities.

Northwestern University's Institute for Language Disorders, founded in 1955, has helped hundreds of children who, like Keith, suffer from "the invisible handicap." Called lazy, stubborn, or naughty and dismissed as unteachable, these children often go undiagnosed and are condemned to lives as garbled as their communication skills. But today, through the work at Northwestern and other institutions, and in schools, an increasing number of parents and educators are coming to understand these subtle but debilitating learning problems.

"The children with too many names," victims of this tragedy, have previously been lumped together and burdened with a welter of confusing terminology. They have been called dyslexic, aphasic, perceptually handicapped, interjacent children, reversal children, or simply educationally handicapped. Parent groups often refer to this youngster as "the other child."

Today these problems are grouped under the general heading "learning disabilities," because in all such cases some ability to learn is affected. An estimated 5 percent of the school population has some form of learning disability—some severe, some mild, but all justifying special care. Some authorities estimate that boys with the problem outnumber girls by 7 to 1.

The exact cause of a given learning disability cannot always be determined. Illnesses, infections, or injuries may in some way interfere with the normal supply of oxygen to the brain. In some cases the problems result from genetic or hereditary influences. Whatever the causes, however, treatment of learning disabilities has become an educational, rather than a medical, process.

Perhaps for this reason, recognition and understanding have been slow in coming. Other handicaps, more easily recognized and evaluated, have been treated for years, while the child with a specific learning disability went unrecognized or uneducated. Doris Johnson, director of teacher training at the Northwestern Institute, says, "Teachers not only did not know what caused these children's problems, they had no idea how to teach them. All they knew was that they weren't reached by the standard methods."

Every childhood learning disabilities expert receives letters from anguished parents. "Since he was about three, I have repeatedly said to myself, 'Something is wrong, what can I do to help this boy?' His I.Q. comes out very superior, his grades very inadequate, his reasoning, at times very unreasonable." . . . "My grandson is sent home an average of once a week because of behavior problems. He has a high I.Q. but a very short attention span." . . . "Our daughter caused so much disorder in a pre-kindergarten private school that we were asked to seek psychiatric help. We were of the opinion that she must be stupid, but to our amazement, she was found to have a 130 I.Q."

Miss Johnson explains, "It is very important to understand what these children are *not*. They are not retarded, they are of at least average intelligence, and many of them are quite bright. They are not basically emotionally disturbed, although they may develop tremendous frustrations. And, of course, they are not deaf, blind, or physically handicapped, the other categories for which we provide special education."

Children with learning disabilities exhibit a variety of symptoms. One is abnormal motor activity, in which the child fidgets excessively or is exceedingly slow in his movements. Another is poor coordination; buttoning clothes, riding a bicycle, or learning to write becomes unusually difficult. Frequently, such children are impulsive, stirred to action by minor stimuli, compelled to touch everything they can reach. They may be easily distracted and have a short attention span. Some children become fixed on an activity which they continue until made to stop.

Memory disorders are common. Some children can discriminate between "cat" and

* Includes project preparation.

"mat," but they cannot remember the words. Occasionally they remember words for purposes of recognition in reading, but they cannot remember the words for total recall. So they are unable to spell.

Most children seen at the Institute have difficulty learning a particular form of language and communication. For some the problems are spoken or oral, for others difficulties occur in reading, writing, or calculating. Still other children have trouble with nonverbal learning. They are unable to interpret the meanings of gestures, facial expressions, or vocal inflections. Often these youngsters are unable to go from place to place without getting lost.

Classroom teachers are anxious to learn how to help these children. To this end some are trained at their schools by experts in learning disabilities. Others go back to college for special courses.

"Of course, we do not expect the classroom teacher to do the entire job," says Miss Johnson. "Direct remediation is most often done by special teachers trained in learning disabilities. Northwestern prepares many such teachers each year, as do other colleges. However, the demand is greater than the supply, to classroom teachers should be aware of the problems presented by the learning disabled child."

Currently at Northwestern about sixty children, from three to eighteen, come twice each week to the Institute for diagnosis and remediation. "We avoid the words therapy and clinic here," Miss Johnson explains. "We are teachers. But for this type of teaching there is no single right method. Here, the method is determined by the child's specific disability."

Recently, a seventeen-year-old high school senior came to the Institute after being dismissed from a training program. His reading level tested at between first and second grades, but his teachers considered him proficient in class work requiring spoken language and had passed him through school on D minuses, "because they felt sorry for him."

"When he came to us," Miss Johnson says, "he was terribly discouraged and, of course, severely handicapped vocationally. Fortunately, he was also highly motivated." After evaluation and diagnostic teaching at the Institute, the boy made rapid progress. When dismissed he was reading between ninth and tenth grade level. Today he is a self-supporting member of the community.

A child coming to the Institute for his training session is greeted by his teacher, who leads him into a room planned free from distractions. There she engages him in activities designed to fit his particular needs. One child may listen to himself on a dual channel tape recorded and try to monitor his errors in oral language. Another manipulates letters made of felt so that he can rotate them to different positions. Another uses an abacus as a concrete means of learning some mathematical principle.

A child who came to the Institute at four, able only to gesture and babble for communication, was recently dismissed after three years of treatment. Today he is successfully attending school and has an above-average I.Q. This child reached the Institute when his mother, worried because her boy didn't talk, took him to her pediatrician. The doctor discovered many areas of the child's development within a normal range. At that point, he began to suspect learning disabilities and recommended the Institute.

"I couldn't begin to tell you what a blessing the Institute was to my son," says the mother. "What a tragedy for a bright child to live out an unrewarding life because no one finds out how to reach him and teach him."

Dr. Harold McGrady, associate professor of language pathology, who supervises diagnostic work at the Institute, feels, along with other members of the staff, that the role played by parents in a child's program for learning to adapt to his handicap is a vital one. "We try to help them to understand, and we give them suggestions for follow-through activities," he says, "but we don't expect them to be teachers. They have enough of a job being parents."

The Institute is a part of the Department of Communicative Disorders in the School of Speech. Students enrolled in language pathology, as well as other divisions of the department, may participate in the diagnostic and remediation activities of the Institute. In essence, the Institute prepares diagnosticians and teachers of children with learning disabilities.

"More and more school systems are planning for learning disabilities," Miss Johnson says. "Some have self-contained classrooms, some have resource rooms, some have itinerant programs in which specially trained teachers travel around to the children who need special attention. Awareness of this problem is increasing every day."

Increased awarness is partly due to research projects underway at Northwestern and other universities. The Institute's Learning Disabilities Project, a three-year investigation supported by the United States Public Health Service, is scheduled for completion at the end of this summer. During the project the Institute has studied several thousand school-age children from the suburban area north of Chicago to gather data on the incidence of learning disabilities. A statistical awareness of the depth of the problem, educators feel, is critical to a comprehensive program for evaluating and teaching. This work, it is hoped, will lead ultimately to an effective screening device for detecting affected children early enough to spare them the experience of unnecessary school failures.

Other studies currently being conducted by Institute graduate students include work in adjustment problems of MBD (minimial brain damage) children, memory studies, links between neurology and learning disorders, endocrinology and learning disorders, and auditory and visual processes in relation to reading disabilities.

Recent Northwestern graduates are helping to spread the word about the work being done on the Evanston campus to clinics, colleges, universities, and school systems. "Although as yet there is no undergraduate program, each year we graduate about twenty-five M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s qualified to recognize, evaluate, and teach MBD children," Miss Johnson says. "Right now our people are heading programs in Boston, San Francisco and numerous other places. The goal of our field is to have well-trained and alert people in positions to reach all the children in the country."

INDIANAPOLIS ACTS TO PREVENT URBAN DECAY BY USING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, whole sections of our cities are threatened with decline and decay into urban slums. The problem is critical and a solution must be found quickly.

Responding to President Nixon's urging for mobilization of voluntary efforts in the cities, Indianapolis has responded with a program that may well turn out to be one of the best and most workable plans yet. No Federal money is involved.

The following story from the August 4, 1969, National Observer, by Lawrence Connor, tells how:

INDIANAPOLIS TRIES A NEW CONCEPT TO REVAMP AN OLD NEIGHBORHOOD

INDIANAPOLIS.—A 12-square-block area two miles north of downtown Indianapolis contains numerous large frame houses in which many of the city's leaders grew up 50 years ago. Today, the houses are sagging, many of the lawns are gone, and a whole new generation of residents, mostly Negroes, lives there. It is well on the way to becoming a typical urban slum.

But a private, nonprofit corporation hopes to reverse the slide with an unusual housing project. Indianapolis Neighborhood Homes, Inc., expects to spend $2,670,000 in providing a 300-unit housing project. Some of the old structures will be rehabilitated to provide 225 rental units, and 75 new units will be built for purchase.

If the project succeeds, it may become a prototype for other American cities. It is in line with President Nixon's call for voluntary efforts to save the nation's cities.

A few of the units have been completed. The schedule calls for 82 units to be finished by this December, 70 more by next July, and all of them by 1972. Monthly rental charges range from $96 for one-bedroom units to $118 for four bedrooms.

THE FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD

The project is being carried out in one corner of a 4½ square-mile neighborhood designated as a Model Cities area. Eventually, the neighborhood will contain a small park, tot lots and promenade areas created by closing sections of little-traveled streets.

The concept for the program was developed by the Center for Independent Action, a nonprofit foundation based in Washington, D.C., after a study was made by the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Swann and Weiskopf, Chicago architects, developed the neighborhood planning.

A Lilly Endowment, Inc., grant of $750,000 provided development funds and the equity for the financing. New York Life Insurance Co. has committed, or is considering, mortgage loans amounting to $431,000, enough to finance rehabilitation of 75 units. When the 300 units are completed, some $2,000,000 in mortgage loans are expected to have been made.

E. F. Walsh, executive vice president of the Center for Independent Action, says that "with the validity of the concept proven in Indianapolis, the CFIA objective is that 2,000 units of standard housing can be produced in five other urban centers in the country." Names of the other cities have not been announced.

NO FEDERAL AID

He said there is no Federal subsidy or other governmental assistance involved in the financing of the program. And he asserted private efforts can complete the work faster and cheaper.

To rehabilitate existing structures, the walls, floors, roofs, and supports are being renovated, and new heating, wiring, and plumbing are being installed, as are bathroom fixtures, kitchen cabinets, and appliances. Much of the work is being done by Negro craftsmen.

The Center for Independent Action has concentrated on Indianapolis in the past to test some of its voluntary, self-help programs, including the Voluntary Advisory Corps, in which local residents aid disadvantaged persons in finding jobs and keeping them. John Burkhart of Indianapolis, chairman of the board of College Life Insurance Co. of America, is president of the center.

When the housing project was announced last month, Mayor Richard G. Lugar stressed the private aspect of it. "I believe this is a classic demonstration," he said, "of what President Nixon urged in his inaugural address—the commitment of the private sector . . . in the solving of annoying problems which beset the nation's inner-city residents."