

quate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 13372. A bill to require that certain salacious advertisements not otherwise barred from the mails be mailed by registered mail at first-class mail rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AYRES (for himself, Mr. GERARD R. FORD, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 13373. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for assuring safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women by creating a National Occupational Safety and Health Board to be appointed by the President for the purpose of setting mandatory safety and health standards; by authorizing enforcement of the standards developed under the act; by assisting and encouraging the States in their efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions; by providing for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. KING, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 13374. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide adequate financial assistance and to increase the allotment to certain States of construction grant funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13375. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13376. A bill to provide that Interstate Route No. 80 shall be known as the 80th Division Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13377. A bill to provide for the modernization of railroad passenger equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13378. A bill to repeal a portion of the act of July 15, 1968, relating to entrance, admission, and recreation user fees in connection with the national parks and other Federal areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COWGER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. REES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 13379. A bill to supply manpower needs of the Armed Forces of the United States through a voluntary system of enlistments, to further improve, upgrade, and strengthen the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13380. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to

films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 13381. A bill for the relief of Marguerita R. deBarrera and Carlos Barrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 13382. A bill for the relief of Albert G. Harris, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marcella Coslovich Fabretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKNEALLY:

H.R. 13384. A bill for the relief of Tommaso Prestigiacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13385. A bill for the relief of Marilyn Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 13386. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edwin G. Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

205. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Earle Ray Esgate, Gibson, Ga., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. Also, petition of Clarence Mertion, Sr., Washington, D.C., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AFTER APOLLO, WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired, has written a thoughtful and interesting discussion of the future of our national space program. Because of General Eaker's outstanding background in this area, I am including this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

AFTER APOLLO, WHAT NEXT IN SPACE?

(By Ira C. Eaker)

The great success of the Apollo 11 mission has provided many answers in space but it has also raised some questions which the decision makers in Washington must soon answer.

The critics who for the past seven years have carped, "Why go to the moon?" now have their answer. There can no longer be any doubt that the lunar program will be worth its cost many times over.

Those who were certain that there was no necessity to put men on the moon, instru-

mented probes could do as well, also have been discredited completely. Compare the world-wide propaganda differential between Russia's Luna 15 and U.S. Apollo 11 which arrived at the moon the same week.

It is now clear also that man in space can do many useful things which unmanned satellites cannot accomplish. For example, Apollo 11 would have crashed on the moon's surface as did Luna 15, had not Neil Armstrong taken over from the computerized controls and piloted it to a safe landing area.

Some have expressed surprise that the Russians made little apparent effort to win the moon race. Their resources like ours are not unlimited. They chose instead to put their major effort into space weapons development. This also accounts for the fact that they have repeatedly refused our overtures for joint space programs. So long as their space effort is militarily oriented there is no prospect for cooperative ventures in space between the U.S. and the USSR. Their leaders will never consider admitting our scientists to their laboratories and test centers.

The question now of major concern in the space program is what follows the Apollo series. Some space enthusiasts want at once to head for Mars. The manned exploration of Mars has not been fully cost estimated but it will be several times the \$24 billions spent on the whole Apollo program.

One thing is certain, it would be national

folly to abandon space after Apollo or to discontinue space effort for a few years and use the funds thus saved for welfare programs, as some now advocate.

If the tremendous NASA facilities are closed and the great scientific teams are disbanded, even for a year, they can never be reopened or reassembled at present momentum and efficiency.

There is a sound space program which can follow Apollo and at a cost the U.S. can afford.

First, we must find out more about what man can profitably do in space. This calls for a space station in which men live and work for a time, returning to earth at intervals and being replaced by fresh crews.

The NASA space station must include some experiments in defense capability, formerly programmed for the Air Force MOL (Manned Orbital Laboratory), now cancelled. This will help to determine what the USSR has learned in its military space effort, reveal their capability and suggest how to deal with it.

Next, NASA must continue experiments in development of rocket engines of much greater thrust, including nuclear power for space vessels. Research studies on manned probes of Mars can be continued without hardware procurement.

Unmanned satellite development for communications and weather, which have been continuing programs, overshadowed by Apollo, must also be continued.

These necessary programs will keep the facilities and technical teams of NASA occupied but at somewhat lower manpower and budget levels for the next few years.

NASA budgets, which have averaged \$5 billion annually for the past seven years, cannot safely be cut below \$3.5 billion for the next few years and will necessarily have to be increased when the new engines and new vessels for outer space probes (Mars and beyond) have to be ordered.

The all important considerations about future space effort are to keep the facilities active, hold the scientific teams together and insure that we are never caught by technological surprise in space.

THE EXTENT OF POVERTY IN MEMPHIS, TENN.

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a great and prestigious newspaper, has published five probing, provocative articles on the existence and extent of poverty in the city of Memphis.

The author, Mr. Barney DuBois, has successfully brought home to thoughtful citizens the challenge to remove the want and pain of abject poverty.

In summary, the Commercial Appeal has published an impelling editorial entitled "Target: Poverty." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

TARGET: POVERTY

Memphis no longer can ignore its massive poverty problem. Nor can the surrounding Mid-South area of suburbs, small towns and farms pretend that this is strictly an urban dilemma and responsibility. Indeed, even the best of regional efforts would not be enough; the ultimate solutions must flow from the federal level as well as the local.

Painful as it may be to admit that a booming community such as Memphis is unable to fulfill the basic human needs of more than one-fourth of its citizens, the fact is that it hasn't and isn't. And it is evident that despite numerous anti-poverty programs—ranging from Capitol Hill in Washington down to slums in South Memphis—the cancer is spreading too fast to be halted by the cures now available.

In five articles in The Commercial Appeal by reporter Barney DuBois, concluded yesterday, the bitter truth has been explored. Those who have read them should now have a better understanding of what it means for a man to work hard all week and yet see his children, even babies, crying from hunger. The reader has been given a taste of what it's like to live on neckbones and watered oatmeal—if there's that much to eat in the crowded slum home. He has heard the angry accusations against the affluent society from those who work against impossible odds in fighting poverty.

None of this is easy to take. The family fighting its way up the economic ladder in our competitive society seldom looks back to see if others are getting an equal chance to make the difficult climb. We had better start looking. There is revolution brewing at

the bottom of the ladder which could topple it.

Add the racial overtones—the fact that 80 per cent of Memphis poverty is in the black ghettos—and the threat to a stable community is magnified.

Useless as statistics are in getting to the root of the problems facing Memphis, they do provide a gauge for the scope of what must be done. Between the 1960 census and the special census of 1967, Memphis gained about 10,700 whites (mostly by annexation); in the same period the city's black population increased by more than 28,000, generally the result of migration from the villages and farms of Mississippi, Arkansas and West Tennessee. Significantly, the biggest jump in black population was in the age group 19 or under—more than 20,000, almost half of them male.

These, then, are the citizens of tomorrow—the children who need a good education, who will be entering the job market, rearing families and grasping for a livable income.

The census figures leave no doubt about where the problem lies in geographic terms. The areas of Memphis where black residential population is 50 per cent or more form a large inner-city sector in the form of a letter "C." It forms at the north between Wolf River and Jackson, curves west to the Mississippi River, and bends south and then eastward between Crump Boulevard and Interstate 240. Most of the census districts where in the median family income is \$3,500 a year or less lie within that big "C." It is the area where illegitimate births average 30 per cent and sometimes rise above 60 per cent. It is the area where still-births, premature births and infant mortality run above average. It is even the part of Memphis where we find the highest rate of deaths by stroke and hypertensive heart disease.

But for those who survive in the urban jungle life remains a day-to-day struggle. Anxiety, fear and depression stalk the dark streets. Crime, prostitution and dope pushing are a part of the daily environment. Home may be a crowded hovel and sanitation almost nonexistent. Illiterate parents, driven into the city by modernized farm methods and insensitive government programs, wallow in confusion and watch their children recycled into another generation of poverty.

There it is, Memphis. And it's becoming worse despite all the steps taken by governmental agencies over the past five or six years.

The poverty problem needs no more surveying. It demands coordinated action at all levels—municipal, county, state, regional and federal.

Memphis is beginning to make a stab at finding adequate and nutritional food for hungry school children. There are job-training and job-placement programs. There is public health care. There are low-cost housing projects. There is increasing equality in education. There are signs of growing concern among the more affluent. There is increased emphasis on fighting poverty in City Hall and in the Shelby County Court.

But we still are merely scratching the surface. Most of the efforts are piecemeal. We are trying to patch a fabric that is decayed and threadbare. It's not enough.

To meet the undeniable needs the community should begin with a coordinator, an official who can centralize the focus on all the complex and interrelated parts of the poverty problem. He should find and get every available penny of federal assistance, and see that it is wisely spent. Mississippi and Arkansas should be made to see that they share with Tennessee the responsibility for regional poverty, which knows no boundary lines and which simply has its gravitational core in the City of Memphis. Members of Congress should participate and cooperate with local government in making existing help more available and in creating new programs which do more than pacify.

Costly? Yes. But the price of failure to act soon and effectively will be much higher. What needs to be done—what must be done—can be done, if we will.

DRAFT APPEAL CHIEF CHARGES MEDDLING BY GENERAL HER- SHEY

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers today cite just one more instance of the outrageous behavior of Selective Service Director, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey. According to two outgoing members of the supposedly independent National Selective Service Appeal Board, General Hershey rides "roughshod" over this Board.

This Board, under the intent of Congress, is to decide cases on their merits, not on the basis of the whim of the Selective Service Director, who should have retired long ago. As the following article shows, General Hershey systematically and continuously subverts the independent Board. If those who have worked most intimately with General Hershey report these practices, there must be some merit to the charges of others who say that the present draft system is unfair, punitive, and capricious.

I include the following news article from this morning's Washington Post in the RECORD at this time. It documents very clearly the deficiencies in the present Selective Service System. It is just one more reason why reform is needed in the Nation's draft system and why Congress should begin hearings on this important area at the earliest possible date.

The article follows:

DRAFT APPEAL CHIEF CHARGES MEDDLING BY GENERAL HERSHEY

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., August 5.—The outgoing chairman of the National Selective Service Appeal Board and a board member who resigned last month charge that Selective Service Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey runs roughshod over the supposedly independent board.

In fact, the member who resigned, Dr. Kenneth W. Clement of Bratenahl, Ohio, believes Hershey should be retired and replaced by a civilian since "for some time now, he has been unable to distinguish between himself and the Selective Service."

Judge Henry J. Gwiazda of New Britain, the outgoing appeal board chairman, said that what he called Hershey's maneuvering and meddling impeded justice in many draft cases and was aimed at reducing the board to a rubber stamp for Hershey's policies.

"We are not only under Gen. Hershey's thumb, we are actually subject to him," Gwiazda told UPI in an interview.

[The board's third member, Charles N. Collatos, said in Lynnfield, Mass., that he thinks Hershey "is doing a good job," Associated Press reported.]

Gwiazda, who has submitted his resignation from the board at the request of President Nixon, said the 75-year-old Hershey has used his position to quash board options which, by executive order, are supposed to be

independent of the director of the Selective Service System.

Most intolerable has been the board's inability to appoint an executive secretary—who by law must not be affiliated with the military, Gwiazda said.

The executive secretary of the National Selective Service Appeal Board is the key man, according to Gwiazda, responsible for running the board's Washington office and, most important, for "briefing" information about the draft appellant to the three board members whose final decision carries the weight of the President.

Gwiazda said the staffing problem was part of "an effort on the part of the director of long standing to eliminate the board, usurp the prerogatives and authority of the board or to make the board subservient to the director."

Gwiazda said Hershey had offered him Col. Francis S. Drath and Col. George J. Wendel—both of the Selective Service staff—to brief the cases.

Hershey has used one paragraph of the 1948 Universal Military Training and Service Act, which says the Selective Service System must provide compensation, offices and other necessary facilities at its headquarters, to give himself budget control and power over the board, Gwiazda said.

Gwiazda said he had recently requested Col. Robert T. Hays, retired head of the legal division of the Selective Service, to fill the post of executive secretary. Hays fit the civilian bill because he had retired, Gwiazda said.

The appointment was not permitted by Hershey, Gwiazda said, "because we would then have a man as competent as the man running Hershey's legal division."

Gwiazda said he had issued a directive to Col. Thoms M. Pickle, chief of the administrative division of the Selective Service to inscribe Hays on the personnel rolls and, "it was there that I obviously had stepped on the director's toes."

Gwiazda said all three of the board members were called in by Hershey, and "it was pointed out to us that he is the one to take charge of this personnel thing, and he is the one who is going to furnish us the people and that we, or I particularly, have no authority to issue directives."

Supporting Gwiazda's claim that the board is hamstrung by Hershey, Clement, a board member whose resignation was accepted by President Nixon last month, told UPI, "especially for the last six months, the general has stepped up his efforts to interfere."

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, a very important book has recently been written about the efforts of one Arab leader to bring peace to the Middle East. The title is "The Search for Peace in the Middle East—The Challenge of President Bourguiba." The author is Samuel Merlin, director of political studies of the Institute for Mediterranean Affairs in New York.

"The Search for Peace in the Middle East" is the story of a dramatic initiative to unfreeze the Palestine deadlock. It was undertaken by the President of

Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba, during a 54-day tour in the Middle East and Southeast Europe. Since then he has been pursuing his campaign with ever-increasing vigor, especially in the aftermath of the Israel-Arab war in June 1967.

Bourguiba's campaign for a negotiated solution to the Palestine problem provoked violent reactions in the Arab world—demonstrations and counter demonstrations, mutual recriminations, and attempts to assassinate the Tunisian President—culminating in a formal break of diplomatic relations between Cairo and Tunis.

What caused disarray among the Arabs in the Middle East was his challenge to two of the most deeply inculcated and widely accepted tenets in popular Arab opinion: the reality of a pan-Arab nation stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic, and the inevitable disappearance of Israel from the political map of the region. He bravely and unhesitatingly proclaimed pan-Arabism as a myth and the existence of Israel as a historic reality.

President Bourguiba's main motivation stemmed from his basic philosophy that war is no solution to international problems and that conflict can best be solved through negotiations undertaken in a spirit of good will. He believes that a solution to the Palestine conflict is possible and that it can be achieved, though gradually, on the basis of mutual respect and without victors or vanquished.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of this book is that both subject and author are a breed apart from the familiar figures on the Middle Eastern political scene. Though one is an Arab statesman and the other an Israeli citizen and scholar, they share a perspective that is neither narrow nor partisan; both of them see the complex problems of the Middle East within the wider context of historic trends and realities and both are animated by the same vision of peace and justice. This vision is more realistic for them than the prevailing attitudes of fanaticism and intransigence.

Known to his countrymen as "the Father of Tunisia's independence," "the Supreme Warrior," and "the Beloved," Habib Bourguiba emerges as one of the most arresting figures on the contemporary international scene. Through his fierce independence and his bold questioning of the dogma of Pan-Arabism, the courageous President of Tunisia—the smallest and poorest of all the north African states—has had a profound influence not only on inter-Arab relations but on the course of international politics well beyond the Arab world.

This, then, is the story of a man and a challenge: of that man's steadfast refusal to succumb to the rampant despair about the prospect for peace in the explosive Middle East.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several reviews of this noteworthy book be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the (Louisville, Ky.) Courier-Journal & Times, Mar. 16, 1969]

BOURGUIBA'S QUEST OF DESTINY

(A review by Israel T. Naamani)

This is a story about a fluorescent personality, a man in anxious quest of destiny—Habib Bourguiba. Samuel Merlin, the author of this strangely fascinating narrative, has served as the director of political studies for the Institute of Mediterranean Affairs (in New York) since 1957.

The book has the quality of a first-rate detective story. Merlin eagerly raises many questions and is not modest in supplying cogent answers. What made the president of Arab Tunisia on March 6, 1965, in the "Old City" of Jerusalem (then in Jordan, before the Israeli occupation) launch his concerted campaign for Arab-Israeli peace—an effort that lasted about seven months of touring the Middle East? Was he acting for King Hussein? For De Gaulle? Had he consulted Nasser? Did he have the blessings of Tito? What did the Shah of Iran tell him? What did the president of Turkey have to say? Did Bourguiba have a "revelation on the way to Damascus?" Was he possessed by an irrational desire to play Samson in the Temple?

In his initial speech Bourguiba told "the most embittered people of the world, whose only spiritual nourishment consisted of wild promises of speedy liberation, revenge," that their politicians were guilty of "intransigence and inflexibility" and "... the policy of 'all or nothing' brought us only defeat."

The reaction in the Arab world was vehement. Changing his tactics, employing a "zig-zag of thoughts" and verbal virtuosity, the Arab president restated his views in different terms and pointed out that what he said openly was what Nasser and other leaders said privately. The reaction in the Western world was one of amazement and encomium. The Christian Science Monitor thought he should get the Nobel prize for peace. De Gaulle lifted him to the peak of Mt. Olympus—he likened him to himself! The official Israeli attitude "was reserved and confused."

What really motivated Bourguiba? Merlin thinks it was fear of pan-Arabism, the dread of Nasserism. "The disappearance of Israel, as a hypothesis, would certainly enable pan-Arabism to overrun countries like Jordan and the Lebanon." Eventually also Arab Tunisia. "And the purpose of his tour became crystal clear; to save his country, it is imperative for him openly and dramatically to challenge Nasser's leadership. . . . Here indeed was a purpose of such magnitude and importance that he decided to stake his career on it, and even to risk his life, not to speak of his popularity in the Arab world."

This reviewer tends to agree with Merlin. When the syntactical dust of Bourguiba's speeches is settled, one realizes that the Tunisian leader set out to challenge Nasser's Ibn Monroe Doctrine. To paraphrase Brutus: "Not that I loved the Arabs less, but that I loved Tunisia more."

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Apr. 6, 1969]

SANE TALK FROM ARABS

The crisis in the Middle East has sharpened since George Ball, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, warned that the danger there is potentially greater than it is in Southeast Asia. It has intensified since President Nixon more recently voiced concern lest it detonate into a confrontation among the great powers. In this touch-and-go situation Samuel Merlin's story of the peace initiatives undertaken by President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia is a welcome reminder that sanity is not without champions in the Arab world despite the stridency of President Nasser at Cairo.

This long, fascinating book is admirably free from the clichés that too often envelop discussions of Palestine. Written by a veteran newspaperman, member of the first Israeli Parliament, and presently director of the Institute for Mediterranean Affairs in New York, it provides an invaluable compendium of Middle Eastern history since the early 1950s, centering the reader's attention upon the 54-day campaign launched in 1965 by the intrepid Tunisian president who seeks to unfreeze the Middle Eastern deadlock over Palestine through an appeal for negotiations.

Bourguiba's challenge elicited thunderous cheers from Arab audiences, but none from President Nasser and his supporters in several Arab states heeded Bourguiba's warnings that war would prove disastrous—as it did two years later in "the six day" conflict of 1967. The Tunisian statesman's attack pan Arabism, his opposition to growing Russian influence in the Middle East, his insistence upon education, economic development and conciliation among races within each state, brought down upon him floods of abuse from opportunistic Arab leaders. He still persists—with the solid support of his people in Tunisia.

"The Search for Peace in the Middle East" covers a chapter all too often forgotten these days, as artillery roars sporadically across the Canal and terrorists ply their trade. Whether fractious Arab leaders will heed the counsel of "the Tito of the Arab world" in time remains in doubt.

JAMES H. POWERS.

TUNISIA: BOURGUIBA: VOICE OF REASON IN THE MIDEAST

(By Leon Dennen, NEA foreign news analyst)

(NOTE.—The following syndicated column (Newspaper Enterprise Assn.) appeared on March 3, 1969 in numerous newspapers throughout the country)

NEW YORK—In the volatile Middle East conflict there is still time for objectivity and moderation despite the escalation of Arab terrorism.

Another round of a major Arab-Israeli conflict is not as imminent—or inevitable—as those now pushing for an "imposed peace" by the great powers seem to believe.

These are some of the conclusions reached by Samuel Merlin, director of the Institute for Mediterranean Affairs in New York, who has a new book entitled "The Search for Peace in the Middle East."

President Nixon's foreign policy advisers and the Russians—if they really want to stave off a second wave of warfare—will do well to read carefully Merlin's study of the complex political, social and cultural problems that keep the Middle East in perpetual turmoil.

Although a citizen of Israel and a former member of Jerusalem's parliament (Knesset), Merlin sees the Arab statesman, Tunisia's President Habib Bourguiba, as one of the Moslem leaders likely to hold the key to Arab-Israeli negotiations.

Not that Bourguiba knows the secret of instant diplomacy. An Arab nationalist, he can hardly be suspected of pro-Israeli sympathies. But he is one of an influential group of Moslem leaders who counsel moderation in the Middle East.

Unlike President Nasser of Egypt, he believes the conception of a Pan-Arab nation stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic is an illusion.

"Arabism," in Bourguiba's view, will succeed only after it casts off "its backward-looking, negative and destructive forces" and turns to a progressive and humanistic vision blended with Western civilization.

Bourguiba started the militant Arab leaders in 1965 when, during a tour of the

Middle East, he told a gathering in Jordan that the existence of Israel is a fact of life and a historic reality.

He also told the Palestinian refugees: "The policy of all or nothing brought us only defeat in Palestine and the sad situation in which we find ourselves today."

He warned that it was grave error to reject compromise.

Nassar castigated Bourguiba as a "traitor" and Tunisia was eventually forced to resign from the Arab League.

But Tunisia's president, despite repeated attempts on his life by Arab terrorists, continues to advocate a policy of moderation in the Middle East.

His cautious offer of his good offices to bring together representatives of Israel and Palestinian Arabs for peace negotiations has so far not been heeded, Merlin says, adding, "But the day may not be far off when both parties will avail themselves of this opportunity."

In Merlin's view, enlightened Moslem statesmen like Bourguiba, in co-operation with the Moslem leaders of Iran and Turkey, are in a much better position to influence moderate Arabs in Egypt and Jordan than the big powers or even the United Nations.

They, too, may fail. But they must no longer be ignored in forging what President Nixon calls "an acceptable settlement" of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

MERLIN'S "SEARCH FOR PEACE IN MIDDLE EAST" PROVIDES THOROUGH REVIEW OF BOURGUIBA PLAN

(NOTE.—The following review appeared in the Detroit Jewish News on January 31, 1969, and was written by the editor-in-chief, Mr. Philip Slomovitz.)

Samuel Merlin, who was a member of the first Knesset, whose leadership in the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation brought him closely to the ranks of Vladimir Jabotinsky and the Revisionist Zionists, displays marked ability as a man of research and student of history in a volume in which he deals with "The Challenge of President Bourguiba" of Tunisia. In nearly 500 pages he has incorporated every statement that has been uttered by Bourguiba on the question of the Middle East and his dissection of them and his explanation of the Bourguiba position are of immense interest.

Entitled "The Search for Peace in the Middle East," this volume, published by Thomas Yoseloff, serves as a valuable addendum to previously published works dealing with the Arab-Israel conflict.

There is a long subtitle to the book: "The Story of President Bourguiba's Campaign for a Negotiated Peace Between Israel and the Arab States." The basic declarations, rebuking Nasser, urging the admission that Israel is a reality, are all in this compilation. But there also are many assertions that were antagonistic and damaging to Israel. Merlin admits them but looks at the over-all picture in his discussion of a study of a serious issue and an important personality.

Merlin makes specific references to a speech by Bourguiba to the Turkish parliament in which he took a strong pro-Arab position and a very antagonistic one towards Israel but even on that score he explains: "Careful reading of his Turkish speech shows that though Bourguiba was inimical to Israel in appraising historic events, his speech did not contain any call to violence. On the contrary, we may perhaps even read constructive implications. For example, there is the inference that if Israel had not indulged in the Suez Campaign, and later in the diversion of the Jordan waters, there might still have been a possibility of healing the wounds."

While some of the proof provided by Merlin is not thoroughly convincing, he makes

an interesting case for Bourguiba's position, and his accumulation of Bourguiba's condemnation of Nasser and his endorsement of proposals for recognition of Israel's existence emerge as major in the conciliatory attitude of the Tunisian president.

Of special current interest is Merlin's account of Bourguiba's visits in Jordan and Lebanon, his appeals for reason and intelligence by Arab leaders, his assertion that "we must have enough courage to dominate our passions" and Merlin comments:

"One must consider that Jordan's King (Hussein) and Lebanon's President (Helou), though they did not publicly identify themselves with Bourguiba's views, nonetheless consistently refrained from taking a stand against him: What is more, the Jordanian and Lebanese papers published detailed accounts of Bourguiba's views. In Jordan, the press is not free to do as it likes. The non-Nasserite Lebanese papers were generally sympathetic. One Jordanian newspaper, Al Maner, came out on March 7 (1965) in praise of his (Bourguiba's) ideas: 'The Arabs should learn a lesson from what Bourguiba said. They must understand that in dealing with the Palestine problem one has to be realistic and not be swept away by emotions . . . Some observers in Israel suggested that perhaps King Hussein himself had prompted Bourguiba's campaign . . .'

In his relations with Jews, Bourguiba is portrayed as doing his utmost to assure the security of Jewish communities in Tunisia. He was accused by Egyptians as having made "a dark deal" with the Parisian Rothschild Bank. "When Bourguiba made his peace initiative in the Middle East," Merlin writes, "Nasser and other Arab leaders, the press and radio presented this initiative to their people as part of a deal among the Tunisian president, imperialism, Israel and world Jewry. Nasser referred to Bourguiba as 'Ben-Gurion's man.'"

Even on the question of Arab-Jewish relations Bourguiba "was careful to say nothing in public that could jeopardize his future relations with the leaders of Arab states" while seeking in his own country to prevent indignities upon Jews. Merlin points out, however, that: "Tunisian Jews are discreetly permitted to visit Israel and return to their country. Those who wanted to emigrate to Israel were permitted to do so." But while Jews were expelled from Arab lands, Merlin emphasizes that Bourguiba "would like to see the stream of Jewish emigration slowed down if not ended altogether, for he is said to see in the Jews a creative element which he would like to preserve for Tunisia's future development . . ."

Merlin places much stock in Bourguiba's advocacy of a peace plan for the Middle East, even if it calls for Israel's return to early stages of statehood, thereby negating much of what could be hoped for in advocating accord. Merlin declares that Bourguiba's peace offer "of his good offices to bring together representatives of Israel and the Palestinian Arabs has so far not been heeded. But the day may not be far off when both parties will avail themselves of this opportunity. They can afford to ignore this offer much longer only at their own risk and peril . . ."

Asserting that in his peace campaign Habib Bourguiba grew in stature, Merlin commends the Tunisian president's "superior qualities, enlightenment, culture, superb style, pragmatism, moderation, common sense, lack of fanaticism or dogmatism . . ."

While there will no doubt be many differing views on Merlin's conclusions, his gathering of data regarding an important Moslem's views on the Arab-Israel conflict, the peace offer, the contrasting attitudes of the leaders among Israel's enemy neighbors, make the present work valuable for the data it contains.

MIRV

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the Senate debate over the deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system approaches a climax, I would like to caution my colleagues in that body not to overlook a far greater danger of escalation in the arms race than the defensive Safeguard—the continued atmospheric testing of multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles. The MIRV, an awesome nuclear weapon, impedes the possibility of substantive strategic arms limitation talks between the two powers; it would give rise to potential mutual fear of either side's obtaining a first-strike capability; it enhances the threat of an escalation of the arms race to an unprecedented level. I strongly recommend that the United States immediately suspend atmospheric testing of MIRV, and continue to do so as long as the Soviet Union does not resume testing.

On July 2, 1969, I, along with 101 other Members, cosponsored Mr. ANDERSON's resolution in the House calling on the President to propose to the Soviet Union a mutual moratorium on the flight testing of MIRV's. In cosponsoring this resolution, I wanted to indicate to President Nixon my deep concern over the MIRV issue and my support for a mutual moratorium until such time as a formal agreement can be reached in the upcoming arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union. Senator BROOKE introduced a similar resolution, S. 211 in the Senate on June 17, 1969.

A joint Soviet-American suspension of MIRV atmospheric flight testing is a constructive way of preserving the opportunity to forestall deployment of this dangerous technology—an opportunity that will not long remain open to us. At the present stage of MIRV development, we can monitor MIRV tests by the Soviet Union, just as they can monitor ours. So we would know if Russia resumed testing—we would know instantly, and we would resume testing. Both nations are capable of unilaterally policing a short-term MIRV moratorium, since neither side would be able to conduct significant flight testing without exposing itself to the other nation's sophisticated surveillance system. But if MIRV is not halted in the test stages, it may be too late, since the system does not lend itself to easy detection once it is deployed.

With the possibility of MIRV deployment only a short time off, it is most vital that we act now to at least delay its deployment until the possibility of a formal agreement on MIRV has been thoroughly explored in arms talks. Once MIRV systems are deployed, it will be impossible to tell—without onsite inspection—whether a missile has one or many warheads. Each side will have to presume that any missile which could be mirrored, would be mirrored. We and the Soviet Union can now determine how many ICBM's exist

in a country by use of sophisticated surveillance techniques. Neither nation can do this with MIRV, because only onsite inspection can determine how many warheads a missile carries. It is extremely unlikely that either the United States or Soviet Union would agree to onsite inspections.

Once both nations have deployed MIRV, it would be virtually impossible to reach any kind of meaningful arms limitation agreement. President Nixon stated on March 14, 1969:

I want no provocation that might deter arms talks.

If MIRV testing is not stopped, and if we ever arrive at any kind of an arms control agreement in the future, it will be at a level so much higher than now that the danger will be vast. We must cease testing of MIRV pending arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

The United States is significantly ahead of the Soviets in MIRV research and development, an advantage that would not be compromised by U.S. cessation of atmospheric testing. The Soviets are definitely testing MIRV's, but there is some doubt about whether they are anywhere near our technological sophistication in MIRV development. In any case, our national security and our current MIRV advantage would not be compromised by a cessation of atmospheric testing. Instead, deployment of a MIRV system would jeopardize the stability of mutual deterrence by increasing the vulnerability of hardened missile silos like our land-based Minuteman.

The arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union is based on a mutual deterrence or second strike capability. This assured retaliatory capacity calls for the victim in a nuclear attack to possess the ability to inflict enough damage on the aggressor to discourage such an attack. This second strike capability is now the bedrock of our defense strategy and that of the Soviets. Deployment of MIRV technology is a multiplication of offensive capability. It presents a direct threat to mutual deterrence. When either side achieves a sufficiently accurate MIRV capability, it will have a significant capacity to reduce the other side's retaliatory ability. It creates a potential first strike capability—an ability to inflict enough damage on the victim that he is too crippled to retaliate. The United States does not seek a first strike capability. Such a situation would create a planet characterized by mutual suspicion, fear, and instability. President Nixon has opposed dramatic increases in our offensive capability, because it would be provocative to the Soviet Union. It would escalate the arms race. Therefore, MIRV is incompatible with the sensible strategic doctrine President Nixon has enunciated for the security of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

We have reached a critical juncture in the arms race, one from which there would be no turning back. Once the U.S. fully deploys MIRV's, it will escalate the arms race to an unprecedented level of danger. The Soviet Union would have to build its defenses to counteract MIRV, and, we, in turn, would have to build up

an ICBM force which would possess three to five times its present destructive force to penetrate the defenses of the Soviet Union. U.S. deployment of the MIRV may cause a spiraling of the arms race to the point of no return, costing vast sums, and at the end, leaving the two nuclear powers at relatively the same security level as they are now. Both the United States and the Soviet Union would be forced into a race that would not only drain billions from each nation's treasury, but would also make a potential nuclear war far more destructive than any now anticipated.

While the ABM battle continues in the Senate as an important issue in the arms race, we must not forget the potential disasters of deployment of the offensive MIRV. A suspension of the atmospheric testing of MIRV is vital for any substantive arms control talks with the Soviets; it is vital for a reduction of the risks of nuclear war; it is vital for curtailing the arms race.

COMPLIANCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS
ACT OF 1964 BY ARKANSAS AGRICULTURAL
EXTENSION SERVICE

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently a statement was published in the Record which was very critical of the Agricultural Extension Services in the South in regard to their compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. C. A. Vines, director of the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service, informs me that rapid strides have been made in Arkansas in compliance with the act and that the statement was most unfair.

The Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service has recently published a statement of its efforts to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record.

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

STATEMENT OF EFFORTS TO COMPLY WITH
THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

JULY 1, 1969.

The services of the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service have been available to all people, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, since its inception.

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Extension administration has taken the following action to comply with the various provisions of the Act:

1. The Director assumed the responsibility for compliance with the Act by the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service. District Extension Agent-Chairmen and the County Extension Chairmen, under the supervision of the Director, assumed responsibilities for compliance in the various districts and counties.

2. Orientation and training of all Extension workers regarding policies and requirements of the Act have been carried out through office conferences; areas, district, and state conferences; and the use of printed materials which were furnished by the Fed-

eral Extension Service. During the past year all employees have reviewed again the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the various rules and regulations.

3. Periodic reports have been obtained from the counties, and this will be continued to assure that the organization is in compliance and that it will continue to comply with the rules and regulations.

4. Changes have been made in staff assignments to meet compliance requirements of the Act. Extension employees are working with all the people and are not assigned by virtue of race, color, or national origin to serve a specific clientele group. The word "Negro" no longer appears in the titles of Extension employees. At the present time the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service has three Negro men and one Negro woman serving as specialists on the state staff. There are 12 Negro men serving as associate county Extension agents and five as assistant county Extension agents. Six Negro women are serving as associate Extension home economists and nine as assistant Extension home economists.

5. During recent years, 12 Negro men have been promoted from assistant to associate county Extension agents, and six Negro women have been promoted from assistant to associate Extension home economists. One Negro man has been promoted from area agricultural agent to a state specialist position, and one Negro woman has been promoted from the position of area home demonstration agent to a state specialist position.

6. There are 22 counties in Arkansas with both white and Negro employees. In all of these counties, the Negro and white staff is housed in office space arranged without regard to race, color, or national origin. The state office is completely integrated. All office signs, directories (including telephone personnel lists), entrances to the offices, rest rooms, and drinking fountains are designed for employees and clientele to prevent discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

7. Extension employees participate in an official capacity in conferences, conventions, and meetings which are open to all people, thus assuring that any person or group may participate and shall not be excluded or treated differently because of race, color, or national origin.

8. All professional improvement activities; in-service training opportunities; area, district, and state conferences are conducted on an integrated basis to eliminate any possibility of discriminatory or segregated practices.

9. One plan of work is prepared in each county, enabling all county employees, where competent, to work across racial lines.

10. All mailing lists in counties include all interested people regardless of race, color, or national origin, and materials are mailed to the people without distinctions based on race or color.

11. All publications, research reports, announcements regarding new or changed programs, newsletters, and other information are distributed without regard to race, color, or national origin.

12. Steps have been taken to include representatives of all segments of the present and potential clientele in the program planning processes.

13. Information pertaining to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been disseminated to the public and potential beneficiaries through personal contacts, letters, newspaper stories, and meetings. Eighty-three newspapers in Arkansas, during the past year, carried news articles relating that the Agricultural Extension Service serves all people regardless of race, color, or national origin.

14. The various private organizations receiving assistance from the Extension Service were advised of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act and were notified in writing that Extension personnel cannot assist or conduct programs through organizations that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

15. The training of all white and non-white leaders in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H Club programs is integrated in all counties.

16. Equal opportunities are being provided for all 4-H Club members, Extension Homemakers Club members, and leaders to participate on a non-segregated basis in all county, area, district, state, regional, and national activities.

17. All persons have equal opportunity to participate in tours, field days, meetings, short courses, and other educational activities conducted by the Extension Service.

18. County Extension Advisory Committees have been established in all counties. An equal number of members for each committee are appointed by the county judge and the Director of Extension. The committees, composed of lay leaders, are selected with consideration given to occupation, sex, geographic location, and minority groups.

19. The composition of the County Extension Advisory Committees was analyzed as of June 30, 1968, for the purpose of determining whether or not all committees had equitable representation of both sexes and all races. In order to have proper distribution of membership, the committees were enlarged in certain counties, with the additional membership being either Negro men, Negro women, or white women.

20. A series of 36 seminars with an attendance of 1,368 was held during August and September, 1968, for the purpose of training the members of the county development councils as to principles of economic development, changing institutions, and how people maintain services and facilities. Both men and women (white and Negro) participated in the seminars. This was an educational endeavor to strengthen the county development program and to assure that the county program is designed to include all social and economic groups.

21. A description of complaint procedures has been communicated to the county staffs and general public.

22. Compliance checks were made, involving all 78 county Extension units in Arkansas. The compliance checks were made by the Director of Extension through questionnaires and letters.

23. All employees have read and studied the reprint from the Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 169—Thursday, August 29, 1968, the Rules and Regulations pertaining to Title 7—Agriculture, Subtitle A, Part 18—Equal Employment Opportunity in the State Cooperative Extension Services.

24. All job descriptions have been reviewed and revised where needed.

25. A new personnel appraisal system has been developed with new evaluation procedures being established. The work performance of each person is being evaluated by his supervisor and he is being informed of his rating through individual conferences.

26. Beginning July 1, 1969, the same minimum starting salary has been established for the positions of associate county Extension agent, assistant county Extension agent, associate Extension home economist, and assistant Extension home economist regardless of sex, color, or national origin.

27. The Extension Education Specialist has been assigned the responsibility for the recruitment of new county Extension employees. Extension Leaflet No. 435 was developed to be used in connection with the recruitment of new personnel and carries a state-

ment regarding equal employment opportunities.

WHY SOME VOTED AGAINST SURTAX

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, there seem to be some Members who are not quite clear as to why some of us—perhaps 170—voted against President Nixon's 10-percent surtax extension—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 4, 1969, page 22064.

I suggest a few reasons:¹

1. Can we really believe that voting for this surtax will halt inflation? Not for a moment . . . One cannot in good conscience do the "responsible" thing and tax the American taxpayer still more when it obviously will be a futile gesture. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 14, page 18012.)

2. I have not heard one convincing argument that the proposed tax increase would not be passed on to consumers and so actually inflate prices . . . An increase in taxes will work a new hardship on the forgotten American . . . (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 14, page 18027.)

3. I did not support, nor vote for, this increase because taking 10% more taxes out of your pocket and increasing by 10% the taxes of all businesses will in the long run be inflationary, not deflationary. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 15, page 20385.)

4. I believed that there were better alternatives available to the Congress by which inflation might be attacked and fiscal responsibility restored. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 14, page 19046.)

5. The tax package will not stop the present cost-push inflationary spiral. Nor will it result in any immediate lowering of interest rates. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 17, page 22802.)

6. Raising taxes further will tend to influence still higher prices for goods and services. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 14, page 18085.)

7. While I am deeply concerned about the seriousness of our fiscal crisis, I opposed the 10 percent income tax surcharge . . . because I do not believe it will resolve that crisis. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 16, page 21641.)

Existence of a \$3.1 billion surplus, representing about a \$4 billion mistake by the Nixon administration in its 30-day fiscal forecast, could be a reason to vote against the Nixon surtax.

By contrast, President Johnson's 6-month forecast of \$2.4 billion surplus was far more accurate. Even adding some \$900 million to the education bill, as we did, over Nixon administration objections, still leaves us with a surplus about the size of President Johnson's January estimate.

Now, if 8 years of "wild-eyed, free-spending liberalism" left us a \$3.1 billion surplus in fiscal 1969, then surely a "sound, conservative, business-oriented, economy-minded" administration will not need increased funds and certainly not need more taxes.

¹ Sources available on request.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, improvement is the watchword of our society. It is precisely because man has always sought a better way of doing things that we now enjoy the marvelous comforts of our technological world.

Our desire for improvement has altered our way of living, given mankind the key to mastery over his own environment, enhanced our knowledge of medicine, and made the luxuries of the 19th century the commonplace possessions of everyone who lives in the 20th century.

It is trite and redundant to remark that we are living in a changing world. But it is useful to exercise discrimination, to inspect each change and alteration carefully. Hopefully, we will adopt those changes and innovations which will truly contribute to a better society and reject those proposals which however well motivated might produce an undesirable result.

Mr. President, I regard the present proposal to permit the direct election of the President of the United States by popular vote as a dangerous and serious threat to our democratic process.

If this proposition were to be adopted, it would further diminish the voice of the residents of our rural areas.

We have all been dismayed whenever there has been a disclosure of fraudulent voting. We are committed to the preservation of the dignity and the power of the individual citizen. We believe in majority rule, but we also are committed to preserving the voice of the minority.

The organization of this body, which each State having equal representation, seeks to preserve the integrity of the individual, and give restraint to the sometime unwise power of immediate mass reaction. The organization of the House of Representatives of this Congress provides representation on a population basis.

The Founding Fathers may have been seeking merely a convenient mechanism when they established the electoral college. I personally do not like its present provisions which result in a winner-take-all situation. But were we to elect the President by popular vote, this obviously unfair situation might be magnified. The huge voting power of any great American city would completely outweigh the wishes of all the residents of the State of Arizona. The mass vote of a dozen cities in the United States could outbalance the total vote in most of the western half of the United States.

This danger is pointed out in an editorial published in the Arizona Republic which clearly demonstrates that the popular election of the President of the United States would disenfranchise a great many of our citizens:

According to the 1960 national census there are more people in New York State

than in nineteen other states combined. Theoretically this means that the New York electorate could, under the so-called popular presidential election, out-vote the electorate of the following states—Arizona, Alaska, Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, Delaware, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, New Mexico, Maine, Nebraska, Colorado and Oregon.

Supporters of this proposal defend their position by claiming that never in history have all the voters of New York State given all their votes to a single candidate or a single proposition. And this is true. But under the scheme they advance the possibility of an entire portion of the Nation being disenfranchised is created.

There are two proposals which would provide certain needed reform and at the same time preserve a degree of equality between the 50 States. One such proposal would divide the State's electoral votes in a manner corresponding to the popular vote of that State. A second proposal would give the two electoral votes representing the U.S. Senate seats to the winner of the State, and then award the electoral votes represented by the congressional districts to whichever candidate carried that particular congressional district. Both of these proposals have merit.

In my view, the suggestion that we establish a popular-vote election of the President of the United States without regard to State boundaries is dangerous and destructive. It would further enlarge the authority of the Federal Government and further diminish the authority and responsibility of the States. It would lead to disenchantment of the electorate, and perhaps to widespread corruption in those areas where political bossism is still dominant.

Mr. President, there is a gentleman of my acquaintance, who has been an outstanding advocate of the principle of electoral reform along the lines I have described. I am proud to count him among my friends, not only for his speaking out on this matter, but also for his devotion to principle, well illustrated by the newspapers published under his aegis.

I refer to Eugene Pulliam, publisher of the Arizona Republic, the Phoenix Gazette, the Indianapolis Star, and the Indianapolis News. The position these newspapers have taken and the one I advocate is not in any sense an attempt jealously to preserve an unwarranted prerogative for those States within our Union where the population is numerically unequal to the high density areas of the East. This is not a sectional division. I am prompted to speak because of my concern for the future of our Republic, should unwise action be taken, as well as the desire to see the rights and voices of all our citizens safeguarded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a series of editorials published in the Arizona Republic, the Indianapolis Star, and the Indianapolis News.

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

DO YOU WANT YOUR STATE DISENFRANCHISED?

WHY DISENFRANCHISE SO MANY STATES?

If the proposal to replace the electoral college with direct presidential elections succeeds, Arizona will be one of a number of states whose voters could in effect be disenfranchised.

There are, according to the 1960 national census, more people in New York State than in 19 other states combined. Theoretically, this means that the New York electorate could, under the so-called "popular" presidential election system, outvote the electorate of the following states:

Arizona, Alaska, Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, Delaware, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, New Mexico, Maine, Nebraska, Colorado, and Oregon.

(Under the electoral college system, the worst that can happen is that New York's electoral vote can offset the electoral vote of 10 states.)

An election victory in New York and California could count more than an election victory in 26 other states combined.

Obviously, such a system could be disastrous in a nation which prides itself on its unique regional and geographical differences. Yet the proposal for such a system has already been approved by the House Judiciary Committee.

In our earlier series of editorials, we explained the need for electoral reform. The present electoral college system is outmoded and in part downright unfair. But the proposed remedy, the one which is currently fashionable, would be far worse.

It would invite tampering with the ballot boxes in the large cities and states, thereby encouraging boss politics and political corruption . . .

It would encourage the proliferation of splinter parties . . .

It would obviate the need for a genuine national consensus, in place of a momentary and perhaps temporary majority mandate . . .

It would undermine our federalist system, which helps restrain unchecked federal ambition by requiring that political actions be conducted through the machinery of the states. Thus it would replace our representative form of government with a so-called "popular" form . . .

And, as noted, it could in effect disenfranchise a sizable number of states whose voters have just as great a stake in the presidency as do voters in the larger cities and states.

It is interesting that Indiana Sen. Birch Bayh is leading the drive for popular election of the President, when only two years ago he made a fiery, convincing speech opposing just such a proposal. It is also interesting that Sen. Ted Kennedy would be so strongly in favor of popular presidential elections, when his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, delivered one of the most lucid arguments ever made against that so-called "reform."

It is true that there can be no progress without change. But it is also true that change, indiscriminate change, does not automatically lead to progress.

The changes proposed by the popular presidential election are a good example of the sort of change that could lead to calamity.

TO AVOID BOSS CONTROL

In the Senate lies the best hope for initiating a step toward sensible revision of the Electoral College, since it has in its Judiciary Committee a bill which would allot electoral votes on a district-by-district basis.

The House Judiciary Committee has reported out a bill which would abolish the Electoral College and substitute direct popular election of the president and vice-president. This would be the wrong way to go for a number of compelling reasons.

One is that direct popular election would make a fundamental change in the structure of the government. In 1956 Senator John F. Kennedy (D-Mass.), later President, pointed to this in defending the Electoral College against similar proposals. Direct popular election, he said, "while purporting to be more democratic, would increase the power of and encourage splinter parties, and I believe it would break down the federal system under which most states entered the Union, which provides a system of checks and balances to insure that no one area or one group shall obtain too much power."

The point Mr. Kennedy made about splinter parties is another of the reasons direct popular election would be wrong. We have seen in the recent example of the French election how proliferation of splinter parties can confuse the issues of an election, dilute the strength of major parties and cast doubt on the mandate of the vote. Under the Electoral College system splinter parties are inconsequential. In direct popular election they can be spoilers.

A handful of states could control the election of the president and vice-president by direct popular vote, and this is a point which many Americans seem to miss. This may have been what was in John Kennedy's mind when he referred to "a system of checks and balances to insure that no one area or one group shall obtain too much power."

Under the present Electoral College system with the practice of casting each state's electoral vote in a bloc, a handful of the most populous states are regarded as pivotal. It is almost impossible to be elected without winning most of them. But they are only *pivotal*—winning all of them by whatever margin is not enough. It is still necessary to win in a substantial number of the rest of the states.

In a nationwide direct popular election a handful of states could elect the president and vice-president, regardless of what happened in the rest of the country.

This was pointed out in a recent article by Dr. George Comfort, professor of political science at Butler University. He noted that in the 1968 election 54.6 per cent of all the votes were cast in nine states embracing 12 of the largest cities. These states were California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

The vote in these states was largely determined by the vote in the 12 big cities. In Illinois, for example, more than half of the total state vote usually is cast in Cook County alone.

The significance of this is that political machines in 12 cities in 9 heavily populated states can pile up pluralities so big that the votes in the rest of the country would not matter in a nation-wide popular election.

Under the Electoral College system this does not happen because the influence of the big city vote stops at the state line. The candidates who seriously hope to be elected must pay attention to virtually all of the states. In a direct popular election they could concentrate their attention on the few most populous ones with the biggest cities. The rest would not matter.

"Today, we have a system which—in all but one instance throughout our history—has given us presidents elected by plurality of the popular vote," said John Kennedy in his 1956 Senate statement. "Nevertheless, it is proposed to exchange this system—under which we have, on the whole, obtained able presidents capable of meeting the increased demands upon our executive—for an unknown, untried, but obviously precarious system which was abandoned in this country long ago, which previous Congresses have rejected, and which has been thoroughly discredited in Europe."

That statement is just as pertinent and just as true in 1969.

The Electoral College system which we have is a sound and successful system. It could be improved by doing away with state bloc voting, which the district-by-district bill would accomplish. This is what should be done.

DISENFRANCHISED

One aspect of the popular vote amendment proposed by Sen. Birch Bayh of this state is the question of what such an approach would mean to the voters of Indiana.

The answer is that, depending on the variables of any given election, the voting strength of this state could be swallowed up by the population power of the largest states in the union. Equally to the point, votes cast honestly by citizens of this state could be nullified by dishonest votes in New York or Chicago or Kansas City.

This is an ironic development in view of the fact that one argument urged in behalf of the popular vote approach is that it would "equalize" election results, and that mathematical arguments have been brought forward to suggest Indiana and other states would gain proportionally if the popular vote went through. But these arguments, although interesting as arithmetic, ignore the hard realities of politics.

These realities include the fact that some nine large states, of which Indiana is not one, encompass some 51.9 per cent of the nation's population and could theoretically control the election. Moreover, within these states themselves a great part of the population is included in cities with a million or more inhabitants—cities which Indiana does not possess.

Under these circumstances, it seems apparent that electoral efforts would have to be focused heavily on these cities and these states, where the most voters counted by the head can be reached the most directly. It is therefore likely that the big cities and the big-city states would in point of fact wield as much influence or more than under the present system, even if their impact on the election is supposed to be reduced in theory.

The problem becomes more serious when we reflect that these cities are also the areas in which fraudulent votes are most chronic, and that the popular vote approach would create maximum incentives for such fraud. Without far stricter vote policing than has occurred so far or is presently contemplated, the quantum of fraud in these areas is almost certain to increase with the popular vote. This will accentuate the power of the big-city states still further.

Under this proposal, in short, we believe the citizens of Indiana, whatever the theoretical benefits being extended to them, stand in danger of being doubly disenfranchised. First, by the emphasis the popular vote system would place on the big-city states. And second, by the heightened incentive the system would give to fraudulent voting and the heightened impact of such voting on the final outcome.

THE NEW FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, few Americans would have expected to see, beaming from the front page of their newspaper, the President of the United States in a warm embrace with the Communist dictator of Rumania—a Communist country in the collaboration bloc with the Red Chinese, our declared foe in the unresolved UNO war in Korea.

Perhaps the peace our President seeks through Rumania is the peace that was forsaken in Korea where we remain in a state of war with troops committed—suffering loss of American lives whenever the Red Chinese puppets in North Korea elect to violate the cease-fire.

But then, who would have expected that our State Department would authorize travel for select Americans behind the Bamboo Curtain.

Too, the Rockefeller mission to Latin America has proven to be another blunder. Someone's goals might have been accomplished but it is doubtful any benefit was gained for the United States or for the Latin American friends of the United States.

U.S. foreign policy has become a maze of bewilderment. How could anyone make this many mistakes accidentally?

I include the Pan American Headlines for August, an editorial by Willard Edwards, and an article by Virginia Prewett following these remarks:

[From Pan American Headlines, August-September 1969]

NELSON IN WONDERLAND—ROCKEFELLER MISSION STRIKES OUT IN LATIN AMERICA

Whoever sold President Nixon the idea of a Rockefeller fact-finding tour presented him with a rather unwelcome bag of worms. From its inception, the tour was a misfortune. Perhaps something will be salvaged from the trip when Gov. Rockefeller submits his report in August. Our fingers are crossed on this possibility.

Let us make a brief tally of some of the successive bumbles.

(1) The very programming of the tour was a crass mistake. Latin Americans are a proud people with a high concept of the importance of their separate national problems. There was an arrogance and an offensiveness in a schedule which brought Governor Rockefeller, with his imposing entourage of 30 or more, into each country for a snap three or four hours of conference. The nations resented being ticked off in this casual manner by their omniscient visitors. The visits took on the officious schedule of a Cook's tourist.

(2) Inevitably, the visits were an open invitation to nasty demonstrations by all the subversives. A delegation, which was seeking goodwill, discovered that its visit had simply fomented anti-Gringoism. The Rockefeller people departed to leave behind them near-class war in some of the countries.

(3) In Argentina, America's staunch friend, Rockefeller's visit upset the delicate social balance that President Onganía had achieved, and precipitated a general strike. In the course of the disorders, President Onganía had the grim experience of seeing the assassination of Augusto Vandor, the one top labor leader who had helped him prevent complete control of the Argentine trade unions by the Peronists and Communists.

(4) In Brazil, the swing country in South America, Rockefeller, thinking of the New York City far-Left voters, gave a deliberate snub to President Costa e Silva by conspicuously staying away from the ceremony when the President decorated General Porter, a member of his own party. Nelson apparently didn't want his name associated with the Pentagon.

(5) Any prestige which the trip could have given to the Nixon administration was nullified by the open refusal of three nations—Chile, Peru and Venezuela—to receive the Rockefeller party. These are key South American countries, once on our side. Nothing could have more humilatingly shown up the precariousness of our paper majority in the OAS. Without the dictators—Duvalier, Stroessner, Somoza, Lopez and Sanchez—we would be outvoted in the OAS. The Rockefeller mission, with its faulty advance plan-

ning, brought these unpleasant political sores out into the open.

If President Nixon is going to pivot his long deferred Latin American policy upon the findings of such an inept mission, we are afraid he will be building his policy upon sand. Not since Don Quixote have we witnessed such a pilgrimage of innocents.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 25, 1969]

RHODESIA UNABLE TO OPEN DOORS IN WASHINGTON

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Foreign agents are everywhere in the capital and it was not unusual to encounter one of them in the Senate office building.

Kenneth H. Towsey, registered representative of Rhodesia, confessed he was a bewildered and frustrated man.

Why, he asked, are so many doors on Capitol Hill closed to him? Why, in a nation approaching the 200th anniversary of its freedom from British rule, do most members of Congress shun reappraisal of an American policy devoted to crushing his small country's struggle for independence from Great Britain?

He was particularly baffled because a national opinion poll had revealed more than 80 per cent of the American people in sympathy with that struggle.

As a former diplomat who resigned his consular post in the British embassy when Rhodesia proclaimed its independence in 1965, Towsey has been around Washington long enough to understand the realities of American politics.

He set up the Rhodesian information office here and registered as a foreign agent, as required by law. His mission is to present his country's viewpoint. He has found that difficult because emotions and prejudices obscure any discussion of issues involving racial minorities.

NO PROBLEMS FOR OTHER AGENTS

The doors of most members of Congress are open to scores of other foreign agents, many of them prosperous, who collect big fees for promoting the interests of nations dependent on Uncle Sam's beneficence.

Not more than a dozen of 100 senators and 25 or 30 of 435 representatives will listen to the Rhodesian emissary, he said. The remainder shrink from questioning this government's support of United Nations sanctions against the small, landlocked, African country on the absurd claim that it constitutes a threat to world peace.

In the present political climate in the United States, it is enough for this majority to know that there are about 4,200,000 blacks and 225,000 whites in Rhodesia and that the sanctions are designed to produce black majority rule by enforcing a one-man, one-vote system. They fear being called advocates of "white supremacy" if they question the wisdom of immediate imposition of this system in Rhodesia.

The constitution proposed by Rhodesia last year provides for a white minority in control of its parliament for an unspecified period. It left no doubt that racial parity would eventually be attained, but few will listen, Towsey said, to Rhodesia's reasons for going slow before thrusting unconditional voting rights on 4-million tribal Africans.

Is the American press equally reluctant to present Rhodesia's side of the argument? Towsey said a recent incident inclined him to a dismal affirmative.

POLL GRATIFYING TO TOWSEY

When the W. H. Long marketing organization of Greensboro, N.C., published last month the results of a poll it had taken in more than 250 communities in 50 states, he was understandably gratified.

The results showed 83.7 per cent of Americans opposed to the U.N. sanctions; 86.2 per cent in disagreement with Britain's claim to

the right to specify voting requirements in Rhodesia; 81.7 per cent in favor of a hands-off policy; 92.4 per cent against halting trade with countries because they had not adopted the one-man, one-vote standard.

Towsey sent the poll far and wide, to more than 6,000 outlets. That was a month ago, and the only response he noted was a Washington newspaper's denunciation of the poll as "loaded." Otherwise, his clipping service reported a blank.

The Nixon administration eventually must decide whether to reappraise the policy dictated by former President Johnson against the Rhodesian quest for independence. It is receiving disturbing reports of communist terrorist plans in southern Africa which are aided by this nation's boycotts and embargoes in that area.

ASK LATINOS TO AVOID U.S. CLASH

(By Virginia Prewett)

WASHINGTON.—A powerful Latin American voice is urging Latin Americans who now threaten to form an official common front vis-a-vis Uncle Sam not to take the plunge.

Colombia's President Carlos Lleras Restrepo, a constitutionally-elected liberal with continental prestige, told his countrymen in a televised chat on July 2 the following:

That if the hemisphere must now choose between splitting into two antagonistic camps or developing a better U.S.-Latin American cooperation, the Latinos should opt for the latter.

President Lleras, whose personal diplomacy toward the United States is friendly but firmly independent, also called on Latin Americans to understand the United States better. No Latin American leader of comparable stature has made such an appeal in recent memory.

"When we speak of the United States," he said, "We personify the country as if it were one individual. We see the old image of Uncle Sam with his striped pants, top hat and beard, as if he could decide about coffee prices, etc."

"But we must abandon this idea and realize our relations with the United States are with an extremely complex country, with no single will ruling," he said. President Lleras spoke of divided powers among the executive, the president and Congress and pointed out that capital, labor, regional interests and pressure groups affect the U.S. policy pluralistically.

The Colombian, recently a state visitor here, also said he wonders why the underdeveloped Latin American countries focus their complaints against the developed world on the United States, as if no other developed countries exist. The same complaints could be made against France, Russia, Britain, Germany and Japan, he said.

EDUCATION ON DRUG ABUSE—A CRITICAL NEED

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, two unrelated news stories which appeared in California newspapers recently graphically, and tragically, point out one of the most perplexing problems facing parents, educators, and law enforcement officials today—how to effectively inform teenagers and young adults on the dangers of drug abuse.

One story originating from my district tells of the tragic death of a 17-year-old

girl who drowned while swimming under the influence of LSD in a pond on a mountain ranch commune run by a celebrated former university professor.

The other—an interview with a recently retired professional football player—revealed that some ballplayers allegedly use stimulant drugs excessively to improve their stamina and performance, despite a league prohibition against the practice.

To the over-30 generation, narcotics and certain dangerous drugs are bad per se. Nothing credible can be said to mitigate the blanket indictment against their use. The common cliché holds that heavy use of such drugs breeds addiction, crime, prostitution, moral degradation, and so forth. The Nation's press is rampant with examples to back up such generalizations.

Yet, young people increasingly tend to take a more independent view. Like all generations of youth before them—and armed with a greater degree of sophistication with which we have endowed them—they do not accept as sacrosanct these generalizations of their elders. Many tend to discount the unfortunate examples as being exceptions to the rule—the inevitable result of a few unstable members in any society who are consciously or subconsciously compelled to carry any act to the extreme. They accusingly cite the use of alcohol by their elders to "prove" their point.

Faced with what they often view as a hypocritical, insecure world, many of these young people are too easily fascinated by the charismatic rumors and myths that drugs bring truth and love and beauty and happiness. Rightly or wrongly, they tend to believe that "everybody's doing it" without the dire, life-shattering consequences that the adult world publicizes.

Herein lies one of the basic problems. When faced with these challenges to their credibility, adults retreat to trite sermons devoid of "believable" facts. Few parents can knowledgeably and unemotionally explain the consequences of continued use of marijuana. Educators too frequently are stymied by questions about the physiological effects of varying consumption levels of amphetamines, barbiturates, and other "mind-bending" drugs. Law enforcement officials revert to more arrests and harsher punishments as a deterrent weapon, in response to community frustrations.

The net result causes only increased alienation and bitterness between young people and their parents, teachers, and the community at large.

Amidst the confusing dialog between the generations, however, three facts do stand out clearly:

First. Teenagers and young adults are using narcotics and dangerous drugs with increasing prevalence—though much of this may be confined to experimentation.

Second. The younger generation is unbelievably naive about the dangerous consequences that too easily results from their experimentation, and lacks confidence in, and knowledge of sources to turn to for what they regard as reliable information.

Third. The adult world, including educational and law enforcement institu-

tions, by and large does not understand the problem and is equally devoid of sufficient, credible information and knowledge with which to respond to the questions of youth.

There is no question but what law enforcement activities must be stepped up. At the same time, these activities must be reoriented to place greater emphasis upon cutting off the source of supply, in lieu of merely "busting" increasing numbers of misled teenagers.

I have introduced, and am preparing for future introduction, legislation which will—like a rifle shot—zero in on the impervious perpetrators of the traffic in illicit drugs. This, alone, will not solve the problem entirely; it will provide only a first-line barricade in the war on drug abuse.

To augment the arsenal of weapons, we must provide our youth and adults alike with the facts to fight the rumors and myths and generalizations. That is why I am today cosponsoring the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

This legislation—which is gaining widespread support among Congressmen of both parties—authorizes vitally needed Federal grants to encourage the development of drug abuse education programs in elementary and secondary schools and in community seminars. It will encourage the development of new and improved curricula; provides for demonstrating their use and evaluating their effectiveness in model programs; insures the dissemination of educational materials; expands training programs for teachers, counselors and law enforcement officials; and, offers community education programs for parents and others.

The youth of our Nation are not adverse or unresponsive to reliable information. They will believe factual information when presented in a credible climate. Within their own culture, they are increasingly heeding the warning of compatriots that "speed" kills. Their desire for knowledge is abundant; we cannot shirk our responsibility to provide them with the knowledge they so desperately seek.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge favorable action by Congress on this legislation at an early date. The stakes are high—the lives of our youth hang in the balance. If we ignore their plight, and continue to retreat into shells of purely punishment-oriented righteousness, we will have only ourselves to blame for the consequences.

JAMES CARR WINS PRAISE FOR JOB AS SAN FRANCISCO UTILITIES CHIEF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall the service of James K. Carr in a variety of Federal capacities, including the 2 years he spent as the first water

and power consultant on the staff of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a decade later in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations as Under Secretary of Interior.

Jim Carr today is general manager of the San Francisco public utilities system, which is a diversified utilities complex operating the world's fourth largest airport, a domestic water and power supply system, and municipal railroad system carrying nearly 700,000 passengers a day.

A few days ago Mr. Carr was honored on his fifth anniversary of taking the reigns of this public utility empire. In the words of San Francisco mayor, Joseph L. Alioto:

He is one of the finest public servants I've ever known.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 27, the Sacramento Bee carried a very fine report of this tribute and of Jim Carr's service to his State and Nation. So that I may share the occasion with my many colleagues who remember this dynamic public servant, I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

JAMES CARR WINS PRAISE FOR JOB AS SAN FRANCISCO UTILITIES CHIEF

(By Lee Fremstad)

SAN FRANCISCO.—"He is one of the finest public servants I've ever known—and I've known a lot of them," said Joseph L. Alioto, mayor of San Francisco, as he raised his wine glass in a luncheon toast to the man seated next to him.

"Hear! Hear!" responded the guests as they lifted their glasses to the very good health of James Kennedy Carr, who squirmed in a state close to embarrassment as the words of esteem piled one upon the other.

It was the latest accolade for the 55-year-old Carr, whose five-year anniversary as general manager of San Francisco's giant public utilities empire was marked this month.

Words of praise are not unfamiliar to Carr. He has heard many of them since his initiation into public service as a rodman on a U.S. Geological Survey team in the Mt. Lassen area in 1933.

These days the native son from Redding sits in command of a utilities complex which includes the fourth largest airport in the world, handling a million travelers each month; a water department which serves 2 million residents in San Francisco and three other counties; the Hetch Hetchy Water and Power System, a self-supporting agency which delivers pure Sierra water from the Yosemite to bay area users; and a municipal railway system which serves 690,000 passengers on a typical day.

Those glasses could well have been lifted, too, for Carr's 35-year career in public service.

COMBINED SKILLS

Considering his family background, Carr more likely could have become a politician than the professional engineer he is. As it turned out, he has merged both political and engineering skills in fashioning his dynamic career.

His father was Judge Francis Carr, Northern California Democratic political leader for more than 30 years. Young Carr got into the game early, stumping his neighborhood as a 6-year-old rooting for James M. Cox over Warren G. Harding in the 1920 presidential race.

He worked for a while as a law clerk in his father's office but did not follow his brothers Francis and Laurence into law school. Instead he went to the University of Santa Clara where he graduated in 1934 at the age of 20 with a degree in civil engineering.

By age 21 he was assistant district engineer for the Works Progress Administration in 10 Northern California counties. A year later he was the first junior engineer hired by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Shasta Dam project and staked out what was to become Shasta Dam.

His association with the bureau, and just about every major Northern California water project, lasted for 15 years. In 1951, he made his first venture to Washington, D.C., where he served as the first water and power consultant to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Carr was lured back to California in 1953 to become assistant general manager of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. In the five years he was with SMUD, Carr's political skills were called upon as frequently as his engineering ability. One of his first assignments, successful as it turned out, was to fight a move to take away the agency's federal power assignment.

IRRESISTIBLE OFFER

Early in 1961, about the time Katherine, his wife since 1939, had the new wall-to-wall carpets put into the Sacramento home they were so fond of, Carr got a job offer he could not refuse.

Leaving Sacramento, new carpets and all, Carr flew off to Washington, D.C., where he became undersecretary of the interior in the incoming administration of John F. Kennedy.

Carr served under Kennedy, and then Lyndon B. Johnson until 1964 when the San Francisco utilities post became vacant with the death of Robert C. Kirkwood.

Carr's career defies any classification in narrow terms of either engineering or politics. He is consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission on nuclear desalting and was chairman of a panel of scientists and engineers at a 1963 desalting conference in Vienna.

He headed a U.S. delegation to Japan for the State and Interior Departments for natural resources development. He went to Madrid last November for another desalting conference.

Carr headed the Alaska Earthquake Commission which arrived in Seward while the fires were still burning after the disastrous 1964 earthquake.

Carr's interest in natural resources and their preservation earned him a unique memorial a few years ago when a research vessel of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries hauled up a hitherto unknown species of fish from the Caribbean.

CARR'S RATFISH

To acknowledge Carr's interest and help in the bureau's exploratory fishing program, the find was christened *Neoharriotta carri*, which translates to "Carr's long-snouted ratfish."

It is, Carr points out readily, perhaps the ugliest creature he has ever seen.

From the beginning as a young engineer Carr has believed that the products of the engineer's art should be more than just functional. At Shasta Dam he conceived the idea for the spectacular scenic-road approach to the huge structure. He had two million young pine trees planted on the nearby slopes which had been long bare because of fumes from a copper smelter.

Around the visitor's area he planted flower beds which his fellow engineers began calling "Carr's petunia patch."

CHIDED ENGINEERS

Carr chided his colleagues at an engineers' convention in Las Vegas in 1964: "We should ask ourselves repeatedly, 'Is what we build to remain throughout our lives a monument to beauty or a monument to ugliness?'"

He says engineers too often have been the mere hirelings of men concentrating on profit alone.

Carr defined the role of the engineer at that 1964 convention in terms that most would agree describe the career of Carr himself.

"It is our responsibility," he said, "to use mathematics, materials, money and men to improve the quality, the character, the livability of the community."

FREE TRADE—A TWO-WAY STREET

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest an editorial in the August 4 edition of the Washington Evening Star. Titled "A Good Appointment," the editorial praised Senate approval of the appointment of Carl Gilbert as President Nixon's Special Trade Negotiator.

The editorial went on to state that Mr. Gilbert, long a proponent of free trade, will have his work cut out in fending off protectionist impulses from within as well as without the administration. The villain within the administration, as the Star sees it, is Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the Washington Evening Star shows lack of understanding, if it feels that Mr. Stans does not understand the evils of a protectionist trade policy, and if it feels that achieving free trade is simply a matter of the United States being in favor of free trade.

Achieving freer trade requires far more than the lowering of trade barriers by this country. Other countries must also reply in kind if meaningful and lasting results are to be obtained. Secretary Stans is aware of this crucial fact—just as he is aware of the Nixon administration's commitment to a freer trade policy.

For the benefit of those who would like to understand Mr. Stans' position on this matter, let me suggest the perusal of his straightforward comments made in Tokyo, Japan, July 30, 1969, to the seventh meeting of the Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. Mr. Stans' remarks amply indicate that he is fully aware both of this country's desire to achieve freer trade and the manner in which such trade can be achieved. His comments follow:

REMARKS BY MR. STANS

This Seventh Meeting of the Joint Committee represents, for me, a renewed pleasure, and a new privilege. For this conference affords me the pleasure of once again returning to Japan, which I had visited only some two months ago.

In our trade and economic relations since the last meeting of the Joint Committee nearly two years ago, the growth has been striking. At that time, our total bilateral trade had just broken the \$5 billion mark. Now our latest full-year figures, for 1968, show that this trade has surpassed the \$7 billion level and perhaps will be above \$8 billion this year.

The flow of our trade, in both directions, has accounted for this expansion but, not surprisingly, the pace in the two directions has been uneven. Indeed, taking a somewhat longer period of four years, although U.S. exports to Japan have increased by a healthy

average of 10 percent annually, but Japanese sales to the United States have spurted much more dramatically, at a rate of nearly 25 percent. Last year alone, our purchases from Japan rose by more than one-third, which was in itself greater than Japan's total exports to any other market.

The result, as all of us around this table know, has been a shift for the United States to a bilateral deficit position, beginning in 1965, with the deficit in 1968 amounting to \$1.1 billion. This is the largest trade deficit that we have with any country.

For this current year 1969, our exports to Japan are up only moderately, but our purchases of Japanese goods in the first five months of this year, however, were running 22 percent higher than in the same period of 1968. If these developments continue, our trade deficit with Japan this year will probably be about \$1.5 billion. Secretary Petty has already pointed out that this is not a healthy relationship, for us or for you.

RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

It is perfectly understandable that a matter of major concern to Japan is the protectionist sentiment in the United States, especially as reflected in the number of restrictive bills introduced in the U.S. Congress, and I may say, the speeches which were made on the floor of Congress yesterday.

This is perhaps explained by the astonishing array of manufactured products where the United States takes the major share of Japan's exports. Last year, the United States received about three-fourths of your total exports of television receivers, plywood, nails, bolts, and nuts, and may I add, woven wool products. We also took more than half of your export of such products as footwear, pottery, sound recorders, radios, toys and sporting goods, clothing, and various steel items. And not much below the one-half mark are automobiles, sewing machines, cutlery, ball and roller bearings, and motorcycles. So it is not really sufficient to note that the United States accounts for nearly one-third of total Japanese sales abroad, for in many commodity areas the U.S. share is far more.

Last May I asked you to listen to what I had to say, and not to newspaper reports of what I was going to say. By the same token, I would suggest that you not judge the future course of U.S. policy in terms of what some unofficial observers say that it is.

The Nixon Administration is firmly committed to the maintenance—and enlargement—of a freer trade policy. Carrying out this commitment entails certain difficulties, however, and will require some cooperation on the part of our trading partners who have the most to gain from continued open access to the American market.

NON-TARIFF BARRIERS

I am most gratified that Japan accepted the proposal I made in May, that lists of non-tariff barriers be exchanged between our two Governments prior to this meeting. And I am pleased to note that the exchange has now been completed. I want to refer merely to one or two aspects of these lists, and then offer a new suggestion for further progress.

I believe that any review of this area of trade barriers would demonstrate two things: First, considering the constantly expanding and enormous inflow of Japanese products into the United States, those areas where Japan might perceive some restrictive activity on the part of the United States have had a very minor impact. They are, in addition, fully open to public inspection and knowledge and are so administered.

Second, in all candor I cannot make a similar statement with respect to the barriers which Japan has to our trade, and we think they are of much more significance than those we have.

Our latest note on the liberalization of quantitative restrictions on the selective list of priority items currently under discussion

makes it clear that, in our view, Japan's offers represent only very limited progress toward Japan's obligations to remove all remaining illegal quantitative restrictions as well as eliminate its import licensing system at an early date.

We urge Japan to effect full liberalization, and we can never be satisfied until that is done. Secretary Hardin and I, during our counterpart sessions this afternoon, will be discussing plans for further consultations with Japan, which we hope can take place in Washington in the fall. We would hope that these consultations would result in a firm timetable for the removal of all remaining restrictions on our exports of agricultural and industrial products to Japan. In the light of our trade imbalance, that would be a fair action.

In the meantime, I would like to make another suggestion. Our bilateral submissions on non-tariff barriers in the last 60 days show clearly that such exchanges of views can be valuable, for we believe that we can reassure you very promptly on some of the concerns you have expressed about our trade barriers. Undoubtedly you can clear up some questions we raised about yours. I propose, therefore, that we now follow up with an exchange of written comments on each country's submission within the next 60 days. Following that, there should be discussion at the technical level.

I have spoken, in recent months, as I did during my last visit here, of an "Open Table" approach to this problem area which the specialists call NTBs. I do believe that Japan, more than any other country, has a greater variety of inhibiting practices which are invisible but very real; by that I mean they are difficult for your trading partners to accurately discern, and therefore to intelligently discuss. I have only to use the phrase "administrative guidance," which Secretary Petty has already referred to, to make myself understood on this point. I am hopeful that our continued discussion of these matters, along with Japan's growing understanding of its increasingly important place in the world community, will result in a progressive erosion of these barriers to a freer flow of goods.

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT

Eliminating your trade barriers is undoubtedly the most constructive move that we could suggest. I do not believe, however, that a freer exchange of goods can be viewed in isolation, for it often has a close relationship to investment. Because we so well recognize the advantages to our domestic economy of an inflow of risk, equity capital—with its inputs of foreign managerial and technical know-how—we welcome, and indeed encourage, foreign investment in the United States.

In fact, new Japanese investment in the United States rose sharply last year. It is now represented in a number of States, in addition to Alaska which has been the region of heaviest investment.

But when we look at the situation affecting foreign investment in Japan itself, we see that the Japanese Government has apparently done even less to liberalize its restrictions here than it has accomplished in the field of trade. One example of the relationship between trade and investment is the limitation on the freedom of American companies to establish, and expand, sales and service facilities, a limitation which does not reciprocate the open investment policies of the United States.

Another example is that the Administration cannot effectively respond to criticism from the Congress, and from American businessmen, who wish to know why the United States should continue to absorb increasing quantities of Japanese goods when Japan has barriers to both U.S. exports and U.S. capital. The fact of our rising purchases of Japanese automobiles, for example, compared

with the Japanese investment restrictions in this same industry, is often cited to me as the leading case in point.

While Japan has announced the second stage of its five-year liberalization program, I must say that we are disappointed that the selected industries—in many instances, actually narrow segments of industries—are largely areas which do not hold much interest for potential American investors. Most important, we are concerned at the continued emphasis on "liberalization" in terms of 50 percent foreign participation. In our view, and this is bolstered by American history, the concept should embrace majority foreign ownership, up to 100 percent, if that is what the private parties involved desire. This again would be true reciprocity.

In light of Japan's increasingly impressive economic growth, the very real contributions which foreign investment can make to maintaining that growth, and Japan's expanding stake in a world of freer movement of goods and capital, we urge Japan to accelerate its liberalization timetable, and to do so in terms that are meaningful to U.S. business.

Textile problem

This brings me to textiles. This is a subject which we have discussed before. In fact, it has attracted public discussion far beyond that which we have had among ourselves.

I do not intend to emphasize the matter here in this meeting, or to restate the full case, or to say anything other than that the problem has become increasingly serious and a solution is even more necessary than before.

Here are just a few facts:

In 1968 alone our net import balance of cotton, wool, and man-made fiber textile products in the U.S. exceeded \$800 million, an increase of 60 percent above the previous year. Thus far in 1969 we have seen a further deterioration of that position. Undoubtedly our negative balance will be above \$1 Billion this year.

The first five months of this year as compared with the first five months of last year saw all man-made fiber textile and apparel imports from all sources increase 29 percent.

Man-made fiber apparel imports increased 83 percent in this period. From Japan alone, imports of man-made fiber textile and apparel products were up 52 percent, with man-made fiber apparel from Japan up 95 percent during the same period, almost double in one year's time.

We face constant reminders that other countries have restricted the access to their textile markets, many of them under agreement with Japan, leaving us the only major free world market fully open to wool and man-made fiber textile imports. We are the only open and free market for these products in the world. We cannot continue to absorb all the world can produce without great harm to the textile industry and its workers.

American firms in greater numbers are being forced to consider moving their operations overseas, to the lowest cost labor areas. This is merely transferring employment from the United States to third countries, and that doesn't help Japan either.

I recognize the difficulties in this textile situation that appear from your point of view. Your textile and apparel workers and your industry spokesmen want to continue their full access to our market, particularly since their access to other markets is so restricted. They fear being closed out of the United States. But their fears and alarms are not justified by the facts of our attitude. We foresee no harm to Japan's industry or its workers in a constructive solution. I am confident that the goals of both countries can be met without displacement of the workers or companies in either your industry or ours.

I have stated our suggestions before, in our previous meetings, as to how to resolve this problem. Our judgment is that the interests of all concerned would be best served by the development of a flexible multilateral agreement and, under the multilateral agreement, a series of comprehensive bilateral agreements covering wool and man-made fiber textiles and apparel. But our position is not frozen on that procedure. We invite your suggestions—we appeal for your help—as to how we can resolve this major problem which in the long run certainly is a mutual one and involves our mutual well being.

We are willing to start negotiations at any time. We are willing to negotiate in Tokyo, in Washington, or in Geneva. We are willing to include cotton textiles in these negotiations as well.

The situation compels us to urge that we join together in reaching a mutually satisfactory arrangement and quickly.

CONCLUSION

I hope to discuss these subjects in more detail in our counterpart meeting this afternoon with Minister Ohira. In summary, I would like to say this now.

We have come here in a spirit of true friendship and a sincere desire to cooperate in the solution of all of our mutual problems.

We agree with Minister Ohira on the dangers of protectionism in the U.S. We can both dislike it, but neither of us can ignore the factors that it feeds on. To the extent it springs from Japan's restrictions on our trade in the face of our high trade imbalance, or from Japan's reluctance to help us prevent loss of employment in the textile industry, it would be highly unfortunate if we could not agree to take steps quickly to reverse it.

There is nothing contradictory between our basic belief in freer trade and our desire for an orderly world market in textiles. The reality is that the textile problem is so severe that it is an impediment to our desire to move toward freer trade. We cannot expect enactment of new trade legislation until it is resolved.

It is inevitable that world producers of textiles will recognize that the U.S. cannot accept the serious harm that will result to its economy if the present flood of textiles is continued. The problem will not go away. It is getting worse. All we ask is a prompt agreement for a reasonable flow of trade.

We believe our trade relations would be enhanced immeasurably, with a net advantage to Japan, if Japan would remove all quantitative restrictions on imports this year, rather than only half of them in 1971; and if Japan were to liberalize all investment this year, rather than part next year and part in 1972, and would liberalize to 100% rather than 50%.

As Mr. Gilbert has said, we want to work with you in every possible way toward the elimination of nontariff barriers on both sides.

Our remarks are not intended on any point to be selfish, but to state what we really believe needs to be done to strengthen our trade relationships, to the long time advantage of both of us.

We do not pretend to have all the answers. We seek a true partnership of spirit, and we invite your views and your help on those matters which trouble us, and we will do our best to resolve those which trouble you. An attitude of give and take, and a firm resolve to meet, talk, and act on our differences, can smooth them out and allow us both to grow securely, in trade and in internal strength. We invite Japan, as a mature nation, with the second strongest economy, to join us in full partnership and full reciprocity.

THE SUIT AGAINST THE UMW

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable conditions under which miners have been forced to work for years is properly getting more and more attention these days. One of the outstanding crusaders for mine safety has been Representative KEN HECHLER of West Virginia, a truly dedicated and sincere man. On the Senate side the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., has reported out a strong mine safety bill from his Labor Subcommittee. Today's Washington Post calls attention to some of the problems faced by miners. Because of the importance of this editorial I commend it to my colleagues:

THE SUIT AGAINST THE UMW

Monday 4,000 disabled miners and mine widows filed suit in U.S. District Court accusing the leadership of the United Mine Workers of misusing welfare and pension funds. Attending the press conference announcing the suit were four miners. All began working in the mines at an early age. All are now disabled with back injuries, heart conditions or black lungs. All are now deprived of their pensions and medical benefits. The story was told of a sick miner from the coal fields of West Virginia whose benefit card was cruelly revoked by the union. He needed medicine, but with no card and no money to buy it, he was dead in a week.

Personal disasters such as these led to the formation in 1967 of the Association of Disabled Miners and Widows. It is this group that is asking at least \$75 million in compensatory damages from the UMW. In a well-written suit, it alleges a gross abuse of trust by the union and its president W. A. (Tony) Boyle, trustees of the union's Welfare and Retirement Fund, the union-controlled National Bank of Washington, the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association and certain individuals.

Specifically, the disabled—and apparently disowned—miners charge that the trustees of the Welfare Fund have cheated the rank and file of at least \$20 million by improper investment, that they have conspired with coal operators against the interests of the miners and pensioners, that between \$40 million and \$100 million a year for the past five years has been deposited in the National Bank of Washington but has not been collecting interest—income that should have been going to miners.

Although the Suit against the UMW is new, the charges are not. For the past few months, Ralph Nader and others, including Rep. Ken Hechler of West Virginia, have been calling attention to UMW practices. Ralph Nader's disclosures, if true—and he is known to gather his facts with care—depict the UMW as regressive, unresponsive and arrogant.

The suit by the disabled miners is important because it finally forces the union's leaders into meeting the charges with something more than denials through press releases, letters-to-the-editor or the inevitable full-page ad. To be sure it may be some time until the suit comes to trial before the U.S. District Court—perhaps two or three years. But in the meanwhile public scrutiny of the UMW will doubtless increase.

HE BANS MANUALS TO END
MEDIOCRITY

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, in the August 5 edition of the Washington Post, Willard Clopton, Jr.'s column, "The Federal Diary," commended George B. Hartzog, Jr., for his work as Director of the National Park Service.

The article, "He Bans Manuals To End Mediocrity," discussed Mr. Hartzog's administrative decision to abolish the handbooks and manuals used by his agency in order to increase creative and fresh thinking.

As one who has served in subordinate capacities both as a career employee in the Department of the Interior and as a member of the Armed Forces over a period of some 25 years before coming to Congress, I well remember with appreciation those few instances in which my superiors permitted me to exercise some initiative and direction on my own. As a consequence I found my work a great deal more exciting as well as rewarding.

It is largely a result of this kind of leadership that Mr. Hartzog has provided for the National Park Service that resulted in the employees of that agency of Government giving about a million and a half dollars of overtime for which they were not paid. This amounts to about \$250 per employee in the Park Service. This additional time which was purely a contribution on their part was made necessary by the employment ceiling that was required by the Congress last year.

Rather than let the service deteriorate and at the same time disappoint visitors to our National Parks and Monuments who drove many thousands of miles, they gave freely of their time in this manner.

Their willingness to give this additional time was, I am sure, the result of the kind of leadership that Mr. Hartzog has provided. He is an extremely dedicated public servant. His outstanding service in improving the quality of our national parks and thus encouraging domestic travel is particularly commendable.

I want to take this opportunity also to commend Mr. Clopton for his excellent reporting of this kind of "enlightened" management in one of our Government agencies. The full text of Mr. Clopton's article follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY: HE BANS MANUALS TO
END MEDIOCRITY

(By Willard Clopton, Jr.)

Government offices are cluttered with piles of manuals and handbooks which tell employees and supervisors, in tedious detail, how to do their jobs. They're needed, we're told, in order to insure uniformity in management.

Well, Director George B. Hartzog Jr. of the National Park Service has decided that uniformity is exactly what he doesn't want. What he wants instead from his people is "creativity and personal growth." Accordingly, Hartzog just issued an order abolish-

ing nearly all of the 56 handbooks and administrative manuals used by his agency.

The one ones to be kept will be a few used by agency attorneys in preparing litigation. The rest are being replaced by the adoption of broad administrative policies which lay down general guidelines, and the establishment of program and personal performance standards to be used in evaluating the finished product.

In other words, bosses will be given a general idea of what's expected and the rest is up to their ingenuity.

"My experience in government leads me to believe that, generally, 'uniformity' is a synonym for 'mediocrity,'" Hartzog said in a recent speech at the Federal Executive Institute in Charlottesville, Va.

He said he's convinced that people don't work for money alone, but in order to achieve and grow to their full potential.

What he wants to do he said, is attract "highly motivated" people to the Park Service and "encourage, recognize and reward" the initiative they show. He said he wants to promote "an attitude of constructive inquiry, a receptivity to change and a determination to find better ways of doing our job."

Hartzog may have read a recent article in the magazine Psychology Today by Dr. Frederick Herzberg. The piece, called "Motivation, Morale and Money," points out that real satisfaction on the job isn't the same thing as the mere absence of discontent.

Consider money. A worker can get mighty unhappy if he feels he isn't being paid what he's worth. But Herzberg notes that once the man gets a raise, and after some time passes, "he will begin to want another raise just as badly as if he had never received the first one." Nothing has really happened to alter his attitude toward the work he does or to increase the pleasure he gets from it.

Herzberg writes that the satisfaction of what he calls man's "animal" needs "produces a kind of opiate relief." But "positive satisfaction or happiness seems to require some attainment or psychological growth."

Thus, workers who concentrate on finding their workday satisfaction in such things as more pay, longer breaks and a free parking space are actually "fixated at a low level of maturity," he suggests.

But he adds that "Industry (and he could well have said government), by ignoring man's psychological need for growth and structuring jobs and rewards as if man had only animal drives, creates the condition for perpetuating immaturity. . . ."

"Leaders in industry claim to offer challenge and the opportunity for achievement in the business (read "bureaucratic") world," he goes on. "But they must learn to recognize that the typical management approach to man-as-a-worker actually blocks man's efforts to achieve his full potential."

The famed psychoanalyst Carl Jung put it this way:

"The supreme goal of man is to fulfill himself as a creative, unique individual according to his own innate potentialities and within the limits of reality."

One can only wonder how the late Dr. Jung would have gone about reforming the bureaucracy. But it's likely he would have considered getting rid of the handbooks and manuals a good first step in the therapeutic process.

FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several financial disclosure bills have been introduced this session of

Congress. While these are good bills, none to date contains the full disclosure provisions that many of our citizens have rightfully demanded of public service employees.

I am introducing today a bill with full disclosure provisions which is the most stringent bill to date in this Congress. It provides for the following:

First, full disclosure for Members of the House and Senate, all officers and employees of the House and Senate with annual salaries greater than \$18,000, and all presidential, vice presidential, senatorial, and congressional candidates;

Second, full disclosure for justices and judges of the U.S. court system;

Third, full disclosure for the President, Vice President, Cabinet members and other policymaking officials of the executive branch as determined by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and

Fourth, full disclosure for any employee in the executive with an annual salary greater than \$18,000.

This last measure is most crucial, as bills previously introduced only covered individuals in the executive who have civil service status as "policymakers." No public servant earning a salary of \$18,000 or more should escape disclosure simply because civil service regulations do not officially list him as a policymaker.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary because the present disclosure rules contain too many loopholes. For example, Members who are attorneys do not have to list clients, or the business that their law partners have with firms regulated by Federal agencies. Present rules do not require disclosure of fees for speeches or articles under \$5,000, and do not require disclosure of gifts, contributions for office expenses, loans, debts, business income from non-Government contractors or from farm subsidies. The Senate's new disclosure rule calls for listing honorariums over \$300, but does not require disclosure of business income, stocks, or legal fees. At present, neither Supreme Court Judges nor most Federal employees have to file any disclosure information.

This bill is simple: It requires full financial disclosure. I urge its enactment as a needed reform to rectify the current situation.

A HALF MILLION PRESCRIPTIONS
IN OVER 50 YEARS

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who can recall with pleasure, as I do occasionally, the days when the corner drugstore was not a supermarket cluttered with hardware and home appliances will also remember the pharmacist of 50 years ago. He was the master of powders and potions, clad in a white jacket and surrounded by thousands of bottles and jars out of which came relief from pain

and distress, according to the doctor's prescription.

One of my constituents, Mr. A. F. "Sixty" Bond, of Clendenin, W. Va., has bridged that span of time with a career of 51 years in pharmacy. A vigorous 70 years of age, he still works 40 hours each week in his profession, and has filled an estimated 500,000 prescriptions. As a reminder that there are still thousands of hard-working, responsible Americans of the old school among us, I call to your attention the following report of his career, published in the July 31 issue of the *Charleston, W. Va., Daily Mail*:

CLENDENIN MAN RECEIVES TOP
PHARMACEUTICAL HONOR

(By Jerry Kessel)

A. F. (Sixty) Bond, whose career as a pharmacist goes back 51 years, today received the Beal Award, the highest honor given by the West Virginia Pharmaceutical Assn.

Bond, who has operated Bond's Drug Store in Clendenin for 16 years, was named the recipient at the group's annual convention, but the plaque didn't come in until this week.

A native of Pendleton County, Bond graduated from Keyser High School in 1918 and went to work for Romig Drug Store there.

FLU EPIDEMIC

He remembers that year well. "The flu epidemic was in 1918," he said, "and the store was next to the undertaking parlor. Prescriptions piled up that year, sometimes 200 at a time, and so did the bodies. Some of the old patent medicines were coming in then, he recalled, and people were buying lots of Bayer Aspirin and Vicks Salve."

In 1925 Bond enrolled in the West Virginia University School of Pharmacy. He graduated in 1928 and received the Lehn and Fink Gold Medal, the school's award for the best scholastic award.

"My daughter also received the same award," he noted proudly. "We have identical gold medals."

His daughter, Ann (Mrs. Luther Smith), is a pharmacist in her father's drug store.

"I work 40 hours a week and my daughter does the rest. I couldn't get along without her," Bond declared.

Bond estimates he has filled "about a half million prescriptions."

He's had little trouble with narcotic addicts who try to obtain their drugs without a prescription.

"Sometimes one will come in with a sad story about needing some paregoric 'for a sick baby' but I can tell pretty much who they are and if I sense one, I just shut him off," Bond said.

In the days of prohibition, Bond said, two of the most popular items were Horke Vino and Virginia Dare, medicines sold as tonics. Their big appeal was their alcoholic content.

"Folks would boil them down a bit and have their liquor," Bond said.

ORIGINALLY "SWIFTY"

How did Bond acquire the nickname Sixty?

"When I was young, my family had to move around. My father died when I was six and I picked up odd jobs. Somehow I was called Swifty. It finally was changed to Sixty," he said.

"One of my friends said it should be Sexy but I'm 70 years old and I don't know about that," he laughingly said.

Bond has held every office in both the Kanawha and the state pharmaceutical associations.

He was married in 1929 to Bessie Smith, of Roane County. In addition to their daughter, they have one son, Albert F., Jr., who works for Projects Research in Huntsville, Ala.

THE DIRTY MAIL CASE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is not one Member of Congress who has not heard from constituents expressing a sense of outrage over receiving unsolicited pornographic material through the mails.

As we all know, the courts have made it rather difficult to legislate in this area, however, it was my pleasure last week to join with several of my colleagues in sponsoring a bill which states, among other important features, that these smut peddlers must first ask permission of a prospective customer by sending a form letter containing no pictures or lurid language. With permission, the seller may send as much advertising as he pleases. Without permission, he risks a jail sentence if he puts the offensive material in the mail.

An editorial appearing in the Monday, August 4, 1969, edition of the *Peoria Journal Star* discusses the effect of these court decisions and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE DIRTY MAIL CASE

We have gone downright silly in this country when we stretch the "free expression" right to the point where the government becomes an accomplice at shipping unwanted and shocking pornography directly into the home.

It is one thing to defend the rights of people to be dirty if they choose and the rights of performers to display eroticism on the stage so long as the only participants are those who wanted to see it and paid for the "privilege."

It is something else altogether to ship "advertising" that is unvarnished and obscene pornography by any standard that admits the possible existence of such a thing, unmasked, into homes where it shocks and disturbs many.

This junk is as vicious an invasion of privacy and as shocking an assault on the sensibilities and rights of many Americans as is the obscene phone call.

The phone call is criminal. The mailed pictures of the same obscenities are not only privileged—but Uncle Sam becomes the accessory who forces them upon the protesting householders!

Presently, the "rule" is that if you don't want it, you fill out a form and notify the sender, and the law says he must not send you any more of that stuff.

And the Supreme Court is now deciding if that violates the freedoms of the senders of junk mail, specifically those sending pornography!

It is unthinkable that they will find that even if you protest and make it clear you don't want this stuff in your home, the United States government is legally bound to assist the pornographers in forcing it into your presence and into your home against your will!

That they would even consider this obscene invasion of a man's "castle" and privacy and rights is shocking enough.

Far from forcing it on everybody, the U.S. government ought to abandon the present policy, restore severe penalties for inflicting commercial obscenity without invitation upon persons simply because they have a

postal address, and ban from the mails commercially aimed obscenity.

When the basic rights of the pornographer-for-profit and the basic rights of the average citizen collide, our concern should be for the householder, not the purveyor of filth.

Acquiring a postal address should not involve abandoning the rights of privacy, nor reduce anyone to the class of a second-class citizen and thus a helpless victim of any creep who tries to make money out of the crudest appeals to sex.

The "freedom" to have that kind of approach to sex ought to be matched, at least, by the freedom to have a different standard—without having the lowest standard possible forced on everybody!

Meanwhile, the worst shocker of all is the Washington director of the American Civil Liberties Union, so busy defending the freedoms of the pornographers that he is attacking more basic freedoms for all.

He charges the citizen's "right of refusal" as presently practiced violates freedom of expression by "making a censor of every citizen."

Hell, yes! Every man is his own "censor," for his own standards, and his own home. Not anybody else's. That is freedom. That is tolerance. That is individuality.

This legal apostle of "civil liberties" would make the venal, money-seeking publishers of pornography the final judge of taste for all of us, and our own feelings, our own personal choices, and our own homes would be brushed aside. Tolerance is for their, not for anybody else's, taste. Freedom is for them, not for anybody else's privacy.

This clown is working against the civil liberties of 200,000,000 Americans in seeking to provide a commercial privilege for a few.

Next he'll be arguing that if you have a window peeper, you are violating his civil liberties if you pull down your shade! You gotta leave it open!

How nutty can we get?

FALLACIES IN OUR EVER-EXPANDING WELFARE AND CIVIL RIGHTS FIELDS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from a constituent, whose name I must withhold to prevent possible retaliation. It clearly delineates two fallacies in our ever-expanding welfare and civil rights fields.

Everyone of good will deplores the conditions under which some of our citizens live and, unfortunately, the first thought that comes to mind is that the Federal Government "ought to do something" to help them. So the Federal Government has done something in the form of providing low-cost housing projects with subsidized rent. These look great when new and without doubt are a considerable improvement over much of the housing previously occupied by their new tenants.

But human nature does not change with new quarters and humanitarians who press for Government action generally fail to consider the motivations of the human race. It is well known to landlords that their tenants often

have little regard for the property because they have no equity in it, and when the Government is involved, the lack of concern is magnified. My constituent's letter clearly illustrates how quickly such subsidized housing deteriorates.

In the field of civil rights, again the motivations of human nature have not been considered. In the desire to help alleviate the problems encountered by the black race, Government officials went overboard and discriminated in reverse, giving preference to black citizens. Black militants figured that "a little was good, so a lot is better," and their demands have accelerated. At the same time, they have vigorously promoted black separatism and in the process have instilled hatred of whites in a large number of fine black citizens. Again, my constituent's letter clearly illustrates how this divisiveness is creating problems.

Mr. Speaker, the letter, with names deleted, follows:

DEAR SR: Subject: Low cost housing for the elderly and those of below average income. For reasons of old age and poor health, my wife and I retired January 1, 1969. Our son, who is making a career of the Navy, informed us of a low cost housing project in south east San Diego, known as the Bay Vista Methodist Heights Apartments, sponsored by a local Methodist church, and financed through the Prudential Life Assurance Company and our Federal government with 265 two-and-three bedroom apartments. We made inquiry and were informed that this was to be an integrated community with a hope for a balance of 75% black and 25% white and other ethnic people. The government-subsidized rent was to amount to 25% of our gross income; this amount to include all utilities, and outside maintenance. We were delighted as this amount fit well within our limited budget.

My wife and I moved in February, at which time the project was about 60% completed. We are both avid hikers and there was lots of walking area. We made long walks every day and observed with interest the gradual progress. Huge sums were being invested to make this a beautiful place to live. There is a Head Start school for the little ones; also two large and well-equipped playgrounds, and all beautifully landscaped; plants and flowers, palm trees, full-grown olive trees, many shrubs, sprinklered lawns, and all maintained. Each family as they were moved in was handed a set of rules and regulations, all set up to make this a good place to live.

A fine manager, Mr. Ronald Warren, has tried valiantly to build up a good cooperative effort. During our daily walks and contacts, we had a fine opportunity to watch the progress and also the rapid deterioration. Despite a constant effort on the part of management and a 25% tenant turn-over, the entire project went from bad to worse with broken windows and doors, filthy laundry and garbage rooms, litter and beer cans thrown everywhere, trees and shrubs pulled up by the roots, sprinklers demolished, terrible house-keeping with pest control units arriving on the picture almost every day. White and other ethnic children were forced out of the play areas by Negro children; many beaten, stoned and threatened. Most of the non-Negro parents were told that, if they did not move, they would be forced to, which they were. From many of the teenagers, a "good morning" would bring a cold stare or downright looks of hatred. The Black Panther Party seems to have a lot of influence with the young people in this area. It will soon be all black.

In all fairness we must report that we had the pleasure of meeting and knowing some

very fine black people; ones that did give a damn, mostly among the older and better adjusted, that seemed to appreciate their improved status. Some seemed to think that the new generation is trying to pay back for the many years of suffering and discrimination.

We have always liked to think of ourselves as something of crusaders, and believed that all races and creeds might live together in some harmony. We still do, but guess we are a bit premature. My wife and I have raised and educated six children, and have operated a small cleaning store for the past 14 years. We are now living in a different area, pretty much "lily-white." Our rent is over twice the amount that we were paying, which we can ill afford, but peace of mind and some freedom from fear are worth considerable sacrifice.

Perhaps communication, education and emancipation may hold some of the answers. To us this should have been an honor and privilege to be chosen to live in this fine new low cost housing project. It seems such a waste to spend millions to provide new slum housing for old. Perhaps a better percentage of integration might help. We have a number of thoughts for providing low income people with better housing at a much lower cost to Uncle Sam.

Thank you for bearing with us.

THE REGULATORY AGENCIES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most provocative articles I have read in a long time was published in the August 1969 Washington Monthly. The author is Louis M. Kohlmeier, Jr., a Washington correspondent for the Wall Street Journal. The topic Mr. Kohlmeier discusses is that of the regulatory agencies. In his article, Mr. Kohlmeier raises what I believe are a number of substantive and valid criticisms of our present system. While few will agree with all of the proposed solutions, I hope that many would agree that change is long overdue in this area. I commend to my colleagues this thoughtful analysis of the regulatory agencies for their information, consideration, and comment:

THE REGULATORY AGENCIES: WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

(By Louis M. Kohlmeier, Jr.)

The modern nations of the world have adopted three fundamentally different political approaches to mass production and mass consumption. Under communism, as practiced in the Soviet Union, the state had abolished private property, assumed ownership of the means of production, and attempted to distribute equally among the people the output of consumer goods and services. Under socialism, as practiced in the Scandinavian countries and some other nations of western Europe, the state has nationalized selected industries and institutions, but the people have retained some private property rights as well as the right genuinely to elect a new government. Under the capitalist system, as practiced in the United States, government has left production almost entirely in private hands and has superimposed upon those industrial activities most vital to the public interest the authority of government to regulate com-

merce. The distinctions between the three systems have changed and blurred, but certainly have not disappeared. Americans enjoy the greatest freedom and the highest standard of living of any people in the world.

On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly obvious that all is not well in the consumers' paradise. For example, transportation was, in a large sense, the beginning of both industrialization and government regulation of industry; but now, some three-quarters of a century after that beginning, America's transportation facilities do not offer the people the widest possible choices of services at the lowest possible prices. Washington has promoted the construction of thousands of miles of urban and intercity superhighways; but the more it builds, the more crowded the highways become. Government is consequently turning once more to the railroads but finds that train service all over the nation has declined to the point that it may become extinct within five years. Government determines that it must subsidize the development of modern trains but finds that our railroad technology has sunk so low that this nation, the most technologically advanced in the world, must send a delegation to Japan to learn how to build a truly modern passenger train.

There is evidence that government regulation of commercial airline transportation, which began with the purpose of assuring flying consumers the most frequent and the most reasonably priced service, now has become government protection of the biggest airlines, meaning overpriced and not-so-frequent airline service. And there is equally good reason to conclude that regulation of the trucking and the ocean shipping transportation industries has also become protection contradictory to the original promises.

Government agencies, like people, are not all good or all bad. One agency—the Federal Power Commission—recently lowered the prices many consumers pay for the natural gas they use. But this same agency also has placed a floor under the prices producers receive for their natural gas and consistently has ruled against price competition among the big companies that transport gas from wells in the Southwest to the nation's cities. If this agency was not wholly to blame, its bad planning still was part of the reason why 30 million people in the Northeast were plunged into darkness on the evening of November 9, 1965, by the most massive electric power failure in history.

Another agency, created years ago to protect the public resource of radio spectrum space, can be reasonably accused of squandering that resource in regulating the commercial television industry.

To many observers, it looks as if big business and a mass-production economy have become too much for a constitutional democracy to manage effectively for the benefit of the people. But to conclude that the agencies created to protect the consumer have been captured by the industries they were supposed to regulate is to oversimplify. Industries do have an interest in the agencies. And when politics and business mix there is the risk of scandal. But the exercise of power in Washington is never so simple.

If constitutional democracy has failed to master modern industrial economics, the reasons must lie in the meanings given to the Constitution over nearly 200 years. The Constitution provided in its preamble for a government to "promote the general welfare." It provided in its substantive parts for private property rights, and it checked these rights with a power conferred on the central government to regulate commerce. The Constitution assigned this power to the Congress, as the branch of government closest to the people. In the age of industrialization, Congress could not or would not legislate with finality: it chose to delegate its power to regulate commerce by setting up regulatory

agencies. Each agency was to be expert in the economics of the industry assigned to it. To each agency Congress sooner or later gave a mandate, a sweeping statement of purpose and authority to assure the public interest in a field of private industrial endeavor. To each agency Congress also gave the power to fulfill that mandate by writing rules and making decisions. The agencies' rules and decisions are the law. Inasmuch as the agencies were to be experts in economics, a calling distinct from politics, Congress appropriately created walls to shield the agencies from presidential direction and political shenanigans. This rationale of government regulation of business did not spring forth full-blown but, over the years, evolved as Congress adapted constitutional meanings to mass-production economics.

Each agency began small and clear of purpose. With the increase of industrial technology, old purposes have tended to fade and new powers have been needed. If rates and prices are to be controlled, then the number of competitors in an industry also must be regulated. A law nine pages long and an agency of 32 civil servants becomes, over the course of more than 200 amendments, a law 400 pages long and a bureaucracy of more than 1200. And finally there emerge many large, expert agencies. In an economic sense they are industrial planners, and in a political sense they are a distinct branch of government.

In law or in practice, the agencies are not a part of any one of the three branches established by the Constitution. Planning is essentially an executive function, but the agencies are by law independent of the President's direction. Making law is a legislative function, but the agencies in practice are largely independent of Congress—because Congress has deferred to their expert judgments for the writing of rules with full force of law. And deciding obligations and privileges under law is traditionally a judicial function, but the agencies are generally independent of the courts because the Supreme Court also has deferred often to their expertise. In their independence and with their power, the agencies have become something tantamount to a fourth branch of government.

Perhaps the Constitution could survive a fourth branch in which there are deposited pieces of each of the three kinds of power the founding fathers determined to separate. The difficulty is that the fourth branch lacks the essential bases of power upon which the three constitutional branches rest. The power of the legislative branch derives fundamentally from the constituencies from which each of its more than 500 members were elected. The power of the executive rests upon a constituency and consensus of the nation's people at large. And the power of the judiciary is grounded in life tenure.

POWERS AND CONFLICTS

The power of the regulatory agencies does not rest on constituencies of voters, either regional or national, or on life tenure. Theoretically, the agencies' technological proficiency is their source of power and their guarantee of independence, yet Congress has not discovered a way to make experts out of political appointees. Their expert knowledge was to be applied to the public interest; but Congress has found no way to communicate effectively with the agencies, nor have the agencies found a way to communicate directly with the consumers they are supposed to represent. They are isolated from the President, yet their walls are pierced by political pressures brought sometimes by the White House and sometimes by members of Congress itself.

Thus each agency develops a constituency of its own—the industry, or industries, it was created to regulate. The arrangement is not so sinister as it may sound, at least in

terms of pay-offs and petty political wrongdoing. The conflicts of interest are on a far larger scale.

Some such conflicts are among the agencies themselves. They are inevitable when individual agencies go their own separate ways toward bigger and better super-highways, or airliners, or ships, as ends in themselves. One agency of government promotes the atomic generation of electricity. Another sides with the natural gas industry. One promotes the airlines, another railroads and a third highways. One agency promotes small business and another defends big business. And all this without communication either way with "the people."

There is a second and perhaps larger conflict. On the one hand, government agencies uniformly become protectors of industry against the rigors of competition, particularly price competition. On the other hand, there is the competitive free enterprise system, as enforced by federal anti-trust laws that are almost as old as government regulation of industry.

And there are also conflicts in the exercise of power between the regulatory agencies and the three branches of government, conflicts which are not so easily seen. Evidence and testimony pop up from time to time suggesting that something has gone awry in governments' attempts to adjust constitutional powers and freedoms to the needs of a mass-production economy. The late Justice Robert H. Jackson said some years ago that the rise of the consumer agencies was "probably the most significant legal trend of the last century." Then he added that the rationalization of the agencies with constitutional purposes is but "a smooth cover which we draw over our confusion as we might use a counterpane to conceal a disordered bed." President Kennedy spoke of "a chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete regulation evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times." Indeed, every President of recent history has complained, with justification, that he is charged with more responsibility to the people as wage earners and wage spenders than he has the authority to fulfill.

Perhaps the only sure conclusion is that government, as presently constituted, has made more promises than it can keep. Perhaps an inflation of promises and laws, no less than of money, is built into the system of representative government. But the promises have been made and government will not repeal them. America will continue to try to find new answers, in the old Constitution or perhaps eventually in a new one, by weighing, as it always has, private rights against government powers, state powers against national powers, and, within the national government, legislative and executive and judicial powers against one another.

The balance today weighs more in Washington's favor, as against individual and state rights, than once it did. And, inside Washington, the balance weighs more toward executive power. The nation's hopes for material plenty are centered on the President, and gradually the President, by vote of Congress or without it, is acquiring authority commensurate with his responsibility. He has a Council of Economic Advisers and a special assistant for consumer affairs. He can use the power of his office to prevent a steel price increase and to settle a railroad strike. He has a Department of Transportation that has assumed some of the authority of a few of the old independent regulatory agencies and all of the responsibility for bringing sense and coordination to the nation's conflicting transportation laws and agencies. He has, in short, begun to do what the branch closest to the people has failed to do: coordinate the conflicting powers of government, and establish some manner of priority among multiple federal aims.

STAFFING THE FOURTH BRANCH

Shortly after his election in 1960, President Kennedy assigned James M. Landis, an old family friend, former Harvard Law School dean, and former regulator, to the task of studying the agencies' efficiency and effectiveness. The Landis report was not a secret document, and it was the basis of several messages the President sent to Congress. President Johnson, within days of the Kennedy assassination, spoke to the regulators directly and privately, although the White House press office released his statement. In it Mr. Johnson said he wanted the regulators to concern themselves with "cooperation" with business rather than "new areas of control" of business. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson appointed to the agencies, as vacancies occurred, men they felt shared their philosophies.

But, as Lyndon Johnson's statement indicated, their philosophies were not identical, even if both were Democrats. John Kennedy was a liberal who favored tough and expansive regulation of business and initially appointed tough and expansive regulators. Lyndon Johnson was a liberal on matters such as civil rights, but on issues of property rights he was a conservative who used his appointment power to soften and curtail regulation. Richard Nixon is also a conservative who, during the 1968 Presidential election campaign, sent a form letter to 3,000 securities-industry leaders pledging that the Securities and Exchange Commission would follow a soft line during the Nixon Administration.

Taken together, the known evidence of interventions from Wilson to Nixon demonstrates that Presidents, Democratic or Republican, have not disassociated themselves from the substance of regulation. Contemporary regulation, in form and substance, also is influenced by a more or less constant application of patronage politics. The spoils system, roughly the equivalent of the system that remains in the executive branch, invaded the regulatory agencies in 1950. Prior to that year, Presidents at times had given appointments to commissions and boards as rewards for party service. By law, no party may have a majority of more than one among the members of most agencies, but Presidents past and present usually have been able to find in the opposite party men and women to their liking. In 1950, however, a significantly larger opportunity for patronage politics came into being.

That, presumably, was not the intention. President Truman in 1950 submitted to Congress reorganization plans for the major regulatory agencies. Their main purpose was to authorize the President to designate one of the members of each agency as its chairman and to vest in the chairman the responsibility for naming key staff personnel. Previously, the members of most agencies elected one of themselves as chairman, usually rotating the position annually, and all members participated in the hiring of important staff people. President Truman told Congress that his aim was to pinpoint responsibility of efficient operation of the agencies and to speed their work, trim their backlogs and generally improve "effectiveness and economy." Mr. Truman must be taken at his word, but, as so often has happened with the regulators, the end results have been quite different from the effects intended.

Congress agreed to all the reorganization plans except one for the Interstate Commerce Commission. The railroad industry, unwilling to take its chances with a chairman of Harry Truman's choice, stirred up enough opposition so that Congress voted to bar the President from naming the ICC chairman. At almost all other agencies, the President since 1950 has designated the chairman, the chairman serves at the President's pleasure and each time the White House changes party hands the chairmanships also change party

hands. The Supreme Court has never been called upon to decide whether, as a matter of constitutional law, the chairmen may serve at the pleasure of the President or are entitled to the chair for the duration of their terms as members of a commission or board. Some chairmen have been of the latter view, but not strongly enough to fight all the way to the Supreme Court. Some chairmen since 1950 also have had to be persuaded by the new President to vacate the chairmanship; most have not. Most have gone quietly, accepting the principle that the chairmanship belongs to the party in the White House.

The extension of Presidential power to the chairman has had profound effects because it reaches laterally to the other agency members and seeps downward into the agency staffs. Political allegiance and alliance are more important to all than they once were. Indeed, politics has become a larger topic of concern inside some agencies than it is inside departments of the executive branch. In the political limbo of the regulatory agencies, declarations and demonstrations of loyalty to the President are a useful kind of job insurance.

A few agencies still remain relatively non-political. The Interstate Commerce Commission is not unconcerned with politics, but it also is not consumed with politics, partly because it picks its own chairman. The Federal Reserve Board is not concerned to excess, because its members have 14-year terms. By and large, however, politics has, since 1950, eroded the expertise which is supposed to be the touchstone of regulation. When James Landis asserted nine years ago that the agencies had suffered "a deterioration in quality, both at the top level and throughout the staff," no one seriously challenged his statement. It remains valid today.

A BLOB IN EVERY JOB

The test of competence for each candidate consists of the submission by the White House of his or her name to industry executives before sending it on to the Senate for confirmation. CAB candidates are cleared with airline executives, FPC candidates with gas and electric companies, ICC candidates with railroad officials and usually truckers too. (Such procedures are also followed in executive branch appointments that may have quasi-regulatory functions, as was the case when the American Medical Association objected to the proposed appointment of Dr. John Knowles.)

Every President in recent history has run some sort of check with industry before appointing or reappointing a regulator. The method of checking has not always been the same, and industry reactions have been given varying weights by different Presidents. But the practice is so well established that not long ago a new president of Eastern Air Lines proposed publicly that the whole thing be brought out into the open through a committee of airline presidents to select a list of "competent candidates" for consideration by the President in filling the next vacancy on the CAB. The committee was not formed, at least not out in the open. The appointment machinery apparently works well enough, for example, to satisfy one bank executive, who said of the banking regulators: "This system works best if there's a blob in every job."

Almost no President has ever sent up for Senate confirmation a name to which industry takes vigorous exception. President Truman, for instance, refused, for no reason that was apparent at the time, to reappoint James Landis. Landis, who had been chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the 1930's, was chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1947. As his term on the CAB was drawing to an end, the White House announced he would not be reappointed. Landis subsequently said: "There is no question that the airlines were against me. I am

against monopolistic practices and a number of things that they have been doing." The only exception in recent history was in 1949, when President Truman tried unsuccessfully to reappoint Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission over gas-industry opposition. More often, the names that the White House picks pass the industry check without difficulty.

Why do Presidents run checks with industry before picking regulators? Fundamentally, because Presidents usually look upon regulation more or less as industry's preserve, but also because they want to be forewarned of opposition. If it appears that a nomination will face a stiff fight, the President must decide whether to drop it or do battle with the Senate. Another reason for the checkouts is that all Presidents, Democrats as well as Republicans, number leading industrialists among their personal friends and political contributors. Conferring with them is regarded an act of courtesy, if not prudence.

No President can forever ignore the business community or incur its universal and undying wrath by appointing hostile regulators. As John F. Kennedy learned, an excessive amount of Presidential hostility toward the business community can in the long run shake business confidence in the future of the nation's economy. Badly shaken confidence means a falling stock market and perhaps curtailment of new plant construction and new job opportunities. That is bad politics. Regulatory-agency appointments are not the be-all of business confidence, but they surely are part of the fabric of White House relations with business.

Politics and regulation being what they are, regulators generally fall into one of two categories. The first consists of occasional appointees who are bright, able, and ambitious; they invariably stay for a few years and then resign, long before the expiration of the five-year or seven-year terms to which they were appointed. But most incumbent regulators are in a second category—those who are appointed wholly because of their political credentials and need of jobs, and who want to stay on indefinitely, or at least as long as their political connections and industry acceptability remain intact.

The premature resignations of men regarded by their peers as bright and able have been decried over and over again. When the first Hoover Commission investigated the regulatory agencies during the Truman Administration in the late 1940's, it complained that the regulators were coming and going so rapidly that many "do not remain long enough to master the problems of regulation and to perform their duties well." During the Eisenhower Administration, in 1956, the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in a moment of frankness, told a House committee that the CAB never adheres to "a fixed philosophy for any very fixed period of time because the members come and go."

Key staff members who are bright and able also come and go. The politics involved is not subtle. A principal value to the President of his power to designate chairmen is the patronage potential in each chairman's authority to appoint key staff personnel. These staff officials—the head of the CAB's Bureau of Economic Regulation, of the SEC's Division of Trading and Markets, of the FCC's Broadcast Bureau—do not have the job security enjoyed by the mass of federal civil servants of lower rank in the agencies and the executive branch. They are part of the "Schedule C" layer of Washington officialdom that is below the rank of Presidential appointment and above the rank of civil service protection; they can be hired and fired at will.

There was a time, before 1950, when someone who wanted one of the top agency staff jobs and who was accepted by the members of the commission or board had simply to

obtain a letter of endorsement from one of the senators of his home state. Once hired, from outside the agency or by way of promotion from within, he usually stayed. A change in command at the White House didn't reach him. Now the appointments go through the same political patronage clearance procedure at Democratic or Republican National Committee headquarters that is involved in all noncivil service appointments to high federal office.

The job seeker normally goes first to his Democratic or Republican national committeeman or committeewoman, or to another party official of his home state designated to clear federal jobs for that state. If the state official looks with favor on the job claim, he submits it to National Committee headquarters. Only then does the job seeker go to see the chairman of the agency for whom he wants to work. "This is normal procedure," says a Democrat who served as a top staff official of the SEC during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. "The chairman of any agency could argue against me or anyone else sent over by the National Committee, if he really felt strongly. But that ordinarily doesn't happen."

What does happen is that when the White House changes party hands, the chairman of the agencies change and the top staff appointees go and come with the chairmen. When Dwight Eisenhower became President, staff heads rolled at the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and most other agencies. When John Kennedy became President there was a wholesale turn-out of Republicans. And when Richard Nixon moved into the White House, the Democrats were turned out.

All this is not to say that there is no expertise left in the agencies. A few experienced staff officials at some agencies have remained through Democratic and Republican Administrations. They've usually done so by means of friendly alliances that permit the politically displaced to take lesser jobs with civil service protection in an agency, hoping to return to power when the next Administration comes along. But these are the exceptions. The rise of politics and the decline of expertise inside the agencies is described, privately, by a member of the Federal Trade Commission: "At the FTC everybody, down to Grade 13, knows who's a Republican and who's a Democrat and who contributed to what party."

A PROPOSAL FOR REFORM

The executive branch, by and large, is not now as defenseless as the regulators against pressures brought by special-interest segments of the population. The pressures bear on the great departments, some of which tend to be advocates of broad special-interest groups. The Department of Labor is regarded by all concerned as the voice of organized labor; the Department of Commerce is the accepted advocate of business; the Department of Agriculture is the spokesman for (as well as subsidizers of) farmers. But these departments are advocates of very large special-interest groups which, because they are not of a single view on matters of competition, subsidy, and so forth, expose department officers to varying points of view. And, most importantly, their advocacies are not unduly objectionable to the public because cabinet secretaries are subject to the discipline of the President, whose constituency embraces all the people.

If the President and his executive branch are now reasonably secure against the pressures and commitments that have plagued the regulators, they may not remain so. The experience of the democracies of western Europe suggests that increased centralization of power within government generates its own pressures and problems. Big business and big labor are capable of generating big political pressures that do not necessarily assist efficient government planning. Issues of

mechanization, full employment, and higher wages in such industries as transportation, communications, steel, and automobiles tend to be resolved more by political than economic means; and, if they are not resolved, big labor is capable of general strikes that paralyze a nation. Government, industry, and labor relationships in the United States do not yet parallel those in Europe. But neither is America as far from Europe as it once was. General Motors says that industry and government should work "not as adversaries, but as allies," and government no longer disagrees.

Big government and its counterparts in industry and labor will not disappear; they were responses to the demands of the people in an era of industrialization and urbanization, for economic security and abundance. Blind condemnation of bigness is no more useful than blind affirmation. If the needs of governmental efficiency and priority are to be balanced anew with doctrines of economic freedom and individualism, bigness must be disciplined through a redistribution of powers among the three constitutional branches. This would involve a re-evaluation of the relationship between the federal government and the states, as well as a reaffirmation of antitrust law as the best and only means this nation has discovered to assure economic freedom and economic individualism.

ABOLITION

The independent regulatory agencies should be abolished, and the powers of each should be carefully re-examined. Those promises and powers in their laws which do not conflict with competitive principles and antitrust statutes should be distributed among the three branches; those that do conflict should be repealed. In redistributing those powers which are retained, consideration must be given to the question of whether some tasks, assumed by Washington in pursuit of the general welfare of the entire nation, can more effectively be performed by state and local governments, alone or in a new form of partnership with the federal government. Washington must treat all who are subject to its laws with equality and uniformity.

That fundamental constitutional requirement inhibits effectiveness of centralized planning in a nation as large, populous, and variegated as the United States. The transportation requirements of New York are not the same as those of Nashville and Tucson. The Federal Trade Commission admittedly has not been able to effectively police the retail advertising of all merchants on every Main Street, and one FCC member has said, "Federal efforts alone can never be successful." If Washington delegates or shares its tasks, it must also share its tax revenues. The most promising method is bloc grants to the states; Washington would, for example, grant to each state a proportionate sum for transportation purposes and allow the state to decide where and how to spend the money. Federal authority and money cannot be shared in areas of exclusive federal jurisdiction, such as navigable waters and airways. But federal funds, shared or not, should not be used to subsidize private corporations.

In the redistribution of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government, each branch would be charged with larger economic responsibility and authority.

If Congress insists that the President bear responsibility for full employment and full purchasing power, then he must have authority for making monetary policy, which now is vested in the Federal Reserve Board. Perhaps efficiency also requires that he have the authority to raise and lower income-tax rates within a limited range prescribed by Congress. But his authority should be confined to power that is narrow in its range of discretion and uniform in its application. He

should not, formally or informally, exercise authority over prices charged by private corporations or wages negotiated by labor unions. Nor should his Council of Economic Advisers promulgate price and wage guidelines. The role of the council should be to advise the President in the exercise of his authority and in his recommendations to Congress, and to coordinate the enforcement and administration of law by the great departments of the executive branch.

Congress itself is inherently incapable of regulating the nation's commerce or else it would not have created the independent regulatory agencies or enacted the Employment Act and created the Council of Economic Advisers. Having charged the President with responsibility, and having now begun to enlarge the authority of the executive branch, Congress should have no great difficulty in removing the regulators and reapportioning their powers.

Constitutionally, there is no solution to the problem of the regulators other than to abolish them and redistribute those powers which may be exercised by the three branches. The Constitution created a government of the people, and the people gave their sovereignty only to officers whom they elected and judges to whom they gave lifetime tenure.

Regulators are extensions of the legislative branch, but it would be totally inconsistent and wholly impractical to elect regulators to four-year or other terms. Congress created the agencies for the very purpose of removing the regulation of commerce from politics and substituting independent expertise for political partisanship. There is no reason to believe that popular election of regulators would not further intensify the politics of regulation and deny expertise and independence.

To confer upon the regulators, as they now exist, lifetime tenure also would be inconsistent and impractical. The Constitution, in granting tenure to judges, denied them the power to decide issues other than those brought before them. Judges cannot reach out to make law where they feel law should be made; it was the purpose of regulation by independent agency to do precisely that.

To transfer the regulators and their powers intact to the executive branch would confer upon the President powers which, as the Supreme Court has said, would be so discretionary in form and so arbitrary in effect as to be unconstitutional.

Abolition of the agencies, it must be emphasized, does not mean abandonment of specific federal promises of the lowest possible rates and prices and the greatest abundance of goods and services, or repeal of the general promise of economic stability and security. It does mean restructuring some parts of government and industry to improve the likelihood that those promises can be fulfilled.

ANTITRUST LAW

Reaffirmation of competition as a national policy and refurbishment of antitrust law as the means of enforcing that policy are absolutely essential prerequisites to abolition of the regulatory agencies. The writing and enforcement of antitrust law will never be a pure science, economic or political. Antitrust is, as regulation attempted to be, a political policy addressed to industrial economies. The policy of antitrust is to foster competition; the policy of regulation, formal or informal, is to suppress competition. There will continue to be valid exceptions to the rule of competition. Natural monopolies, in the form of local electric, water, and transit companies, are exceptions that will continue to be regulated under state authority. But all the exceptions that by law or habit have been created in Washington should be re-examined.

Antitrust law is a useful instrument for enlarging the store of knowledge concerning the public effects of industrial concentration. It can be made more useful. Enforcement by the Justice Department should be coordinated with the work of the Council of Economic Advisers. The informal efforts of the President to regulate prices and wages through the prestige or inherent powers of his office would be abandoned. Those ends would be pursued through formal antitrust actions, coordinated with fiscal and monetary policy by the Council of Economic Advisers, filed by the Justice Department, and decided by the commerce court. The formal exceptions to antitrust law enacted by Congress for the benefit of the regulatory agencies should be repealed.

Enforcement of the Sherman and Clayton Acts has been inadequate. Active participation by the Council of Economic Advisers in formulation of antitrust policies and suits should result in greater enforcement effort. But, pending the Council's participation, Congress can act to reinvigorate enforcement. The antitrust division of the Justice Department needs more money and manpower. Its annual budget of about \$7 million is less than half the budget of a single large regulatory agency and one-tenth the amount the government has paid in airline subsidies in a single year. After giving it more money and manpower, Congress should forbid the division to negotiate consent-decree settlements of antitrust suits it has brought. It has been allowed to compromise suits on the theory that, being understaffed, it thus could bring more suits. All suits should go to trial; and, in price-fixing suits, businessmen no longer should be allowed to plead no-contest and thus avoid trial where the trial record can be used by private parties and by the states as the basis for triple-damage suits against the price-fixers. More businessmen convicted of price-fixing should be fined the full \$50,000 and be required to spend one full year in a federal prison.

Congress should further augment enforcement by enacting an absolute ban on all future mergers involving significant competitors—direct, indirect, or potential. A significant merger could be defined as one in which one of the merger partners has annual sales or assets in excess of \$100 million.

When competition is reaffirmed and antitrust law is refurbished, there will be no need of regulators. The agencies should be abolished on a first-in, first-out basis.

TRANSPORTATION

The transportation area demands first attention, as President Kennedy indicated. The antitrust law exemptions that permit railroads, truck lines, and barge lines to fix rates should be repealed. The Interstate Commerce Commission's controls on entry into these industries, through its power to license common carriers and its power to approve mergers, also should be repealed. Railroad and other transportation industry executives who persist in fixing prices should be subject to the criminal penalties of the Sherman Act. Antitrust law would take the place of regulatory law, and there no longer would be an function for the ICC.

The authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to fix domestic airline fares, control entry into the industry, and approve mergers should similarly be repealed. Commercial airlines are no longer an infant industry, and they should by law be declared ineligible for subsidies. If these actions are taken, and antitrust law is thereby substituted for regulatory law, there will be no reason or excuse for a Civil Aeronautics Board.

The elimination of rate-fixing conferences, subsidies, and controls on entry will not be so easily accomplished in areas of overseas air and ocean transportation. The democracies of western Europe, which have ownership interests in their international airlines and shipping companies and which are the main-

stays of the International Air Transport Association and other rate-fixing conferences, will resist United States withdrawal. Nonetheless, the United States supplies far more passengers and freight than any other nation, and it should use its influences to re-establish competition on international air and sea traffic lanes.

Pan American World Airways and other U.S. companies operating international air services are not now receiving federal subsidies, and they, like domestic airlines, should no longer be eligible for subsidies. To end the need for federal subsidization of construction of commercial ships, American shipping companies should be given the freedom they are now denied to build ships in foreign shipyards. To end the need for ship-operating subsidies, U.S. ship lines must meet foreign-flag competition the same way other United States producers are expected to compete on the international market. Higher American wages and other operating costs must be offset by superior American technology and automation, American shipbuilders, ship operators, and maritime labor for too long have lobbied in Washington intensively and successfully for subsidies with the fundamental argument that America needs its ships for national defense emergencies. Automated ships designed in America and built in foreign yards will be under American control for defense emergencies.

Coordination of the remaining federal programs involving domestic transportation will lie within the responsibility and authority of the Department of Transportation. It already has authority as well as responsibility in matters of rail, highway, and aviation safety that formerly was vested in the ICC and CAB. Regulation of automobile safety was vested in the department in 1966. Regulation of safety matters in international ocean transportation should be transferred to the department. The Federal Maritime Administration, its authority to subsidize ship construction and operation having been repealed, can thus be totally abolished.

Aviation safety, on domestic and international air routes, will continue to be an important matter of Transportation Department concern. The public interest requires continued operation by the Federal Aviation Administration of the nation's air-traffic-control system and certification by FAA of new types of aircraft. FAA is part of the Transportation Department; its spending must be coordinated with actual levels of air traffic and with total federal spending. Airlines and other civilian users of the FAA's air-traffic-control and navigation system should pay their full share of the costs of operating and improving the system, through establishment of airways-user charges. Federal spending to develop a supersonic commercial airliner should end. The SST should not be built until private enterprise can develop a reliably safe and commercially sound airplane—and perhaps the SST should not be built even then, if the public nuisance of sonic booms cannot be substantially reduced.

Improvement of the nation's rivers, harbors, and coastal waterways for navigation, flood control, and generation of electricity also must remain a federal concern, because these navigable waterways belong to no single state and are in exclusive federal domain. But the works of the Army Corps of Engineers must be transferred to either the Transportation Department or the Department of the Interior. Inasmuch as federal promotion of barge line transportation will be inappropriate in a new era of transportation competition, perhaps the other purposes of waterways improvements will be paramount and the works of the Engineers therefore should be transferred to the Interior Department. Control of floods, dredging of harbors, and control of beach erosion and pollution certainly are proper federal

concerns, but barge lines and other private interests that gain special advantage from such programs must pay appropriate user charges for the benefits received.

Federal spending for improvement of surface transportation within the United States cannot quickly be curtailed. If construction of the Interstate Highway System were stopped prior to its planned completion in 1972, millions of motorists would write irate letters to their congressmen. Federal highway construction already has gone so far that federal subsidies probably are essential to save what is left of the nation's urban and intercity surface transportation facilities. Federal spending for highways and common-carrier forms of transportation will continue to grow until 1972. But coordination, through the Transportation Department, can begin before then. The Highway Trust Fund, which defies coordination, should be eliminated and highway spending controlled by annual appropriations: highway users charges larger than those presently collected should be required of all truck lines. The federal government then should adopt a bloc grant program for transportation, giving to each state annually a proportionate sum, based upon population, to be allocated for urban and intercity highways, rail facilities, subways, or buses. The Transportation Department would have authority to make certain that the grants are used efficiently and honestly, but state governments would have final authority to decide how and where the money is expended.

ABOLISHING THE FCC

Communications services, like transportation services, involve a combination of intrastate, interstate, and international responsibilities and demand new and enlightened approaches. Domestic telephone and telegraph companies are natural local monopolies whose rates and practices will continue to be regulated by the states. Long-distance telephone and telegraph services, both interstate and international, also have been monopolistic in nature and have been regulated by the Federal Communications Commission.

Technology, however, has blurred the distinction the FCC has attempted to maintain between voice (or telephone) services and written communications (or telegraph) services; and technology is further blurring distinctions between wire, cable, and radio as methods of carrying all types of communications. It seems entirely likely that, given free rein, communications satellites offer a relatively cheap new method of transmitting very large volumes of interstate and international communications and of opening both domestic and overseas long-distance communications to a new era of competition. If this potential of communications satellites were realized, competition and antitrust law could be substituted for regulation of long-distance services, and the land-based, local telephone, and other connecting services would continue to be regulated by the states.

Enlarged use of communications satellites would of course require assignment of more radio frequencies and complicate the already large problem of frequency allocation. The existing problem of allocating frequency space among users of industrial radio services, public police and fire departments and similar users, and commercial broadcasters demands more comprehensive and enlightened government study and action. The responsibility for study and the authority to allocate frequency space should be transferred from the Federal Communications Commission to the executive branch. Allocation authority could be shifted to the Commerce Department, where it originated, but would be better pinpointed by transfer to the Transportation Department, which then would be the Department of Transportation and Communications.

In re-evaluating present and projected radio spectrum usage, the executive branch

should immediately add to the space available for satellite and other communications by moving all television broadcasting into the ultra-high-frequency channels, and thus freeing the very-high-frequency channels for other uses. The move will inconvenience television-receiver owners, but no more than they already have been inconvenienced. It will put all commercial TV broadcasters on an equal footing, increase competition in the industry, eliminate the most onerous features and politics of the FCC's 1952 master plan and perhaps even bring back to life more television networks.

Further, the executive branch and Congress should reconsider the 1962 Communications Satellite Act. Reconsideration might well lead to the conclusion that competition, rather than a monopolistic government-industry consortium, is appropriate for international as well as domestic communications. They clearly should reject the proposal, made late in 1968 by a Presidential committee headed by a State Department official, of a still larger government-sponsored monopoly that would own all U.S.-held submarine cable and other facilities, including satellites, for international communications. In addition, Congress and the executive branch should endorse competition by encouraging the development of cable-television and pay-television services with the United States. And the Federal Communications Commission should be abolished.

ENERGY

Re-examination of federal responsibility and authority in the area of energy resources also is long overdue. The inability of the Atomic Energy Commission to promote civilian uses of atomic energy, to the extent hoped, suggests that Congress again should relax governmental controls over private use and take new measures to foster industrial competition. Civilian control of atomic energy should remain, but control should be transferred to the Department of the Interior. The department could regulate safety and other aspects of private industrial usage of atomic energy.

Inasmuch as the primary private use apparently will continue to involve atomic generation of electricity, it is entirely appropriate that the Secretary of the Interior become the coordinating agent of all federal programs concerning energy resources. The Federal Power Commission's authority to license the construction of hydroelectric dams on navigable waterways should be transferred to the Secretary, and Congress must fix standards he is to follow in deciding whether contested dam sites are to be developed by private investor-owned utilities or by public authorities. His decision would be appealable to the new commerce court. Federal regulation of interstate transmission of natural gas and of gas producers should be abandoned; neither transmission nor production is a natural monopoly, and competition should be required in both areas through the application of anti-trust law to entry into the business, to merger proposals, and to rate-fixing. Regulation of electric and gas utilities, which are local distribution monopolies, should remain with the states.

BANKS

Federal supervision of national banks and federal insurance of deposits in national and state banks are essentially safety functions which should be consolidated in the Treasury Department. The Office of Comptroller of the Currency, already in the department, could be renamed the Federal Banking Administration. The Administrator would assume the Comptroller's authority to examine and supervise national banks. The bank regulatory authority of the Federal Reserve Board would be transferred to the administrator, and the function and authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation also

would be consolidated in the new office of the administrator.

The Federal Reserve Board, thus relieved of its responsibility and authority to examine and regulate member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would become solely an agent of monetary policy, adjusting the nation's supply of money and credit to its needs of the moment. The Federal Reserve System of member commercial banks would remain intact, but the board should be abolished as an independent agency. It should be reformed as a part of the executive branch—and must be, if the responsibility which has been charged to the President by Congress for full employment and purchasing power is to be fulfilled.

Conservative bankers assert that the Federal Reserve Board's independence is a healthy brake on the soft money and easy-credit policies of some liberal Presidents. But the Federal Reserve Board has not proved itself unerring in economic wisdom either, and divided responsibility and authority lead to conflict and invite irresponsibility. The President, not the board, is accountable to the intended beneficiaries of full employment and purchasing power.

Authority for monetary policy should be vested in a multimember board, but the board should be part of the executive branch. Its members should be confirmed by the Senate and should serve at the pleasure of the President. It could be composed of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors (who also would be chairman of the new Federal Reserve Board), the Secretary of the Treasury, and the administrator of the new Federal Banking Administration.

Reform, over the long term, also should include an end to the dual system of national and state banks. Chartering of commercial banks by the federal government and the states has led to conflicting standards of competition. Chartering of new banks, which means control of entry into the business, should be left to the states alone. State law on branch banking already controls national as well as state banks and should remain. Banks are not in fact interstate businesses and should not be allowed to spread themselves across state lines. More competition among banks is desirable, and antitrust law should apply to bank mergers and, to the extent possible, to other competitive matters in the banking industry.

A banking industry consisting entirely of state-chartered and state-regulated banks need not be inconsistent with a central banking system headed by the reconstituted Federal Reserve Board. State banks, as well as national banks, presently are members of the Federal Reserve System.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Federal jurisdiction in matters of consumer protection from false advertising, securities frauds, flammable fabrics, and the like should be re-evaluated and new balances struck between federal and state authority and government regulation and free competition. Federal efforts to police hundreds of thousands of retailers and other businessmen who deal directly with consumers should be re-examined and abandoned where Washington cannot succeed.

Those policing functions which the federal government can best perform, such as guarding against false advertising on national television and stock manipulation on national securities exchanges, should be transferred to a new Consumers Affairs Division in the Justice Department. The division would police consumer frauds and misrepresentations by filing suits in the new commerce court. Policing of lesser frauds and misrepresentations would be left to the states and to individuals. To assist, the federal government should provide funds in the form of state grants which would be distributed to Better Business Bureaus and similar organizations and would be used to expand the embryonic

program, now administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to provide legal services to consumers who cannot afford a lawyer's fees.

The Federal Trade Commission's authority to police misleading advertising, flammable fabrics, and mislabeled furs thus would be redistributed between the Consumer Affairs Division and the states. The FTC's authority to enforce the Clayton Antitrust Act would be consolidated with the same authority already existing in the antitrust division of the Justice Department. The Robinson-Patman Act amendment to the Clayton Act, which the antitrust division has almost never used, would be repealed. Hopefully, federal exemptions from antitrust laws which permit states to enact fair-trade laws also would be repealed. And the Federal Trade Commission would be abolished and made over into a part of the judicial branch.

The Securities and Exchange Commission would similarly be taken apart and abolished as it now exists. Authority to investigate fraud in the sale of securities and manipulation of stock market prices would be transferred to the Consumer Affairs Division. Its authority to control entry into the stock market business and to regulate stock exchange commission rates would be repealed. Entry would be free, and mergers and commission rates would be subject to antitrust laws. Antitrust law thus reaffirmed would be employed to bar forevermore member firms of the New York Stock Exchange and other exchanges from fixing commission rates and to bestow on investors the benefits of commission-rate competition. The new federal program of grants to the states for the purpose of strengthening Better Business Bureaus and other consumer protection agencies might well be expanded to also strengthen the securities regulatory agencies of New York, California, and other states.

LABOR

The labyrinth of federal bureaucracies that regulate labor and management relations ought to be reformed. Federal laws guaranteeing workers' right to organize, those proscribing unfair union and management practices and those written to assure democratic procedures in unions' internal affairs, should be administered by the Labor Department through suits filed in the new labor court. The National Labor Relations Board can be reconstituted as the court. The Labor Department already polices unions' internal affairs, through suits filed in federal district courts. It also should assume the functions now vested in the NLRB, including the supervision of union representation elections among employees.

Federal programs now assigned to the National Mediation Board and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service should first be combined and then reviewed by Congress and the Labor Department. Federal mediation clearly has not been successful in transportation. Its collateral effect of stagnating labor-management bargaining, leading ultimately to compulsory arbitration, is surely undesirable. Greater reliance for mediation and conciliation might be placed on state agencies which already exist for those purposes.

Labor's basic right to organize and bargain for wages and other benefits is not an abuse of antitrust laws, but organized labor should not enjoy total immunity from those laws. Unions ought not to be used as price-fixing mechanisms, either by barbers, musicians, and other self-employed persons or by agreement of workers with employers. Antitrust law does and should apply to conspiracies of unions with employers for the purpose of damaging competitive employers or unions.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should be abolished because it is an inefficient means of opening job opportunities to Negroes and other minority

groups. Its responsibility should be transferred either to the Labor Department or to the civil rights division of the Justice Department. Suits to require employers and unions to fulfill their obligations under the 1964 Civil Rights Act would be filed in the new labor court, as they now are filed by the Justice Department in federal district courts.

The reform of the regulators will not be quick or easy. More and perhaps better answers may be found in the course of abolishing the independent regulatory agencies and subjecting their promises and powers to the discipline of constitutional doctrine and of the competitive system reinforced by antitrust laws. If those promises and powers are not so disciplined, governmental efficiency, coordination, and priority will be pursued by other means. Greater economic stability and consumer security will be found, but at a greater sacrifice of economic as well as individual freedom.

A REEVALUATION OF OUR JAPAN POLICY

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt asked the Congress to declare war on Japan, and turn back Japanese military aggression in Asia. The Congress agreed, war was declared and a huge American expeditionary force was sent to fight in the Far East.

The people of our country were not primarily fighting to protect China and Southeast Asia from Japanese conquest. They were fighting to defend American territory and vital national interests against an aggressor who perpetrated a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

Since the end of World War II and in a period of only 15 years, the United States has been engaged in two additional wars in Asia, involving over half a million casualties and almost \$200 billion in expenditures. In both instances the wars were fought to repulse foreign aggression and protect our national security.

The irony of world politics is clearly seen in the Korean and Vietnam conflicts. In both wars the United States has viewed China as the main threat to world order while Japan has been our firm Asian ally. A few years earlier, in World War II, our great ally was China and our implacable enemy was Japan.

To add to the confusion, in the Vietnam war, we are not even pitted on the field of combat against our main antagonist—China. We are fighting Vietnamese in their homeland. There is considerable doubt in the minds of many Americans that we are supporting a government in Vietnam which has broad popular appeal and one which has inherent viability. The pattern of the war does not allow for a neat separation of the Vietnamese protagonists into the forces of good and the forces of evil. An earlier division based upon anti-Communists valiantly struggling against Communist oppressors has lost some of its emotional vitality because it all too

often appears that American soldiers are dying to uphold a corrupt, selfish, inefficient regime in Saigon.

The cost of our efforts in Vietnam in manpower, in money, in international friendship, in domestic programs deferred, in moral confusion has led many Americans to question just what our national interests are in Asia and whether we can afford a continuation of present policies.

In the past 6 months I have taken two extensive trips to Asia to try and resolve these questions for myself. Unfortunately there are no clear-cut answers. I am certain of one thing however—the United States has a vital stake in the future of Asia and our present disgust with the Vietnam war must not result in a rejection of all responsibility for the area.

It is critically important that in the next few years long-range policy objectives in Asia be carefully formulated and dispassionately implemented. It is absurd to lurch from crisis to crisis with predictable constancy and outrageous inevitability.

There have been too few responsible governmental officials in the last 20 years who clearly saw the limitations as well as the extent of America's role in Asia. There has been a tendency to play the role of the reluctant imperialist—the Roman who feels morally compelled to bring civilization to the world and then defend the empire from all its enemies.

With a series of bilateral and multilateral alliances after World War II, we took on military responsibilities that we just do not have the resources to handle. Vietnam has clearly demonstrated that the United States cannot be the policeman for the world. We cannot put down every insurgency in every underdeveloped country, nor should the United States want to.

There has been a tendency to think in terms of military reaction to dynamic social changes that are political and economic in nature. In the minds of some officials it is better to maintain the status quo rather than suffer the discomfort of unpredictable change.

Too many Americans think of Asia as a monolith. Actually it extends from India and Pakistan around through Southeast Asia and Indonesia to China, Korea, and Japan. Asia contains over 50 percent of the world's population and includes a multitude of different languages and dialects, racial groupings and cultures. The people of Asia in the last generation have become imbued with a spirit of nationalism. The force of nationalistic aspirations has been nourished by passionate anticolonial feelings. It is a nationalism which rejects intermeddling by other Asian States, China included, as fully as it disdains European or American interference.

No Asian policy can be uniform in its approach to different countries, cultures, and levels of economic development.

There are for instance two different types of policy commitment in the case of the Korean and Vietnamese wars. It is one thing to repulse Northern military aggression in South Korea with a unified South Korean population. It is quite another thing to defeat a combination of guerrilla subversion and northern mil-

itary aggression in South Vietnam where a substantial portion of the South Vietnamese people are determined to overthrow their government. Sadly, many Americans are not able to differentiate between the two types of commitment. They have not been helped by simplistic overgeneralizations by responsible officials.

Basic policy goals should be considered in the context of what the United States can afford both materially and spiritually. Potential adverse effects to domestic human resource development programs, balance of payments and the general health of the economy should be weighed before policy is established. There should be a systematic consideration of alternative methods of achieving policy objectives.

If this was done 15 or 10 or 5 years ago does anyone believe that the United States would have opted to get bogged down in a seemingly endless war in Vietnam—a country with less than 2 percent of the population and economic productivity of Asia? If Americans could have made a decision in the early sixties to buy South Vietnam for over 200,000 casualties, 30,000 soldiers killed in action and \$100 billion, do you think there would have been many takers?

This is not to say that the United States can, like a recluse, retreat into a fortress America and ignore the rest of the world. The world will not ignore us. What I am suggesting is a careful evaluation of our relationship to countries in Asia within a total framework of American national interest. This means disenthraling ourselves of the notion that the U.S. security is threatened and we must militarily respond whenever there is a revolution against a government located on the periphery of China.

Such an analysis would produce a logical rationale for maintaining a forward line of defense in Asia. It would demonstrate a need to remain in a state of military preparedness to resist overt foreign aggression in Korea, against Japan or even in Southeast Asia. We must not, however, in the future confuse revolutionary war, where two or more political elements in a country are fighting for control of the government, with wars of international conquest. To do so, could lead to future Vietnams with even more tragic consequences.

Irrespective of what we may have thought at one time, American military power is limited and we cannot unilaterally provide a defense shield against Communist subversion throughout Asia. We depend on stable societies with political structures capable of directing the type of capital investment necessary to produce prosperity. Hopefully the governments will be responsive to their people and will develop self-perpetuating democratic institutions. It is important in this regard that our aid efforts concentrate on self-help projects, education and institution building. We must always bear in mind that our efforts are merely supplementary to, not substitutive of, local resourcefulness, developmental planning and execution.

On my most recent trip to Japan in November of last year, Mr. Takeiri, chair-

man of the Komeito Political Party, in talking to me about the dimensions of American power said:

In terms of world morality and political reality it is an illusion that the great powers can control small countries. You have tried in Vietnam and have failed. Your assistance does not change the character of governments nor make them better liked by their people.

The fact that we cannot remake nations and peoples in our own image and likeness should not lead us to despair. Japan with a war shattered economy and a completely demoralized population in 1946 has within the last 20 years performed an economic and social miracle in a uniquely Japanese way. In 1968 her gross national product was \$116 billion and had been expanding at the rate of 10 percent per year for the last 20 years. This colossal productivity makes Japan the third ranking industrial nation in the world in terms of total output. Japan's development has taken place as a result of Japanese energy, vision, and determination. It has been directed by a freely elected government committed to free enterprise economics.

In surveying our role in Asia, it becomes obvious that Japan is the center of gravity in any policy formulation. Without strategic bases on Okinawa or the main Japanese islands, it would be impossible to logistically support a major military operation in Korea, Taiwan, or Southeast Asia. Without Japan's assistance, our economic and technological aid programs to other Asian countries will fall far short of what is needed to fire the torch of sustained progress. In other words, Japan must be the focal point of our Asian policy.

For too long we have been taking the friendship of Japan for granted. We have ignored the fissures that have appeared in the foundation of mutual support and cooperation. It is time to take a long, unbiased look at our relations. We must identify areas of agreement and disagreement and strive to resolve differences which exist so that ultimate goals uniting our two countries will be achieved.

It is essential that we do not engage in crisis diplomacy in our relationship with Japan. We do not want to ignore conflicts of interest until an explosion is imminent. By systematically addressing ourselves to the various problem areas we can establish a basis for mutual understanding in a calm and rational atmosphere. To drift into acrimonious confrontation with Japan would be a tragic failure of our foreign policy.

The United States and Japan have a common desire in wanting stability and peace in Asia. Japan is particularly concerned that social upheavals and political unrest in the undeveloped countries of Asia which leads to major power intervention could result in a direct military confrontation between China and the United States. Japan fears the result would be an utilization of nuclear weapons by both sides and an eventual destruction of Japan as the ally of and a base for the United States.

Japan shares American interest in the resources and markets of Asia. With a population of over 800 million persons

excluding China, with substantial raw material resources, the underdeveloped countries of Asia could in the future be important trading partners to industrial nations on both sides of the Pacific.

Japan wants to remain under the American nuclear umbrella. She knows that if she had not benefited from such protection she would not have reached the present high level of prosperity. Japan has never allocated more than 1.5 percent of her gross national product to defense since World War II. This compares with the 9½ percent that the United States is presently spending on her own and free world defense. If Japan had had to make a similar diversion of resources over the past 20 years, she could never have attained such a high level of economic growth.

Japan's numerous connections with the United States have become close, intricate and mutually rewarding. Our joint trade is over the \$7 billion mark, ranking second only to our trade with Canada and far in excess of any trade that we have with any European country. This is by far the largest trans-oceanic trade between two countries in history. It accounts for 30 percent of Japan's foreign commerce and 9 percent of our own. Japan is our largest customer for agricultural produce with total purchases approaching the \$1 billion mark. She has a wide variety of cultural and intellectual contacts with our country, exceeding by far the number she has with any other nation. Unquestionably our countries have become interdependent at various levels of contact and neither can afford a rupture in this friendly association.

Against a backdrop of cooperation and shared aspirations several serious problems have arisen between our two nations. The first relates to the treaty of mutual security and cooperation and the continued use of military bases in Japan and Okinawa. Most Americans are totally unaware that a problem exists and so the time bomb ticks toward 1970 in a national atmosphere of complacent ignorance.

It is important to remember that the treaty, Okinawa and the U.S. bases in Japan are all interrelated subjects which must be evaluated in terms of Japan's crushing defeat in World War II and her subsequent rehabilitation. For the first time in history Japan was occupied by a foreign army and the myth of the Kamikaze of the divine wind which would always save Japan from defeat and occupation was shattered. The Japanese are an immensely proud people and the shock of nuclear attack, defeat, and conquest produced a deep sense of national humiliation. This manifested itself in a pathological fear of atomic weapons, a strong strain of pacifism and an unalloyed guilt over the militarism that led to Japan's foreign wars and ultimate military destruction.

In the first years following the surrender and occupation, the Japanese accepted the dictates of American policy without objection or reserve. The people were surprised by the generosity of the occupation forces. They had been led to believe that defeat would insure barbaric

reprisals against them. These reprisals did not occur. There developed what former Ambassador Edwin Reischauer calls an "American fixation." All aspects of economic, social, and political life were contrasted to the way Americans did things. Often the American model was imposed by the Americans from above. Following the signing of the peace treaty in 1952 and their subsequent huge economic success the Japanese developed a new self-confidence and a new pride. The "American fixation" is fading and nationalism is beginning to assert itself.

It became clear to me several months ago as I talked to scores of Japanese from all walks of life, that the mood of the Nation has changed dramatically in the last decade. The young have no guilt about World War II and they are dissatisfied with playing the role of shadow to a dominant U.S. presence. One young businessman summed up the new attitude of Japan by saying:

The majority of young people complain that Japan does not have as much independence in foreign affairs as she should have. It is not pleasant having foreign bases on your land. We don't like the fact that the United States apparently plans to be in Japan forever.

An integral part of the Japanese psychological dilemma in their relationship with the United States and their ability to pursue an independent foreign policy, is article 9 of Japan's new constitution. In article 9 Japan renounces forever war as the sovereign right of a nation and promises not to maintain land, sea, and air forces as well as other war potential. Although this policy is still a part of the Japanese Constitution and no government would dare abolish it, the Japanese presently maintain a balanced military force of over 250,000 men. The Government gets around the Constitution by calling its soldiers, airmen, and seamen a "self-defense force."

Although most Japanese acknowledge the need for a self-defense force, they are opposed to any governmental action which would thrust Japan toward an involvement in a foreign war. They also resist any substantial increase in defense spending, knowing economic growth would suffer.

Emerging from the panoply of post-war national attitudes, the crisis that is approaching for Japanese-American relations in 1970 can be identified. In 1970 the mutual security treaty will have been in force for 10 years and will then be subject to abolition by either party with a 1-year notice of intent to terminate. Leftwing groups in Japan intend to force the Government to give notice to terminate by sponsoring mass street demonstrations and rallies adjacent to American military installations.

It is the treaty which provides the legal foundation for U.S. commitment to come to the aid of Japan in the event of armed attack against her. The treaty also grants the use to America of military bases in Japan. It is obvious that the treaty is essential to America's defense posture in Asia. It is equally obvious why Communist and Marxist elements in Japan would dearly love to see it eliminated.

The number of diehard leftwingers is a small percentage of the total Japanese population, but they are presently benefited by three conditions: first, a general belief that the United States has too many bases, too close to civilian population centers, and that the United States never intends to abandon these bases; second, a nearly universal and increasingly vocal desire by Japanese and Okinawans to have Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands returned to Japan as an integral part of the Japanese state. At the present time approximately one million Okinawans and other Ryukyans are administered by an American high commissioner who doubles as commander of U.S. military forces on Okinawa and holds the rank of lieutenant general; third, a deep-seated fear held by many Japanese that U.S. military engagements in other parts of Asia are going to draw Japan into a war with China, in which Japan would once again be subject to nuclear attack. The Vietnam war has particularly inflamed this anxiety.

It cannot be doubted that, if the United States wants to retain its high level of cooperation with Japan and wants to nurture mutual friendship, accommodations are going to have to be made with popular Japanese sentiment. A way is going to have to be found within the next year to return administrative control of the Okinawan people to Japan and still not compromise the effectiveness of our base structure on the island. A way is going to have to be found to make our military presence less visible to the Japanese on the home islands. This may have to be done by moving our bases out of population centers and perhaps eliminating nonessential bases.

The two factors which greatly complicate a satisfactory resolution of the Okinawa problem is that American bases on the home islands of Japan cannot be used to support a military action elsewhere in Asia without prior consultation with the Japanese Government. Additionally, no nuclear weapons can be stored on bases located in Japan. The question is can the Japanese Government politically afford to resume administrative control of Okinawa without subjecting the American bases there to the same type of restriction on free use and nuclear storages as exists in Japan?

My conversations on Okinawa last November with the American High Commissioner, Lieutenant General Unger, and members of General Unger's staff lead me to believe that the Military Establishment does not think we can restrict our use of the Okinawan bases to the same limitations as exist for the Japanese bases and still have the capacity to live up to our defense commitments in Asia.

A solution must be found to this apparent impasse. It is going to require creative and affirmative thinking by the Nixon administration. A head in the sand approach will resolve nothing and produce an even deeper division on the issue between Japan and the United States.

In my opinion, a possible solution which should be considered is the early announcement that the United States

has been burdened with the administrative control of Okinawa for over 20 years. It is time that the Japanese assumed their responsibilities for the overall welfare of the Ryukyans. We, therefore, are forthwith going to divest ourselves of such control. No mention would be made of free use of the bases or nuclear storage. These points would be left for future negotiations with the recognition that any modification of American rights could well be conditioned upon Japan doing more for itself in the area of self-defense.

A second serious problem area in which Japanese interests are often at cross-purposes with those of the United States is bilateral trade policy. It is not my intent today to catalog the various commodities which constitute the \$7 billion commerce between our two countries. I want to point out however, that protectionism is always a nemesis to the health and expansion of trade and that a protectionistic state of mind is gaining strength in both Japan and the States. Frankly, neither nation can afford it.

Following World War II the United States gave \$4 billion in loans and credits to Japan. For the first two decades following the war the balance of trade was heavily in our favor, providing in 1961 the remarkable surplus to the United States of \$654.8 million. In 1965 Japan was able for the first time to achieve a parity in her trade with us. In 1968 it was \$1.1 billion in Japan's favor. When you consider that Japan is also selling \$175 million worth of goods to the South Vietnamese Government, goods purchased with American dollars, you can readily see the extent of the deterioration that has occurred in our overall balance of commercial accounts with Japan in the past several years.

Japanese imports have had a particularly large impact on the steel and textile industries. By way of example, Japan sold \$490 million worth of steel and \$216 million worth of textiles in the United States in 1965. In 1968 the respective figures are \$809 million for steel and \$272 million for textiles.

Strong protectionist lobbies are operating in Capitol Hill to restrict Japanese imports. Congress must not succumb to such tempting false panaceas. It takes 435,000 workers to produce the commodities we sell to Japan. A self-defeating and self-sustaining spiral of restrictive trade legislation on both sides of the Pacific could endanger the jobs of one or all of these American workers.

But trade is a two-way street. If the United States is to use restraint in imposing new trade barriers, Japan must reduce those barriers to the U.S. goods which presently exist in violation of her covenants under the Gatt Treaty. At the moment she has 121 illegal quota restrictions on various commodities. Japan almost totally excludes U.S. automobiles and computers from her domestic market. Japanese licensing procedures inhibit the importation of many other commodities which are not officially subject to quota restrictions. Many Ameri-

can businessmen throw up their arms in disgust and dismiss as impossible the prospect of being able to cut through redtape and acquire a Japanese import license.

On-going negotiations on the details of trade policy between high-ranking American and Japanese officials must be given high priority. Our trade with Japan is vastly more important to the United States than trade with all the rest of Asia combined. The underlying philosophy of any agreements should be to the end that a freer and more expansive commerce is developed between our two countries. This means, and I reiterate, refusal by the United States to establish restrictive trade laws and willingness by Japan to eliminate various practices which unfairly and illegally constrain the importation of goods from the United States.

An American looking at Asia today cannot help but stand in awe of the enormity of the problems facing underdeveloped countries in the region. Teeming populations, inhibiting religious and social customs, grinding poverty, low levels of education, all contribute to institutional structures that produce change at a slow and irregular pace.

Technological innovation and communications are having a dramatic impact on popular attitudes. Misery is no longer accepted as inevitable. Progress is a value of mystical dimensions. Ferment and dissatisfaction have replaced dull resignation to the unchangeable. Political unrest is an inescapable offshoot of this new awakening.

The United States as a revolutionary country should feel sympathetic to the revolution of aspirations occurring in Asia and other parts of the world. Justice, freedom, opportunity, progress are not exclusively Western values. They are human values of universal appeal.

The war in Vietnam has distorted our vision. It has tended to polarize our thought between monolithic communism and noncommunism fighting for supremacy in the third world. In actuality the fever of irrepressible change is multifaceted and is far too effervescent for the United States or any other world power to control. We cannot remake the world. We can, however, in Asia, with the help of Japan, share our technical skills and capital resources to assist in the developmental process. We can relate to Japan of the 1970's and abolish stereotypes conceived during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

We must recognize the bitterness of Asia's colonial heritage and expect that our own motives will at times be held suspect. Our strategy should emphasize social and economic initiatives, not military reaction. It has to be based on long-term objectives not short-term crisis planning. We should not try and shape the present in the image of the irretrievable past. Altered circumstances require fresh vision.

We must not attempt to defend our past mistakes in Asian policy. But neither do we want to make the greatest mistake of all—that of waiting with arms folded

and doing nothing for fear of making a mistake. History will judge us harshly if we do.

MINERAL KING

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been considerable discussion concerning the development of the recreation potential in the Mineral King area of California.

A few days ago I noticed in the New York Times a "Letter to the Editor" from an old friend of mine, Horace M. Albright, formerly Director of the National Park Service, and a lifelong conservationist. I know of no one more knowledgeable in the field than Mr. Albright and I feel that his remarks, contained in the Times of Saturday, July 26, make sense and will help to bring some order out of a confused situation.

I therefore share these remarks with my colleagues by inserting them in the RECORD at this point:

MINERAL KING PROJECT

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

July 15, 1969.

TO THE EDITOR:

As a former director of the National Park Service, familiar with the Mineral King area of California for 54 years, I believe it important to clarify several points in your recent editorials.

The U.S. Forest Service, under the policy of multiple use of the public lands under its jurisdiction, designated the Mineral King region in the Sequoia National Forest for development as an all-year recreational area. It advertised for competitive development proposals from private enterprise, considered bids submitted by six organizations, and accepted the proposal of Walt Disney Productions.

During more than four years the cooperative planning by Federal and state governments, only the Sierra Club has objected to this project.

There is really no sound conservation or legal foundation for its opposition because:

Mineral King has been subjected to resource utilization for many years—for cutting of timber, mining, hunting, livestock grazing, summer homes. It is not now, and for nearly a century has not been a primitive area. It is not within the purview of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Although it contains much of the watershed of the East Fork of the Kaweah River, it was withheld from addition to Sequoia National Park when that park was extended to the crest of the Sierra Nevada in 1926, because it was affected by commercial and private in-holdings. This view was not opposed by the Sierra Club.

The Forest Service proposes to lease to Disney for a period of thirty years only the authorized eighty acres, the same that has been done in the development of almost 100 other major winter sports areas throughout the United States.

A road to Mineral King has traversed the Sequoia National Park for many years. The only natural feature that it touches is the Atwell Mill Grove of Big Trees.

The surveyed route of the planned new road fully protects this grove. When built, the new road can no more affect the health and safety of the Atwell Grove than do the roads through the Giant Forest and General Grant Groves in Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks, the Mariposa, Tuolumne and Merced Groves in Yosemite National Park, or the Calaveras and other groves in state parks farther north.

The state highway officials, the Forest Service and Disney Productions are to be commended for their plans for Mineral King. Walt Disney was a dedicated conservationist and was recognized as such by his election to honorary membership in the Sierra Club. He also received the Department of the Interior's highest tribute, the Conservation Award; and also the American Forestry Association's distinguished service award for his conservation activities.

Walt Disney's organization carries on his ideals. The public need have no apprehensions that Mineral King will be despoiled by the development proposed.

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, today I plan to place in the mail 170,000 copies of the annual Seventh Congressional District of Missouri public opinion poll. Included in the poll will be questions dealing with important legislation soon to be voted on by Members of the Congress. I insert the text of the questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should the Federal Government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you favor the actions of the administration to try and balance the budget and pay on the national debt?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you favor a lottery system for the drafting of military personnel?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Should the electoral college be abolished and the President elected by a direct vote of the people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Do you feel the Paris peace talks to be the best means of ending the Vietnam war?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Should the Federal Government guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Should the Post Office be converted into a government-owned corporation and be operated on a self supporting basis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Should part of the revenue collected from Federal income taxes be returned to the States to use as they see fit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. How do you rate the kind of job President Nixon is doing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Excellent	Good	Fair
	Poor	Undecided	Other

(Optional)

The following personal data will be helpful in interpreting the results of this poll, although you need not list your name and address.

Sex: Male; Female
 Party Preference: Republican; Democrat; Independent
 Age: 18-20; 21-24; 25-44; 45-64; 65-over
 Name
 Address
 City

THE NEED TO PATCH THE LOOPHOLES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. MIKVA, Mr. Speaker, warnings of an incipient "taxpayers' revolt" have sounded within Congress and throughout the Nation. Concern for the high cost of Government, for an ever-growing Federal budget, and for the waste and lopsided set of priorities which govern the use of the tax dollar is shared by Members of Congress and the average citizen alike. At this very same time, the Congress has passed an extension of the 10-percent surtax. Yet, it seems to me questionable logic to speak of the need for additional revenue through the surtax—a measure which continues to place the greatest burden of high taxes on the middle-income earner—while failing to strike at the heart of a tax structure which permits the loss of billions of dollars in needed revenue through tax loopholes from which only a small proportion of the population, primarily among the wealthiest of our citizens, benefit.

Both in the amount of taxable dollars which remain untouched by the income tax and in the loss of faith experienced by the average taxpayer as he becomes aware of the inequities which abound in the tax structure, the costs of the present system are enormous. We cannot afford to ignore the demand for meaningful tax reform such as that proposed in a bill introduced by Mr. REUSS and 26 Members of Congress; if enacted, this bill is estimated to return \$9 billion in additional revenue to the Federal Treasury, an increase which by itself would have made the extension of the surtax unnecessary. It simply is not fair that the rich actually pay a lower proportion of their income in taxes than do any of the rest of the taxpaying population.

Encouraging signs have come from the President, from the Ways and Means Committee, and from my colleagues in the House and Senate that the malaise of the taxpayer and the obvious injustices of the present system are recognized. The question now is whether we will simply hear a lot of talk with no action, or whether the taxpayers of the Nation will effect their wishes to get rid of the tax havens, the tax breaks, and the tax exemptions.

Reduction of the oil depletion allowance—from 27½ to 10 percent—provisions to tax capital gains presently untaxed at death which often pass to descendants greatly enhanced in value but not subject to Federal income tax; and the Slum Prevention Act, which I have sponsored, to deny all tax depreciation benefits to owners of property which does not comply with local housing and building codes, are among those measures which could insure that the general interest—not special interests—will prevail in our tax policies.

Of all proposals, the most obvious re-

form yet suggested is the requirement that a minimum income tax of 20 percent be placed on incomes of \$50,000 and above. This measure would at least see to it that all citizens pay some share of their incomes in taxes. This measure, however, cannot be the measure of meaningful reform. In terms of dollars or in the number of taxpayers affected this is not "where the ducks are."

Clearly, no one measure can completely erase the inequities of the past several decades, but the time has come when Congress has a real opportunity to begin the long neglected task of instituting a truly progressive tax system. At the very least it ought to get started.

The two articles which I insert at this point in the RECORD cogently express my own feelings on tax reform. Mr. Wicker makes clear the immediacy of the tax reform issue, especially as it relates to congressional action on the surtax. Mr. Slawson's technical treatment of the subject presents the issues and some of the answers which must be considered by every Member of this body if we are to have meaningful tax reform.

The articles follow:

IN THE NATION: WHEN THE MOMENT COMES

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 9.—There is so much to be said for prompt extension of the 10 per cent surcharge on income taxes that it would be easy to make villains of those Senators who are holding out for inclusion of fundamental tax reform in the extension. But in politics as in ordinary life, when it is easy to spot a villain, he usually isn't.

The recalcitrant Senators are not, by and large, making a case against the surcharge; they are trying to seize a moment for tax reform. Anyone who has watched the legislative process closely knows that such moments actually come when public sentiment and political conditions meet to form opportunity—when, as Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen said during the 1964 civil rights debate, "The time of an idea has come."

CARPE DIEM

Perhaps the most famous such moment of recent times came in 1965, after the Selma marches led by Martin Luther King; the high-water mark of the civil rights movement, Selma led President Johnson to propose and Congress to approve, on a tide of public sentiment, the Voting Rights Act that has done so much to enfranchise the Southern black man. How transient such moments are is well illustrated by the fact that the Nixon Administration now has asked that the effect of this legislation on the South be softened.

LOST OPPORTUNITY?

Already this year, one rare "time of an idea" may have been squandered by the Administration's tergiversation. After the threat raised by the George Wallace candidacy last year, the public mood by every conceivable measure was ripe for fundamental reform of Presidential elections, probably including the elimination of the Electoral College.

But when the new President made his recommendations, he refused to support a popular election amendment on grounds it probably could not pass the state legislatures, and he even vacillated between more limited reforms. Without real Presidential backing for anything, the moment for electoral reform may well have been lost; certainly it has been badly blurred.

Thus it is of vital importance that both the outgoing Johnson and the new Nixon Administrations have aroused public interest in tax reform; that the impact of the surcharge itself has produced something near a tax revolt among the middle class; and that Senators and Representatives circulating among their constituents this year have found few demands so insistent as that for tax reform—which no doubt is somewhat confused with tax reduction, but which nevertheless directs itself at outrages like the oil depletion allowance.

Moreover, for once, this political situation matches the public mood. Because those Senators who are backing tax reform hold something near the decisive votes on the surcharge extension (which was approved by the House by only 210 to 205, despite the support of both Democratic and Republican leaders), because the surcharge would expire unless positive Congressional action keeps it in effect, and because it is the vital kingpin of the Administration to wring inflation out of the economy, the reformers are in a unique position that may not come again.

The Administration has promised a thoroughgoing tax reform bill later this year or next; so have Congressional leaders for the surcharge extension; and there is no reason to doubt that a reform bill would be forthcoming if the extension bill, with a limited package of reforms, were to be approved quickly. But that is not the point.

Any strong reform bill will be aimed at eliminating inequities; and that means in turn that those who benefit from the inequities, like the oil industry, will fight tooth and nail against reform. Nothing in the Nixon Administration's record so far encourages the belief that it has much will to resist the pressures of any special interest but that of the NAACP; and the history of Congress is replete with surrenders to oil men and to other groups that oppose tax reform.

A TOUGH GAME

The necessity for extension of the surcharge is, therefore, the crucial weapon of the reformers; making tax reform a condition of their vote for extension is what enables them to play the tough game usually employed by special interests and their defenders—in fact, the kind of tough game played by Congressional economizers when they delayed the original surcharge bill until they could force adoption of a Federal spending ceiling. Should tax reforms be less persevering?

TAX REFORM: MOVES TO PATCH THE LOOPHOLES

(By W. David Slawson)

On April 21, one day before his subordinates at the Treasury were scheduled to testify on the subject to the House Committee on Ways and Means and only a few weeks after he had said that he would not make any major tax proposals until 1970, President Nixon announced his "important first steps in tax reform" at a press conference called for the purpose. His unexpected action placed the leadership of both parties behind tax reform and thereby gave the nation its first opportunity for a truly significant change in its tax laws since World War II.

Credit for the opportunity does not belong exclusively to the new President; in 1966, President Johnson directed the Treasury to prepare proposals and background studies for reform. The Treasury submitted its report in the spring of 1967, but by then Mr. Johnson had decided to concentrate on urging Congress to enact a tax surcharge as a weapon against inflation, and the reform proposals were ignored. A small group of Treasury officials and interested Congressmen nevertheless continued to work behind the scenes. A rider attached to the tax surcharge bill called upon the Administration to prepare tax-reform "studies and proposals"

for presentation to Congress by the end of 1968.

His hand thus forced, Mr. Johnson ordered the earlier Treasury proposals updated and submitted them to Congress, without comment, on December 31. They were at first also ignored by the incoming President, but were taken up by Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, who began holding hearings on them this spring. The hearings greatly contributed to a ground swell of popular and Congressional support which had been gaining momentum all winter until, by April 21, President Nixon had either to act or see his opposition on the Hill take control and receive the political credit.

Whatever motivated them, the Nixon proposals merit support. They go only a short way toward solving some immense problems, but that would be far more than the last two Democratic Presidents were able to accomplish, or than President Johnson was even willing to suggest. More important, they serve to align the Nixon Administration, at least in substantial part, behind the earlier Treasury proposals now being considered in the House, and those proposals are quite good indeed. Tax reform of some kind seems a distinct possibility.

The President's proposals can best be viewed against the inequities they are designed to correct. The first, a "low income allowance," is a system of deductions which would eliminate income taxes entirely for the very poor (families of four with incomes of less than \$3,500, for example) and students working part time, and give some relief to the elderly and handicapped. The income levels at which federal taxes currently become effective were set back before World War II, when a family of four might have lived at least decently on \$3,500 a year. An adjustment of the kind proposed is long overdue.

A second proposal would liberalize deductions for moving expenses. Its principal beneficiaries would be rising young executives in national corporations, who are moved frequently and far at company expense—though without benefit of as much tax relief as they might deserve—but everyone who moves will obviously benefit as well.

Under existing law, a taxpayer who receives both taxable and excludable income can take all his personal deductions against the former and so gain a double benefit from the exclusion. Interest on funds borrowed to purchase securities on which a capital gain is realized, for example, may be deducted in full against the half of the capital gain which is taxable, thus allowing much more than half of it to escape tax. A third reform proposal would require that such deductions be allocated between taxable and excludable income.

Existing tax law allows farmers to deduct expenses, even of a long-term capital nature, in the year in which the taxes are paid—that is, to operate on a simple "cash basis"—and, sometimes, to pay only a capital gains tax on whatever receipts they realize from the sale of their plants or livestock in the years after the expenses are incurred. The two privileges can be combined to the substantial advantage of taxpayers with large amounts of nonfarm income. Such a taxpayer, for example, can buy a dairy herd (which he may never see), deduct its expenses against his high nonfarm income, and realize the gains from sale in a subsequent year when his income may be less and when the gains will be taxable only at the much lower capital-gains rates anyway. Another reform proposal would deny such farm deductions against nonfarm income in excess of \$5,000 per year, unless the taxpayer were willing to follow normal accrual procedure for all his farm transactions—the justification being that anyone with sizable nonfarm income presumably has the sophistication not to need the privilege of simple "cash-basis" ac-

counting. Probably in deference to the farm bloc, however, the proposal is silent on the other leg of the abuse. There is no more justification for farmers to receive capital-gains treatment on their dairy cattle than there is, say, for a truck manufacturer to enjoy it on the sale of his trucks, and the special treatment for farmers is doubly unjustifiable because it significantly benefits only the small percentage whose incomes are high enough to be taxable, otherwise, at the highest ordinary-income rates.

A proposal with the nickname "LTP" (for "limitation on tax preferences") is the Nixon answer to the furor created by the Treasury's disclosure that many taxpayers with very high incomes pay no tax, or only a token tax, because they qualify for so many gimmick deductions that their income for tax purposes is near zero.

However, LTP is itself another gimmick. It derives from the Treasury's original and sound idea for a "minimum income tax," which would have required everyone to pay at least as much tax on half their income as they would pay without any of the gimmick deductions. The Nixon version uses the same approach, but, among other limitations which reduce it to near impotence, fails to require reinclusion of the two most important deductions: capital gains and interest on municipal bonds are left outside the scheme, as tax free as ever.

When asked to explain the omission of municipal bond interest, Administration officials first replied that the Justice Department had raised questions of constitutionality. Whatever may have motivated those questions, it cannot have been any real legal doubts. Supreme Court decisions have long since made clear that private income from state and municipal sources is subject to federal tax just as much as private income generally. An explanation later offered was that taxing the interest on such bonds, even to the limited extent involved in a "minimum income tax," would jeopardize federal-state and federal-local relationships. That explanation at least makes sense, since state and local governments would, of course, have to pay higher interest rates to offset the effect of imposing a federal tax. But studies show that the federal government could impose its tax, subsidize the higher state and local interest payments and still come out much ahead. The source of the Administration's refusal to include municipal bond interest in its proposal is now known to have been Attorney General Mitchell, whose private practice was primarily as an attorney for the issuers and purchasers of such bonds.

Still another proposal deals with trusts. They are now taxed at the same rates as individuals, so that a taxpayer seeking to transfer income-producing property can avoid taxes by putting it in trust for years, where it will be taxed at essentially the rate an individual would pay if that were his sole source of income, and let the trust distribute the property with its accumulated income to the recipient afterward. Existing law sometimes allows the donor and recipient thus to escape entirely paying the greater tax the latter would have had to pay on a direct transfer of the property, and in all cases limits the recipient's tax liability to the tax difference for the five years preceding the property's distribution. The reform proposal is to eliminate both the five-year limit and the technicalities which sometimes allow the recipient to escape paying the tax differential entirely.

The law on deductions for gifts to charity is subjected to several proposals, designed to decrease the extreme tax benefits for lower-income givers. The rules applicable to private charitable foundations would be tightened, to restrict the extent to which the creator or his family could continue to control them for his or their private (and tax-free) benefit. The application of normal taxation to

businesses operated by clubs and societies but not substantially related to the services they perform for their members would be extended to similar unrelated businesses operated by churches and social-welfare organizations, and the investment income of clubs and societies would be made subject to tax.

Three proposals deal with the corporate tax. Since a corporation is taxed only 22 per cent on its first \$25,000 of income and 48 per cent on the rest, it pays handsomely to spread a single business enterprise among as many corporations as possible. Grocery chains, for example, may form a different corporation for each of 1,000 or more stores. Present law permits such spreading, subject to a token tax penalty of only \$1,500 per additional corporation. The first proposal would eliminate this loophole by, in effect, taxing as a single corporation all corporations which are subject to control by substantially the same group of shareholders. The second would eliminate a technicality on mineral "production payments" through which about \$200 million in taxes now escape payment each year. The third would eliminate the 7 per cent investment credit, which at present allows corporations a credit against their tax of 7 per cent of what they invest in depreciable property other than depreciable real estate. This proposal is not so much a reform as an attempt to fight inflation by dampening investment. As such, it would be of questionable efficacy.

One difficulty is that it would be effective only selectively, and not always with the selection one might wish. The credit does not apply to, and so its elimination would not affect, investment in real estate; nor would elimination do anything to dampen corporate growth by investment in non-depreciable intangible items such as heavy advertising. Even in the areas to which the credit applies, its elimination would have little anti-inflationary effect in the short run because corporate investment plans are normally made months or even years in advance and cannot easily be turned off in response to a quick change in tax consequences. And in the long run, the effect on corporate investment would probably be eliminated by the ability of corporations to pass on to consumers their resultant higher taxes in the form of higher prices. Both theory and history indicate this result. Corporation income taxes today (state taxes included) exceed 50 per cent, yet the ratio of corporate after-tax income to corporate investment—i.e., the corporate rate of after-tax profit—is still almost exactly the same as it was in the twenties, when corporate taxes were so low as to be negligible. If elimination of the credit served an anti-inflationary purpose at all, it would be only in the "middle run"—if any exists—between the time span of corporate planning, and the time span for passing on taxes in the form of higher prices, and by the time that "middle run" comes around in, say, a year or so, the inflationary picture may have changed entirely. The net result of the proposal may therefore be simply to increase corporate taxes and thereby raise prices, a result no different from, and hence just as regressive as, the imposition of a sales tax. The poor, whose incomes are spent almost entirely on the kinds of goods and services which would be hit by such a price increase, would end up paying the cost.

The only other proposal of note in the Presidential package is a technical one designed to remove a tax advantage now enjoyed by the huge corporate conglomerates, which enables them to pay more for businesses that they acquire and so stimulates their acquisition activity. The proposal would have its intended effect (which would not be nearly enough, however, to stop the growth

of conglomerates), but it is subject to serious question on the merits. It is my opinion, at least, that the tax advantage it seeks to remove—the deductibility of interest paid on bonds in certain situations—is one which businesses other than conglomerates can also avail themselves of in comparable circumstances, and so ought either to be removed entirely or left alone.

Although subject to serious criticism, the Nixon proposals have value. The road to tax reform has been blocked so often that one can hardly afford to scoff at what, after all, would be far more than President Kennedy was able to accomplish or than President Johnson even proposed. But the time may be ripe for achieving more. The December 31 Treasury proposals, rather than the proposals of the President, are providing the principal focus for the current hearings of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and Chairman Mills has let it be known that he does not intend to limit the committee's recommendations to what the President wants.

Among the many Treasury proposals which are superior to those of the President, or which the President chose not to support at all, three are especially important. The Treasury's "minimum income tax" would constitute a real, not fraudulent, step toward tax equity by imposing an alternative tax equal to the tax which would ordinarily be paid on one-half of one's income if certain very important exclusions from income were added back in—specifically, interest on municipal bonds, percentage depletion in excess of cost, the normally excluded half of capital gains, and appreciation on property given to charity. A second Treasury proposal would tax the appreciated value of property which is given away to noncharitable recipients or which is still held by the owner at the time of his death. A third would combine the now separate taxes on estates and on gifts during life into a single "transfer tax" and, in the process, greatly simplify and tighten the two taxes provisions.

Should Congressman Mills' committee decide to report out of the last mentioned Treasury proposal, however, it would do well to eliminate a qualification on one of its provisions which would effectively cancel it. Under existing law, trusts lasting more than a generation can pass an interest from one generation to the next entirely without tax, on the theory that an interest in a trust is not transferred at all, but is, rather, extinguished and "created anew" each time a member of one generation dies and a member of the next generation takes his place. The Treasury would tax the passing of such trust interests like any other gift or estate transfer, but only for trusts created after the reform was adopted. Since by the Treasury's own statistics, almost all family trusts in estates of \$2 million or more are of the generation-skipping variety, this means, in effect, that at least another full generation of the very rich will be assured of immunity from estate or gift tax, and if history is any guide at all, we can be sure that by the time this particular reform catches up with the second or third generation of heirs (by the year 2000, perhaps?), a new generation of Wall Street lawyers will have found a new gimmick to beat it. The lack of need for the qualification can be seen from the fact that the beneficiaries of these trusts are, or will be, in no worse position relative to a change in the tax laws than are those who have or will receive property free of trust—in either case, the heirs will receive property or income from property which they can enjoy during their life and which will, or should be, subject to whatever transfer taxes are in effect when they die. If the Treasury's notion that every property disposition has a vested right to be taxed only in accordance with the tax laws in force at the moment of its creation

were applied across the board, every parcel of property would have its own set of tax laws and some property would still be taxable in accordance with the laws of the Presidency of William McKinley!

The real shortcoming of both sets of proposals is not that they would imperfectly accomplish the reforms they propose, but that they fail even to attempt the most important reforms. First and most obviously, nothing (except the Treasury's "minimum income tax," which would have a partial effect) has been proposed to eliminate or reduce oil and gas depletion allowances or similar allowances for other minerals, or the related privileges of deducting "intangible" drilling expenses. Government-sponsored studies have predicted that the elimination of these privileges for oil and gas alone, even assuming no compensating price or cost adjustments by the industry, would yield, conservatively, an additional \$1.6 billion in revenues per year. The assumption of no compensating adjustments is extremely conservative; the additional revenues which would actually be received would probably be twice that much, or about \$3 billion. Also conspicuously absent are proposals to eliminate the broad and unjustifiable "tax shelters" at present available for investments in real estate. These are complicated—so complicated, in fact, that the results of eliminating them can only be vaguely guessed—but they derive principally from the real estate investor's ability to deduct about twice as much depreciation for tax purposes as actually occurs in the initial years and then resell his property and report the difference between the resale price and his artificially reduced basis as capital gains, taxable at less than half ordinary rates.

The documents passed to Congress by the Treasury on December 31, however, contain "studies" of the economic implications of a repeal of the depletion allowance and the deduction for intangible drilling costs on the oil and gas industry and of a repeal of the special tax privileges for real estate. Needless to say, both studies carry clear implications that repeals would be desirable, and both are sufficiently well reasoned and factual to supply ample ammunition for Congressional committees or anyone else choosing to make use of them. Chairman Mills recently let it be known that he favors action to cut back the depletion allowance even if the President should oppose it—though Mills apparently would not support, let alone propose, action to eliminate the allowance entirely.

But the omission which dwarfs all others is the failure of the proposals to include any thoroughgoing revision of the tax treatment of capital appreciation. Much the larger portion of the wealth of the very wealthy in the United States is gained not from earnings (salaries or wages) but from property, and the larger portion of that is gained not in immediate cash (rents, dividends, etc.) but in the growth in value of the property concerned—so-called "capital appreciation." The two major sources of capital appreciation are corporate stock and real estate. Upward of \$600 billion of corporate stock is held by or for individuals, and all but a fifth of it is held by or for the richest 1 per cent of the population. From 1950 through 1964 it averaged 6.5 per cent appreciation per year in book value (a fair measure of stable, long-term growth) and better than 11 percent per year in market value. Book value growth since 1964 has been at an even faster pace. From this source alone, therefore, the richest 1 per cent receive income of upward of \$30 billion a year. Under present law, this income produces only about \$1 billion in tax—a rate of only 3.3 per cent despite the income's being received by persons most of whom are (or should be) in

the 70 per cent bracket. Comparable figures for real estate do not exist, but if we disregard occupant-owned homes on the ground that they are not primarily investments, the amounts, concentrations and rates of tax would probably be found to be similar. The failure of the income tax to reach this income makes a mockery of the tax's pretensions of being progressive, that is, of taxing the rich more, proportionately, than the poor. In fact, when capital appreciation is taken into account, the rich pay a *much lower* proportion of their income in tax than do any of the rest of us except the really poor.

Appreciation is taxed so lightly because under existing law it is not even considered to be income unless and until the property is sold. Since most such investment property is never sold but is held until death and then bequeathed to an heir, most of it escapes tax entirely. Moreover, that which is sold and taxed, is taxed at an especially low rate which never exceeds 25 per cent. The one aspect of this situation which the Treasury proposals at least would correct, even partially, is the failure to assess a tax at death or when the property is given away during the owner's lifetime. The Treasury would consider such transfers as "sales" for tax purposes unless they were made to charity. That correction is important, but it would still leave property owners with a lifetime's free use of income most of which, if they had earned it as salary or wages, would have had to have been paid as tax, and it would still leave them paying only at the low rate of 25 per cent or less.

Any such immense omission from the income tax might be thought to have elicited a great deal of controversy, but this one has not, because the tax law's failure even to consider appreciation as income has led or allowed most tax commentators to leave it out of account entirely. It is common to read even in reputable comments, for example, that not much more revenue could be obtained even if the richest 1 per cent were taxed at 100 per cent of their income, because their total annual income left after tax at current rates is only something like \$1 billion or \$2 billion a year—but unbeknownst to the reader, "income" in such statements carries the highly artificial and exclusive meaning which has been attached to it by the tax laws. If the *real* income—including appreciation—of the richest 1 per cent were taxed even at, say, 50 per cent, the additional revenue would be more than \$15 billion from corporate stock alone, plus something comparable from real estate and other appreciable property. Put another way, including such income within the scope of the income tax would, conservatively, increase existing revenues of \$75 billion by almost half—or would allow rates to be reduced almost a third for everyone.

But even a clear-eyed attempt to include this kind of income in the income tax would encounter difficulties. Appreciation may be hard to measure in the absence of an actual sale, or taxing it may discourage investment and so slow the growth of the economy. That neither difficulty is conclusive in all situations, however, can be seen from two examples: publicly traded stock has a market value which can easily be ascertained with or without an actual sale, and the large corporations which issue it make their investment decisions essentially without regard to their stock's tax status; and land, whether unimproved or underlying improvements, has a value which appraisers can fix at least approximately, and although investment in land would be discouraged by taxing its increased value, discouraging that kind of "investment" would not slow the growth of the economy because the mere holding of land for profit (which for this purpose must be sharply distinguished from the building of improvements on it) makes no contribution

to economic growth and, indeed, often hinders it.

The income tax laws *could* feasibly be adapted to include much, probably most, of the appreciation which now escapes tax. That which could not feasibly be included should, if we are to have a fair tax system, be subject to special treatment under some other kind of tax. Some Western European countries apply a capital or "worth" tax of some small per cent per year for that purpose, and there seems no reason why a similar scheme could not be adopted here. Or, wealth not feasibly reachable by the income tax might be subjected to an especially high estate-tax rate, so that its recipient would at least be restricted in his ability to pass on the same, privileged tax-free status to his heirs.

The Nixon proposals differ principally from the Treasury proposals in their failure to include any steps toward placing a fairer share of the tax burden on capital appreciation. The conclusion seems inescapable that they were drafted with the intention not to disturb the large holders of the nation's accumulated wealth. Even the steps the Treasury proposes to take in this direction are far from enough, given the immensity of the problem, but they are probably as much as we can realistically hope to achieve at this time.

The Nixon proposals deserve support as the bare minimum that ought to be done. The Treasury proposals, plus Chairman Mills's suggestions to reduce the percentage depletion allowance, deserve wholehearted support, as the best general program for reform offered in this generation, if not in this century. But no one should lose sight of the fact that in the long run still more fundamental reforms are necessary if the burdens and benefits of the nation's economy are to be fairly shared by all.

SUGGESTED COURSE FOR SOME COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, 1963, the National Governors' Conference unanimously adopted a report of the Committee on Cold War Education which dealt with the foundations of American freedom and the assault upon it by the international Communist movement. The report stated in part:

The Cold War of Communism far outshadows any creation of the Third Reich. It is the broadest, most effective, political warfare ever conducted in the history of mankind. Its aim is to conquer the rest of the free world by use of diplomatic proposals, economic sorties, propaganda, intimidation, sabotage, terrorism, support of revolutionaries in now-free countries, and by driving wedges between the free-world allies.

At another point in the report it was stated that—

The Communist bloc is waging a very real war against the free nations. He must fully understand the nature and extent of this war and of Communist objectives.

The report of the National Governors' Conference emphasized the utter necessity of education on the Communist threat as have the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the Veter-

ans of Foreign Wars, the National Education Association and other national organizations, along with national officials and agencies of government.

It is understandable then why the Lower-Merion-Narberth Council of Republican Women, located just outside of Philadelphia, Pa., have protested the appointment of a leading functionary of the Communist Party of the United States to teach a course on black history at Bryn Mawr College in this area. Apparently the women of the council have taken the trouble to learn the nature of the Communist movement and its danger to the American way of life. Perhaps courses on this subject should be mandatory for college presidents such as Miss Katherine McBride, Bryn Mawr's guiding light. I would be willing to bet that just about any high school student in the State of Florida who has attended the 30-hour mandatory course on freedom versus communism which that State requires would never make the mistake that Miss McBride made in exposing her students to the wiles of Herbert Aptheker.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the article "Council Questions College's Good Faith in Picking 'Red,'" from the Main Line Chronicle, of Ardmore, Pa., of July 10, 1969:

COUNCIL QUESTIONS COLLEGE'S GOOD FAITH IN PICKING "RED"

A strong protest was lodged with Bryn Mawr College by the Lower Merion-Narberth Council of Republican Women against the appointment of an admitted Communist to lecture at the college.

Miss Katherine McBride, president of the college, has insisted that Dr. Herbert Aptheker will teach only "black history" at Bryn Mawr, not Communism.

Her naive explanation was called "specious reasoning" by the Council. If a lecturer on "black history" were needed, it was pointed out, either Lincoln University or Cheyney College could furnish authoritative lecturers: the college did not have to call in a white Communist.

THUMBING ITS NOSE

The college has been accused repeatedly of spawning and sponsoring Red influences, and the appointment of Dr. Aptheker has been taken as an indication that Bryn Mawr now feels bold enough to thumb its nose at the community.

The defenders of the college declare that what Bryn Mawr does on campus is of no concern to the community, and that "academic freedom"—which others call "academic arrogance"—must be preserved.

The Council, however, maintains that "we have a legitimate complaint against Bryn Mawr College for bringing such a subversive influence into the community." Bringing in Communists has a direct influence upon "the attitudes and activities of the students in our secondary schools."

Others who have protested the appointment have declared it to be political in character rather than academic, noting that Dr. Aptheker was jubilant over his selection because of what it means to the Communist Party, giving it status and respectability.

TEXT OF LETTER

The Council's protest letter was sent to both Miss McBride and Judge Edmund B. Spaeth Jr., head of the board of trustees of the college. The letter follows:

"We wish to protest the appointment of Herbert Aptheker as lecturer at Bryn Mawr College.

"There is a question of community involvement in such an appointment. Bryn Mawr is not part of Lower Merion Township per se, but because of its geographical position in our community, its policies have a direct effect upon the attitudes and activities of the students in our secondary schools.

"Since many of our members are parents of students in these schools, we feel that we have a legitimate complaint against Bryn Mawr College for bringing such a subversive influence to our community.

"To say that Mr. Aptheker would be here simply for the teaching of Black Studies, would be peculiarly specious reasoning. To bring the Theorist of the Communist Party into our midst for that purpose when we have Lincoln University and Cheyney College to draw from, is for Bryn Mawr College to approach the threshold of the practice of discrimination against the Black Race.

"The College can no longer separate itself from the Community—the students themselves are too active and the Student Body too fluid to contain its influence in an Educational Island.

"There have been too many instances of student unrest at both the college and secondary level to allow the suasion of such a man to go unchallenged.

"We ask you to reassess your decision in this matter."

The letter is signed by Mrs. Earl B. Marks, president of the Council.

THE 1969 POLL OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to release the results of the 1969 poll of the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois which revealed that 68.3 percent of those answering support the development of an ABM system. The results also disclosed that 45.1 percent support the 6-month retention of the 10 percent surtax.

The questionnaire was mailed throughout the Fourth Illinois District in the first week of June. In view of the votes pending this week on both the ABM and tax issues, the results are quite pertinent especially since the district I represent is a complex suburban area possessing a true cross section of our population.

Because of the substantial support for an ABM system, I thought it practical to personally advise both Illinois Senators of the results of this issue, since some Members of the Senate do not have the time to keep in touch with grassroots opinion back home.

Another significant result was that 92.4 percent feel that law enforcement efforts are being hindered by court decisions. On the question of lowering the voting age to 18, 64.4 percent responded "No" in contrast to a 63 percent "No" response to the identical question a year ago.

On the question of admission of Red China to the United Nations 70.1 percent voted "No." May I direct the attention of the Members to the fact that the question on developing a volunteer army to replace the draft when the Vietnam War

ends drew a 47.7 percent affirmative response.

This 1969 questionnaire drew an 18 percent response from the Fourth Illinois Congressional District which is suburban Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the response to my questionnaire demonstrates the healthy interest that citizens are displaying in current events and I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the complete questionnaire results:

The 1969 citizens' questionnaire results, Fourth Congressional District of Illinois

[In percent]

1. Do you favor raising the amount retired persons may earn without surrendering Social Security benefits?

Yes 95.4
No 4.6

2. Do you believe a volunteer army can be developed to replace the draft when the Vietnam War ends?

Yes 47.7
No 52.3

3. Do you approve of the President's request for a 6-month retention of the 10% surtax?

Yes 45.1
No 54.9

4. Do you favor development of the modified anti-ballistic missile defense system?

Yes 68.3
No 31.7

5. Would you support tax credit for industrial plants to install water and air pollution control facilities?

Yes 64.5
No 35.5

6. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?

Yes 35.6
No 64.4

7. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?

Yes 29.9
No 70.1

8. Do you think law enforcement efforts are being hindered by court decisions?

Yes 92.4
No 7.6

9. Do you favor proper enforcement of our laws by the courts to stop personal and group destructive acts?

Yes 97.7
No 2.3

10. Are you in favor of increasing Social Security taxes to provide increased Social Security benefits?

Yes 43.3
No 56.7

POWELL COLORADO TREK HONORED

HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to the hundreds of Nevadans and persons from other States

who will be taking part this coming weekend in a pageant commemorating the tremendous feat of Maj. John Wesley Powell and a stalwart crew of men who shot the Colorado River and arrived at the mouth of the Virgin River, their termination point, August 1869.

That was a century ago this month, August 1969, that Major Powell's expedition successfully came to civilization once again after over a 3-month journey through the great Grand Canyon. Major Powell's party started at Green River, Wyo., May 24, 1869, to explore the Colorado River.

Unknown dangers were ahead for these men, and their erstwhile efforts to achieve the goal set by Major Powell is well-documented today in several texts. Perhaps the best one is a book later written by Powell himself. While these men sought to conquer the mighty raging river for the first time, they undoubtedly had little time to appreciate the scientific value of their journey which was to be told later by the commander of that treacherous inland voyage.

Since the Powell expedition, numerous expeditions have succeeded in passing through the glorious river canyon, several members of these parties being well-known Members of Congress today.

But to Powell and his men of 1869 goes our tribute today and to the organizations commemorating the event this August 9 and 10 weekend. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge these groups which include: The State of Nevada, the Nevada Historical Society, the Nevada Park System, the National Park Service, the Moapa Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Sierra Club, and the residents of the Overton arm of Lake Meade, nearby the mouth of the Virgin River and at Powell's termination point.

RESULTS OF 1969 PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy to actively solicit the views and opinions of my constituents in the First Congressional District on current domestic and foreign issues, I recently sent by postal patron delivery my third annual public opinion questionnaire.

I am most encouraged by the increasingly higher percentage of returns each year, reaching a high point this year of a 12.4-percent return from among more than 137,000 questionnaires. This reflects not only a heightened interest in current affairs but is indicative of the growing desire to communicate one's ideas and participate in the decisionmaking processes in the Congress.

Among those issues leading the list in terms of well-defined opinions are welfare reforms, criminal justice, postal service, and public pensions. Of the almost 17,000 responses, 82.7 percent are

against the implementation of a system of guaranteed annual incomes; 12 percent want the Post Office Department reorganized as a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis; 88.7 percent favor preventive detention of potentially dangerous criminal defendants, while 90.9 percent, the highest majority on any question, support mandatory sentences for convicted felons where the use of a firearm is involved; and 76.3 percent prefer tying social security, veterans, civil service, and railroad retirement benefits to increases in the cost of living. On one of the more controversial issues, as indicated by the highest percentage of undecided votes, the deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system is favored by 49.4 percent of the respondents, while 29.6 percent are opposed to the President's proposal.

Obviously, these questions do not cover all of the subjects in which my constituents have expressed an interest, but they do represent a significant sampling of important questions on which there are decided controversies. Other issues of equal importance, and of no less current concern, have been dealt with in previous questionnaires. These responses have proven to be an invaluable source of information from representative Americans and, when compared with the results of questionnaires prepared by other Members, contribute significantly to the effectiveness of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulation of my 1969 public opinion questionnaire follows:

[Results in percent]

1. Should the Federal government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees?

Yes	63.9
No	27.5
Undecided	7.7
No response	0.9

2. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?

Yes	34.0
No	61.9
Undecided	3.4
No response	0.7

3. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States and local governments, for use as they see fit, a percentage of the tax money now collected in Federal income taxes?

Yes	67.8
No	21.0
Undecided	9.0
No response	2.2

4. Do you believe the Federal government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?

Yes	10.5
No	82.7
Undecided	5.7
No response	1.1

5. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?

Yes	72.0
No	16.5
Undecided	10.2
No response	1.3

6. Red China—Do you favor U.S. support for admission of Peking to the United Nations?

Yes	33.2
No	53.5
Undecided	12.3
No response	1.0

7. Do you favor deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile System proposed by President Nixon?

Yes	49.4
No	29.6
Undecided	19.4
No response	1.6

8. Do you favor denying bail to criminal repeaters and narcotics offenders?

Yes	88.7
No	7.5
Undecided	2.7
No response	1.1

9. Do you favor mandatory jail sentences for the use of firearms by a convicted felon?

Yes	90.9
No	4.3
Undecided	3.5
No response	1.3

10. Do you favor tying Social Security, Railroad Retirement, Civil Service Retirement and Veterans benefits to increases in the cost of living?

Yes	76.3
No	13.9
Undecided	8.4
No response	1.4

Source: Tabulation prepared electronically by Capitol Computer Research, Inc., Box 271, Alexandria, Virginia 22313; a private, non-federal organization.

COLLEGE STUDENTS BASICALLY SOUND

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we seldom read much good news of any kind, and we are constantly besieged with a bad "press" from college student disorders. With this in mind, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the following Associated Press dispatch—it is good news about the college students of today.

We have been overwhelmed with the newspaper accounts of the militant minority—at the expense of the serious student who "attends classes, goes to church, and plans to get ahead just as his father did a quarter of a century ago."

It is time to give recognition to the college people who make their grades—not headlines, as known by the following article:

GREAT MAJORITY OF STUDENTS BASICALLY SOUND CITIZENS

NEW YORK (AP).—The militant minority may occupy the campus building and the headlines, but today's average college man attends classes, goes to church and plans to get ahead just as his father did a quarter of a century ago.

Not only are brick-wielding dissidents rare among today's college population, but most students say American society is "basically

sound." Only 9 per cent of all students could be classed as "revolutionaries" believing that existing institutions should be scrapped and replaced.

So reports a nationwide survey of student and alumni attitudes conducted by Roper Research Associates and commissioned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) During winter 1968 1,500 students and almost 700 alumni were interviewed.

"I found it a rather encouraging study," said Burns Roper, president of the research firm. "There was a good deal of criticism of the system, but it was mostly 'let's change the system from within' rather than 'let's overthrow it.'"

Some conclusions of the Roper study:

Less than one-fourth of college students have smoked marijuana and only 3 per cent have tried LSD. About 46 per cent would like to make marijuana legal and 7 per cent favor legal sanctions for LSD.

Belief in some form of god was voiced by about 60 per cent of college students. Forty per cent of the freshmen and 3 per cent of seniors said they believed in the orthodox "Supreme Being who created the earth and who rewards and punishes everyone."

Two-thirds of unmarried male seniors said they have had sexual relations with one or more women to date—half the freshmen have.

Although about a third of college students plan to go into the military after graduation, almost as many wish to avoid the draft—25 percent by legal means and 2 per cent by any means including a stint in federal prison if necessary.

Not only are college students "squarer" than many worried parents believed, they are also more probusiness than had been assumed. Most plan careers in business and industry. Careers in education, professional work and government service followed in that order.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 4, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to learn of the progress which is being made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules on legislative reorganization bills. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) for his interest and leadership in pursuing this important subject.

As sponsor of one of the reorganization bills (H.R. 9331) now under study by the subcommittee, I hope that public hearings soon will be scheduled on these measures.

There can be little question that proposed congressional reforms are long overdue. It has been 23 years since the last major reorganization legislation was approved by Congress. In view of the significant social, economic, and technological changes, it is clear that the 1946 act does not address itself to the problems of the 1960's and 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress must tackle this matter of reorganization so that we are prepared to face the coming decade with competence and assurance.

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. R. McC. TOMPKINS AT THE ANNUAL NAVY LEAGUE MEETING, PARRIS ISLAND, S.C.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to call to the attention of the Members of the House the very thoughtful and especially well delivered address by Maj. Gen. R. McC. Tompkins at the Navy League annual meeting at Parris Island, S.C., on June 20.

General Tompkins in his lucid way focuses attention on some important considerations of American sea power and equally crucial considerations concerning the place of the military in modern American life. He speaks with great pride of the men he has served with in his career of over 30 years and reminds us of the honored place that the military profession should have among us. His address follows:

OPENING REMARKS AT NAVY LEAGUE ANNUAL MEETING AT PARRIS ISLAND, S.C., MADE BY MAJ. GEN. R. McC. TOMPKINS, ON JUNE 20, 1969

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shuman, Mr. Keyserling, Mr. Firth, Rear Adm. Hare and Mr. Moss, Maj. Gen. Peatross, and other distinguished military leaders, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am most happy to be home again and to be with you here tonight. This is the first formal gathering I have attended in the Low country since that memorable evening in 1967 at La Tal Inn, at Fripp Island. That was shortly before I went out to Viet Nam, and the occasion was Military Appreciation Night—but I didn't know it. The information I had from my Chief of Staff, the Staff Secretary, my own personal secretary and my Aide was that sports clothes would be appropriate. Thus it came about that on the appointed night while all of Beaufort—including my trusty staff—arrived at the Inn with the ladies smartly dressed in mink stoles and brocade dresses, and the gentlemen in smartly-cut lounge suits of the type favored by well-dressed financiers in New York—the then-Commanding General of Parris Island and his lady presented a curious spectacle as they joined the party. Julie had on a sweater and skirt and loafers. I had arrayed myself in a tasty costume based on an old tweed riding coat and a polo shirt. We felt like sparrows among peacocks. But with the hospitality and kindness so typical of Beaufortians, we were made welcome and no one mentioned our astonishing costumes.

Tonight, as you can see, I've taken the precaution of wearing a white uniform. Now, no matter what happens, I can always mutter something about exigencies of the Service and other similar clap-trap.

I can tell you that several times in my life I've found myself in rather hazardous and precarious positions. None of them, however, have filled me with quite the same trepidation that I feel right now.

I understand from Mr. Keyserling that my job is to talk to you.

And I further understand that your job is to listen to me.

I can only hope that you don't finish your job before I finish mine.

But I want you to know that I've spent a good many hours trying to decide what I might say that would be worth your attention. I've discarded several favorite topics because I know perfectly well that this is no time for a long-winded discourse of glittering

generalities shot through with golden threads of the obvious. And I don't propose to dip into my not inconsiderable stock of clichés and platitudes to extol the United States Marine Corps. The record of the Corps will have to stand on its own merits.

But while I was doing all this meditating, one fact kept nagging at me until I decided to discuss it with you here tonight.

Just a few months ago there came to my desk—the report of the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

This vital survey, directed by the Chairman in September of 1968, lays it right on the line. It shows, in excruciating detail that we, the world's greatest naval power, have let things slide backwards to an alarming degree. The average age of our ships, the lack of planned replacements, the unavailability of necessary spare parts for obsolescent ships, and a host of related factors have placed us in a most serious posture.

I know that you are all familiar with this vital report. It is unemotional, factual—and completely frightening in the evidence it presents.

I shall content myself with reading only three short sentences. First, the final sentence in Section 605, under the heading "U.S. Naval Strategy":

"Without a strong and modern Navy, which permits many additional choices in international affairs, the United States could find itself in a position of being unable to carry out commitments or of paying too high a price to do so."

And two sections under the heading "Conclusions":

Section 801: "The U.S. Navy is in a serious condition primarily because of the age of its ships."

Section 802: "That the Navy is as effective as it is now is a great tribute to the efforts and the devotion to duty of its officers and men."

I would like to re-emphasize that final section. That our ships keep going, under the burden of operational commitments more severe than any "peacetime" Navy has ever experienced is indeed a great tribute. And it comes about by the hard work and leadership of a comparatively small percentage of career officers and enlisted men, coupled with the innate pride and patriotism of the majority of the willing, if non-career, personnel who man them.

But it is the *career men*, officers and enlisted alike, who are the key to our success in continuing to operate under today's terribly difficult conditions. If cost-effectiveness ever got around to considering these men they would be found to be one of America's great bargains. The only trouble is that there are not enough men such as these. And, because this is so, in the long haul the ability of the Navy to serve national policy to the full potential of sea power can only diminish.

The ship-building and modernization program envisaged by the Chairman will ensure, we pray, that by the 1980's the United States should have the required fleet of about 850 ships of modern design and construction.

But what about the officers and men to take them to sea, to sail them, to fight them, and to do all the other things required? Never lose sight of the fact that it is the hard core of professionals who are the indispensable element in training the citizen who serves temporarily. You will recall that as late as 1940, the U.S. Navy numbered 160,997 men. By 1945, it numbered 3,380,817—an expansion of over 20 times. It was that hard core of professionals who made this possible.

Someone once said: "A profession is neither a hobby nor an enthusiasm. It is not something embarked on in an emergency, however necessary at times that may be. A profession is something to which you give your life."

And it is one of the inescapable facts of

this decade that fewer and fewer young men are attracted to a military career, to adopt it as their profession, to spend their useful life following the Flag. The appeal of a military career is verging on an all-time low. Thousands of fine young Americans serve their obligated service gallantly and without complaint. But to make a career out of it?—"no thank you" at best, or "don't be silly" more frequently.

Why is it that young men who have proven themselves in battle, are unwilling to become career men in one of the Services?

There is, understandably, a national weariness with the unending atmosphere of war and crisis. It has gone on for a long time—a perpetual dark shadow over American life. And concurrently there has grown up a not inconsiderable body of opinion in this country that believes the wretched military, by some legerdemain, are at the bottom of the whole mess.

These are not my opinions alone—the unilateral opinions of an aging professional. Far from it.

On 4 June 1969, the President of the United States addressed the graduating class at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Among many other things, President Nixon said:

"... It is open season on the Armed Forces ... The military profession is derided in some of the so-called best circles in America. Patriotism is considered by some to be a backward fetish of the uneducated and unsophisticated."

And this from a recent editorial in the Washington Post:

"It is common now to hear 'the military' called to account for all that has gone wrong with the economy or the state of domestic tranquility. Somehow a monster has been created in our midst and now, it is said, that the monster must be slain. All of it is so easy—and so uncomfortably reminiscent of Joe McCarthy's sly attacks on the State Department. Generals, the theory goes, are more murderous than the rest of us; more war-mongering, crueler. It is made more complicated by the undeniable fact that 'the military mind' does exist, that a battalion commander's perception of his mission is different from that of the rest of us."

For as many years as I can recall—and they inevitably become more and more—that term the "military mind" has been used in a critical sense.

The fact that a battalion commander's perception of his mission undoubtedly will be different from that of someone who bears no responsibility is perfectly natural—it couldn't be any other way. And by the same token the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker—each in his chosen field—will perceive his task in the light of his training, knowledge, and experience.

But I am certain that, if you asked at random a dozen people what the term "the military mind" meant to them, the definitions could scarcely be called complimentary. At best—to many people—the term denotes a rigid, unimaginative, narrowminded stuffed-shirt type, overly preoccupied with unimportant minutiae, totally concerned with an archaic type of existence who probably couldn't get along in civilian life.

Cartoonists usually depict the military mind as residing in a gross, venal, medal-encrusted slob, pop-eyed, greedy, and obviously without a redeeming trait.

This attitude is a great pity because it is so far from the truth. But it is apparently what many people believe and it accounts, in no small measure, for the reluctance of young men to embark on a career in the profession of worms.

But the truth of the matter is quite different. Perhaps General Shepherd put the record straight when, in the course of testifying before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Armed Services Committee on 7 February 1955, he said:

"There is no more honorable profession than a career spent in the service of one's Country. The military profession is founded upon ideals of devotion to duty, acceptance of responsibility, and absolute loyalty. Such a career demands of those who follow it complete dedication to these unselfish principles. There are individuals who accept service to their Country primarily for the intangible rewards that follow such loyalty and devotion."

Let me repeat some of those archaic phrases:

- "Devotion to duty."
- "Acceptance of responsibility."
- "Absolute loyalty."
- "Complete dedication."
- "Unselfish principles."
- "Intangible rewards."
- "Loyalty and devotion."

These are the qualities, gentlemen, that I believe are typical of the so-called military mind. And if that be so, and every experience of my service life proves it to be so, then I say "Thank God for the military mind."

For over 30 years, I have had the honor as a professional Marine of following our Flag all over the world. And long before my time, other men followed that Flag and fought for it and all it stands for. But all of us—1775 and 1969—have one thing in common and that is an unequivocal belief in the United States. For better or for worse, it is OUR Country.

And I cannot understand how there could be Americans who, in President Nixon's own words, consider patriotism the backward fetish of the uneducated and unsophisticated. Something is badly out of focus.

But all our people should understand exactly what it is that this country of ours is facing—now and in the future.

We—the United States—by default rather than by choice—find ourselves with the fate of the 20th century in our hands. With Britain's decline, our burdens become greater and more inescapable. Ho Chi Minh has stated that Viet Nam is the first of the wars of liberation and others will follow when they have won Viet Nam.

There is no doubt in my mind that for a long time to come, the Armed Services of the United States will be called upon to serve in parts of the globe as yet undreamed of. Granted that it might be rather old-fashioned to mention it in this day and age, but we may find a parallel in the 19th century for our present requirement to fight limited wars.

Between 1824 and 1901, the British Army fought in some 29 wars and campaigns that have been officially dignified by names. And there were hundreds of other bitter little fights that went on in the most improbable places and were never considered of sufficient stature to be listed in the approved battle honors. But a man can get killed just as dead at a trail-crossing on the Kyber Pass as ever he can in the Argonne or Normandy or Khe Sanh. He just has less company.

But this was the type of burden that Great Britain had to carry—and now the burden is ours. The British Army and the Royal Navy have marched and sailed over the horizon and into the pages of history. They are only a token force of a gallant people.

And we shoulder this burden at a time of unrest and dissent that has not been seen in this beloved Country of ours since those tragic years between 1860 and 1865.

We are fighting this bitter expensive war in Viet Nam. The reasons for our involvement go back 20-22-24 years, depending on how you reckon these things. But there's no sense in hashing them over now. The fact is—we're there.

I can tell you though that this Country has never been involved in a task more difficult than the one we're facing in Viet Nam. And it is a task that places a heavy burden on our younger generation.

Wars, you know, are fought mainly by young men—the riflemen and their lieutenants. They are the ones who go forward to the point of contact where war is girt with horrors. And these young men—age 18 to 23, perhaps—endure these horrors and overcome them along with the reasonable promptings of fear and the yearnings of the belly and do what has to be done.

And while the lieutenant and his men are facing the terrible realities of life and death in some stinking rice paddy, we're treated to some pretty curious spectacles here at home where one can safely indulge in all kinds of irrational activities.

There are the infragant yippie packs catervauling that America is 200 years mistaken.

Then that irrational, irresponsible minority of non-people whose sole product is division, whose single achievement is the treasonable encouragement of the enemy—collect blood for the Viet Cong, praise Ho Chi Minh, and dishonor the American Flag.

And we then have certain circles that choose to euphemize such treason as the "peace movement," mass criminality as "demonstration," and exhibitionistic anarchy as "protest" and "dissent."

It might be well for some of our fellow citizens to understand, as James Mill said, that war is an ugly thing, but it is not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling that thinks nothing is worth war is much worse. The man who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, who cares for nothing more than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.

Somewhere there is a long line of silent men who probably watch with consternation and amazement what we are doing to this Country and to ourselves. They are the "Better Men" who helped secure our Nation in battles large and small from the earliest days down through almost 200 years of our history.

Those half-forgotten actions such as Brandywine and Trenton and Yorktown; San Jacinto and Chapultepec; El Caney; Belleau Woods, Solissons, Blanc Mount, St. Mihiel and the Argonne.

And in our own memory and experience, the great battles of World War II and the bitter fighting in Korea.

And today those "Better Men" are the men who carry that lonely, heavy burden in Viet Nam where there are no 40-hour weeks and no campus riots.

We say that a tour of duty in Viet Nam for a Marine is 13 months. And so it is. But thus far in this war there are over 11,000 Marines who won't be completing their normal tours. They were killed in action.

They didn't stage sit-down strikes. They went because they deemed it their duty—whatever that might mean to you. They went because their Country needed them there.

They went for the guys with the long hair and the protest signs, the draft-card burners, the hippies, the anti-everything people who have nothing better to do.

They went for all the men who have fought gallantly on many battlefields to keep our Country free.

They went for all Americans—including those who have abdicated their privilege of being an American.

They went because they were men and, being such, they carried the burden of the Free World on their young shoulders.

The Navy League could do no greater service for the Naval Establishment, the Armed Forces, and the United States than to ensure that the people of this Country understand and appreciate why it is those wretched people in uniform are doing their best to carry out the orders of the President.

If and when people comprehend the deadly realities of the confrontation going on today

in Viet Nam—and where tomorrow, God only knows—then, and only then, will fighting men be accorded the respect they so richly deserve.

LOS ANGELES FAMILY PLANNING COUNCIL OFF TO GOOD START

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in last January's report of the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning, one of the more immediate problems presented was that of the approximately 5 million women throughout this country who are financially unable to receive adequate family planning services.

Over 150,000 of that 5 million total reside in the Los Angeles area, and they are now beginning to get proper information and services through the newly established Regional Family Planning Council. Already, in the first 3 months of this year, the council's outreach program brought in about 4,000 new patients.

I commend Dr. Richard Sanville, executive director of the Los Angeles Regional Family Planning Council, for the excellent work his group is now doing. I believe that other areas—both urban and rural—could use the Los Angeles program as a model for increased efforts in this crucial section. And, to do so, it means that the Federal Government must vastly enlarge its commitments.

According to the President's Committee report, for fiscal 1970 at least \$60 million should be allocated for such services if there is to be any effect upon the key 5 million lower income women. However, when the House approved the funding for these programs last week, only around \$45 million was targeted for family planning services.

Underfunding family planning services rates as false economy. The gap is widening between persons who can afford such services and those who cannot, and that gap deepens even more when we are faced with the tautology that the birth rate is highest in those areas where income levels are lowest.

As it now stands, even the prospect of spending the allocated \$45 million is dim, since these services are covered by statutory expenditure controls. Congress must give family planning services the high priority indicated by President Nixon in his population control message last month.

The July 23 Los Angeles Times carried a significant article about the Los Angeles Regional Family Planning Council, and I now insert that article into the RECORD at this point:

BIRTH CONTROL BEING MOBILIZED HERE
(By Jean Murphy)

Death control without birth control is leading the world to disaster.

On that assumption, a unique attack on the problem of too many pregnancies has been initiated in Los Angeles. Said Richard

Sanville, executive director of the Los Angeles Regional Family Planning Council:

"Most of the problems of our times—smog, water pollution, poverty, violence, crime, congestion—are all caused by the fact that we're practicing death control (i.e. improved medical care for the elderly, longer life spans) without birth control.

"A couple with three children have more than their share. No one should do more than reproduce himself. Otherwise, we're facing absolute disaster.

"We need some important world figure, like Mr. Nixon, to get up and say again and again, 'Listen, world, this beautiful island in space we live on is no longer going to be beautiful because we can no longer support the number of people who are here and who are going to be here and we've got to do something about it.'"

(President Nixon, several days after Sanville's statement, called for a five-year program of making birth control help available to all American women of childbearing age. "I promptly wrote the President a letter of approbation—with one qualification: the time has passed when we can afford *not* to infringe upon people's religious convictions or personal wishes. The world is on the brink of disaster," Sanville said.)

It's almost too late for us to solve the problem; it depends on every man and woman. . . . We have lived at the golden moment. From here on in, the way things are, it's going to be all downhill.

"We're using up our resources as though there were no tomorrow. Sure, the earth can support more people on a subsistence level, but we're talking about the quality of life.

"It's a worldwide emergency and everybody pussyfoots around it. Even the term family planning is a euphemism. It should be called birth control or conception control or population control. We ought to say what we mean."

Birth control is the concern of the Regional Family Planning Council, now in its first year of operation and, Sanville said, the only one of its kind in the country.

"Before last November, our area had disparate, isolated clinics. There was no coordination. Some recognized that this was an inefficient way to get a big job done," he said. The council was formed and funding obtained from the Office of Economic Opportunities, \$450,000 for the first year, nearly \$1 million for the year beginning Oct. 1.

"Our goal is to substantially reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancies, infant deaths, stillbirths, premature babies, abortions and illegitimate births and to make a significant contribution toward complete health care for the medically indigent; our goal is to raise the standard of living and the health level of the population," Sanville said.

DELEGATE AGENCIES

Under the council's umbrella, there are nine delegate agencies, 33 birth control clinics, 20 physicians in private practice in South Central Los Angeles and Operation Outreach.

"Our outreach and education program is based on door-knocking," Sanville explained. "Outreach workers are mature, indigenous women who know what having too many babies can mean."

In poverty areas, the workers go from door to door; they visit mothers in hospitals; they address groups; they attend kaffeeklatsches. Sanville credits Outreach with bringing about 4,000 new patients into birth control clinics in the first three months of 1969.

"Our biggest stumbling block is lack of information," said Mrs. Joyce Henderson, public health nurse and assistant director of Outreach.

Sanville agreed that ignorance spawns unwanted babies.

"It happens right here in Los Angeles: a woman has a baby and literally doesn't know why.

"Once, we went into a home where the woman was pregnant with her fifth child. Her husband had threatened to leave her because he couldn't support more children and she was crying. 'You didn't have to have it, you know,' we said. But we were three months too late; neither she nor her husband had known that pregnancy can be prevented."

The council's "target area" is comprised of 154,500 women between the ages of 15 and 45 who meet OEO poverty guidelines.

"We had hoped to reach between 5% and 10% the first year, but with our present momentum, we'll exceed our expectations," Sanville said. For such women, counseling, examination and contraceptives are free.

"A millionaire can get a smallpox vaccination free. Any couple should be given a contraceptive free," Sanville said.

The council considers the intrauterine device and the pill the most effective contraceptives.

Although the overall birth rate in Los Angeles County is declining, the pressures created by too many unwanted, uncared for babies continue to be acute in some poverty areas.

According to Dr. Carl Coffelt, chief of the maternal health division of the County Health Department, the countywide birth rate is 17.6, the number of live births per 1,000 population per year. In the Northeast health district, the rate is 27.4; in the East, 25.5; in the Southeast, 22; in Santa Monica West, 13.3.

DEATH RATE

The infant death rate in the Southeast district is 29.1 compared to 19.1 countywide. The maternal death rate in the Southeast is 8.1 compared to 2.5 countywide.

"It is significant that those areas with high birth rates also have high rates of both infant and maternal mortality, morbidity and other related health problems," Dr. Coffelt said. "Family planning is an effective way to reduce infant death rates."

Sanville, who holds a master's degree in public health from UCLA, was administrator of Central City Community Mental Health Center before joining the council. He has worked with family planning in South America and the Caribbean as well as in Los Angeles for 10 years.

Council offices are located at 1636 W. 8th St. The address and telephone number of a nearby clinic may be obtained by calling 386-5614.

GUNS ON THE LOOSE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post chronicling the complete failure of the gun law of the District of Columbia to either reduce crime, which is reaching a new high in the District of Columbia, or control weapons ownership. Many of us in this body have pointed out the complete ineffectiveness of registration legislation to prevent either crime or criminal ownership and misuse of firearms.

The editorial follows:

GUNS ON THE LOOSE

Considering the amount of effort that went into the enactment of a gun registration law for the District of Columbia, enforcement of this sensible, salutary requirement has been remarkably lackadaisical. June 15 was

the deadline for compulsory registration of all firearms in this crime-troubled community. No more than about 25,000 guns have been registered, however, although it is estimated on the basis of voluntary registration in the past and on the basis of records of gun purchases in the District that some 75,000 firearms are owned by responsible citizens legally entitled to possess them.

It is easy enough to understand why persons ineligible to own guns fail to comply with the registration law. But this failure on the part of responsible citizens of whom more is required than the completion of an application form seems very puzzling. Perhaps it stems, in part, from inadequate publicity about the registration law. Perhaps it is attributable, in part, to inertia and apathy among District government officials. Obviously, there is a lot of misunderstanding about the nature and impact of the gun law.

There is nothing about the registration requirement that limits in any way the freedom of legitimate and responsible gun owners to purchase, possess and use their firearms for sport, for target shooting, for protection or for any other lawful activity. The law spells trouble only for persons who cannot qualify under it for ownership of a lethal weapon—criminals, drunks, the mentally ill. It is useful in forbidding transfer of guns to such persons and useful, too, in providing an additional charge against those who use guns for criminal purposes. The law-abiding ought to support the law by bringing themselves in conformity with it as speedily as they can. The District authorities ought to give it vigorous enforcement in every way at their command. There are too many guns on the loose in this community.

THE NEED FOR COMPETITION IN BROADCASTING

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, broadcasting frequencies are among the most limited and precious resources of a modern society. In our country, virtually all of the available radio and television channels are already in use. Access to the immense communication potential of the air waves is now limited to a relatively small number of broadcasters.

Since 1934, the Federal Government has recognized that these resources are a public trust. Their use is a privilege, to be exercised in the best public interest. Under the Communications Act of 1934, licenses are renewed every 3 years. The FCC license review procedure underscores the centrality of the public interest in broadcast license allocation. It is possible for the FCC to consider a wide range of evidence about the ability of various applicants to use a broadcast channel in the best public interest. Although the review has seldom resulted in the transfer of a broadcast license from an operating station to a previously unlicensed applicant, the competition protects the public's ultimate rights in the matter.

In recent months, some broadcasting interests have mounted a campaign to give broadcast license holders virtual perpetual rights to the airwaves.

A number of Members of Congress have responded to the broadcasters' urg-

ings. Bills have been introduced in both Houses which would give broadcasters virtually perpetual rights to their licenses. The bills, of which S. 2004 and H.R. 10010 were the first, would require the FCC to make an initial finding on each license renewal application without considering any application other than the license holder's. If the FCC finds that the license holder is serving the public interest, convenience, and necessity to an acceptable degree, the license will be granted. Except for flagrant violators of the public interest, license holders would be sheltered from competition.

The existing competitive procedure requires any license applicant to be prepared to demonstrate that he is the best qualified to serve the public interest with his programming. To effect such judgments, applications of incumbent license holders must be judged in comparison with all alternative applications, not in isolation from other applications. I am convinced that such open competition for broadcast licenses is the best way to guarantee that our airwaves will be put to constructive use.

A number of relevant and highly appropriate commentaries on the matter have appeared in the press recently. So that Members can inform themselves further, I insert the attached articles to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1969]

TELEVISION—CHALLENGING THOSE WHO
CONTROL THE TV CHANNELS
(By Jack Gould)

Challenges by citizens groups to renewals of licenses for long-established television stations have aroused more reaction in Washington than any other recent development in broadcasting. The controversy poses a long-range social question of substantial importance: Is TV to be a "locked-in" medium in perpetuity?

Upward of 40 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate to shield existing broadcasters from last-minute petitions to lift their franchises and award them to other groups claiming they could render a more fruitful program service. And the Federal Communications Commission, in what can only be described as unseemly haste, elected not even to study a thoughtful 350-page petition from a group of New Yorkers which sought to block renewal of The Daily News' license for WPIX on Channel 11. The WPIX renewal was rushed through the F.C.C. bureaucracy even though there was no legal barrier to the regulatory agency's power to pause and examine what the petitioners had in mind. That particular battle may be headed for the courts.

Through a proposed amendment to the Communications Act, Senator John O. Pastore, Rhode Island Democrat and Chairman of the Senate Communications subcommittee, would, for all practical purposes, wipe out the feasibility of any meaningful challenge to present occupants of television's channels. Under his suggested bill, no competing application for an existing channel could be entertained by the F.C.C. until the commission itself had first found that the present license-holder had been remiss in his responsibilities. And, if the wording of the amendment means what it appears to say, the F.C.C. would be required to rely primarily, if not wholly, on the representations of the license-holders.

It is small wonder that Broadcasting magazine, the alter ego of the lobbyists of the National Association of Broadcasters, has applauded Senator Pastore and other congressmen who have advanced similar pro-

posals. Everyone knows that the F.C.C. has never lifted a license solely on the ground of inadequate program performance. Now, if Senator Pastore's bill clears through Congress, the preservation of the status quo will be tighter than ever.

The motivation behind the Senator's solicitude for present broadcasters is the desire to avoid interminable hearings prompted by capricious challenges which, on the surface, appear to have more nuisance value than substance. But the danger is that such a curb may also outlaw challenges having genuine merit.

When a group prepares an exhaustive petition, with extraordinary explicit detail on how it would use a channel, the effort hardly can be considered frivolous. And that was the precise accomplishment of the New York group headed by Lawrence K. Grossman, a former vice president of the National Broadcasting Company. His associates include representatives of the Puerto Rican and Negro minorities in both the proposed management of a new station and in its financial structure. The outline of how the outlet would become involved in the community reflects a heartening awareness that broadcasting could be notably different from what it is now. There would be entertainment and commercials, but no plugs for cigarettes or anything in the nature of advertising warlike toys, and over 23 per cent of the week's scheduling would be devoted to programs outside of entertainment and sports.

With some legal uncertainty still attached to The Daily News case, the merits of the challenge can hardly be assessed precipitously. The likelihood of upsetting the WPIX renewal is perhaps not too strong, but for the F.C.C. (save for the dissenting Commissioner Nicholas Johnson) to give the fast brushoff to such a document hardly speaks well for the agency's receptivity to new concepts.

The organized campaign to assure broadcasters indefinite immunity to challenges poses a unique problem of major social consequence. The clearcut purpose of a system of renewing licenses every three years is to keep broadcasting performance under constant review. If that is not the purpose, then a permanent franchise might as well be granted and all the costly fol-de-rol of renewal proceedings unceremoniously junked at great savings to the taxpayer.

Senator Pastore and his like-minded colleagues in the Senate and House raise the point that the huge investments of existing licensees should not be jeopardized by challenges either not seriously intended or wanting in the necessary financial resources. But this line of thinking overlooks one simple remedy: the F.C.C. could readily devise special application requirements that would quickly separate bona fide challenges from playthings intended purely as harassment. Since the burden of proof might properly be placed on the challenger, exacting documentation of the sincerity of his intentions and his ability to perform might be demanded.

But candor is also necessary when it comes to discussing an existing television station's huge stake in its occupancy of a channel. At least 90 per cent of the value of the broadcasting property rests in the channel per se, and under the law that channel does not belong to the broadcaster but to the public. Banner sums of tens of millions of dollars are not paid out for studio equipment and antenna towers. What lies at the heart of the unconscionable trafficking in licenses is the desire to control a priceless facility with the knowledge that it is perennially protected.

Yesterday's generation, which was lucky enough to scoop up channels in the early days, does have a very real monopoly, a monopoly that both Congress and the F.C.C. majority go to inordinate lengths to preserve. But broadcasting is much more than a tan-

gible item of property; it is the dominant medium for the conveyance of opinions and attitudes.

Just because a broadcaster has held a license for two decades or more does not automatically mean that he alone is best qualified to meet the needs of a continuously changing society and the rising requirements and goals of emerging groups with fresh ideas and approaches. Shutting out these eager forces from even a prayer of gaining access to the best Very High Frequency channels is bound sooner or later to bring an increasingly strong reaction. The opening of V.H.F. channels to some new blood is clearly a matter deserving of a long-range review by Congress, the F.C.C. and the White House. True diversity begins with diversity of management and it might as well be faced that this means finding room for newcomers. Shunting them off to less desirable Ultra-High frequency channels or Cable TV is electronic segregation. Since all V.H.F. channels everywhere have been spoken for, it may well be that the only socially desirable solution is to consider whether one licensee should control a channel seven days a week. Shared channels have worked in London commercial TV and, if that is the only way of increasing the number of entrepreneurs in American television, it deserves consideration. Why, for instance, should only three companies have access to national networks when there might be six dividing weekdays and weekends? Shared channels are part of the basic structure of radio: there are daytime stations and full-time stations.

Every proposed innovation inevitably raises howls of disapproval, but that is hardly the important issue in television. Unless existing broadcasters affirmatively open their doors to those who believe the home screens can be very different and infinitely more useful than it now is, then sooner or later serious challenges to the status quo will increase. The rearguard action in Washington to thwart those ambitions is the most telling evidence of the case for change.

[From the New Republic, July 5, 1969]

BOREDOM IN PERPETUITY?

When the Federal Communications Commission awarded the license of Boston's WHDH-TV to a competitor, it shook the industry, Congress, said the National Association of Broadcasters, should forthwith prohibit the FCC from allowing a competing application for a station license, unless the original holder was found to be acting contrary to the public interest. To which *The New York Times* responded: "An analogous change in the election laws . . . would mean that no one could run for public office until the incumbent had been impeached."

Senator John O. Pastore (D., R.I.) chairman of the State Communications Subcommittee, who has conducted hearings on the pernicious effect on viewers of sex and violence on the home screen, found himself in sympathy with the NAB. He obligingly introduced a bill (S. 2004) to amend the Communications Act so as to make it virtually impossible for a competing group to challenge a present holder of a broadcasting license. That bill now has 18 co-sponsors in the Senate; 56 similar bills have been introduced in the House. It's a scandal.

The express purpose of the Communications Act is to make the best use of scarce broadcast channels by selecting the licensees who will best serve the public interest. That is why, in theory, licenses are granted for only three years—and not in perpetuity to grant communications corporations which latched onto desirable channels during the past two decades. A broadcaster presumably must meet the same standards on renewal as those for which he was granted a license in the first place—a point to which the FCC's attention was again called last week by Warren E. Burger in one of his last opinions as

judge of the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Judge (now Chief Justice) Burger withdrew the renewal of a license the Commission had awarded WLBT-TV in Jackson, Mississippi (it had been accused of racial discrimination in programming) and instructed the FCC to invite new applicants. The Commission examiner had shown, Judge Burger said, a "curious neutrality-in-favor-of-the-licensee."

For two decades, the FCC automatically renewed the license of *The New York Daily News* WPIX-TV. It did it again recently—and then, under pressure, reversed itself in the face of charges that WPIX presented "distorted news." The accusation was made in a formal complaint by Forum Communications, a group of businessmen and community leaders whose competing application the FCC had elected not even to study. A story in *Variety* last January said that the station was allegedly using old films to illustrate current news; Walter Engels, the station's news manager, admitted to some of the "abuses" (crowd scenes of Budapest identified as Prague). The station's president, Fred Thrower, later said that the charges were "entirely baseless." The FCC intends to investigate further. If the renewal is finally denied WPIX-TV—a station whose schedule consists almost exclusively of old movies and syndicated reruns with a minimum of news—it will be somewhat like the government finally getting Al Capone for income tax evasion.

An individual license at stake sends shudders through the broadcasting fraternity, for if licenses are "put up for grabs" every three years the huge and spiraling prices brought by the sale of stations will belong to the past. The multi-million-dollar sums paid for stations are not for plant and equipment but for the control of a priceless facility—the channel. Broadcasters do not like to be told, as they were by Judge Burger, that they "are temporary permittees—fiduciaries—of a great public resource, and they must meet the highest standards which are embraced in the public-interest concept."

Television needs new voices, more creativity, greater diversity in order to refresh this bored society. Congress, however, is disposed to buy broadcasters' contention that all's well and no newcomers need apply.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]

UTILIZING TELEVISION

To the Editor: The need for new approaches to the use of television is urgent.

The lay viewer would have thought that Senator John O. Pastore's (R.I.) vociferous complaints about TV programming in April Congressional hearings had indicated a desire for innovations and review of old policies. Yet, according to Jack Gould's column (June 1) the Senator supports an amendment that would in reality close the door to license ownership challenges from groups outside the traditional F.C.C. bureaucratic structures.

There is no doubt that the financial and commercial interests of current monopolistic channel owners prevent the fullest and most creative uses of the television medium. Individual ownership of television stations by Congressmen cannot be disassociated from Capitol Hill support of Senator Pastore's legislative proposals.

Is there not a need for further open confrontation between the people and questionable Congressional tactics where such a socially and politically influential medium is concerned? As Chairman of the Senate Communications subcommittee, Senator Pastore might do well to make fully public all of his views on communications, not just those that will bring easy public approval, such as the traditional criticisms of too much violence, too many commercials, and low taste in programming.

ADELE ALICE RIDDLE.

NEWPORT, R.I., June 23, 1969.

[From the Saturday Review, June 28, 1969]

WHO WILL CRY HAVOC?

(By Robert Lewis Shayon)

During the debates on the Radio Act of 1927, a Congressman named Johnson said: "The power of the press will not be comparable to that of broadcasting stations when the industry is fully developed. . . . If the strong arm of the law does not prevent monopoly ownership. . . . American thought and American politics will be largely at the mercy of those who operate these stations." How ironic that Congress, which passed the 1927 act and thereby laid the foundation for the present structure of broadcasting, should be, forty-two years later, the instrument that will almost certainly fulfill Representative Johnson's prophecy!

At this writing, more than fifty-six Congressmen and one Senator (with eighteen other Senators as cosponsors) have each introduced identical versions of a bill that grants virtual property rights in perpetuity to broadcast licensees. The new legislation, as introduced by Senator John O. Pastore, would forbid the FCC, in a license renewal proceeding, to consider the application of any person other than the incumbent licensee, unless the latter has been already denied renewal. This is comparable to saying that you can't elect a new officeholder until the incumbent has been impeached. The power of the broadcasters is such that every observer of the communications scene expects that the bill will be voted into law, possibly this summer. It will slam the door on competitive bidders for broadcast franchises, as well as disintegrate the recent efforts by citizen groups to seek a voice in the FCC's disposition of the airwaves.

According to the communications law, licensees may be granted only "the use of such channels, but not the ownership thereof. . . . for limited periods of time." A renewal application (every three years) now automatically triggers a comparative hearing when a challenger files a technically correct, substantive application for the same channel. Several such significant challenges have been filed recently in a number of areas, and this is why Congress, at the behest of the National Association of Broadcasters, is hurrying to put its finger in the dike.

Congress intended originally that the most able broadcasters should have the licenses, but the FCC, through the years, eroded this intent and "squatters rights" developed. The FCC and Congress later obliged the industry by allowing license-holders to sell their franchises to the highest bidder, without having to consider any other applicants. The United Church of Christ case—challenging the licensing of WLBT in Jackson, Mississippi, which discriminated against the black community—opened the door to citizen group action in renewals (the unanimous Appellate Court opinion was written by Warren Burger, the new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court).

In the more recent WHDH (Boston) case, the FCC took the license away from an incumbent and awarded it to a challenger. This rare show of activism inspired the aforementioned "filing on top" or "strike" applications by new business groups challenging incumbents. Broadcasters play games with champions of the public interest, so long as they merely make rhetoric or struggle along with meager resources; but when the industry feels its jugular vein threatened, it lowers the boom. The broadcast licenses, which the station owners get free from the public, are trafficked annually for tens of millions of dollars in an unending round of fat killings derived from tax write-offs via depreciation, a practice similar to oil depletion allowances. Open, competitive bidding would ruin the market. Who would pay millions for a license that had to come up for serious scrutiny every three years?

At the NAB convention in March, Presi-

dent Vincent Waslewsky proposed the legislation that is now being pushed through the Congress. Senator Pastore, at the convention, stated his "deep-seated conviction that public service is not encouraged or promoted by placing the sword of Damocles over the heads of broadcasters. . . ."

Senator Pastore has set July 15 and 16 for Senate hearings on his bill. His eighteen cosponsors are Democrats and Republicans along the whole political spectrum: Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee; Norris Cotton (R-N.H.), ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee; Mike Mansfield, Senate majority leader; and members of the Commerce Committee.

At the July hearings, the chairman of the FCC, Rosel Hyde, is expected to argue against the legislation. Proponents of the bill argue that it is really in the public interest to give the present license-holder "the benefit of the doubt warranted by his previous investment and experience." Also, they assert that broadcasters will cut back on expense to maximize revenue if their tenure as licensees is uncertain.

Supporters of the legislation also argue that at renewal time the burden of proof of service in the public interest will still be on the broadcaster. The record reiterates that it is the FCC that determines how the burden of proof shall be allocated, and, historically, the commission or its staff has placed that burden on the challenger, who rarely has access to the requisite evidence, which is safely in the hands of either the licensee or the FCC staff. Our Congressmen are stampeding to serve their local broadcasters, they have gotten word of the industry's "educational campaign." Each politician's destiny, of course, rests heavily on his image as projected by the broadcasters, who have the eyes and ears of his constituency, not only at campaign time but all through his term of office. What Congressman or Senator will dare to vote against the bill? And if he runs again, which of his challengers at the polls will dare risk the disfavor of the broadcaster who has the power to shape his competing political image?

Congressman Johnson and his colleagues who wrote the Radio Act of 1927 sensed that they were fashioning a dangerous creature. Alas, they failed to cast themselves as Franksteins. As for the press (largely crossbred now with the new media), it maintains a general discreet silence. Who will cry havoc down the airwaves? It is but a subset of a familiar category: the power that runs the nation rests not in the public officials but in the shadows where the flow of ideas is controlled. Conspiratorial fantasy? Who owns the Brooklyn Bridge? When the bridge is sold, it is because no one comes forth to claim it.

WYATT POLL RESULTS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, each year since I was first elected to this body I have issued a questionnaire on significant national and international issues to those I represent in Oregon's First Congressional District.

The same procedure was followed this year, with over 180,000 questionnaires distributed to my constituents. I received 30,894 replies, a record number of returns.

These annual polls are highly important to me, as they indicate the feelings

of those I represent on matters which will come before the Congress. The tabu-

lation of this year's questionnaire results has just been completed, and I would like

to present it at this time for the benefit of my colleagues in this body:

[In percent]

	[In percent]				[In percent]		
	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. If the Paris talks drag on with no apparent progress toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict, would you favor a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam?	57.8	31.0	11.2	13. Should Congress place a ceiling on the total amount of Federal farm subsidy payments which 1 person may receive in any 1 year?	85.0	5.1	9.7
2. Should the President be required to secure the approval of Congress before taking any action involving the commitment of American forces to hostile actions abroad?	73.6	21.0	5.4	14. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in social security benefit payments?	81.3	11.0	7.7
3. Should the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Red China?	44.3	43.4	12.3	15. Should Congress propose a constitutional amendment to set the minimum voting age at 18 in all States?	24.6	69.5	5.9
4. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic-missile program?	51.9	31.8	16.3	16. Should Congress propose a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools?	70.8	20.8	9.1
5. Foreign aid:							
a. Should the United States continue to extend military assistance to other nations?	34.6	53.2	12.2				Percentage favoring
b. Should the United States continue to extend economic assistance to other nations?	57.2	31.7	11.2				
6. Once the Vietnam conflict has been resolved, would you favor replacement of the present draft system with an all-volunteer army?	52.9	38.0	9.2	17. Electoral college reform is being advocated. Which of the following choices do you prefer? (Please check 1 only)			
7. Tax reform: Do you feel that there are substantial inequities and loopholes in the Federal income tax laws which require change?	92.7	3.0	4.3	a. Abolish the electoral college system and provide for the direct popular election of the President.			76.4
8. Do you favor the banning of cigarette advertising on television?	64.7	26.4	8.9	b. Provide for the election of presidential electors by districts within each State, rather than the present "winner-take-all" system of State at-large election.			5.2
9. Should Congress enact a statute to require the licensing and registration of all firearms?	34.7	60.7	4.6	c. Provide for the proportional division of each State's electoral votes among the various presidential candidates in accord with the share of the popular vote each receives in the State.			9.5
10. Should the Congress create a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs?	38.7	34.7	26.6	d. No change in the present system.			5.1
11. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal to create a National Law Enforcement Academy to upgrade the competence of State and local police?	70.1	19.1	10.8	e. No opinion.			3.8
12. Should the National Labor Relations Act be amended to require that farmers recognize and bargain with unions representing their workers?	28.1	55.9	16.0				

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom for some time, I have prepared and will mail shortly a questionnaire to all of the voting citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio. As I have told them many times, "Your Congressman, FRANK T. BOW, would like your opinion," and I hope there will be a heavy response so that we can lay plans for legislative work in the future.

The questionnaire will contain an explanatory message as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1969.

DEAR FRIENDS: The first half of the 1969 session of Congress has been completed and this seems to be an appropriate time to issue the annual questionnaire seeking your opinion.

Most of the questions on the inside pages refer to problems that will be considered in the remaining months of 1969. We do not expect to adjourn this session of the Congress until mid-December. More and more, this has become a full-time job requiring the presence of your Congressman in Washington all year-round.

The fact that Congressmen are not able to return to their home districts as frequently as we did in years gone by makes the questionnaire and your mail increasingly important. Being unable to visit with you to learn your opinions, I must rely more heavily on your answers to the questionnaire and on your letters so that I truly represent your

views in Congress. I hope that everyone will check his opinions on the questions, add any comments you wish in the space below, and return this to me promptly.

You will note that it does not require an envelope for the return. Simply fold it so that my address is on the outside, affix a six cent stamp and put it in the mail.

One additional note for those who have occasion to use my Canton District Office: the office has been moved to the new Citizens Savings Building at 100 Central Plaza South, Suite 452. The telephone number has also been changed—the new number is 456-2869. I have also added a telephone answering device which will give you the telephone numbers of members of my Washington staff if you have an emergency call when the offices are closed.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

The questions will read as follows:

FRANK T. BOW'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

	His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a Federal tax-sharing program under which the Federal Government would share a portion of its revenues with the States giving them broad discretion in the expenditure of the money?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. From what you have read about the tax reform bill passed by the House of Representatives this month, do you believe that most of the so-called tax loopholes have been closed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you favor the bill soon to be debated in the House to abolish the electoral college and choose our President by direct popular vote?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Should Federal scholarship and loan funds be withheld from students who participate in criminal, destructive, or disruptive behavior at the institutions they attend?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you favor President Nixon's program of selecting postmasters and rural letter carriers on the basis of merit, rather than that of political appointment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Do you favor removing the limitations on earnings of those who receive social security retirement or disability payments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. In his proposals, the President would lower the cost of food stamps for the poor: the very poor could get them free. The amount of food the stamps could buy would be increased. The authorizations for the relief of hunger in the United States would be increased by \$1,000,000,000 from the present \$1,500,000,000. Do you favor these proposals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Would you support a complete overhaul of the welfare system which included these features: (1) uniform national standard of payments to provide minimum necessary income for the aged, disabled, children without parents; (2) an annual minimum income guarantee for families which include a potentially able-bodied worker with provisions for job training and incentives to make the family become self-sustaining.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic-missile program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Do you favor establishing the territorial limits of the United States (now 3 miles out at sea) with respect to the ships of any other country at the same distance as the territorial limits claimed by that country?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Do you support President Nixon's proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a self-supporting Government-owned corporation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In the following questions, please indicate the alternative that most closely represents your opinion:

	His	Hers
1. With regard to the Middle East, the United States should—		
(a) Give maximum support to Israel including military equipment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Give maximum support to the Arab nations including military equipment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Work with the Soviet Union, England, and France to effect a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Adopt a hands-off policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

FRANK T. BOW'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

	His	Hers
2. With regard to Vietnam, the United States should (check 2 if necessary)—		
(a) Continue withdrawal of American troops regardless of consequences	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Continue withdrawal as quickly as South Vietnam troops can take over the military responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Make additional concessions at the Paris peace talks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Increase military pressure on North Vietnam in an effort to bring about concessions from that nation and the Vietcong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Resume bombing in an effort to win military victory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. With regard to social security benefits, we should—		
(a) Enact the Bow bill for automatic cost-of-living increases (about 7 percent if enacted effective this month)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Enact a 15 percent benefit increase even though this might require additional payroll taxes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. With regard to the Selective Service System, do you believe Congress should—		
(a) Modify the basic rule for selective service, selecting by lot first from the youngest in the prime age group, ages 19 to 26, and work up, rather than from the oldest and work down, and also permit graduate students who are selected after undergraduate deferment to finish an academic year if already started	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Abandon the Selective Service System for a voluntary military manpower procurement system to provide for meeting the manpower needs of the Armed Forces through a completely voluntary system of enlistments except in times of declared war	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. With the completion of the successful Apollo 11 moon landing, do you believe that the United States should now—		
(a) Continue to increase its space budget with a new goal of landing a man on Mars and/or other planets by the end of this century	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Scale down our space budget and concentrate on domestic human needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Would you rate President Nixon's performance to date as (circle 1)—		
Excellent		
Good		
Fair		
Poor		

NEED FOR ENACTMENT OF JUDICIAL REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee I have long recognized the need for improvements in our Federal court system. I was, therefore, pleased to introduce in the House, H.R. 10951, a companion bill to S. 1506, which the distinguished Senator from Maryland Mr. TYDINGS, developed after exhaustive and careful study of the problem. In my judgment this legislation will accomplish significant and long overdue reforms and help attain the basic objective of our Federal judicial system—to assure that justice is rendered swiftly and fairly, by judges who possess the highest qualifications and standards of integrity and probity. In today's issue of the Washington Post there appears an excellent editorial endorsing this legislation and I include it in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1969]
HOW TO RELIEVE UNFIT JUDGES

The judicial cleanup operations in Illinois are being watched with special interest in Congress and elsewhere because the method used at Springfield is similar to the proposals now under study by the Senate Judiciary Committee for the federal courts. Charges of corruption on the bench in Illinois led to an investigation by a court-appointed commission. The outcome was a finding that Chief Justice Roy J. Solfsberg Jr. and Justice Ray I. Klingbiel were guilty of gross impropriety—the acquisition of stock in a new Chicago bank while handling a case involving an organizer of the bank. Both resigned in line with the investigating commission's recommendations.

A legislative committee in Illinois is now demanding a much wider investigation of financial dealings on the part of judges. Probably the most important fact is that Illinois, along with California and a few other states, appears to have found a satisfactory method of dealing with misbehavior on the bench—one of the most baffling problems that arises under the American system of government. The result in Springfield will doubtless encourage Congress to go ahead with the reform being sponsored by Senator Tydings.

The Tydings bill would set up in the judicial branch a Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure composed of five district

and circuit judges. Any complaint against a judge would go before this body for investigation. If it should prove to be frivolous or without foundation, it could be dismissed without further action. But if the commission should find evidence of misbehavior (willful misconduct in office of persistent failure to perform his duties) it could recommend the removal of a federal judge.

The proposal is carefully safeguarded, with a review of the findings by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and a final appeal to the Supreme Court. But it is anticipated that in most cases the judge in question would comply with the recommendation of the commission, as the judges in Illinois have done. Experience has shown that some means of dealing with misconduct and disability on the bench (short of the cumbersome impeachment process) is essential to an efficient and untainted judicial system. Congress should not lag behind the states in this area of reform.

MESSAGE TO PARENTS ON DRUGS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, as a parent with three children, as well as a Member of the House of Representatives, I share the increasing awareness and concern over the twin problems of drug addiction and the ever-increasing traffic in this poison. Every home in each community is in danger. There is no question of geographical immunity.

I am particularly concerned over the fact that everything from marijuana and pep pills to heroin are being sold in the schools of our Nation, including many of those within our own 13th Congressional District. This activity brings this perilous specter into the home of every parent. As the school year gets fully underway again, a mass concerted effort must be made to combat this ever imminent threat. Each of us must be aware of the problem, able to recognize and cope with it. Ability to recognize early danger signals and symptoms is all important. Swift detection and knowledge of who to go to is the linchpin of any effort to cope with it effectively. The enclosed information is designed to alert every parent to danger signs to watch for in a child.

Our struggle against this insidious traffic must combine alertness, awareness, determination, and consistency. On a national level I have introduced and supported legislation which carries the severest penalties for those parasites and pariahs who engage in such criminal trade, particularly those who prey upon youngsters. Coupled with such penalization is a full range of rehabilitative services aimed at aiding those who succumb. Yet, all this will fail if individual family groups and parents are unaware or unwilling to play an active part, cooperating fully with appropriate authorities.

Above all, let us be constantly reminded that no child is immune. No home is sacrosanct. No school can close its gates to this activity. An endangered child could come from any home. Be alert. I fervently hope the information contained herein will never be of use to you, but it is at least available.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. David Pon Tell, a constituent of mine, was honored by nationwide recognition. He received the National Council for Small Business Management Development award as National Small Businessman of the Year. I would like to add my congratulations to a man who deserves a great deal of credit for hard work and imaginative leadership. Much of our American economic development depends on the initiative and efforts of such men. I am proud to represent Mr. Pon Tell and the other businessmen of the 29th District of California.

At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD this excerpt from the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce News, July 1969, which speaks of Mr. Pon Tell's achievement:

NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Eureka! San Gabriel can well be proud. It has achieved national acclaim! It has produced the "National Small Businessman of the Year". Dave Pon Tell, first Vice-President

of the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce and President of Presentation Industries, Inc., a highly successful San Gabriel firm with branch offices in San Francisco. The Company is engaged in research, design, consultation, manufacture, installation and service of first quality two and three dimensional communication tools for exhibitions, museums, briefings, sales meetings and educational environments. The intent of all the materials developed by Presentation Industries is to sell the idea, product or service.

Dave was chosen over hundreds of other small businessmen (small businesses considered are those grossing less than five million yearly and hiring less than 250 employees) at a recent annual conference of the National Council for Small Business Management Development held in Connecticut. National newspapers and technical magazines will proclaim the honor. A factor influencing the decision of the judges was the extent of improvement in Dave's business as a result of his leadership, guidance and management techniques. Congratulations, Dave!

PLANNING GROUP ENDORSES PAYMENT LIMIT

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 20 members of the National Planning Association Agriculture Committee have signed a report recommending a limit of \$15,000 on the aggregate Government payments that can go to a single farm.

This statement is especially timely, because still unresolved by the Congress is the question of placing a \$20,000 limit on payments to farmers for the 1970 crop. The limit was voted in the House bill, and out of the Senate version. House conferees have not yet met.

Text of the statement and members signing the NPA statement follow:

LIMITING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Government payments to farmers are a principal instrument of farm price and income policy. An increasingly important question is whether payments might be used to redress in part the very uneven distribution of income within agriculture and, in particular, whether payments to the largest producers might be limited.¹

Payments under all programs were distributed among individual producers in 1967, as shown in Table 1, page 2. Commodity programs accounted for 86 percent of all payments: \$932 million for cotton, \$865 million for feed grains, \$731 million for wheat, \$81 million for sugar, and \$33 million for wool—a total of \$2,642 million. Payments for long-term land retirement and for agricultural conservation accounted for most of the remainder.

Complete information is not available on how payments under the different commodity programs were distributed in 1967. Data for states in which more than half of all payments were made for a particular commodity, however, show that large payments are proportionately much more important for cotton than for feed grains or wheat (Table 2, page 2). Each of 14 Mississippi counties had more \$50,000-plus payments than the states of Iowa and Illinois combined. A special tabulation of individual commodity payments amounting to \$10,000 or more in 1967 showed that 18,054 were for cotton, 4,579 for wheat, 850 for feed grains, and 165 for wool.²

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—SIZE OF PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL PRODUCERS ALL PROGRAMS, 1967

Range of payments	Average payment	Number of payments	Payments	
			Total (million)	Percent
Less than \$5,000.....	(1)	(1)	\$1,852.0	62.4
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	\$6,825	60,942	409.8	13.8
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	14,750	25,309	373.3	12.6
\$25,000 to \$39,999.....	40,176	6,128	246.2	8.3
\$100,000 to \$499,999.....	167,268	388	64.9	2.2
\$500,000 or more.....	1,020,000	20	20.4	.7
Total.....			\$2,966.6	100.0

¹ Not available.

² Does not include \$115,300,000 for which distribution by size of payment was not determined.

Source: Senate hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, Department of Agriculture and related agencies, 90th Cong. 2d sess., fiscal year 1969, pt. 2, p. 1485.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSES OF PRESENT PAYMENT PROGRAMS

The payment programs, with some exceptions, grew out of efforts to accomplish three things: (1) support farm income; (2) permit surplus stocks to be liquidated and prevent accumulation of new surpluses; and (3) maintain an acceptable relationship between market prices in the United States and prices at which commodities move in foreign trade.

Wool payments were begun in 1956 as an alternative to further increasing the tariff on wool. The payments are a percentage supplement to the market price and do not require production control on the part of the producer. Production costs for wool are so high in the United States, however, that domestic wool production has declined despite the supplemented price.

The feed grain program was introduced in 1961 to reverse the build-up of surplus stocks that had occurred when prices were supported but production was not controlled. Farmers were offered payments to cut back feed grain acreages. Price supports for feed grains, which already were near export prices, were not much changed. Excess stocks were worked off by 1966, a rising volume of exports was achieved without significant subsidy, and a moderate amount of income support was given to producers.

The current wheat program was adopted after growers rejected compulsory production control in 1963. Support prices, which had been much above export prices for many years, were reduced approximately to the level at which wheat was moving in world trade. In order to maintain wheat growers' income and to prevent excess production, growers were offered high payments to stay within or to cut back from acreage allotments. Wheat certificates that must be purchased by millers are the source of part of the payments now going to producers.

The cotton program in effect prior to 1964 supported prices much above world trade levels and required a large export subsidy to make foreign markets accessible to U.S. cotton. Surplus stocks were accumulating despite compulsory acreage allotments because the national allotment could not be put below 16 million acres. Imports of cotton products and competition from man-made fibers were reducing markets for U.S. producers. The program now in effect supports the domestic cotton price at a much lower level and requires no export subsidy to sell abroad. It provides high payments to producers who comply with acreage restrictions that in some years have been below the old allotments. An old allotment still cannot be exceeded unless the producer chooses to stay out of the program altogether and to export his cotton, a seldom-used option.

Payments under the Sugar Act have been made for 30 years. The principal means of supporting domestic prices is import quotas; but prices are supplemented by payments to growers who comply with certain requirements, including compliance with any allotments when in effect and minimum wage

standards. The payment rate is lower to large producers than to small producers.

Wool payments are strictly price supplements to increase incomes of producers. They play no other program role.

FEASIBILITY OF LIMITING PAYMENTS

Payment rates to large wool producers might be scaled down—perhaps to zero beyond some level of output—without creating unmanageable problems in supply management or in other respects.³ The main consideration in deciding whether to adopt such a policy, of course, is the intended income effect of the program. Other considerations include effects on farm size and efficiency, to be discussed later.

In contrast, feed grain payments are almost entirely rewards for complying with production controls that must be effective if current price supports are to be workable. If feed grain payment rates to large producers were substantially reduced, most would stay out of the program. Virtually the whole burden of reducing acreage would fall on family-size farms, and the government's cost of obtaining needed participation would increase. Moreover, the principal income benefit of the feed grain program is the supported market price made possible by acreage control, and that market price is available to participants and nonparticipants alike. Payments could be limited to \$10,000 per producer, however, without weakening the supply control effect of the program. This would be feasible because too few producers now receive larger payments to matter.⁴

TABLE 2.—SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL PRODUCERS IN STATES IN WHICH MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF ALL PAYMENTS WERE MADE FOR A PARTICULAR COMMODITY, 1967

Range of payments	[Percent of total]		
	Feed grains (10 States)	Wheat (8 States)	Cotton (9 States)
Less than \$5,000.....	91.0	64.8	39.8
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	6.6	21.1	14.7
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	2.1	11.4	21.1
\$25,000 to \$99,999.....	.3	2.5	18.4
\$100,000 or more.....	(1)	.2	6.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Less than 0.05 percent.

Source: Senate hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, Department of Agriculture and related agencies, 90th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1969, pt. 2, pp. 1485-1492.

Wheat payments contain both income supplement and supply control compliance elements. The payment rates adopted when the present program began were chosen mainly to keep incomes of producers at the earlier level. The rates necessary for this income purpose were considerably higher than needed to obtain sufficient compliance with acreage restrictions to make the new level

of price support workable. Thus, there is considerable opportunity in the wheat program to scale down or limit the income supplement portion of the payment going to large producers. But a compliance portion available to almost all producers should remain if the present level of price support (which is below the International Grains Arrangement price) is to be effective. A limitation on the amount of payment going to an individual producer could be established at \$15,000, however, without affecting a critical proportion of wheat production.

Payments under the cotton program are largely income supplements. The current price support for cotton—about 20 cents per pound—is so low that production probably would not much exceed market outlets at that price if all payments to growers were eliminated and compulsory acreage allotments were withdrawn. Cotton payments could feasibly be scaled down for large producers, and only a small compliance payment would be needed to prevent surplus production at the current market support price. Payments going to a single producer probably could be limited to \$15,000 without endangering supply control and price support.

Sugar payments appear to be largely supplemental to income and thus susceptible to further scaling down for large producers. The sugar program, however, was not studied in detail.

FARM SIZE, EFFICIENCY

Any government program that improves returns in agriculture and reduces risk on farms of all types probably tends to make investment in large-scale units more attractive. Payment limitations would reduce the incentive for investment in agriculture, which continues to be troubled with excess capacity, and would lessen emphasis on bigness.

On the other hand, efficiency considerations suggest that supplemental payments should not be scaled down or limited so as to perpetuate farms not large enough to gain the principal economies of size.⁵ Studies indicate the large family farms in feed grain, wheat, and even cotton production can be equally or nearly as efficient as large-scale units.⁶ Payment limitations in the range of \$10,000 to \$20,000 would be compatible with efficiency in farming.

Limiting supplemental payments to farms larger than efficient family farms would not hold tiny units in agriculture. The great contrast in efficiency in American agriculture is between well-organized and adequately capitalized family farms on the one hand and farms too small to provide productive work for the family on the other. The problem of poverty of families dependent for their living on tiny farms would remain. Although measures to correct this situation are urgently needed, payments for farm products sold are not an effective way to attack the problem.

Significant limitation of supplemental payments is likely to encourage owners of large-scale units to modify their operations in an effort to receive full benefits. The nominal ownership of land might be changed by revision of titles, or leasing arrangements might be altered so that the land owner received the principal benefits of payments in the form of higher rents. Safeguards provided in legislation might reduce this difficulty but probably could not eliminate it entirely.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Planning Association's Agriculture Committee believes that Federal farm commodity programs should be altered to limit payments going to the largest producers. The high government payments to large farm producers are not justified by lack

of wealth and income on the part of recipients, nor are such payments necessary to make other features of the programs workable.

We have concluded, from a study of the payment system under the Agricultural Act of 1965, that the farm commodity programs would better serve the national and the farm interests if a limit were placed on payments.

In proposing a limitation on payments, we point out a distinction between compliance payments—those necessary to obtain participation in voluntary programs to prevent surpluses—and supplemental payments—those simply adding to incomes of recipients. Feed grain payments are almost entirely compliance payments, regardless of names attached to them. Wool payments are wholly supplemental, and cotton payments are nearly so. Wheat payments are in part compliance and in part supplemental.

Supplemental payments can be sharply limited without affecting other features of a program. If voluntary production-control features are to be retained, limits on compliance payments must be set high enough so that producers no longer having an incentive to comply will account for only a small fraction of potential output.

We recommend that total annual payments to a single producer or farm in connection with commodity programs be limited to about \$15,000.

We see some merit in scaling down payments to the largest producers rather than applying an abrupt cutoff point. For example, the full rate of payment might be paid up to a total of \$10,000. From that point to \$15,000, the rate might be cut to 75 percent of the full rate. From \$15,000 to \$17,500, the rate could be reduced to 50 percent, and so on, until the absolute limit of \$20,000 was reached.⁷

A payment ceiling of the proposed kind would not have an important adverse effect on the surplus control feature of any program. Questions would remain about the income distribution effects of programs, but a ceiling would be a simple and feasible way of putting commodity programs in better coordination with national goals of social equity.

The savings in payments resulting from a ceiling, though likely to be less than 10 percent of total payment costs, could make a significant contribution to improving the lot of the rural poor if applied to education, retraining, and other investments in human resources. The proposed ceiling would be sufficiently high to accommodate farms large enough to be efficient but would reduce emphasis on mere bigness in agriculture.

Two important changes in the cotton program should accompany payment limitations. One would prevent a price support provision designed to negate a payment limitation. The other would remove all penalties, other than loss of payments, for exceeding acreage allotments. Large growers willing to produce for the market without payments should be permitted to do so even if only a few might prefer this option. For all payment programs, administrative arrangements should prevent, so far as possible, the evasion of a ceiling by such devices as nominally dividing ownership among family members or revising leasing arrangements.

It should be noted that we propose a ceiling only on payments made in connection with commodity programs. Programs to retire low quality land in whole farm units from general crop production for long periods of time have a somewhat different objective and are less likely to result in windfalls for well-off people. For these reasons, a payment limitation should not be imposed on long-term land retirement programs unless and until a need for it is demonstrated.⁸

MEMBERS OF THE NPA AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE SIGNING THE STATEMENT

Lauren K. Soth, Chairman, Editor of the Editorial Pages, Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Robert K. Buck, Vice Chairman, Waukee, Iowa.

Ferriss Owen, Vice Chairman, Director, Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company.

John Baker, Community Development Services.

Murray R. Benedict, Professor Emeritus, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of California.

Charles Edwin Bishop, Vice President, The University of North Carolina.

Sam Henry Bober, Tucson, Arizona.

George E. Brandow, Department of Agricultural Economics, Pennsylvania State University.

Willard W. Cochrane, Dean, Office of International Programs, University of Minnesota.

August Dahme, Aberdeen, South Dakota.* Arval I. Erikson, Economic Advisor, Oscar Mayer & Co.

Harry I. Graham, Oxon Hill, Maryland. W. E. Hamilton, Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation.*

Earl O. Heady, Executive Director, The Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

A. C. Hoffman, Vice President, Kraft Foods Division, National Dairy Products Corporation.

Flint McRoberts, The McRoberts Farm. James G. Maddox, Professor, Department of Economics, North Carolina State University.

Donald R. Murphy, West Des Moines, Iowa. William H. Nicholls, Director, Center for Latin American Studies, Vanderbilt University.

R. J. Odegard, O. J. Odegard Potato Company.

T. W. Schultz, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Chicago.* Lloyd R. Wescott, Holsteins, Inc.

FOOTNOTES

¹ W. E. Hamilton: A more important question, in my opinion, is whether payments should continue to be a principal instrument of farm price and income policy. I believe there is a place for payments to help farm people make needed adjustments—i.e., I would support payments to obtain needed adjustments in land use through long-term land retirement contracts, and to provide retraining and adjustment assistance to low-income farmers who do not have the resources that are needed for a successful farming operation. The limitation issue relates primarily to commodity program payments which do not achieve long-term adjustments in resource use. Instead of trying to devise a system of limiting such payments, I would prefer to phase out the programs which make payments to supplement commodity prices.

² W. W. Wilcox, *Large Farm Program Payments and Implications of Proposals for Limitations*, The Library of Congress Legislative Service S. 129, February 1969, p. 9. Sugar program payments were not included.

³ T. W. Schultz: The phrase "unmanageable problems in supply management" is pure jargon. The United States is heavily dependent upon imported wool.

⁴ T. W. Schultz: This sentence should read, "... because only a few producers receive large payments."

⁵ T. W. Schultz: This assumption is wrong because these payments tend to distort economic incentives that strongly induce inefficient bigness.

⁶ Some relevant studies are discussed in J. P. Madden, *Economies of Size in Farming*, Agriculture Economic Report No. 107, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1967.

⁷ T. W. Schultz: While I agree with this recommendation, it is only a very small first step in correcting the distortion in economic incentives that burden U.S. agriculture as a consequence of our farm commodity programs.

⁸ August Dahme: I believe that if we should have a land retirement program, it should have payment limitations, using the same formula recommended for commodity programs.

MINNESOTA EXPERIMENTAL CITY MAY BE ENCLOSED UNDER A 1-MILE DOME

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fascinating and intriguing possibilities for the Minnesota experimental city is that of enclosure under domes. We are all familiar with shopping centers completely enclosed for protection against the weather, and the Houston Astrodome, which has proved the feasibility of enclosure under a dome for certain uses.

The Minnesota experimental city contemplates dome enclosures of 1 mile in diameter with the possibility of the enclosure being air conditioned. A variation of this approach involves interconnected separate domes with diameters of one-fourth mile each in an arrangement resembling a "bunch of grapes."

Following is a discussion of dome enclosures extracted from volume III of the Minnesota experimental city progress report, dated May 1969:

B. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

(II.B.1.) ENCLOSURE AT CITY SCALE

One intriguing possibility which has been advanced for a high-technology city is that of a full enclosure, or umbrella. Such enclosure would create the potential for a totally new environment in terms of the physical dimensions and in terms of the patterns of living and working and playing it would support. As with similar heroic proposals, the full range of potentials and outcomes would not become immediately clear but would unfold over time. A variety of investigative, experimental, and developmental projects would be needed to mount the task of enclosing the city. These will range from engineering considerations through a broad spectrum of social and economic implications, and ecological and climatological impacts.

A dome enclosure with a diameter of the order of one mile has been suggested as relevant to the Experimental City proposal—taking into consideration the Minnesota location, timing, and available technology. To achieve this end objective of a one-mile diameter enclosure, it has been suggested that two intermediate stages may be necessary because of the magnitude of the undertaking.

Test Model: A test model of suitable dimension should be constructed to deal with as many of the anticipated engineering problems as practicable. Such a model would be used for studying feasible structural techniques, materials requirements, and interacting systems, particularly those related to climatological factors. (An eight-foot diam-

eter model was found to be satisfactory for most of such investigations in connection with the 200-foot diameter U.S. Expo '67 structure at Montreal.)

Enclosure for a Microcosm Balanced Community: Building upon the test results of the above model, it is suggested that a ¼-mile diameter enclosure be constructed over a microcosm balanced community. Such an intermediate model might be constructed as a part of the Experimental City or as a permanent installation in another location. This full-scale test would provide reliable insights into man's reaction to living in the enclosed space; it would permit projections of likely socio-cultural impacts; it would serve as a proving ground for interacting environmental systems similar to those to be developed for the one-mile diameter city enclosure.

(II.B.1.) SCALING FACTOR STUDY

It is not certain that the present state-of-the-art will be adequate to allow design of an air conditioning system for an enclosure having a diameter of the order of one mile without some additional experimental information. Adherence to proper scaling factors and similar parameters is required when extrapolating model tests or small-scale tests to full-scale conditions. For scaling based on diameter, the ratio of the diameter of the Experimental City to the diameter of the Houston Astrodome is of the order of ten. In most cases the extrapolation of model tests to full-scale conditions having a diameter scaling factor of this size can be carried out successfully. However, data on a full-range of scaling factors will be necessary before the actual air conditioning system for the Experimental City is designed.

(II.B.1.) CLUSTERED DOME CONCEPT

A possible configuration for an enclosed experimental city would be a grouping of interconnected separate domes, each having diameters of the order of ¼ mile. One efficient configuration for these domes would be a "bunch of grapes" arrangement, each connected to a long enclosed corridor. This corridor could house the transportation system and allow ready access to the domes spaced along its length. The potentials of this modular concept need examination. For example, domes of various sizes could be constructed as they are needed and dismantled when they no longer serve a useful purpose; separate domes could be built for containing various climatic environments such as tropical, cold, and temperate.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1970

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 5, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the passage of H.R. 13018, the Military Construction Act, and voted for recommitment, because I subscribe to the views in the report on page 52 to section 708 of the bill; namely, that the amendment is ill conceived, ill advised, vague and, therefore, in my opinion, is unconstitutional. It has the effect of stifling freedom of speech. It has been our cherished American possession to be able to petition our Government.

I would subscribe to section 708 if it had provided a distance from which a person may picket.

I wonder, as some of my colleagues must also, why the Armed Services Committee would involve itself with title 18 of the United States Code respecting criminal penalties, and particularly amending a section designed to protect our judicial process, judges, and juries, and the fair decision which is also guaranteed in our Constitution.

Section 708 was apparently added to the bill in committee without advance notice, discussions, or hearings. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT), for offering his amendment to delete section 708 from the bill, and I support the Leggett amendment.

In addition, I am opposed to the \$2.5 million authorization contained in the bill for anti-ballistic-missile communications system in Colorado. In addition to being opposed to the ABM system in general, I do not believe this authorization should be a part of the Military Construction Act. I am opposed to the anti-ballistic-missile system for reasons stated on this floor during debate on the issue in the House in February and again in a statement in the House on March 20, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons I did not feel that I could, in good conscience, vote for passage of H.R. 13018, the Military Construction Act.

LT. COL. GEORGE H. ROBERTS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend an outstanding military officer upon his retirement. Lt. Col. George H. Roberts has spent 23 years in active military service to this country, encompassing World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam era. His efforts have included extensive and vital assignments with the Army's Chemical Warfare Service. Colonel Roberts has served at Edgewood Arsenal, Fort McClellan, the Alaska General Depot, and in the Office, Chief Chemical Officer, Army Chemical Warfare Service. His awards and decorations include the Army Commendation Medal with four oak leaf clusters, the Good Conduct Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the National Defense Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, and the Armed Forces Reserve Medal.

Colonel Roberts has not only served long and well within the military; he has devoted a great deal of personal time and effort to young men in the areas where he has been stationed, through his leadership in the Boy Scouts of America. In his work with scouting, he received the Silver Beaver Award from the Baltimore Area Council, Boy Scouts of America. This is the highest award which can be given to an adult volunteer by any local scouting council. His example of service and loyalty is an excellent one for all of our young people to study and follow.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PREVENT
CRIMINAL ACTS DANGEROUS TO
TRAVELERS ON TRAINS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on July 31 I reintroduced legislation to make it a criminal offense to commit acts dangerous to persons onboard trains. I am pleased to note that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee, has joined me in this bipartisan effort to deal with an increasingly serious problem.

Vandalism and acts such as throwing stones or shooting at trains have been a matter of concern to the railroad industry and law-enforcement agencies for a considerable time. Unfortunately, the situation is not improving. In the last Congress, at Senate hearings on similar legislation, a representative of the Association of American Railroads succinctly described the problem:

It should be emphasized that we are not dealing with a mere nuisance program. Some occurrences have resulted in serious injury. Anytime someone fires a bullet at a train it is possible that someone may be killed. Indeed this has happened.

In this connection, I would like to include in the RECORD a recent article from The New York Times of July 28, which points out that some of the major problems of railroads result from an increase in vandalism.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about the concept of Federal criminal laws to deal with the kind of criminal acts taking place. There is a Federal train wrecking statute, for example; a statute making it a Federal crime to destroy or injure property moving in interstate or foreign commerce; and a statute making it a Federal crime to embezzle or steal interstate or foreign shipments. Through these laws Congress has recognized the national interest and the need for Federal action.

It is clear that existing law enforcement is not adequate, and while enactment of this legislation will not solve the entire problem it will serve as a deterrent against the commission of such acts and will provide an additional warning to potential criminals that should assist the efforts of law enforcement officials.

The New York Times article follows:
COMMUTER LINES AT CRISIS POINT—NEGLECTED FOR YEARS, RAILROADS SERVING CITY ARE FALTERING

No American city is as dependent on railroad commuter service as New York. But after decades of neglect, the state of the commuter lines has reached a point of acute crisis.

Last-minute cancellations of Long Island Rail Road trains are delaying and embittering more and more commuters every day. New Haven riders are finding their trains crowded, littered and late. The Penn Central is arguing with New York State's Public Service Commission over how to get badly needed cars for its Hudson and Harlem Divisions. And commuters throughout New York City's suburbs are wondering if they will be forced to pay higher fares for poorer service.

Perhaps the only plus in the metropolitan commuter rail situation is to be found in New Jersey, where two of the three commuter lines serving New York City are showing signs of improvement, in part through an infusion of state operating subsidies. But these gains have been made in a situation regarded as so unsatisfactory as not to afford much gratification to riders.

This picture has been drawn by The New York Times from interviews with rail officials, commuters and representatives of government and civil agencies concerned with the plight of the six railroads that bring a quarter of a million commuters into the city each working day.

Experts and observers say the inefficiency of metropolitan rail service springs from a variety of factors, including the need to turn from the railroads' long-term origins to rapid service systems, an increase in vandalism over which the lines have little control, public indifference and a history of controversial management practices.

But increasingly the commuter who daily faces the threat of cancellations, breakdowns, overcrowding and long delays has been showing a lack of patience with such explanations.

"It's amazing what a stoic lot commuters have been," a New Haven rider remarked recently. However, this stoicism has been yielding to rage and activism.

T. David Reznik, a marketing analyst, doesn't ride the railroad to work these days—he walks the railroad to work. Instead of taking his regular Penn Central trains to and from Larchmont each day, he takes a variety of trains so he can go through the aisles distributing complaint sheets to his fellow passengers.

The printed sheets have blank spaces in which passengers can write in the number of "bulbs not working" and "fans not working" or the "minutes late" in arriving.

"I start in back and work my way forward, car by car," Mr. Reznik said. "The conductors keep threatening to arrest me." He said he had handed out 4,000 forms in the last three weeks, and the Federal Department of Transportation has been receiving the completed forms from passengers.

On Long Island, a drive is being organized to obtain 10,000 signatures on petitions asking for the removal of the top management of the state-owned Long Island Rail Road, and reports are current that Governor Rockefeller will seek the dismissal of the line's president.

Conductors are hearing more and more from angry passengers, and at least a few of them are growling back. Asked what the trouble was in a delay, one conductor told a fuming commuter recently: "I'll write you a letter."

Passengers are expressing a rising anxiety over railroad safety, especially on overcrowded trains. They suffer and swelter in cars with sealed windows when air-conditioning fails. With cinder blocks dropped on trains from overpasses and sharp rocks flung at windows by vandals, some riders feel like moving objects in a shooting gallery. Executives do not know at what hour they will get to work and their wives do not know what time they will reach home at night.

Frederick A. Menes of Old Westbury, L. I., has been getting up at 5:30 A.M. every weekday, half an hour earlier than usual, to be certain of getting a train that will bring him in on time to his job as general personnel supervisor for the New York Telephone Company.

Mr. Menes begins his morning anxiously listening to radio reports of rail delays on the Long Island Rail Road. What has been canceled today? Until recently he counted on catching a 7:26 train out of East Williston that was due at Pennsylvania Station at 8:12.

If the 7:26 has been scratched, Mr. Menes dashes for the 7:02, changing at Jamaica for

a packed train that is scheduled to arrive in Manhattan at 7:55.

But even if the 7:26 is running, it is not at all certain that it will arrive on time. If another train has been canceled, the 7:26—normally an express after Jamaica—may add some local stops in Queens, and may lumber into Penn Station at 8:30 or 8:35.

Such frustrations have important implications for New York City.

Late arrivals to work mean costly lost time and scrapped schedules for the city's businesses. Suburbanites who turn to their automobiles add to the city's traffic, parking and pollution problems and swell demands for new expressways or increased subway facilities. State officials confront demands for subsidies or even railroad takeovers that would shift costs to all taxpayers, including city residents who never ride the commuter lines.

"It's getting to the point at which something's about to blow," said Barrie Vreeland, director of the transportation department of the Commerce and Industry Association. Mr. Vreeland's office has been receiving a stream of complaints from corporate personnel officers worried about late arrivals at work.

Ralph C. Gross, president of the association, described the rail problems as "detrimental to business expansion and economic growth" here because "most of the top and middle-level executives who work in New York live outside the city."

Urban planners are generally agreed that there is no more efficient, or potentially faster, way of moving large numbers of people from suburban or urban business centers than by rail. Yet in much of the nation, railroad passenger service largely has disappeared.

The Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration says only five American cities still have regular commuter rail service: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Boston. Most cities now have auto-oriented transportation systems.

As a result, experts say that billions of dollars of public money have been pouring into expressway systems while only a few millions have trickled into capital improvements for commuter railroads.

As urbanization chews up fields and meadows near the city, executives are moving farther out into the suburbs, sometimes well beyond the 50-mile range, and that makes high-speed rail transit more necessary for them. But suburbanites who turn from trains to autos put pressure on for the building of more highways.

The Regional Plan Association, the non-governmental research organization, notes that "the autos required to transport the equivalent of one trainload of commuters use about four acres of parking space—eight times the area of the main concourse at Grand Central Terminal."

Fundamental to the railroads' problem is the fact that they were not designed to do the job they are now doing. According to Robert W. Minor, senior vice president of the Penn Central, the lines were originally long-haul carriers and were not engineered for the short-haul, high-speed service required today.

Commuter railroads here do not have the equipment needed for rapid acceleration and deceleration in the short distances between suburban stations. And the stations themselves generally lack the high-level platforms needed for fast loading and unloading of passengers.

Efforts are beginning to be made to change all this through the introduction of new equipment, financing and major reconstruction, but the overhaul is going to take years, according to railroad experts. And they note that the transition itself is contributing to delays and breakdowns.

Those who nourish a hope that things will soon get better have little to go on but optimism, in the opinion of most rail specialists.

The Regional Plan Association pointed out that the commuter lines are largely based on "the investments made in capital rail equipment prior to 1929." The Depression discouraged investments, then World War II came along, and then the postwar automobile boom, with its corresponding decline in riders using the rails.

According to records of the American Railway Car Institute, the trade association of railway car manufacturers, there is no continuing industry in the manufacture of self-propelled "inter-urban or commuter cars."

In 1969, said Walter A. Renz, the association's president, only 25 cars have been ordered for all the commuter lines in the nation.

"The cars cost so much because there are so few orders," he said. "It's no secret that the railroads detest these passenger runs, and I haven't seen any real commuter car business for a long, long time."

Added to these problems are difficulties and prospects peculiar to each of the commuter railroads in this area.

U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days I have included in the RECORD articles from the Washington Evening Star which voice a concern for the deplorable condition of our merchant marine fleet. The following is the last article in this timely series, and I include it herewith for the benefit of my colleagues:

CRISIS AT SEA: NEW U.S. MARITIME POLICY IN MAKING

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Before his election, Richard Nixon castigated the Johnson administration for policies which he said had put this country on a course toward becoming a second-rate seapower.

He found a "shocking deemphasis of our national maritime efforts" and promised:

"We shall adopt a policy that recognizes the role of government in the well-being of an industry so vital to our national defense and stimulates private enterprise to revitalize the industry."

By early fall, the nation should get a good idea of how far the Nixon administration is ready to go to reverse the downward slide of America's merchant fleet.

An interdepartmental working group on maritime policies currently is trying to determine how the President's promised policy can best be carried out. One member of that group, Undersecretary of Commerce Rocco C. Siciliano, said last week that the administration's programs probably would go to Congress in 60 days.

ALTERNATIVES MAPPED

The President will be handed a number of alternatives on how best to build up the merchant fleet.

Nixon could urge Congress to approve a widely recommended tax deferral measure, which would stimulate private financing of ship construction.

Or he could ask Congress to increase funds for ship construction subsidies, which would assure more ships, while decreasing funds for operating subsidies, which are used mainly to equalize the difference in wages and other benefits paid American and foreign seamen.

Another possible step would involve the largely unusable reserve fleet. Nixon could divert the millions being spent to preserve

useless ships to building more merchant ships.

The big problem is money, but the approach to spending seems to be different than during the Johnson administration, in the opinion of everyone interviewed in the preparation of this series.

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson, D-Wash., chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, is expressing "cautious optimism" after preliminary talks with several Cabinet officers about maritime spending.

Rep. Edward A. Garmatz, D-Md., chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, notes a "different climate," and Rep. William S. Mailliard, R-Calif., the House committee's ranking minority member who drafted his party's maritime platform, is confident that Nixon is committed to restoring the merchant marine.

Spokesmen for the shipping lines, ship builders and maritime labor also seem more hopeful that a decade of neglect is coming to an end. In an industry plagued by divisiveness, there are signs of a growing willingness to make concessions in the interest of achieving what all want most: A government commitment to a long-range program to make the United States a front-running maritime power rather than a poor fifth.

The main reason the industry has been so fragmented was the discouraging view from the bridge—nothing ahead but fog. President Johnson promised a broad-gauge program and named a prestigious committee to make recommendations, but sent Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd to Congress with a program nobody liked.

QUESTIONS RAISED

Nixon's committee, in reviewing the recommendations and reports of the Johnson years and a score of earlier studies, is asking these questions:

How much shipping capacity do we need to meet national defense and essential civilian requirements? And how do we get it in the most advantageous way?

For planning purposes, the committee is envisioning the most severe international emergency possible and asking how many ships could actually be counted on to respond. It wants to know how many U.S.-owned ships flying foreign flags with foreign crews would answer the call if the cause was unpopular? How many ships of allied nations would respond?

Another element in determining how large the U.S. flag fleet should be is our peacetime commerce. How much of America's foreign trade should be carried in American flag ships?

Before becoming president, Nixon promised a sharp boost in the U.S. merchant fleet's share of the nation's ocean trade. He noted that U.S. ships now carry only 5.6 percent of the total, while Soviet ships transport more than 50 percent of Russia's cargo. Nixon set a goal of more than 30 percent by the mid-1970s.

SHIP ALTERNATIVES

The interdepartmental committee also is debating whether all the shipbuilding money should be spent on the big, highly productive but enormously expensive ships, or whether part of it should be used for smaller, more austere cargo ships for the vanishing U.S. tramp fleet.

Some committee members are impressed by the fast turnabout capacity of the new container-carrying ships, the more voyages they can make and the profits they can pour back into more ship building.

Other committee members are arguing that, as the Soviets have found, the less developed nations don't have the port facilities and harbors to accommodate the sophisticated new ships. The smaller ships will do nicely in those harbors, they contend, and the shrinking tramp fleet will be strengthened.

Furthermore, it is argued, the administration is going to need labor's support to help push its maritime proposals through Congress. And if all labor sees ahead are a few costly automated giants, rather than a mix of big ships and a number of smaller ones, maritime labor leaders are likely to withhold their support.

MESSAGE TO HALL

Nixon showed his awareness of labor's stake. He sent a message to Paul Hall, president of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department which represents more than 7 million workers, pledging "a strong and viable merchant marine." And he recently promised Joseph Curran, the president of the National Maritime Union, to consult with labor representatives before making public his new maritime program.

Some of the major proposals now being weighed by the President's maritime policy group:

1. A minimum 5-year effort, with the government providing \$300 million annually, to build between 35 and 40 ships a year instead of the present 10 or 12. That was proposed in both the House and the Senate last year, and again this year, as the starting point for congressional action.

TAX DEFERMENTS

2. Extension of the tax deferral privilege now enjoyed by the subsidized lines to the unsubsidized lines. The subsidized lines are now permitted to put their profits into a tax reserve fund which enables them to accumulate capital for new construction.

Magnuson included that proposal in his over-all maritime bill and told the Senate:

"If tax deferred funds may be accumulated but spent only for building new vessels, there is an increased incentive to invest capital in new vessels." He argued that availability of these funds would decrease the need for construction subsidy funds.

3. Various suggestions to halt the exodus of U.S. merchant ships to foreign flags and to encourage their return to U.S. registry. These range from voluntary action on the part of the "flags of convenience" ship owners to a requirement that a certain percentage of oil imports must be carried in American ships.

The government permits 12 percent of domestic oil consumption to be imported oil. Joseph Kahn, chairman of the board of Seatrains Lines, Inc., argues that if the government required that 25 percent of the imported oil be carried in American ships, there would be "no need for a subsidy of any kind for construction of American flag tankers. It would mean a lot of ships."

A RE-EVALUATION

4. A re-evaluation of the "effective control" theory under which more than 15 million deadweight tons of ships flying the Liberian, Panamanian or Honduran flags are now classified as available to the United States in an emergency.

About 12 million tons of these are in tankers and 3 million in ore-carriers. Since less than 7 million tons of tankers, mostly of World War II vintage, now fly the American flag and the tonnage of ore-carriers is almost nil, members of Congress are asking defense planners how sure they are that the raw materials and fuel needed for our industrial machine would actually be delivered in an emergency.

5. Some form of longterm financing to encourage ship building and reduce the need for government subsidies.

6. More money and more attention to research and development in ship construction. The pending Magnuson-Garmatz bills propose \$25 million for research, and Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson has asked the best engineering brains in the country to work on a long-range research program. He believes new technology is "probably the key to a profitable future" in the maritime industry.

PASSENGER PLAN

7. Revitalizing the American passenger fleet. This may have a low priority with the planners, but labor worries as more and more ship jobs disappear, and American tourists want to sail on the safest ships in the world.

One proposal advocates the sale of unprofitable passenger ships on condition that the ship line agree to construct new ships suitable for the cruise trade so popular today.

Another proposal—regarded by some as something of a lifeline—would permit the merger of passenger operations on a broad consolidated company basis. Garmatz, for one, believes the only way passenger ships are going to be saved is by having one corporation for all American passenger service.

There are hopeful signs in the present gloomy picture.

KEY MARITIME AIDES

First, the men President Nixon picked for the top maritime jobs and for his policy group are all intimately identified with maritime affairs.

Gibson, the maritime administrator, is a former senior vice president for operations of the Grace Line who commanded an ocean freighter at the age of 22—the youngest ship captain in recent merchant marine history.

Undersecretary Siciliano, a former assistant secretary of labor in the Eisenhower administration, was at the time of his new appointment president of the Pacific Maritime Administration, which handles labor relations between West Coast shipping companies and longshoremen's unions.

CARL A PIONEER

Robert Carl, special assistant for transportation to the undersecretary of the Navy, went to sea in the early 1930s as an ordinary seaman and has since pioneered in every aspect of ocean transportation—as a Navy captain, as an organizer of the Military Sea Transportation Service, as a ship owner, as president of the largest marine maintenance corporation in the United States and now as the naval undersecretary's adviser on maritime policy.

Carl asserts that the present Defense Department is fully aware of the importance of the merchant marine and its present depressed state and will support any new program to revive it.

Another hopeful note is the present stance of maritime labor.

Gibson, among others, found it "encouraging that last season's negotiations were carried through with practically no work stoppage, which makes the maritime industry more attractive to investors."

The maritime administrator noted that a lot of work has been done by both unions and management to show investors that things have changed—and that it's now safe for them to put their money into a maritime industry on the threshold of a new era.

TRANQUILLITY GREETES THE EAGLE

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to call to the attention of the House a short but touching poem by Mrs. Natalie H. Dorsey of Boca Raton, Fla., which expresses the religious feeling of one who watched with pride and awe the landing of two Americans on the moon:

Life has its moments of grandeur.
Of drama intense, unsurpassed,
A brief shining moment of wonder,
Repercussion, world-wide and vast;

Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, Mike Collins:
Intrepid, skilled, science-bred;
A whole world breathless and waiting,
As upward, moonward they sped.

Quietly said their Commander
"Tranquility Base Here,"
"The Eagle Has Landed"—historic words,
Humanity spellbound—a cheer, a tear;
We saw, on TV, watching people
Older ones their hearts beating fast;
The young their eyes now alight,
New hope for their future, at last.

What courage and skill—what knowhow!
How proud the U.S. on this day!
How gladly the nations of Earth
Shared our glory, many kneeling to pray.

So God in His wisdom unfailing
Saw fit to permit us this hour
Saw fit to remind a torn-apart world
Of his magnificent, omnipotent power.

GEN. EARLE G. WHEELER'S EXCELLENT SPEECH ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF POLISH SOLDIERS TO THE SURVIVAL OF FREEDOM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, USA, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, was the principal speaker at a banquet held in Washington marking the 25th anniversary of the Polish-American Congress.

In his remarks General Wheeler outlined in a magnificent manner the impressive array of contributions made by Polish soldiers in the struggle for freedom.

I take this opportunity to first congratulate General Wheeler for his deep understanding of the valor of Polish soldiers and also to include his entire speech in the RECORD.

General Wheeler's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. EARLE G. WHEELER, USA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, BEFORE THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1969

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 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 100th 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 sadder, 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 called 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 Anders' 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 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 Communist capabilities and not upon the will-of-the-wisp of Communist 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.

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 traveling 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.*" (Emphasis added.)

"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.*" (Emphasis added.)

No one could possibly wish more for a

lasting 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 men 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 CASE OF THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the 18-year-old vote amendment, I would like to take this opportunity to explain why I consider it to be an important and timely piece of legislation.

On the recent campus tour which I led, a 22-man team of Members, after meeting and talking with over a thousand students in all parts of the country, produced a report to the President. In it, one of the major recommendations we made was lowering the voting age to 18.

Why? To begin with, we found that today's young Americans were better educated, more informed, and more intensely interested in the political process than ever before. On the basis of all available evidence, there was no question about their qualifications.

Second, at a time when there is so much talk of a generation gap and dropping out of society, extending the franchise to include 18-year-olds is a sensible, just countermeasure that will help to keep the vast majority of our young people in the mainstream of our society, where they have an important contribution to make.

To those who hesitate to endorse such a proposal, I would point out that the 18-year-old vote is not uncertain or experimental. It has been tried and tested in individual States with total success—in States, I might add, that do not enjoy any special economic or educational opportunities unavailable elsewhere in the country.

By supporting this proposal, the Congress can make a real contribution to the future of America, and can give a promising, but much-maligned generation of future leaders a vote of confidence at a time when it is sorely needed.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal their most serious consideration, and not to allow the misbehavior of a small minority of our young people to blind them to the tremendous promise of the majority. In historical perspective, this may be one of the most important decisions we will be called on to make in the 91st Congress.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART II

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the critical factors contributing to the outbreak of war between the Arab States and Israel in June 1967 was the prior infusion into the Middle East of large quantities of modern weapons by the major world powers.

The Soviet Union caused—indeed, it initiated—much of the political instability in the area by supplying sophisticated arms to both Egypt and Syria, while Great Britain and France also fueled this instability by selling arms to Israel and Jordan prior to the war.

But what concerns me here is the U.S. arms aid policy in the Middle East. Historically, our policy has apparently been one of balancing opposing forces in the area. Before 1965, we recognized Israel, while declining to sell it arms, but encouraging it to acquire what it needed from our European allies.

On the other hand, we recognized all

Arab States and agreed to supply some of them with limited quantities of weapons. This policy presumably pleased everyone: Jewish people because we recognized the legitimacy of Israel and encouraged our allies to arm it; and the Arab States because we would provide them, not Israel, with weapons.

This policy soon proved inadequate, partially due to heavy Soviet arms shipments into the area and shifting political priorities among our European allies. Thus, today we find ourselves directly contributing to the destabilization of the Middle East by supplying arms to most of the antagonists—precisely what our original policy sought to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, we are firmly committed to the existence of Israel not only because of our heritage but also because she is the only real democracy in the Middle East. When Israel is threatened, I believe we should go to her aid. At the same time we cannot abandon what friends we may have among the Arabs. It is not in our interests to have Israelis and Arabs fighting each other, yet we are nevertheless giving both sides the military hardware to do just that.

Allow me to demonstrate how short sighted and inflexible our policy has become by comparing our actions prior to the 6-day war with those following it.

In March 1965, the United States announced that it no longer would hold off supplying arms to Israel in view of heavy Soviet arms aid to Egypt. By May, Israel was displaying its American-built arms, mostly Hawk missiles. It was later revealed—February 1966—that during the previous year the United States had secretly supplied Israel with Patton tanks in an effort to counter Soviet tank sales to Egypt and Syria.

By then 2 months later, in April 1966, the United States announced that, in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East, it planned to sell "a limited number" of F-104 Starfighters to Jordan. Then only 6 weeks later the United States startled the world by announcing it had secretly agreed to sell tactical jet bombers to Israel as a deterrent against the numerically superior air power of Arab nations. Seven months later, in December, the United States turned around and announced that it planned to give Jordan a variety of armaments—as the New York Times put it, "to bolster her against Israel." And 7 months after that, the 6-day war broke out.

On the Israel-Jordan front, the world witnessed American-equipped Jordanians fighting Israelis in American tanks, and Israelis firing American missiles at Jordanians flying American-built jets.

Thus, over a 2-year period, the United States rushed back and forth between antagonists, first giving arms to one side and then "balancing" matters by giving arms to the other. I maintain that this policy was misguided, myopic, and, as proved, disastrous.

Now, let us see what the United States did following the 6 day war of 1967:

Within 30 days after the cessation of hostilities, the United States announced that arms shipments to both sides would be resumed, and by October 1967, vir-

tually all U.S. arms curbs on the area had been lifted.

Israel has now received more Hawk missiles and a promise of 58 F-4 Phantom jets, to be delivered some time this year. Jordan will soon receive—if it has not already—a second squadron of F-104 Starfighters, as well as additional Patton tanks, armored personnel carriers, self-propelled weapons, 105 millimeter and 155-millimeter guns, and jeep-mounted antitank weapons.

Most of this equipment is being used today in the continuing clashes between Israel and Jordan. The next full-scale outbreak of warfare in the Middle East is, I fear, imminent, and dare we ask what equipment the combatants will use, and who, together with the Soviet Union, must share much of the responsibility for it?

Mr. Speaker, frankly I do not believe that our arms aid policy promotes either tranquility or stability. I refuse to believe that my Government has learned nothing from past mistakes. Perhaps one can overlook a temporarily short-sighted policy, but there is no excuse for us to repeat it in the face of historical evidence that the policy is misguided.

Selling to both sides is at best a temporary expedient, a stop-gap measure designed to stabilize momentarily a critical situation. It is not meant to be a cornerstone of our arms aid policy to the Middle East. Yet, that is what it has become: an official policy actively pursued rather than an interim tactical response.

In order that we not repeat this policy ad infinitum, the United States, in my opinion, must immediately seek long-term solutions. This involves coming to an immediate, broad-based agreement with both our allies and the Soviet Union to put a lid on the Middle East arms race. Whatever agreement is reached must threaten the sovereignty of neither Israel nor the Arab countries, but it must drastically reduce the quantity of arms that are currently flowing into the area.

It is obvious that our State Department must get off dead center and act far more aggressively in its search for a solution. I call on those individuals within our Government who are directly responsible for such matters to seek nothing less than placing the question of conventional arms control in the Middle East as a top priority item to be discussed at the forthcoming Geneva Disarmament Conference.

Under the leadership of the President, our State Department, our disarmament negotiators and the executive establishment we must begin to resolve this critically dangerous matter now.

TOPICS: INDIA, ASIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has just returned from a tour of Asia and India—a tour during which he

made clear the need for a new role for the United States to assume in its future Asian policies. The economic and cultural progress of India's democratic government since its independence from Great Britain in 1947—progress largely spurred by U.S. economic assistance—is an exemplary case of what our future policies in Asia should be. We must encourage large nations like India, Japan, and Indonesia to assert a larger role in Asia—to assume and share more of the responsibility in Asia rather than relying so heavily on American military assistance and intervention. A stable democracy like India, characterized by steadily increasing living standards, offers a far better alternative to totalitarianism for the small developing nations of Asia than all the military aid and intervention that the United States can muster.

It is time that we changed the startlingly naive philosophy that U.S. military might is going to influence the underdeveloped nations of Asia toward democracy, or that military intervention alone will contain communism in that area and help secure world peace. Our experience in Vietnam graphically illustrates the fallacy and absurdity of that kind of reasoning. Expanding U.S. trade and economic assistance to these large nations, rather than simply relying on military aid and involvement, can greatly strengthen political and cultural stability within Asia. Only through the striking example of democracies like Japan and India can our system of government spread throughout Asia. Only by assisting their peaceful progress toward a high standard of living, increased economic stability, cultural progress, and stable government, can we hope to achieve peace in Asia. It is time to direct our Asian policy toward this goal, to initiate a more farsighted approach to a continent that contains a larger population than the other four continents combined.

Chester Bowles, former U.S. ambassador to India, points out the need for such an approach in a column published August 2 in the New York Times. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put this column in the RECORD at this point:

TOPICS: INDIA, ASIA, AND THE UNITED STATES
(By Chester Bowles)

(NOTE.—Chester Bowles served as Ambassador to India for six years.)

President Nixon's one-day "splashdown" in New Delhi this week focused attention on India's international role. Once that role is fully understood by the American Government, our policies in all of Asia will become more realistic.

Strategically located and with a population greater than Latin America and Africa combined, India is influential in lands beyond her own borders. A politically stable India, with steadily rising living standards, is essential to a stable Asia.

The Vietnam war has demonstrated that even with our great military power and industrial capacity, the United States cannot play an influential part in Asia as long as our political support is limited to a few, relatively small, nations. Japan, India and Indonesia, representing over 90 per cent of all

non-Communist Asians, must carry their share of the responsibility.

India can play a more effective role. An extraordinary expansion of agricultural output coupled with a steady increase in exports and a broad forward movement of Indian industry has created a new sense of hope. Although population control is a major problem, a vigorous family planning program is now moving ahead. Indian leaders are confident that, with adequate assistance, they can achieve close to economic self-sufficiency within five or six years.

A primary hurdle is the annual foreign exchange outlay of about \$500 million to the U.S., the World Bank and other consortium nations for capital repayments and interest on past loans. A debt moratorium which would postpone these payments for, say, five years would greatly ease the pressure and go far to assure India's success.

ALLIES AND DOLLARS

We should have no illusions, however, about economic assistance. Our aid program will not enable us to purchase the friendship of the recipient nations of their unquestioning support for whatever positions we may take in the United Nations. In the case of India, the only valid purpose for our economic assistance is to enable the Indian Government and its people to achieve political viability and economic progress.

On military assistance, the assertion by our Government, in Congressional hearings and elsewhere, that we sell massive quantities of lethal equipment abroad to "foster world peace and encourage economic development" is regarded by our friends as naive and by our critics as downright dishonest.

In the early 1950's, when our military assistance programs were first launched in Asia, our rationale was the containment of China and the U.S.S.R. and in several key situations our assistance, no doubt, made a significant contribution. However, in later years the justification for these programs has become increasingly political and in consequence they have proliferated in areas irrelevant to the original objective.

In actual practice, many of our military assistance programs have increased tensions, raised the military budgets of developing countries, identified us with unpopular dictators and juntas, and convinced people who should be our friends that the United States Government is more interested in peddling arms at a profit or shoring up reactionary regimes than in fostering the cause of peace.

With my wife I have visited almost every corner of India. Everywhere we have found a deep sense of friendliness and appreciation for Americans as individuals and as a people. There have been fewer anti-American demonstrations here than in almost any developing nation.

I understand and often share the frustrations that leading Americans sometimes feel in regard to India. India can be very exasperating indeed. "What," a friend of mine once asked, "has India ever done for us?"

STABILITY IN ASIA

The answer to this question is clear. Since the British left in 1947, India has survived as a stable and democratic nation. In these twenty-two year economic and social progress have been significantly greater than in the previous 200 years under colonialism. The Indian Government and people have maintained not only national unity but freedom of speech, a free press and free, orderly elections.

Indian democracy is an inevitable competitor to totalitarian China. If India succeeds, the prospects for the stability and peace of Asia will be vastly increased.

ALABAMA'S BIRTH AS A STATE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, my State of Alabama held ceremonies commemorating the 150th anniversary of the adoption of a resolution of statehood and a State constitution. Although this took place on August 2, 1819, it was not until December 14 of that year that Alabama was officially admitted to the Union.

In ceremonies at Huntsville, where the constitutional convention was held 150 years ago, Postmaster General Winton Blount unveiled a postage stamp honoring our entry into the Union. Also present to deliver the principle address was our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), who is a direct descendent of John William Walker, president of the 1819 constitutional convention.

In honor of this occasion the Montgomery Advertiser reran a column written by the late Judge Walter B. Jones. Judge Jones was one of our Nation's most distinguished jurists during his 43 years on the bench. His column, "Off the Bench," which appeared in the December 17, 1962, Advertiser, depicted the signing by President Monroe of the resolution creating the State of Alabama.

I find this column most interesting and very appropriate to the very historic occasion which we in Alabama are celebrating this year. I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ALABAMA'S BIRTH AS A STATE

Today is the 150th anniversary of Alabama's adoption of a resolution of statehood and a state constitution by a convention assembled at Huntsville. That was Aug. 2, 1819. On Dec. 14 of that year, Alabama was admitted to the Union.

The late Judge Walter B. Jones, who died six years ago yesterday at his home on Adams Avenue, wrote the following column for The Advertiser about the office of President James Monroe on that December day when the August resolution was received and acted on.

Judge Jones, son of a former Governor and a circuit judge for 43 years, wrote a weekly column, "Off the Bench," for The Advertiser for 33 years, from Dec. 14, 1925, to March 31, 1941 and from Dec. 1, 1947 to June 2, 1963, when his illness forced him to discontinue it. He had interrupted the column between 1941 and 1947 to write a massive legal work.

In commemoration of his death and the birth of Alabama as a state, we are reprinting his column of Dec. 17, 1962.

OFF THE BENCH

(By Judge Walter B. Jones, 1888-1963)

DECEMBER 17, 1962.—On a dreary December afternoon, 143 years ago Friday last, down on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington City, a little town of about 13,000 population, two-thirds of whom were white, a chilly damp wind swept in from the Potomac, moaning through the trees surrounding a large white building. The building had been burned by British troops

only a few years before, and now rebuilt and painted white to hide the marks of the fire, it was the official residence of the president of the United States.

While it was cold and damp outside the building, big wood fires made the inside fairly comfortable. In a large room on an upper floor huge oak logs piled high upon the fire, blazed cheerfully on the hearth, brightening and warming the room. At an oval table a few feet back from the fireplace a tall, thin man sat looking over a bundle of official documents just handed him. Occasionally he put his signature to some of the documents.

The distinguished looking man seated at the table was Virginia-born James Monroe, fifth president of the United States, a battle-scarred hero of the Revolution and four times governor of Virginia. His grayish-blue eyes were deepset and kindly. He was six feet tall, but being stoop-shouldered and ungainly, seemed of less height. His face was delicately refined.

Monroe's eight years in the White House were known as the "Era of Good Feeling." In a message to Congress, December 1823, he stated the Monroe Doctrine that the United States would regard as an unfriendly act any attempt by a European nation to interfere in the affairs of the American countries or to increase its possessions on the American continents.

In his reelection to the presidency in 1820 he received all the votes cast in the electoral college but one cast by a New Hampshire presidential elector for John Quincy Adams in order that no one might share with Washington the honor of a unanimous election.

With the President were two of his clerks, his vice president, Daniel B. Tompkins, formerly governor of New York for 10 years; and the President's Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, the son of the second president of the United States and in a few years to succeed Mr. Monroe in the presidential office.

As the clerk handed the papers from Congress to Secretary of State Adams, sitting at Mr. Monroe's right hand, the former read them to the President, stating to him the purpose and legislative history of the bills and resolutions.

"Now, Mr. President," said the Secretary of State, picking up a document from the table, "here's a resolution I know you'll be happy to sign."

"Yes?" inquired the President.

"It's a resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives which gives us a new state," replied Mr. Adams. "It puts into effect an act you approved last March to enable the people of the Alabama Territory to form a constitution and a state government and for the admission of the territory as a state into the Union."

"How does the resolution read, Mr. Adams?" asked the President, "and what are its chief provisions?"

"Well, it is a resolution declaring the admission of the state of Alabama into the Union," replied the Secretary of State, "and the resolution recites the fact that on Aug. 2, last, the people, by a convention called for that purpose at Huntsville, formed themselves a constitution and state government. These are republican and conform to the principles of the articles of compact between the original states and the people and the states in the Northwest Territory."

"And does the resolution," inquired the president, "admit Alabama on an equal footing with the original states? Please read me the text as to this point, Mr. Secretary."

Mr. Adams read: "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the state of Alabama shall be one and is

hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever."

"Very good. Let me approve the resolution," said the president.

The document was handed to Mr. Monroe, who then moved his inkhorn closer and taking the quill of a feather used in those days as a pen for writing, he wrote the words "Approved, Dec. 14, 1819," and under them signed "James Monroe."

"Now, gentlemen," said Mr. Monroe, "the Union has a new member, Alabama has just become our 22nd state. So let us stand and salute the new state with a toast. Fill every glass up. Pour forth the cheering wine."

The President stood up beside the table facing the south, all following his example. Secretary Adams poured bright sherry from a handsome old cutglass decanter into each small wine glass. When all the glasses had been filled, the President lifted his glass, and standing his full six feet in height, said: "Let us drink in honor of our youngest state." He paused, each lifted high his glass and faced Mr. Monroe as he said:

"I drink to Alabama and her people. May God graciously smile upon the state and bless her people with all goodness, happiness and prosperity." Each glass was lifted high.

The President, the Vice President and the Secretary of State resumed their seats, a servant chucked up the fire. The President turned his attention to other official documents. The ink dried on his signature to the joint resolution. The Territory of Alabama, after a brief life of two years, had passed on into history; and come July 4 in the Union of the flag there would be another five-pointed white star in the cluster on the blue field.

That star, the 22nd, first put in the flag July 4, 1820, represents our state, Alabama and her 3,000,000 people.

NEW YORK TIMES CORRECTS A 1920 ERROR

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had occasion to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the sedate New York Times on January 13, 1920, in which the New York Times sharply scolded Prof. Robert H. Goddard for suggesting that man could develop a rocket which could free itself from the pull of the earth's gravity and could propel itself into space.

I said then how tragically wrong the New York Times was.

It was with great pleasure that I read a United Press International dispatch of New York on July 18 which reported that the New York Times ran a correction admitting that Goddard was indeed right.

I obviously do not agree with many parts of the New York Times' editorial policy. Nevertheless, I am sure we will all agree it takes a great newspaper to correct an error, even if such a correction does come a half century later.

The UPI story follows:

TIMES CORRECTS A 1920 ERROR

NEW YORK, July 17.—The New York Times ran a correction today on an error made in 1920 about the future of rockets.

The Times, on Jan. 13, 1920, scoffed at Professor Robert H. Goddard, the father of space exploration, for believing a rocket could function in a vacuum. "He only seems to lack the knowledge ladled out daily in high schools, the Times wrote.

With the Apollo 11 headed for the moon today, the Times decided:

"It is now definitely established that a rocket can function in a vacuum.

"The Times regrets the error."

THE INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Intercity Rail Passenger Service Act, introduced today by my distinguished colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and 17 colleagues, is an important step forward in assuring modern, convenient, attractive railroad passenger service in the years ahead. This legislation deserves the support of everyone who is concerned over increasing congestion on our highways and in our airways, and who realizes the urgent need for a balanced system of transportation in our Nation.

I am today introducing a bill identical to that sponsored by the gentleman from Washington with one important addition. My bill contains a section requiring as a condition precedent for assistance under the act the approval by the Secretary of Transportation of a comprehensive program submitted by each railroad for service and safety improvements in passenger service. I think it vital that the railroads make a positive commitment in the passenger service area in order to obtain Federal assistance.

In all other respects, my bill is identical to the Adams bill, and I want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance this effort received from the National Association of Railroad Passengers and its founder and chairman, Anthony Haswell.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to purchase and to rehabilitate existing passenger equipment or to purchase new equipment where the railroads or regional transportation authorities are unable to provide such equipment themselves. The equipment pool created by the bill would be leased by the Department of Transportation at a cost which will cover the operating expenses.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I intend to press for early hearings on this legislation. We have delayed far too long in taking action to preserve and improve railroad passenger service. "his bill, as a companion measure to the mass transit trust fund legislation I introduced earlier, and a comprehensive railroad safety bill I will introduce next week, should provide a sound basis for revitalizing a vital sector of our national transportation picture.

RESEARCH AND PESTICIDES

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy over the use of DDT and other persistent chemicals, too little public attention is being directed toward the efforts which have been and are being made to develop safe and effective alternatives to long-lasting agricultural pesticides. I refer specifically to the ongoing research efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the area of biological control of insect pests.

For a number of years now, research entomologists in USDA's Agricultural Research Service have been quietly and diligently searching for better and more effective ways to control the population of man's natural adversaries in the insect world—and they have been succeeding. In my own State of Washington, ARS researchers are exploring biological control methods for the codling moth, a serious and highly destructive apple pest.

The Washington fruit industry actively and enthusiastically supports this program, and growers have organized Pest Control Districts in order to facilitate the cooperative sanitation measures necessary to the success of a biological control project. This program is on the verge of moving from the research stage to large scale field application if adequate funds are made available. Other biological control efforts such as the screwworm and pink bollworm programs have shown success in the past and promise for the future.

This is a story which needs to be told, and the Wall Street Journal is to be commended for singling it out for front page treatment. It is an exciting story—a challenging one—and staff reporter Burt Schorr has done an excellent job of putting it together for public attention. The only thing I would add to the following article, Mr. Speaker, would be a plea for increased public support for even greater research and developmental efforts in the field of biological control.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1969]

REPLACING DDT—U.S. RESEARCHERS GAIN IN EFFORTS TO DEVELOP SAFER INSECT CONTROLS—BIOLOGICAL METHODS SUCCEED AGAINST SEVERAL PESTS; INDUSTRY WILL FEEL IMPACT—BAD NEWS FOR THE BOLL WEEVIL

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—The famed bug-killer DDT is losing its deadly wallop and falling into disfavor as a threat to wildlife and mankind. But even if DDT fades from use, the insects will hardly take over the world, for potential replacements are on the way.

In fact, U.S. entomologists appear close to an important advance in man's age-old war against the insects that devour his crops. This attack won't be spearheaded by the well-known chemical insecticides but an expanding arsenal of biological controls based on weapons provided by nature. If the approach succeeds as hoped, it may sooner or later reduce the use of chemical insecticides—and

any resulting pollution of the environment. The effort will include:

Massive deployment of bugs that are harmless to man but prey on crop-destroying pests.

Large-scale sterilization of adult insects to disrupt their reproductive cycle.

Use of synthetic copies of the natural scents secreted by pest species to lure bugs to their destruction.

Such biological-control methods are showing high promise in field tests. And some Agriculture Department officials predict that in certain parts of the country biological warfare, coupled with limited use of chemicals, will soon make possible the almost-complete eradication of the cotton boll weevil, now probably the nation's costliest single pest.

IMPACT ON INDUSTRY

By the early 1970s, some experts say, insecticide producers might find their domestic farm market—now calculated at around \$110 million annually—leveling off or shrinking.

In the long run, though, such de-emphasis on farm insecticides might indirectly benefit the chemical industry; it might help prevent current clamor against bug-killers such as DDT from swelling into a drive for tougher restrictions on chemical pesticides generally, including weed-killers.

One of the promising experiments with biological techniques is now going forward in the Coachella Valley of Southern California, where farmers used to spray more than 4,600 cotton acres with chemicals to combat pink bollworm infestations.

Most mornings before dawn these summer days, a yellow Agriculture Department plane sweeps above the valley floor spewing out thousands of sterilized male and female adult pink bollworm moths through a tube projecting from the cabin. Chilled immobile at about 38 degrees, the gray-winged insects cascade into the warmer air, then revive to mate with normal adults in the cotton fields below. The union frustrates the pairing of fertile moths and produces no eggs or destructive larvae. Avoidance of insecticide-spraying helps preserve insects that normally prey on cotton pests other than the pink bollworm.

CABBAGE PATCH RESEARCH

Another progress report comes from a cabbage patch near Columbia, Mo. There, the cabbageworm, which chomps destructively on a variety of vegetables, including spinach and broccoli as well as cabbage, has been frustrated by the release of a tiny parasite wasp.

The wasp injects its eggs into the cabbageworm eggs on plant leaves; when the wasp grubs emerge, they devour the host eggs. Employing this and other biological techniques, Government entomologist Frank D. Parker has eliminated over 99% of the cabbageworms from the test plot—and all insecticides as well.

Not everyone, though, is as optimistic about biological-control possibilities as Federal researchers are. Many farmers, insecticide makers and state legislators resisting restrictions on DDT are distinctly skeptical. They contend it may be several years before effective alternatives are really ready. And they question the practicality of releasing sterilized adult insects, claiming that with some species it would be necessary to deploy as many as 50 times the normal insect population.

At any rate, Government entomologists are pushing confidently ahead, armed with knowledge of past successes. As long ago as 1888, one Agriculture Department pioneer found a ladybird beetle in Australia that preys on a pest called the cottony-cushion scale, then threatening to wipe out California citrus groves. After two years of beetle shipments from Down Under, the scale was brought under control.

INTEREST WANES

Interest in biological methods waned following the spectacular successes of DDT during World War II and the rapid proliferation of chemical insecticides in the postwar years. Reece I. Sailer, chief of Agriculture's parasitic insect branch in Beltsville, Md., recalls somewhat bitterly that some 25 Government scientists were working on biological controls in 1938, but by 1955 the number had declined to only a half-dozen or so.

Soon after that, however, interest in the biological approach began to revive, and some notable victories followed: In recent years, massive releases of sterilized male screwworm flies have reduced the population of this Southern and Western cattle pest; annual savings to livestock producers from Florida to California are estimated at \$120 million. And the Japanese beetle, which once chewed on nearly 300 species of U.S. plants, has largely succumbed to a dusting program that spread a disease that attacked the Nipponese invader.

Today Uncle Sam has over 170 entomologists, chemists and other specialists busy on biological control projects. One important center, the Federal Entomology Research Laboratory at Columbia, Mo., which opened in 1966, has just this year begun producing sufficient wasp eggs for experimental use against the cotton bollworm in Texas and the apple-boring codling moth larva in Indiana.

In part, the resurgent interest in biological control springs from increased public concern about chemical dangers. DDT and some other long-lasting chemical insecticides, rather than breaking down harmlessly within a few weeks after spraying, often retain their potency for long periods—up to 15 years in cases of especially heavy DDT applications. If these chemicals enter the chain of food production, they can build up in the fatty tissues of animals and human beings with possibly harmful consequences.

This year Michigan barred all use of DDT except by public health agencies and indoor pest exterminators. And the Arizona Pesticide Control Board, faced with the problem of too much DDT in milk, ordered a one-year halt to commercial farm applications of the chemical and a related formula, DDD.

Currently, the Wisconsin Natural Resources Department is considering a statewide DDT ban; the legislature's lower house has already approved such prohibition. Also, the U.S. Agriculture Department has suspended use in its spraying programs of nine persistent insecticides, including DDT, until it re-evaluates their environment impact.

The attack on DDT comes at a time when its use is declining in the U.S. Production for U.S. markets totaled only 40 million pounds in the 1966-67 crop year (the latest period available), about half the 1958-59 level. A major reason is mounting insect resistance to DDT; new strains of bugs seem impervious to its effects.

(Even so, restrictions on DDT pose a threat to pesticides generally, contends the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, voice of the industry. Noting the association's vigorous DDT defense in Wisconsin, where annual sales total a piddling \$17,000, NACA President Parke C. Brinkley says, "We're trying to hold the line there because if we lose in Wisconsin we could lose everywhere." He worries most about a possible move in Congress to bar interstate sales of DDT or other pesticides.)

In theory at least, other chemical insecticides might offer alternatives to DDT. There are two newer insecticide families, the organic phosphates and organic carbamates, which break down in hours or days after application. But they are more costly than DDT, and some of them also show signs of declining effectiveness.

In the case of the cotton crop; many experts now believe the solution to its problems lies in biological-plus-chemical suppression of the boll weevil. With the need for weevil spraying reduced dramatically, natural enemies of the bollworm could recover. "This would reduce the need for bollworm spraying by 75%," asserts Theodore B. Davich, chief of the Federal boll weevil lab at State College, Miss.

SEX EDUCATION

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, there is often more heat than light in discussions regarding sex education in the classroom. When an occasional article contributes an illuminating viewpoint, it is worthy of our attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend the following editorial from the July 28, 1969, issue of the Detroit News to the attention of my colleagues:

SEX EDUCATION: FACT OR FANCY?

Problems in sex education? Of course. We would hardly expect a subject as personal and emotionally charged as sex to glide effortlessly from concept to classroom. But one sex education problem that should be thrown out immediately is the politically-tinged criticism of bedrock conservatives who substitute noise for debate, red herrings for issues and blanket condemnation for careful study.

It is possible that the real problems raised by sex education in the schools will prove so difficult that a worthwhile program is impossible to attain. Earnest investigators still admit we are a long way from definitive answers as to who shall teach what, when.

And it is possible that even sincere proponents expect too much, or the wrong results, from "model" programs. It may be that sex education will not "pay off" in terms of less venereal disease, "promiscuity" or "deviant behavior." It may be that the real dividends of sexual knowledge lie in understanding and accepting sexuality philosophically, morally and personally. A "model" program directed toward the wrong results could produce clinically-astute, substantively-ignorant individuals.

But how can these questions be explored and objectively answered, if discussion degenerates into name-calling, fear-mongering, and political mouse-trapping? How can concerned parents and responsible educators shape initial programs or make policy decisions when the air is clogged with cries of "pornography," Communist plots and blue-nose shock?

More important, how can we bow to the flag-wavers who piously argue that sex education should be left to the "parents, churches and schools on a local level," when the ignorance, tragedy, and failure of that brand of sex education is evident everywhere? State guidelines for sex education in the schools are surely the first step in trying to improve the record of existing channels of sex education.

The terrain of sex education is necessarily uneven and pitted with obstacles. If society is to master it, it must first refuse to be put off or stopped by political opportunists who would seize the issue for their own ends. The road to worthwhile sex education can be paved only by concentrating on the basic questions, not the bombast of self-appointed moralists.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, whenever the Public Works Committee, its members, or staff visit areas stricken or threatened by natural disaster, they are impressed by the universal praise that the citizens of those areas express concerning the Army Corps of Engineers. In no small measure this is a result of the efforts and ability of Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, who retired August 1, 1969. General Cassidy has been director of the nationwide water resources program since his appointment in July 1965. During that time the programs that he has so effectively administered and so diligently nurtured have exceeded a billion dollars every year. General Cassidy has managed these programs well and despite many problems that have been imposed upon the Corps of Engineers due to the need for funds elsewhere these projects have by and large been advanced.

The extensive projects engineered and executed by the Corps of Engineers under General Cassidy's direction stagger the imagination when we consider them in the light of past history and in the light of the benefits that we are deriving from nearly every portion of the country. The development of river-basin projects, the control of floods and the establishment of protection to our shorelines from erosion have been of tremendous importance to this country.

In my home State of Florida, General Cassidy has been responsible for the study of the Intracoastal Waterway Caloosahatchee to the Withlacoochee and from St. Marks to Tampa Bay.

In the area of conservation—an area of deep concern to me—the corps of Engineers and General Cassidy have been responsible for the protection of our shorelines from erosion. In addition, the project to preserve one of our greatest national parks, the Everglades National Park, assuring that sufficient water remains to preserve its unique character, has been again the responsibility of General Cassidy.

Those of us who have been dealing with General Cassidy and whose interest is heavily on the side of conservation have been impressed by the general's desire to protect our environment and to preserve our Nation's beauty. In many cases, projects that many people thought would be a regrettable but necessary sacrifice of a natural area turned out to be because of his interest and enhancement of those areas. In this regard, corps created lakes have provided a much-needed source of recreational opportunity to those of us who need to spend time closer to nature and through it, in communion with the Almighty.

I join with the many Members of this House and the members of the Public Works Committee in commending General Cassidy for a job well done and in wishing him well for the future.

PHILLIPS: A MAN WHO GETS THINGS DONE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, few men have the background, tenacity, dedication, and outstanding competence of Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, Director of the Apollo Program. General Phillips has been dedicated to public service throughout his entire life. An excellent article in the July 1969 issue of Today portrays well the contributions of General Phillips to our national space program. I commend this article to the reading of my colleagues and to the general public, as follows:

PHILLIPS: A MAN WHO GETS THINGS DONE

The man could walk around the Apollo launch pad unrecognized by the majority of the workers who prepare moonships for launch.

Dressed in a dark business suit, he might well be a visiting businessman except for his bearing, which says "military."

The man has been responsible for spending more than thirty billion taxpayer dollars to create the most sophisticated system in history.

Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, 48, is winding up five years as director of the Apollo Program for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He is ready, in fact anxious, to get back to the normalcy of the military after 10 years of hectic living-out-of-a-suitcase, billion-dollar responsibility.

Before he was chosen to lead the Apollo Program, Gen. Phillips took over development of the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile development program. At the time he was an obscure Air Force colonel.

Within months Phillips earned a reputation as an effective, brilliant manager.

But even in multi-billion dollar programs like Minuteman and Apollo, Phillips is little known to the public; however civil servants, congressmen and Presidents know him as a man who can get things done.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, the German-born rocket expert credited with the design of America's moon rocket, gives the credit for Apollo's success to Gen. Phillips' management techniques.

Business colleges know Gen. Phillips as the father of "systems engineering" or "systems management," a method of doing business which is reaching into all big industries.

Military men know him as father of the Minuteman missile, the first missile which worked right the first time it was tried.

And the public knows him—if at all—as author of the "Phillips report," a critical assessment of space contractors' Apollo workmanship which reached print even though it was supposed to be a secret intragovernmental letter.

When Gen. Phillips returns to the military, he'd prefer not to return as a program director. He's had enough.

"The job of program director of a big program is very demanding," Phillips says. "And 10 years in the hot heat is a long, long time."

The past five years as boss of Apollo have been particularly tough.

"There are a lot of important decisions a program director has to make pretty much on a personal basis," Gen. Phillips recalls.

It was Gen. Phillips, for example, who decided to send Frank Borman and the Apollo 8 crew around the moon last December, even though men had never flown on the Saturn 5 rocket before.

"In my mind it was a private and personal thing," he says.

The decision to send the Apollo 11 crew to the moon to land was one that "made itself," as Gen. Phillips explained it. The equipment and the people had all been tested. Once Apollo 10 proved the preliminary steps could be accomplished, it was a matter of taking "one more big bite."

Gen. Phillips, a tall slender man who still walks in a hurry and stands and sits erect, a holdover from his military background, had ample training for those crucial decisions.

It was Gen. Phillips, then a brigadier general, who had to decide when Minuteman missiles were safe enough to place them into silos across the country and leave them unattended, with nuclear warheads pointed skyward.

Moments like that have made Phillips keenly aware of what he calls "the burden" of responsibility.

"I like responsibility," he hastily adds, "and wouldn't have it any other way."

But he can't help but feel the pressure of "travel . . . absence from home and family . . . The days are long day after day and week after week."

"But there are satisfactions too," Phillips adds, "Results I think are important for the country."

He knows better than anyone that success is good for the space program. "I personally think a vigorous continuing manned space program is important to the strength of the country."

Like most key space agency officials, Gen. Phillips makes a convincing case for manned programs and for the space budget. He recalls somewhat wistfully when the agency was receiving nearly \$6 billion a year from congress, "and looking at \$7 billion."

"Now it's down to almost \$3 billion in spite of the tremendous accomplishments."

Gen. Phillips strongly believes that the space program stands up well when compared to social programs such as welfare.

"Space exploration is producing much for the country in terms of capability, techniques and stature in the international arena," he contends.

Even though he is temporarily detached from the military to work for the space agency, he obviously restrains himself when talking about the values of federal programs.

But now Gen. Phillips is expecting to put back on his blue Air Force suit and work for the military again.

Gen. Phillips was born in a small lumber town in Arizona where his father was an electrician.

He graduated from the University of Wyoming in 1942 as an electrical engineer and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army.

After the war, the highly-decorated Major remained in Europe for three years and then returned to earn a master's degree at the University of Michigan.

TEENAGE VOLUNTEERS GIVE AID TO KIDNEY DISEASE PATIENTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, an unusual and tragic situation confronts many citizens affected by kidney diseases.

Medical science research and development have made possible techniques for diagnosis and prevention of these diseases; yet, people continue to die from kidney-related ailments simply because

of a severe lack of funds and facilities to make full use of existing technology.

Hospital treatment with a kidney machine is much too expensive for the average American. It can cost up to \$40,000 per year, and even for patients who can afford the luxury, not enough machines are available.

Again, this session, I am sponsoring with the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRESTER) legislation to combat this problem. What medical research needs now is a Government program to encourage education and training of personnel and to fund research and demonstration projects for implementing treatment techniques on a mass basis which would mean lower costs for kidney disease sufferers. Such programs require combined funds and efforts at all government levels, by medical schools, medical societies, and by nonprofit research groups. The proposed legislation, H.R. 12425, would begin to act in all these areas.

In lieu of a large-scale national approach, various local programs have already been initiated. A group of 40 Los Angeles teenagers are now in their second year of such a program which is being carried out at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in the 29th Congressional District of California.

Under direction of Mrs. Douglas Marlow, the teenage volunteers assemble and package dialysis kits for kidney disease patients, and, according to the Los Angeles Times:

Without the help of the young volunteers, patients here would have to pay 2 to 2½ times more for supplies.

I applaud the spirit and dedication of these 40 young Los Angeles men and women. The people of the 29th District can be proud to be involved in this pioneering effort to make the wonders of science possible for more Americans. It is just this type program which H.R. 12425 could support in many other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article from the Los Angeles Times, "Teens Go Beyond Their Years in Service," at this point in the RECORD:

TEENS GO BEYOND THEIR YEARS IN SERVICE
(By Evelyn de Wolfe)

"Teen-agers who make the headlines usually are those who are in trouble or causing trouble. How come you're doing a story on us?" asked 14-year-old Jane Lowenthal, one of 40 teen-agers committed to year-round volunteer service for Cedars-Sinai Medical Center's kidney dialysis program.

Jane and others of her group believe they represent only a small portion of a majority in the younger generation concerned with hope, love and peace.

"We're actually a cross-section of the teenage community, not just a small clique of dogooders," said 15-year-old Bob Danziger, another young paramedical volunteer. "You can't label us. Some of us are liberals; others are moderates. We may even have some conservatives."

"I think what's really important is when a project like this can bring such a diverse group together and give it a purpose that supersedes all differences. When our country becomes united on this basis, we'll have no trouble maintaining peace and economic stability."

The youth project at Cedars-Sinai is re-

ferred to as the "40-foot table." It's just that—a 40-foot table where hundreds of home dialysis kits are assembled and packaged for use in the hospital and for distribution to patients afflicted with kidney diseases.

The youngsters, ranging in age from 13 to 17, call their working area "our cage." Each has pledged a year of service and as a group they have given a total of 12,563 hours to the project. It was initiated two years ago by Mrs. Douglas Marlow, director of dialysis volunteers.

Mrs. Marlow's involvement, also on a volunteer basis, stems from personal experience. Her son, Gordon Marlow, suffers from a kidney disease and was the first home dialysis patient in Southern California.

Medical science has registered considerable progress in the kidney field, both through transplantation and the use of the artificial kidney machine, Mrs. Marlow said. But, she adds, there only 100 patients on kidney machines in California and only 35 patients who have these life-saving machines at home.

Mrs. Marlow at first attempted to organize an adult volunteer group to help defray costs and lighten the load for staff members in the kidney dialysis program but adults were not readily available for long-term service.

"When I proposed using youngsters in the project, the first reaction was one of skepticism," she said. "Could they be depended upon? Would they be sufficiently motivated?"

"With the help of Dr. Arthur Gordon and our hospital's supervisor of dialysis nurses, Miss Louise Hanes, we initiated the program on July 6, 1967."

Each of the young volunteers, most of whom were recruited from the Westside Jewish Community Center, signs up for one year of service in order to make the extensive training worthwhile.

It also gives them an opportunity for in-depth understanding of the 17 different processes they are taught in the making of blood lines, clotting equipment, connectors and other essential parts of artificial kidney machines that fit into the shunt which is permanently implanted in the kidney patient.

They receive instruction in putting together the kidney machine, its sterilization and operation. And they have discussion sessions about present procedures and also lecture in schools.

To humanize the experience, Mrs. Marlow has each student spend one night at her home to watch her son Gordon dialyze on the kidney machine. Each is then asked to describe his or her reactions to the experience.

After this indoctrination Merrick Sayers reported: "I was making the parts for the machine and knew where the parts fit but it was not until I saw the blood leaving the body and entering the machine that I realized what life really was."

REAL INVOLVEMENT

Tina Pasternack feels "it's a chance for real involvement. Nothing is so meaningful as when patients come in to see you just to let you know how grateful they are."

Young volunteers learn that kidney diseases claim at least 100,000 lives each year in the United States, 700 in Southern California alone and that only 2,000 are being kept alive by dialysis machines.

In a hospital the cost to a patient for dialysis twice a week for a year is between \$20,000 to \$40,000. To maintain a patient in home dialysis the cost is between \$3,000 and \$5,000. Without the help of the young volunteers, patients here would have to pay 2 to 2½ times more for supplies.

Last December a group of 12 volunteers made a trip to Mexico City at the invitation of Dr. Luis Cervantes, director of the Government Hospital Kidney Center in Mexico City, who had seen the teen volunteer project in operation at Cedars-Sinai.

On their 16-day goodwill tour (for which they received some financial assistance from comedian Tommy Smothers) they taught doctors and nurses at two Mexican hospitals how to assemble the dialysis kits. In that period, they saved the Mexican kidney program more than \$2,600.

EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Tommy Smothers and scriptwriter Jo Himes have become honorary chairmen of an adult group—We-Kare (Women Engaged in Kidney Advancement in Research and Education.) The group is comprised primarily of mothers of the teen volunteers and was founded by Mrs. William Furman, mother of 17-year-old Paul Furman. The young group has adopted the name of Kare-Teens for its sideline activities as an auxiliary of We-Kare.

As a result of the successful outcome of the Mexican trip an exchange program has been started by Dr. Cervantes whereby two American teen-agers, members of Teen-Kare, will go to Mexico and two Mexican teenagers will come to Los Angeles.

The two American teenagers leaving this month for a summer stay and volunteer internship at the hospital in Mexico City are Ellen Satenstein and Leonard Friedman.

Leonard has given 1,000 volunteer hours to the dialysis project and is one of 10 of the original 18 volunteers who started with the program two years ago.

He works directly with doctors at Cedars-Sinai and is involved in building artificial kidneys for metabolic research on dogs. He devotes four afternoons a week to this volunteer activity.

"Besides getting me started on my career in medicine 12 years early, I think this whole experience will make me a better person," says Leonard. "I get to meet people who would be dead if it weren't for our work. When they express their gratitude and make you feel you're doing something really important, the few hours a day we give up to help them seems like no trouble at all."

A PROGRAM TO COMBAT PRETEEN DELINQUENCY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the seed of delinquency can be weeded out before it takes root, potential delinquents will instead become useful members of society. The National Social Conditioning Camps are structured to combat delinquency before it takes root. I include in the RECORD a booklet describing the work of this worthwhile, non-profit organization. National headquarters of the organization are located in Washington, D.C., with regional office in New York City, Post Office Box 1804. The material follows:

IN THE WILDERNESS OF THE ALARMING FACTS AND FIGURES ABOUT THE PRE-TEEN DELINQUENCY—IS THERE A VOICE CRYING TO BE HEARD?—COULD IT BE YOURS?

If you are a parent or a thinking member of your community, concerned with your children, your schools and churches, your playgrounds, guidance centers, your courts and social agencies—

That voice might well be yours—saying "It's our job to prevent even the seeds of pre-teen delinquency from taking root!"

For one blight destroys an orchard . . . and the prevention of any blight to our Nation's most precious heritage—our children—must be one of major concern to us all.

Educators, psychologists, sociologists—all know that the most likely candidates for pre-teen delinquency are the children who feel confused, deserted, lonely, helpless and unable to cope with problems that seem overwhelming. They are beset with anxieties. Their families often lack the understanding and ability to help them. And, although we sometimes hear of the "upper middle class" pre-teen delinquent, the fact is incontrovertible that the real spawning ground of pre-teen delinquency is *economic poverty*, the broken home and the lack of spiritual and intellectual inspiration and motivation necessary for the maturation of every one of us.

Indeed—these leaders and researchers in the field of child behavior and development advise us that the *inclination* towards delinquent behavior is manifested in the *very young*, disadvantaged child, resentful of his deprivation and keenly aware of the difference between the "haves" and the "have nots". Like their colleagues in the field of preventive medicine, these specialists advocate "Preventive Therapy" in the approach to *pre-teen* delinquency—the concentrated effort to reach out to disadvantaged youngsters with the good things of life. The child who feels loved, wanted and respected by his peers and the adult world, *automatically rejects* delinquent behavior.

This then was the motivation for a group of dedicated, outstanding citizens and educators who corresponded with a full exchange of many viewpoints. These were further evaluated to bring the best, practical solution to this problem.

And, after many months of deliberation and research, the answer became urgently clear—the proposed establishment of one or more Multi-purpose, "Social Conditioning" *free camps*, available year-round as a Shangri-La for our dependent *pre-teen* children. Such camps *strategically* located, will meet generally accepted operational standards including those set up by the American Camping Association.

CAMP SHANGRI-LA A LIVING EXPERIENCE

Camp Shangri-La will be the first of a series of "Social Conditioning" camps for the benefit of our dependent children between the ages of 7 and 12 years, as a *prototype* of similar camps to be established eventually in every state of the union.

Its purpose: to provide these children during summer, week-ends and school vacation periods—the character building experience of group living, by fortifying and strengthening them to better cope with the world we live in today—and tomorrow. We call this program "Social Conditioning". Its heart and life is devoted to "preventive therapy" through prevention programming; the guidance and social conditioning of children who, through circumstance or environment, face almost insurmountable family problems.

How? By providing a fresh beginning to the disaffluent child: improved in social and personal response—far better equipped to function in a constructive way! A youngster now welcomed as a credit to the community, not a liability, nor a Police problem.

Here, children who have only known the hot, crowded city streets will learn the beauty and wonder of the world of nature with its endless rhythms and truths.

Here, the child who feels confused, deserted and alone will learn the happiness of cooperation with others, the joy of acceptance, of sharing, and the pride of responsibility.

Here, skilled teachers and leaders will encourage children to a level of achievement and performance consistent with their ability, so that all youngsters may feel the pride of self-respect in a job well done.

Here, young children will be taught improved skills in getting along with others, while they are led to grow in the development of moral and social courage.

Here, children will be directed towards setting for themselves their own worthwhile goals. They will learn how to make the necessary plans for the achievement of their goals, and the necessity of accepting their responsibilities.

And—above all—children will be helped to grow in self-understanding . . . the dynamics of vicarious sacrifice and the art and pleasure of giving.

All year-round, these camps will be an available haven where, under expert guidance, *pre-teen* children can constructively live together, work together and play together.

Here, they can learn the joy of being close to nature—see rabbit tracks in the winter snow—hear the song of the returning migrant birds in the spring.

An impossible Shangri-La?

Not at all—with your *help* and *financial support*.

Only out of a successful living experience, however brief, can a child be helped to build a moral and physical fiber that will sustain him in the demands of modern living.

You can be a part of our country's forward frontier—the push to weed out the seeds of *pre-teen* delinquency *before* they have a chance to grow.

You can be part of the positive affirmation that every disadvantaged child deserves the chance to be taught the value of a way of life that embraces purpose, joy and dignity.

Let us make no mistake about it! The fight to Prevent Pre-Teen Delinquency is going to be *won* or *lost* at the grass root level—here and now!

Your financial support can help us win the battle and work the miracle in the life and hopes of these children.

All our children have an inherent right to grow up uncorrupted and unafraid.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—TO SUPPRESS NEWS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today's announcement that a woman editor of a local Washington paper was mugged and robbed in broad daylight, in sight of the Capitol, must certainly expose to our people the extent to which a free press has been suppressed in our Nation's Capital.

The victim, who was knocked down and kicked in the face by "three youths," was able to report only that her assailants were 18 or 19 years old.

It is startling to notice that while she can report the age of her assailants it is "irrelevant" to report their race, according to her own newspaper.

Perhaps the next loss of freedom to the reader will be the concealment of the age of criminals on the theory that to report the facts may be harmful to certain age groups.

And following that, there may be no real value in even reporting crime, as it will only alarm the people and cause them to dislike criminals.

Freedom of the press—to report the full facts and the full truth to the public, for whose benefit the right exists, has been diluted and destroyed by the very profession whose proud privilege it should be to defend it to the last.

Pertinent clippings from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star follow:

**WOMEN'S EDITOR OF STAR ROBBED OF \$200,
BEATEN**

Gwen Dobson, women's editor of the Star, was robbed of more than \$200 about 6:15 p.m. yesterday by three youths, one of whom knocked her down and kicked her in the face.

She suffered a possible fractured right cheekbone, and abrasions.

She said she was walking across a small parking lot on the I Street side of the Evening Star building, between 2nd and 3rd Streets SE, when she heard someone running behind her.

Mrs. Dobson was struck on the shoulders and as she fell, her purse was snatched. Then a witness said, her assailant kicked her in the face and fled south into a housing project complex across the street.

The youths were described as 18 to 19 years old.

NEWS GUILD HITS LISTING BY RACE

The executive board of the Baltimore-Washington Newspaper Guild has voted to condemn "the practice of stressing irrelevant racial designations in crime stories" by daily newspapers.

The guild leaders, in an unanimous action taken at a Wednesday meeting, particularly were critical of "deliberate racial orientation in selecting crime stories and identifying suspects."

The guild is the bargaining agent for most editorial and commercial employees of the three Washington daily newspapers. The board said it took action in recognition of its constitutional responsibility "To guarantee . . . constant honesty in the news (and) to raise the standards of journalism and ethics of the industry. . . ."

CIO JOINS GUILD IN RACIAL PROTEST

The Washington AFL-CIO Central Labor Council has joined the executive board of the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild in condemning what the groups feel is a practice of stressing irrelevant racial designations in crime stories.

The guild, which represents editorial, advertising and clerical employees of most daily newspapers in the Washington-Baltimore area, passed a resolution last week condemning the practice.

The local guild is a member of the American Newspaper Guild, an AFL-CIO affiliate.

DDT SYMPOSIUM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one indication which we have regarding the dangers of DDT and other persistent pesticides is the increasing number of persons who are engaged in full-time studies of this subject.

A large number of these people will be attending a symposium at Oregon State University from August 18 to 20 of this year. The title of that symposium is "The Biological Impact of Pesticides in the Environment," and its goal is to assess the significance of pesticides in relation to ecological problems and health.

I would like to congratulate the Environmental Health Sciences Center at Oregon State University for its initiative in sponsoring a symposium of such im-

portance to the preservation of fish and wildlife and man himself. The major problems regarding persistent pesticides will be discussed and no doubt, information will come from that 3-day gathering which will help us to deal with the matter of persistent pesticides and their effects on our environment.

I am particularly pleased to note that representatives of agriculture and conservation as well as other groups will present their views at this conference. The fact is that pesticides are sometimes needed in agriculture and our goal must, therefore, be the use of the safest pesticides in the safest manner possible for man and animals.

Although those in agriculture use a major share of the pesticides in this country, I would like to point out that of the \$1.7 billion which is expected to be spent for pesticides this year, \$255 million will be for household and garden use and another \$255 million will be for institutional and industrial use.

A responsible policy regarding the use of pesticides, then, must be garnered with the help of people in various fields of endeavor who present their viewpoints and talk out their problems. This conference brings many such forces together in an effort to obtain a total picture of man, his environment, and his future with pesticides. It is an encouraging development.

I insert in the RECORD a copy of the program for this symposium to indicate to interested Members of the House and Senate the types of questions which will be discussed during those 3 days:

THE BIOLOGICAL IMPACT OF PESTICIDES IN THE ENVIRONMENT; A SYMPOSIUM ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PESTICIDES IN RELATION TO ECOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND HEALTH

The purpose of this symposium is to assess the impact of pesticides on non-target biological systems by determining (1) the extent of occurrence of pesticide-related damage to health and well-being of man and animals, (2) if this damage is significant, and (3) if this is a direct effect of the pesticide involved. Furthermore, the symposium will consider possible remedies for those problems arising from the introduction of pesticides into the environment.

PROGRAM

MONDAY, AUGUST 18

1. The transport and accumulation of pesticides in environments and ecosystems

Chairman: Dr. Sheldon Lambert, Shell Chemical Company, Modesto, California.

Morning

9:00: Welcome and introduction to the symposium, Dr. Roy A. Young, Acting President, Oregon State University.

9:15: Global Distribution of Pesticides, Dr. Virgil H. Freed, Director, Environmental Health Sciences Center, Oregon State University.

10:00: Coffee break.

10:15: Pesticide Movement in Ecosystems, Dr. Tony J. Peterle, Population and Environmental Biology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

10:45: Biological Magnification of Pesticide Residues, Dr. Parisot or Dr. Macek, Fish Pesticide Laboratory, Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia, Missouri.

11:15: Panel discussion and open forum, Dr. Lambert and panel.

11:50: Summation of session and chairman's remarks, Dr. Lambert.

12:00: Lunch.

II. The impact of chlorinated hydrocarbons on birds

Chairman: Dr. Leon C. Terriere, Department of Entomology, Oregon State University.

Afternoon

1:30: The Thin Egg Shell Problem, Dr. Lucille F. Stickel, Pesticide Research Coordinator, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland.

2:15: Effects of Pesticides on Birds, Dr. James O. Keith, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, Davis, California.

2:45: Coffee break.

3:00: Effects of Various Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, Dr. Robert Risebrough, Department of Nutritional Sciences, Institute of Marine Resources, University of California, Berkeley, California.

3:30: Induction by Dieldrin in Japanese Quail, Dr. James W. Gillett, Department of Agricultural Chemistry, Oregon State University.

4:00: Panel discussion and open forum, Dr. Terriere and panel.

4:50: Summation of session and chairman's remarks, Dr. Terriere.

5:00: Adjournment.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 19

III. The effects of pesticides on fish

Chairman: Dr. James O. Keith.

Morning

8:30: Changing Patterns of Speciation and Distribution, Dr. Denzel Ferguson, Department of Zoology, Mississippi State College, State College Mississippi.

9:15: Estuarine and Marine Residues, Dr. Phillip Butler, Director, Shellfish Research, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Gulf Breeze, Florida.

9:45: Coffee break.

10:00: Effects of Dieldrin on Steelhead Growth and Development, Dr. George Chadwick, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Oregon State University.

10:30: Acute and Chronic Fish Kills by Pesticides, Mr. Eldridge Hunt, Pesticide Investigations Project, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

11:00: Panel discussion and open forum, Dr. Keith and panel.

11:50: Summation of session and chairman's remarks, Dr. Keith.

IV. Effects of pesticides on health and neurophysiology of mammals

Chairman: Dr. W. P. Stephen, Department of Entomology, Oregon State University.

Afternoon

1:30: Pathology of DDT and Dieldrin in Rats, Paul Ortega, M.D., Mt. Zion Medical Center, San Francisco, California.

2:15: Effects of Pesticides on E.E.G. of Rats, Dr. Dorothy Wooley, Department of Environmental Toxicology, University of California, Davis, California.

2:45: Coffee break.

3:00: Effect of Dieldrin on E.E.G. of Sheep, Gary Van Gelder, D.V.M., Veterinary Diagnostic Lab, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

3:30: Effect of Endrin and other Insecticides on E.E.G. of Pigeons and Squirrel Monkeys, Dr. Alvin Revzin, Head, Biochemistry and Pharmacology, Civil Aeromedical Institute, Federal Aviation Authority, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

4:00: Panel discussion and open forum, Dr. Stephen and panel.

4:50: Summation of session and chairman's remarks, Dr. Stephen.

5:00: Adjournment.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 20

V. Factors contributing to pesticide usage and affecting choice of remedies to resultant problems

Chairman: Dr. Joseph Street, Department of Animal Science, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Morning

8:30: Benefits of Pesticides in Food Production, Mr. Kenneth Walker, Assistant to Deputy Director, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

9:00: Benefits of Pesticides in Public Health Programs, Dr. William Durham, Director, Pesticides Research Laboratory, Office of Pesticides, U.S. Public Health Service, Perrine, Florida.

9:30: Unexpected Effects of Substitute Pest Control Methods, Dr. J. E. Swift, Chemical Coordinator, Extension Service, University of California, Berkeley, California.

9:45: Coffee break.

10:00: Analytical Validation of Residues, Dr. Daniel Menzel, Battelle-Northwest, Richland, Washington.

10:30: Panel discussion and open forum, Dr. Street and panel.

11:30: Overall evaluation of symposium, Dr. Street.

12:00: Adjournment.

Afternoon

1:30: Further discussion, as needed, Dr. Street.

Registration times will begin at 8 a.m., each day until start of the session.

A brief period for clarifying questions will be available following each speaker, but discussion will be directed to the appropriate periods.

HOW WE BEAT THE RUSSIANS**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Hotz provides a thought-provoking and significant editorial in Aviation Week & Space Technology of August 4, 1969. Mr. Hotz discusses the elements of the successful Apollo program and the significance of this program for our Nation and the world. At the height of our success in the manned lunar landing, we as a nation would do well to ponder the comments in the following significant editorial:

HOW WE BEAT THE RUSSIANS

(By Robert Hotz)

The United States has decisively beaten the Russians to the moon by at least a year. This is one of the salient facts of our time. It will expand into considerable significance in the years ahead as the world emerges from its numbing elation over this triumph of man over his environment into a thoughtful appraisal of how this incredible victory was won and how the contrasting elements of the competing societies determined the final outcome.

The historical record shows that the Soviet Union pioneered space exploration and manned space flight. It had built a substantial lead over the United States by May, 1961, when President John Fitzgerald Kennedy boldly committed his country to land men on the moon before 1970. In only slightly more than eight years from that national commitment, this nation wiped out the Soviet superiority in manned spaceflight and won the moon race going away. It is a staggering achievement for both man as a species and

this nation as an organization of reasonably free men.

Here are what we believe to be the key elements in this brilliant performance:

First. The Bold, Firm and Imaginative National Commitment. President Kennedy made it clear he was calling for a long-term commitment that would cost considerable in blood, sweat and treasure. With a candor no American President has displayed since he warned the American people not to accept the challenge unless they had the guts to run the full course. Yet despite failures, tragedy and constant carping criticism from some elements, the American people and their Congress never faltered in supporting Apollo with every nickel it required.

President Kennedy's successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, clung steadfastly to the Apollo program and supported it to the hilt even when the political benefits of this policy appeared dubious.

Not since World War II has an American national policy received such sustained and solid support.

Second. A Solid Foundation. The U.S. had a solid technical foundation of people, experience and facilities on which to build the giant pyramid of Apollo. This was a result of its dedicated superiority in post-war military and commercial aircraft development and a broad-base program of military missile research. Without the research laboratories of the old NACA and the brains of their researcher plus the facilities of the military development complexes, including the Cape Canaveral launch facilities and test range, it would have been impossible to even hope for completion of the Apollo mission before the end of this decade. The U.S. did not have to start its moon race with the Russians from scratch.

Third. Lunar Orbital Mission Technique. All of the conventional thinking (circa 1960) on reaching the moon envisioned either a direct flight or a launch from an earth orbit platform. John C. Houbolt, a NASA Langley laboratory researcher, proposed a radically different concept of descending to the moon with a relatively small spacecraft from lunar orbit. After a bitter intramural battle, Houbolt's lunar orbiter concept was adopted as Apollo policy. Conservatively it cut two years' time from Apollo's successful landing. The Soviets continued on the earth orbital philosophy. They are at least a year away from success by that route; longer if they switch to a lunar technique.

Fourth. Use of Industry. The Apollo job was spread by NASA throughout the existing tiers of technical capabilities from design, manufacture and quality control, drawing on every special skill available and developing those that didn't exist. More than 400,000 people and 20,000 firms were marshaled at the peak of the Apollo program to support NASA's program leadership. No single agency, government or industrial, could have done the job on its own.

Fifth. The Gemini Program. At the start of the Gemini program in March, 1965, the U.S. had only 53 hr. of manned space flight compared to 507 hr. for the USSR. At the end, in November, 1966, the U.S. had amassed 1,993 hr. of flight and 12 hr. of EVA (extra-vehicular activity) while the Soviets still had only 507 hr., including 12 min. of EVA. This was where the U.S. really overtook and passed the Russians. During the Gemini program, all of the flight requirements of Apollo were proved—rendezvous, docking, EVA and physical endurance in weightlessness. All of the key Apollo commanders gained their initial space flight experience on Gemini missions.

Sixth. Management Apollo is the most complex technical management problem ever tackled by man. Each succeeding phase of its development posed management problems never before encountered in either industry or government. Some of its early

managers fell by the wayside. NASA itself proved grossly inadequate. Unlike more hidebound organizations, it had the courage and innovation to bolster its resources with experienced program managers from the military. They helped provide the hard drive and development experience that pushed Apollo down the final stretch. In addition use of Bell Laboratories, Boeing and General Electric for key management functions embellished a fundamentally new management pattern.

Seventh. Open Program. The complete openness and sometimes reluctant candor with which NASA conducted its manned space flight program not only insured the global impact of its successful operations but were also a fundamental spur to the technical achievements. Every riveter, electrician, welder and engineer on the program knew that the results of his work would bathe in a pitiless glare of international publicity. This was painfully evident during the tragic spacecraft fire on Pad 34. But the stimuli contributed to the flawless performance of Apollo 11.

The American people should ponder thoughtfully the elements of their national life and resources that were welded into the fabulous flight of Apollo 11. They can be applied to solving other problems of life on earth.

MRS. GREEN WARNS ON EDUCATION**HON. AL ULLMAN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Oregon and good friend (Mrs. GREEN) is recognized throughout the country for her deep understanding of, and sympathy for, the problems we face today in the field of education. As chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Education, she has acquired a broad view and expertise that qualifies her as few others to advise the Congress of the course we should follow in attempting to help restore harmony on campus and meaning to our Federal education programs.

In a recent speech to the National Association of University Business Officers at San Francisco, Mrs. GREEN describes the clear and present danger to our entire system of education. Perhaps even more importantly, she warns against harsh overreaction in responding to it. Her warning deserves the attention of us all, and I insert the speech at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY BUSINESS OFFICERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA—JULY 14, 1969

I really am very pleased to come back and have a chance to visit with people in this group. I had that pleasure back in 1965, I believe it was, in Chicago at one of your conventions, and so much has happened since that time.

In 1965, the escalation in Viet Nam was just beginning, and all of us were listening to those promises of the light that could be seen at the end of the tunnel. Since then we have spent approximately \$100 billion in that small country 8,000 miles away. And well over 36,000 young Americans have left for that country never to return. It might seem off-hand that these two issues, the higher education problems which Mr. Lemman has so well defined and Viet Nam, are far removed from one another; and, yet, strangely enough, at

least as many of us in the Congress see it, they are very, very closely related.

In terms of campus unrest, which is the problem that you people have to face along with your faculty members and your college presidents, it is related. And it is a problem which we in the Congress must face because of the increasing pressure from our constituents.

I am sure that as business officers of the various colleges and universities across the country you have had reason to question the intention of the Federal Government—its promises in terms of authorization, promises that were made in the 1963 act to which Mr. Lemman referred, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, and then the amendments to that act in 1968, and the little resemblance between those authorizations and those promises and the actual appropriations which were made. And, as I said, under this tremendous pressure from people across the country in our districts and in other places, we have had some reason in Congress also to question the ability of the colleges and universities to bring order and to retain academic freedom, which is certainly threatened by elements on the far left.

It seems to me that, first of all, it is essential that confidence be restored if this partnership which started in 1963 is to grow; it seems to me that it certainly is in the mutual interest of the academic community of this Nation and also of the Federal Government that this partnership does grow and does prosper. Each of the parties would, of course, be the beneficiary.

Let me, if I may in the time allotted today, discuss three problems as some of us see them in the Congress. First of all, there is campus unrest. This cannot be ignored today if we are talking about programs in higher education or programs in education at any level. Secondly, it cannot be ignored when we talk of appropriations. What is the outlook for fiscal year 1970? I suspect that many of you have at least a mild interest in that; then third, briefly, what is ahead in terms of legislation?

This explosion on the college campus is a painful, new instruction in a very old lesson: namely, that the methods employed to gain desired ends can sharply warp the ends themselves.

Some very noisy elements have decided in thoroughly autocratic fashion that our system of education reinforces and extends values that will not yield to anything but violence as they see it. I, of course, believe that that is a very shortsighted and very false view. Flies are scattered and an office is flooded at Berkeley; bombs are set off and phone wires are cut at New York University; paintings are torn down and furniture is thrown into the street at Queens College; a dean is unceremoniously taken out of his office and escorted in a manner unknown to him down the stairs; fire destroys the Student Union at Wilberforce University; the Afro-American Study Center burns to the ground at the University of Wisconsin; a student is blinded by a bomb at San Francisco State. I could go on and on citing the incidents—471 incidents, some of them occurring more than once on an individual campus. These are no innocent party raids that we are witnessing on the campus. These are not cases of a little too much beer at the annual fraternity bust.

The American Association of Insurance Companies recently estimated that since January 1, 1969—in fact, between January 1, 1969 and May 31, 1969, there was about \$4.5 million property damage, and this was not complete. It did not include, for example, the damage at San Francisco State or at Mr. Creighton's university, Stanford, here in California.

We are well aware that it is a minority of students that are causing this campus violence, but our concern in the Congress (and reflected in the mail which we receive) is

heightened by the announced intentions of the very militant factions of the SDS and the Black Panthers that they intend to organize at the high school level. Indeed we see increased evidence of this at the high school level and even down into the elementary schools. If we couple this with the increasing use of drugs, then I do not see how anyone could describe the educational scene today as anything but a crisis in education.

A recent Senate study on the use of drugs said that since 1960 there had been a 778% increase in the number of arrests of people under eighteen for the use of drugs—marijuana and the hard drugs. It was reported in that same Senate study that in one high school in Washington, D.C., of 1,400 youngsters, one out of three had used heroin. We know that the people who are pushing marijuana are pushing Heroin. And because there is more money to be made, they are now lacing the marijuana with heroin. And we find junior high youngsters addicts before they know it.

So if we combine these things, I think you can understand the tremendous concern on the part of the elected representatives as they hear from district after district across the country.

Students do have some honest grievances, and all of us who are concerned about education recognize that. One of the grievances which they have, of course, is against the military. But the Pentagon is not the only culprit. The student calls out for an end to teacher absenteeism from the classroom, and we know that in many cases this objection is valid. All too often foundations and businesses and other strange governmental projects can call on the talent and energy of teachers to the detriment of student service. I must say that I have never quite understood nor had much sympathy for the "publish or perish" syndrome. A system of promotion that takes the most experienced people out of their jobs or assigns them fewer and fewer opportunities to practice the art of teaching. In my view, it is upside down to give the youngest faculty members the largest number of students and the most courses. Until faculty members have fully discharged their duties to their students, I simply do not think that they ought to be free to make binding contractual allegiance to other institutions or to agencies of the government.

I think there is an increasing concern on the part of the members of our committee to review the way research grants are given. While technically they flow through the institution (and I don't know how much control you business officers have over them), there is an increasing concern that these research grants indeed go to the institution where there would be some authority exercised, rather than to go to the individual professor giving him total freedom to do as he wishes.

It seems to me that there are lots of examples at Harvard, Berkeley, Columbia, and Chicago, colleges and universities with a most illustrious list of faculty members where too often students see only teaching assistants, while the illustrious ones fold and spindle and otherwise mutilate the idea of service to students. If I can give two examples, a member of my own staff came from the academic community and is going back to it and will receive approximately the same salary as he received in my office, but for a period of nine months. He will only be required to teach three hours. The university has promised him the university plane to take him to any research library in the state and to nearby places. Another example in Oregon, a California professor getting \$25,000 was wanted by an Oregon institution, they offered him \$27,000. He had been required to teach three hours in California, and the answer by the Oregon institution was, "we will not require you to teach at all."

The college student sees his college costs spiral, and he has some honest complaints. He, also, now is asking in a louder voice than ever before for a voice in the operation of the school, and many of us appreciate that demand. After all, it cannot be just the faculty and the administration which sets the tone of the campus. Students must be able to help in making the school the place which they think it should be. But as I see it, this does not mean that students suddenly become the ones most wise, most experienced and most capable of making all policy decisions.

But students do need to be heard, and if honest grievances are taken care of, then the militant factions of SDS and the black panthers quickly lose their sympathetic audience. The list of wrongs in our society is lengthy, and many of these students never cease talking about them. We can be proud of the idealistic young people who want to set things right. We can be proud of their ideals, and we can share them fully for, after all, we helped to create them. But we can also be made heartsick and stunned and shocked into disbelief by acts of hate-generated violence completely outside the mainstream of our system of conflict resolution. Moreover, I think that because we are aware of the just grievances, we have now too long tolerated willful and capricious violence.

In this climate, what will be the public response and what will the congressional response be? Sometimes, as a Member of Congress, I have the feeling that many in the academic community somehow feel that Congressmen are waiting for an opportunity to force the power of the state into the academic community. May I suggest that nothing could be further from the truth, in the first place, Congressmen are typically products of a university environment and are sympathetic to its desire for institutional autonomy. Secondly, Congressmen also typically do not have unlimited faith in the power of the state or of the Government to solve problems. They at least claim to be specialists in this area of government and too often many of us have seen our efforts fail. Therefore, I think without any exception the members of Congress would much prefer that the university solve its own problems. Certainly the last thing that any Congressman needs is a new problem. We have too many of them already and have enough trouble finding the answers. But may I say to you in all sincerity and in all honesty that I do think legislation is coming in this area. In fact, it has already come.

Sixteen of us on the committee sponsored what we believed was moderate legislation. Let me describe it very briefly for those of you who are perhaps not familiar with it. It had two titles, title I asked the college or university all by itself, without any interference at the Federal or State level. To develop a plan for that university and for that university alone that (1) would make sure that the channels of communication were open between all of the factions of the academic community and (2) that there would be steps taken to prevent violence from occurring on that campus and, if it did occur, that there would be steps taken to bring it under control.

This plan was not to receive the veto or the approval of the Commissioner of Education or the Secretary of HEW or anyone else in the Federal Government. It was to be developed by the university to meet that university's problems and it was to be available upon the request of the Commissioner of Education, but only upon his request. If the university itself just simply refused to develop a plan, then it would not be eligible for funds. And you business officers know that in fifty different pieces of legislation we ask a university to develop a plan whether it is title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act or title III, or whatever it is, stating how those funds would be spent, what kind of a

program it would have. So this conforms to precedent. But in other legislation, the Commissioner of Education or the Secretary of HEW does have the power of approval or does have the power of veto. And all of you know it only too well.

What did we say in the legislation that the plan would be? First, that rules and regulations have been or are being prepared which provide for an effective means to assure adequate opportunity for free expression, consultation and orderly discussion by the parties involved of educational and associated problems which affect and are of concern to trustees, administrators, faculty, and students of the institution; and, second, set standards of conduct for students, faculty, other staff, and visitors on such property and facilities intended to accomplish the purposes of the section 101(b), together with appropriate internal disciplinary procedures and sanctions to enforce such standards; and, third, that such rules and regulations have been or will be published within the university and are or will be made available to the Commissioner upon his request. This is really all there was to title I. As I say, it was a decision that was made by sixteen of us on the committee that legislation in this area was going to come and it would be much better for legislation to be carefully considered by a committee that was friendly to education than to have legislation drafted on the floor by other groups.

In title I, opponents of the legislation and the press have mis-stated that we were asking for battle plans, that we were asking for universities to tip their hands to the SDS on what they would do in case of a riot. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was up to the university to include as much or as little as they wanted to include in that plan. But we were persuaded that many colleges and universities had taken the attitude that "it can't happen here." In fact, Dr. Harrington of the University of Wisconsin was in my office a few months ago and he said that when the eruption occurred at Columbia University, at Wisconsin they patted themselves on the back and said, "Well, it can never happen here, only at Columbia." We think it is appropriate for colleges to think through what they would do to prevent riots or bring them under control.

Title II of the bill was a modification of the existing law. Again, I am not completely familiar with the responsibilities of business offices in each and every university and I know they vary from place to place. Some of you have responsibility, I presume, in cutting off funds to students and faculty members under the present law. Section 504, and in other universities I am sure it is left to the student financial aid officer. But the two modifications we made in the present law or the two modifications we proposed were:

One, a change in the penalty to the student or to the faculty member. The present law says that if a student or a faculty member is engaged in a riot or a major disruption on the campus (and it is up to the campus to determine whether it is major or not) then the Federal financial assistance will no longer be available to that student or that faculty member for a period of two years. Some of us felt that the two years was too harsh, that there ought to be more flexibility for the college or university. So we changed that provision from two years automatic and mandatory to a provision that said "up to five".

In other words, the college could determine the seriousness of the offense of the student or the faculty member and could cut off the aid for the rest of that month or for the rest of that semester or for a period of two years or, in case of a person traveling from campus to campus, up to five years.

Now I think section 504 which was adopted last year was in answer to the complaints

of hundreds and hundreds of taxpayers in every congressional district. People largely from the middle and the low-middle income group who were having great difficulty in setting aside enough money to send their own children to college. They wrote and said, "We can't save enough to send our own children to college, and yet you require us to pay taxes to finance revolutionaries on other college campuses."

It has been claimed by some of the academic community that this would not stop riots. It was never intended to stop riots. We consider it simply a contractual arrangement between a student or a faculty member and the Government. And that that person must use the funds in furtherance of his education. He or she would lose the money if he were not to remain in good academic standing. He or she, of course, would lose it if he were to leave the country and go to Acapulco. He would lose it if he flunked out. He would lose it if he were expelled. And in the congressional view last year and again this, that student or faculty member should lose it if he commits an act of violence which the university itself, not the Government, decides is serious in nature and subsequently disrupts the campus.

Business officers, as I say, may become more involved in this particular provision because already this year (and this is why I say legislation is going to be passed) two amendments offered by Congressman Scherle of Iowa have been adopted by an overwhelming majority. Only one time was there an effort to defeat it, and the opponents of it received only fifteen votes. But these two amendments by Congressman Scherle say that if a college or university is not in compliance with section 504, then all funds of every Government agency and Department of the Federal Government will be cut off to the entire university.

The bill which sixteen of us sponsored was defeated in the committee by an 18 to 17 vote. It was a bipartisan effort by the sixteen of us. The defeat of the legislation, as I see it, was a grievous error because legislation is certain to come from other committees. HUAC is holding hearings at the present time. The McClellan committee in the Senate is holding hearings. Already besides the two Scherle amendments, there has been an amendment to the NASA appropriation bill, an amendment to the HUD appropriation bill and an amendment to a supplemental appropriation bill. All carried by very substantial votes.

The additional reason why I regret that it was not adopted in the committee is that now the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the House loses all control over the direction of any legislation on campus unrest because he can no longer control the debate on the floor; he no longer has any say over the recognition of Members to speak who would be friendly to the higher academic community or to others; he can not control the motion to recommit, he can not control substitute motions. All of that power—and that is a tremendous power for the chairman of the committee—is now transferred to the chairman of another committee who may not be nearly as friendly to education. Also the members and the chairman of the Education Committee have now lost all power in the conference committee because people of other committees will be assigned to the conference committee and the only hope we would have would be on the floor to defeat repressive amendments.

What do I consider repressive amendments? I consider punitive and repressive any legislation which would cut off all funds to colleges or universities if, for example, a riot is not brought under control in a certain period of time. This is in the Kuykendall bill, and its in the Harsha Bill, and it is being sponsored by at least fifty-five members of the House.

I also consider very repressive and very punitive the amendment which was adopted in a Senate Committee. It says that all funds under NASA legislation would be cut off to any college or university if military recruiters are barred from a college campus. When you say that all funds will be denied to an institution if a riot is not brought under control in a certain period of time or if military recruiters are barred, you have transferred the power to the most militant factions of SDS and the black panthers. It certainly is possible for a hundred militant people today to go on a campus and bar military recruiters, and if funds are cut off if a riot isn't brought under control, say in a ten day period of time, is a challenge to the most militant faction. They have announced their intention of bringing the university or the college to a halt, and it simply dares them to go out and to prolong the riot.

Under the legislation which the sixteen of us sponsored, the power rests exclusively in the governing board of the institution whether it be the president or the board of trustees or board of regents or whatever it is. It is their determination as to whether or not they want to make a plan, and if they develop that plan, then they are immediately eligible for funds and the SDS or the other groups can not prevent them from getting the funds.

Campus violence also has another very undesirable aspect to it, and this is the fact that it may be the cause of cutbacks in appropriations. Some of us are still fighting the appropriation cutbacks in the committee for fiscal year 1970. If we did not have any campus unrest at all I am enough of a realist to know that when our country is involved in a war effort costing several billion dollars a year—about \$30 billion as a matter of fact—that many deserving programs, particularly domestic programs, are going to suffer.

In the past two years, an effort has been made to make across-the-board cuts in all Federal spending. The thought behind it, I suppose, is a democratic one that all segments of the Government should be forced to economize equally and share the budget strain. This may appeal to our sense of fair play, but also may appeal to our indecision in permitting us to avoid stating national priorities. But realistically there are programs that can be cut and programs that should not be cut. Education, as I see it, falls in the latter grouping. I am firmly convinced that there are areas that can spare funds more easily than education.

Let me just sum up by saying that the editors of *The Congressional Quarterly* recently interviewed highly placed sources in the Pentagon and in industry about the 1969 Budget. And those sources agreed that the 1969 Budget was loaded with fat. Some argued that \$10.8 billion could have been cut from the Fiscal Year 1969 budget without in the slightest way impairing our national defense. We are told by some that the modified ABM system that we are now contemplating in the Senate and the House would only cost \$4 to \$5 billion. But we are also told by other equally well informed people that it will go to at least \$10 billion, and no one less than Senator Symington, a former Secretary of the Air Force, has said it will go much, much higher than that. In fact, he was quoted at one point as saying that "a thick system" might go as high as \$400 billion. Most people in the Congress believe that it will go at least to \$40 or \$50 billion. And that is one of the reasons there is great opposition to it at the present time. In addition, there is no proof that it will provide that security desired, but certainly it will cause more escalation in the arms race.

So I would urge you and your colleagues in the academic community to write not only to your Senators and to the Members of the House about the fiscal year 1970 appropriations, but also to write letters to the

administration. I think that the time is most urgent. The appropriation bill in the House will come up on the floor probably before the August recess.

What is ahead in new legislation? This week, if not too many people are going to Cape Kennedy on Wednesday, my subcommittee will turn to the guaranteed student loan program. Because of the increase in the prime interest rates, this demands immediate attention if it is to function at all on the college campuses.

One of my friends on the appropriation committee is very much disturbed about the cuts in the NDEA loans and rightfully so when we know that the guaranteed student loan program is not working as we had hoped. He told me that he would like to offer an amendment on the floor to increase the NDEA loan funds by one-third, but he could not do it unless there was some legislation accompanying it on campus unrest or unless some legislation had preceded the appropriation bill. So I am unable to tell you what is going to happen in these two areas. I happen to believe that the NDEA loan provision is the best program we have in terms of student financial assistance. I see by your program that Jim Moore is going to be with you this afternoon to discuss these matters.

The other one piece of legislation that I see the possibility of enactment this year is community colleges; I am told that the administration is going to send down a bill in that regard. I must say that I am most concerned about the vocational and the technical needs of our young people and, as I see it, they are not being met. I have told other groups that I place this as No. 1 priority in the country today in terms of education. The enrollment in Vocational education at the Secondary level, and this is of importance to people in higher education too, constitutes a quarter of the total high school enrollment throughout the Nation. Even though five out of six young people never achieve a college education, less than one-half of the noncollege-trained labor force was found by a 1964 Labor Department survey to have had any formal training for current jobs. It seems to me that our schools should be able to offer better preparation to our youth. James Conant, in his book "The Slums and the Suburbs", stated that educational experience of youth should fit their subsequent employment and there should be a smooth transition from full time school to full time job whether the transition be after grade 10 or after graduation from high school or college or university. Unfortunately, this smooth transition is many times not possible because of the lack of vocational education programs.

Oftentimes the rural high schools tend to be too small to offer more than agriculture or home economics. Most of their students will ultimately seek jobs in the cities, but they have no preparation for this urban life. Yet, as we have noted, despite this need for vocational education, the authorization this year, which includes the secondary schools and the community colleges was \$766 million. The budget request by this administration and by the Johnson administration—(both administrations)—was only \$279 million, a little over one-third of the authorization.

May I say to you also as friends in the higher education community, that I have believed for some time that too much emphasis has been placed in this country on the college diploma. We have persuaded, perhaps unconsciously, young people and their parents to believe that success and happiness can only be achieved after graduation from a four-year institution. I think this is not so. In fact, I think this is the cause of a

great deal of the unrest. We have encouraged the enrollment of students who perhaps should have gone to technical schools or community colleges. We have waived admission requirements at many colleges and universities. As a result, we have helped to create anger, frustration and bitterness in young people who are not prepared for the academic process at a university and who cannot compete successfully. Would it not be better to provide good vocational training first? John Gardner, in a speech a few years ago said:

"We must learn to honor excellence, indeed to demand it in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher, and the society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy, and neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

So this year I hope that there will be an administration bill for community colleges. (There have been other bills that have been introduced.) and I hope that successful action can be taken on this legislation.

One of the other great needs (and I say this to you from the small, private institutions) another high priority, in my book, is for operating expenses. Block grants for all institutions but especially directed to the small, private institutions that do not have the benefit of tax dollars. A president of a small college in Connecticut with 2,700 students told me that some of the larger institutions, as he phrased it, could continue to be permissive and have experimentation but that if one strike or one serious disruption occurred on his campus they would be out of business. He said, "we are that close to financial ruin and we could not stand it without being driven to the wall."

May I say also that not only with the financial situation in the country and the cutback in appropriations, but for other reasons too. It does not make too much sense to me to have space available in private, nontax-supported institutions and then to spend tax dollars at the Federal and the State level to increase the space at the larger, multiple universities. So I think that at some time, in the near future, the Congress is going to turn its attention to block grants for colleges and universities throughout the country, and I would hope that it would be without strings attached. But, as I said, because of Vietnam and the adverse climate in terms of college unrest, this has to wait until after, at least, this first session of the 91st Congress.

In conclusion, may I suggest that even though the times are very trying and even though I am told that there are college president vacancies on many college campuses and though I know you business officers are on the firing line every day, that now is not the time that either you or me on the committees in education can give up. Together I think we must plan ahead and somehow persuade the American people that this is a passing problem and that indeed the vast majority of faculties and students will no longer tolerate violence and this disruption. At the same time, may I urge you to make your views known on the financial needs to your representatives in government. I came across a statement recently which I think is very true in 1969. It says this: "In a country like this, if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power." George Washington said that 200 years ago.

Thank you.

DR. STRANGELOVE, GO HOME—
OUR CBW POLICY

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I attended a Defense Department briefing for several Members of Congress on our chemical and biological warfare policies.

Many of us were deeply disturbed by what we learned at that meeting and by the questions which remained unanswered in our own minds. We had been informed of the one-eighth of the iceberg which was visible; we were horrified at the thought of what we might find if we probed more deeply into the matter.

Since that time, largely through the unflagging efforts of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY), more information on our CBW policies has been made public, and we have found that our earlier fears were well founded.

Mr. Speaker, as citizens of a democratic society, we must ask ourselves how we can reconcile the development, production, deployment, and use of these inhuman weapons with the high ideals upon which our society was founded.

A recent article in the weekly magazine Ave Maria, published by the Congregation of the Holy Cross in Notre Dame, Ind., raises precisely this question. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

DR. STRANGELOVE, GO HOME

Running nose. Tightness of chest. Dimness of vision. Pinpointing of eye pupils. Difficulty in breathing. Drooling. Excessive sweating. Nausea. Vomiting. Cramps. Involuntary defecation and urination. Twitching. Jerking. Staggering. Headache. Confusion. Drowsiness. Coma. Convulsion. Cessation of breathing. Death.—symptoms of nerve-gas poisoning as described by Army technical manuals.

Another project stamped "U.S. Government," demonstrating this nation's technological know-how and world leadership, crept into the news last week while all eyes were riveted on Apollo 11 streaking toward the moon.

There wasn't much ballyhoo, though: no special press accommodations, no televised presidential phone call, no fat sheaf of mimeographed handouts jammed full of statistics and technical jargon. The government doesn't thump many tubs about its chemical and biological warfare (CBW) activities, especially when things go wrong.

And things most certainly had gone wrong: Early in July, two dozen Americans (including a civilian) on Okinawa were accidentally exposed to VX, one of the deadliest nerve gases in existence. Like the nerve gas that drifted off a testing range into Utah's Skull Valley last year, killing 6,400 sheep.

This accident wasn't as bad as the one in Utah: The people didn't die, for one thing—in fact, according to the Pentagon, "all were returned to full duty within six hours." And this time it took the Pentagon only a couple of weeks to admit, under pressure, that there'd been a CBW "mishap." For months after the Skull Valley sheep kill, the Army insisted that its nerve gas hadn't been responsible, even though it paid the owner for his loss.

But the fact that almost nobody knew that CBW agents had been deployed overseas—including, apparently, the government of Japan, which retains "residual sovereignty" over Okinawa—is typical of the air of stealth that hangs over the whole CBW program.

The military hides the figures on how much it costs to develop and test and produce gases and germs in uninformative categories scattered through the budget of unrelated installations and activities.

It ships tons of deadly agents around the country and the world, disposes of leaking containers by dumping them into the ocean or burying them in the ground, and tries to act innocent when it's caught lying about what it's done.

It proclaims that work with CBW agents is done under strict safety controls, neglecting to mention that one such laboratory had 3,300 accidents over an eight-year period, infecting some 400 people; that the case of one employee who contracted pneumonic plague, a highly infectious disease, was kept secret although the man was a lifeguard at a swimming pool, although he had come in contact with many people, and although we are bound to report such cases to the World Health Organization; that the Rocky Mountain Arsenal's attempt to dispose of its waste material in a deep dry well, after toxic materials had begun to kill nearby plants and animals, caused more than 1,500 earth tremors in the Denver area, some of them strong enough to damage property nearby.

It insists that it abides by the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning germ and gas warfare, which we are pledged to observe—though our use of tear gas to flush people into the open where bombing raids can reach them, and our heavy use of defoliants as an anti-forest weapon, are certainly chemical warfare in every legitimate sense of the term.

It claims that we keep on hand only a limited inventory of chemical weapons, as a deterrent—though we store about 100,000,000 (one hundred million) lethal doses of nerve gas at Rocky Mountain Arsenal and Tooele Army Depot.

And in all of this, anyone who tries to discover our policy with regard to CBW winds up having to sort through evasions and contradictions and obfuscations and long silences . . . even if he happens to be a United States Congressman, like Richard D. McCarthy, of New York, who told the House of Representatives that "the Army's unclassified briefing was perfunctory at best; the classified presentation was not much better. I get the impression that the security curtain is parted only when it serves the interests of the advocates of the program."

You might think that it goes without saying that this is an intolerable way for a representative government to run any program, especially one as serious and fraught with danger as CBW is. But that's the way it is run. Really. So we have to spell it out.

The government of the United States owes it to its own citizens, to the people of the rest of the world, and to the generations to come, to have a clear official policy on the use of chemical and biological weapons, which can have an immense effect on human, animal and plant life. Such a policy must have built into it strict controls and an effective system of accountability, both for the elements of the policy itself and for actions aimed at putting it into effect; and it must be in harmony with the principles held by this and other civilized nations, especially a reverence and respect for life and a proportionality between the ends sought and the means used to reach those ends.

These principles apply to warfare as well as to other areas of human life; to again quote Congressman McCarthy, the principles of proportionality, as applied to warfare, "require that belligerents refrain from employing any kind of violence which is not necessary for military purposes." Since we have other weapons, more easily controllable and

more limited in their side effects, with which to respond to any CBW attack, there's no need to develop and maintain a CBW offensive capability as a deterrent. And since there's no way to inoculate the American population against the hundred or more possible CBW agents now in existence—not to mention the fact that the hundred or more inoculations might be as deadly as the agents themselves—there's no need to carry on elaborate and expensive research-and-development programs for defensive measures that will never be used.

As to the chemical weapons we are now using: Since we are on record as categorically pledging "not to resort to use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies," and since the way we have used tear gas and defoliants is at the very least a breach in the thin dividing line between "conventional war" and chemical warfare, we should refrain from their use as well.

And, finally, we should begin an era of openness about our activities in the CBW field. One good way to start might be for President Nixon to resubmit to the Senate the 1925 Geneva Protocol for ratification. In the debate, our entire policy on these matters would be reviewed and discussed; and at the end, hopefully, if the treaty were ratified, we could let the world know where we stand on this issue.

After all, we already have one arsenal of weapons with which we can destroy every living creature on this planet several times over. Do we really need to have a variety of ways to achieve such a hellish goal?

MINI-STATE STRATEGY AND PEACE IN ASIA

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had brought to my attention two interesting points of view on the course of our future policy in Southeast Asia. Both articles are written by outstanding analysts, although from different perspectives.

The first article appeared in a number of papers a couple of weeks ago. Written by the noted columnist Joseph Kraft and titled, "Pacific Mini-State Strategy Is Going Out," the thrust of the article strongly suggests that our present policy in the Pacific is outdated, and in fact a hindrance.

Mr. Kraft's thesis is that our present commitments to the so-called mini-states—Vietnam, Korea, Taiwan, and so forth—are preventing the major nations from reaching understandings about their own interests in the area. Kraft believes that until we take a larger view in dealing with the area, our present policy of "fortified mini-states" will continue to frustrate stability. Kraft writes:

What is required now is a new security system for Asia. In such a system the mini-states would not be protected by only one power but guaranteed by a balance among the United States, Russia, China and Japan.

Of course what he is suggesting is balancing the major power interests so that each feels its integrity is secured and its interests protected. This will, according to Kraft, produce the type of stability so lacking now in this area.

The other article I wish to present is written by the Honorable Paul B. Park, who serves in the National Assembly of Korea, and as chairman of the Asian Peace Research Society. Mr. Park, like Mr. Kraft, points out the current frustration of American policy in Asia. He suggests that America's over-commitment in the area may be counterproductive to our goals.

However, at this point Mr. Park and Mr. Kraft have a rather substantial parting of the ways. Mr. Park would have us build our future strategy upon the foundation of Korea. He strongly sets forth his arguments which include:

First, an exact understanding of the Asian Communist, which he regards as a much different phenomenon than his Western counterpart.

Second, the knowledge that Japan neither has the heart nor the determination to play a major military role in the Pacific.

The only reasonable alternative for American policy, according to Mr. Park, is to anchor its future in the area to that of Korea. Only Korea, says Park, has sufficient military ability, suitable experience, and the necessary determination to halt the advance of Asian communism. Korea, bolstered by an American commitment to a joint military command would provide the necessary strength to insure stability and growth in Southeast Asia.

It is rather obvious that Mr. Kraft's thinking is not shared by some leaders of the many smaller nations to which we now have commitments. To move in the direction suggested by Mr. Kraft raises many complex issues as well as serious uncertainties. However, the direction in which Mr. Park's proposal would lead is not clear either.

There is no question that the President is in the process of evaluating the policy options available to us in Asia. I offer these two articles as part of the current dialog and am hopeful they will add something to the emerging debate:

PACIFIC MINI-STATE STRATEGY IS GOING OUT
(By Joseph Kraft)

PARIS.—The sad fate of the story that the President was en route to Moscow warns against great expectations for Mr. Nixon's current trip through the Pacific.

In fact, the trip is chiefly interesting as a gauge of American policy after Vietnam. It suggests an eventual move from a policy based on dependent mini-states to a policy based on the great powers of Asia.

As it happens, the Pacific is more and more becoming a point of convergence for the great powers. In the United States influence is steadily passing to the West Coast. In Russia, vast natural resources and the challenge of China combine to heighten the importance of Siberia and the Pacific ports.

Japan is already the world's third-ranking country. And despite Mao and the cultural revolution, China, with its vast internal market and the skill that has produced nuclear weapons, will probably rank with Japan at the end of the century.

A mild foretaste of the colossal possibilities implicit in the convergence of Pacific powers is afforded by the rich bounty reaped from good relations between the United States and Japan. But even these relations, not to mention Washington's ties with Moscow and Peking, are now complicated by the American role in the petty states fringing the Asian mainland.

These states—South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, Malaysia, and Singapore—looked for a long time like ideal candidates for American protection. Geography made it possible to defend them against China by limited deployment of air and sea power. Thinness made it possible for American economic assistance to have a dramatic impact.

But even the American Gulliver has not been able to solve the political problems of the Asian mini-states. Washington has not rid the Philippines of deadly corruption, nor sorted out the ethnic mess of Malaysia, nor made Chinese nationalists welcome to Formosan patriots, nor given secure constitutional rule to South Korea and Thailand.

On the contrary, American support, by making it possible to avoid realities for a time, has led to an aggravation of internal political problems. In some cases, the inner rot has made countries vulnerable to Communist subversion. And in the case of Vietnam, the United States felt able to head off the Communists only through a major war with a large-scale commitment of American troops on the Asian mainland.

The lesson of Vietnam is that the policy of fortified mini-states does not work. Not only does it fail to crush Communist insurgency but it fosters a more militant spirit in Communist China and gets in the way of more harmonious relations with both Russia and Japan.

What is required now is a new security system for Asia. In such a system the mini-states would not be protected by only one power but guaranteed by a balance among the United States, Russia, China, and Japan.

Such a system is plainly years away. Still it represents the goal to which sensible efforts in Asia should tend at this time. And in that respect, President Nixon's trip is a good beginning.

Vietnam is treated as just another country—not, as in President Johnson's trips, as the center of world gravity. Attention is being focused on some countries that have not even supported the war there—Indonesia, India, and Pakistan.

Most important of all, the trip is bracketed with gestures of conciliation towards China. Just before leaving Washington, the President approved liberalization of rules governing trade and visits to Peking. He winds up his trip in Romania—the country most eager to promote better relations between Washington and Peking.

Even so the trip is largely atmospheric and personal publicity. There may be a point in making an indent for a new Asian security system. But the real way to set that change in motion is to push hard—much harder than so far—for an agreement at the Vietnamese peace talks here in Paris.

PEACE IN ASIA

(By Paul B. Park)

Peace is the theme of our time. This peace however, shall not be achieved when we disregard peace in Asia where one third of the world population exists. Thus, I have come to the realization that without true peace in Asia, there is no true peace in the world. Peace in Asia must be an integral part of our over-all peace endeavor.

Following is my personal views on peace in Asia:

I am an Asian and every day I see a conflict in our area of the world. This conflict is fundamentally an ideological conflict between Communism and democracy or capitalism, if you wish. But I want to put in this term: "Conflict between tyranny and freedom."

America today has overextended her power particularly in Asia in light of the fact that America is not an Asian power. America is in a dilemma; she wants to "pull out" from

Vietnam, yet she does not want to turn over the entire Asia to the Communists. America wants to secure somehow an honorable peace in Asia.

I can truly understand America's stand today and am sympathetic to the situation. I am, as a matter of fact, one of the students who is searching for the same answer for America to remove herself from Asia and secure an honorable peace in Asia as well.

In searching for an answer to the above, I want to point out two of the most important factors overlooked by many good American friends.

I

American people often think that Communists are the same practically the world over. But I see clearly two drastically different kinds of Communists:

(1) The liberal kind of Communist who we find in Eastern Europe and even in today's Russia.

(2) Yet, the Asian Communist is not this kind. My term is "savage" for these Communists and that is a perfect description of the Communist in Red China, North Vietnam and North Korea. They are just repeating, if not doing worse than the very thing that Stalin did in his early days in power in Russia. With them, co-existence is out of the question:

Mr. Secretary of State Rogers just stated: "After all the efforts we made to de-escalate the war in Vietnam, all we received was a negative response." This is not surprising.

Once you know what kind of Communist you are dealing with in Asia you know that there is only one thing that is understood by the Asian Communists and that is "strength". What we need in Asia today is true power and manifestation of commitment and determination. This is the key to Asian peace. Mere good will, gentlemanship or negotiation conferences will not work.

II

Many Americans feel that Japan should be given the role of American manager in Asia. It appears very favorable; yet, being a person who has been educated in Japan and who has had an opportunity to study the Japanese psychology to the core, I know Japan is not just to take over the responsibility in Asia as chief bulwark for freedom. Japanese national interests do not call for this need. Any American policy which is designed to rely on Japan would invite disastrous results. After all, Japan was defeated by the U.S. only a little over 2 decades ago. These kinds of national wounds do not heal that quickly.

With this view, I want to conclude my emphasis by saying that America ought to de-Americanize Asia and it can be done without losing honorable peace in Asia if and when the U.S. knows how to deal with the Asian Communists and secondly if the U.S. realizes that a U.S.-Asian policy cannot depend on Japan.

The United States must seek committed strength and ever-ready deterrent forces in Asia without America actually being there. America must seek one country with a determination to live free and one which has enough military manpower to portray a display of strength with America's blessing.

There is one country which qualifies to do this and that is the Republic of Korea. The Republic of Korea has the fourth largest military force in the world and with the most recent fighting experience against Communist forces during the Korean war and now in Vietnam—with a population of 30 million and adequate economic strength and above all, her determined character and spirit for freedom. This one nation has all the qualifications to serve as America's bulwark defense and deterrent power in Asia.

Korea needs one thing to fulfill this role. And that is unreserved blessing from the United States people and government. This display of America's trust married to Korea's

potential will enable Korea to create a magic power that can safeguard Asia's peace.

From this standpoint, I developed just one plan and this can be done. May I invite your comments on this plan attached.

Thank you.

AN EXPERIMENT OF COALITION GOVERNMENT IN 1946 IN VIETNAM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently South Vietnamese Senator Le Tan Buu was a visitor to Washington and during a conference which I had the honor to attend, he made available to me a study which he did regarding coalition government in Vietnam in 1946.

There are great pressures being applied now for a coalition government in Vietnam but those who urge such a course obviously, totally forget that Vietnam did have a coalition government in 1945 and 1946 and it was this coalition government that led to the present conflict and turmoil.

I believe every student of history ought to read this article. It is worthwhile for us, as Americans, to see the Vietnamese conflict through the eyes of a ranking Vietnamese political leader.

I believe we also should note the experience Vietnam had when certain parts of the country were held by the Communists and others by the Nationalists. There are those who now suggest we should surrender certain parts of South Vietnam to the Communists. History can be a great teacher. Following is the study by Senator Le Tan Buu:

AN EXPERIMENT OF COALITION GOVERNMENT IN 1946 IN VIETNAM

(By Senator Le Tan Buu)

I.—The situation in North Viet-Nam in 1945 and 1946.

March 9th: The Japanese took over French military and administrative establishments in Indochina.

Administrative authority given by the Japanese to a Viceroy, Pan-Ke-Toal, in North Viet-Nam.

July: Communists took over the power in many districts of North Viet-Nam, Viceroy Phan-Ke-Toal remained actionless by collusion with communists then acting under the cover of the League for Independence of Vietnam (Viet-Nam Doc-Lap Dong-Minh-Hoi, in short Viet-Minh).

August 17th: 20,000 demonstrators gathered in front of the City theater to support the Court of Hue. The Viet-Minh appeared for the first time, they lowered the imperial flags and hoisted the red ones with yellow star: Demonstration was spread to every street where there were great quantities of red flags, leaflets and megaphones, and huge crowds. Viceroy Phan-Ke-Toal surrendered. The nationalists disappeared.

August 29th: A provisional government was formed by:

Ho-chi-Minh, President and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Vo-nguyen-Giap, Minister of Interior.

Chu-van-Tan, National Defense.

Duong-duc-Hien, Youth.

Vu-trong-Khanh, Justice.

Dao-trong-Kim, Public Works.

Tran-huy-Lieu, Propaganda.

Nguyen-manh-Ha, Economy.
 Nguyen-van-To, Social Welfare.
 Pham-ngoc-Thach, Hygiene.
 Le-van-Hien, Labor.
 Pham-van-Dong, Finances.
 Vu-dinh-Hoe, Education.
 Cu-huy-Can and Nguyen-van-Xuan, Ministers without portfolio.

On August 25th, 1945 Bao-Dai having abdicated was appointed supreme Counsellor of the Provisional government.

September 9th, 1945: 180,000 Chinese soldiers commanded by General Lu Han came and re-occupied Indochina down to the 16th parallel in accordance with decision of the Potsdam Conference. Supported by General Siao Wen, political counsellor of General Lu Han, Nguyen-hai-Thanh of the Vietnam Revolutionary League (Vietnam Cach-Menh Dong-Minh Ho VNCMDMH) and Vu-hong-Khanh of the Viet-Nam Quoc-Dan Dang made without delay a strong opposition against the Ho-chi-Minh Government. Intervening in order to avoid a clash between Nationalists and Communists, General Siao-wen requested that they should unite with each other to safeguard South Vietnam against French re-occupation and should therefore form a coalition government. Ho-chi-Minh accepted such a proposal but he demanded that a general election should be held before the formation of a communist and nationalist coalition government. On November 11th, 1945 the Indochinese Communist Party announced its dissolution and its replacement by an Association for Marxist Studies.

January 6th, 1946: Communists obtained 80% of the vote in the general election (of which the sincere and free character is not discussed here). Out of 350 seats, Ho-chi-Minh gave 70 to the nationalists, (50 to VNQDD, 20 to VNCMDMH).

March 2nd, 1946: Meeting of the National Assembly. The Provisional Government of Ho-chi-Minh resigned. The National assembly proclaimed a Coalition government composed of:

Ho-chi-Minh (Communist) as President.
 Nguyen-hai-Thanh (VNCMDMH) as Vice-President.
 Huynh-thuc-Khang (Independent) as Minister of Interior.
 Phan-Anh (Independent) as Minister of Defense.
 Vu-dinh-Hoe (Socialist) as Minister of Social Welfare.
 Tran-dang-Khoa (VNQDD) as Minister of Public Works.
 Le-van-Hien (Communist) as Minister of Finances.
 Truong-dinh-Tri (Independent) as Minister of Public Health.
 Huynh-thien-Loc (Independent) as Minister of Agriculture.
 Cu-huy-Can (Communist) as Secretary of State of Agriculture.
 Nguyen-tuong-Tam (VNQDD) as Minister of Foreign Affairs.
 Dang-thai-Mai (Communist) as Minister of Education.
 Duong-duc-Hien (Socialist close to communists) as Minister of Youth.
 Nguyen-van-Tao (Communist) as Minister of Labor.
 Chu-ba-Phuong (VNQDD) as Minister of Economy.
 Nguyen-tan-Gi-Trong (Independent) as Minister of Propaganda.
 Nghiem-ke-To (VNQDD) as Secretary for Foreign Affairs.
 Vo-nguyen-Giap (Communist) and Vu-hong-Khanh (VNQDD) as Military Commissioners.

Bao-Dai as Supreme Counsellor.

A Permanent Committee was appointed by the National Assembly. Composed exclusively of Communist M.P. the permanent Committee represented the National Assembly and acted in its place when it could not be assembled.

Ho-chi-Minh wanted to have the assistance of a Coalition government in order to avoid criticism in his coming negotiations with France.

II—6.3.1946—After the signature of a Preliminary Agreement with the French.

The coalition government began to collapse. The leaders of VNCMDMH and VNQDD charged that the agreement signed by Ho-chi-Minh was an act of surrender to the French.

The Viet-Minh began to fire at the Nationalist in many provinces of North Vietnam. In Hongay Province the V.N.C.M.D.M.H. established a provisory government to resist the Ho-Chi-Minh government. When general Leclerc went to the North with his troops, he saw that the Nationalist were pro-Chinese and anti-French, and the Communists were those who respected the Agreement. Then the Communists joined the French troops to crush the Nationalists though the Chinese troops were still present. In Hanoi the French tanks blocked the ways to the streets where there were Nationalist offices, while the Viet-Minh attacked these offices. The Viet-Minh let the French troops chase out the Nationalists from Lang-Son and Hai-Phong.

After that the Viet-Minh troops came and occupied these cities. In Hongay the French liberated the local Viet-Minh authorities jailed by the V.N.C.M.D.M.H.

When the Chinese troops withdrew from North Viet-Nam (June 1946) Vo-nguyen-Giap began one large scale operation against the Nationalist: First he crushed the V.N.C.M.D.M.H. then the V.N.Q.D.D. His troops wiped out the Nationalists from the Delta. The Nationalist leaders were jailed by all pretexes (from counterfeiting of bank-notes to illegal weapon carrying).

In March 1946, before the signing of 6.3.1946 Agreement, the Vice-President of the Government Nguyen-hai-Thanh, leader of the V.N.C.M.D.M.H., fled to China to be safe and also to avoid the responsibility of collaborating with the French Army.

The Foreign-Minister Nguyen-tuong-Tam (VNQDD) crossed the frontier in May 1946, followed a short time after by VU-HONG-KHANH, a Military Commissioner in the Ho-Chi-Minh government and a signer of the 6.3.1946 Agreement.

But the V.N.C.M.D.M.H. and the V.N.Q.D.D. still had representatives in the Coalition government one V.N.Q.D.D. leader Chu-Ba-Phuong was Minister of Economy and Bo-xuan-Luat one leader of V.N.C.M.D.M.H. vice-minister of Agriculture.

III—A French-Vietnamese conference was held at Fontainebleau (Summer of 1946) in order to carry out the principles mentioned in the 6.3.1946 Agreement. It had no result.

Ho-Chi-Minh, who attended the conference, didn't want to return to Vietnam empty handed, so he signed with Marius Moutet (France-Outremer Minister in the French government) a Modus-Vivendi on 14th September 1946.

This Modus-Vivendi narrowed the agreement between the French and the Vietnamese government about the economical and cultural relations between the two countries. Both sides agreed not to attack each other, and would meet again January 1947 to discuss definite treaty.

The 20 October 1946 Ho-Chi-Minh returned to Hai-Phong and from 23 to 27 of the same month a great number of Nationalists leaders were jailed by Ho because they accused Ho of collusion with the French.

The National Assembly, with the remaining 291 members, opened its 2nd session on 28 October 1946. Out of 50 seats reserved for the V.N.Q.D.D., 20 seats were occupied, the 30 others were empty because these 30 members were already killed or had fled to China. Out of 20 seats for the V.N.C.M.D.M.H., 3 were empty. Other seats were: 90 independents, 30 Viet-Minh (headed by Pham-

Van-Dong), 15 Marxist Study Bloc (where there were Vo-Mguyen-Giap Tran-Huy-Lieu), 45 Democrat pro-Viet-Minh bloc 24 Socialist Pro-Viet-Minh bloc.

Any representative who criticized the government was watched by the V.M. police. While the assembly session went on, many Representatives disappeared. The French Police documents show that 17 representatives of the V.N.Q.D.D. and V.N.C.M.D.M.H. disappeared during the session.

On 31.10.1946 Ho-Chi-Minh and his government resigned, but the Assembly asked him to form a new government.

This government was unanimously accepted by the National Assembly and composed of:

Ho-Chi-Minh (communist) President.
 Hoang-Minh Gam (com.) Foreign Minister.
 Ta-Quang-Buu (com.) Vice-Minister of Defense.
 Vo-Nguyen-Giap (com.) Minister of Defense.

Huynh-Thuc-Mang (Independent) Minister of Interior.

Vu-Dinh-Hoe (socialist Pro-Com) Minister of Justice.

Pham-Van-Dong (com.) Minister of Economy.

Le-Van-Hien (com.) Minister of Finances.
 Nguyen-Van-Nuyen (Independent) Minister of Education.

Tran-Dang-Khoa (VNQDD) Minister of Public-Work.

Nguyen-Van-Tao (com.) Minister of Labor.
 Chu-Ba-Phuong (VNQDD) Minister of Social and Health Affaires.

Hoang-Huu-Nam (com.) Vice-Minister of Interior (Mr. Huyah-Thuc-Khang the Minister was only a puppet).

In any ministry where a non-communist member was minister the Viet-Minh created a Vice-Minister Communist. The latter was the real boss of this ministry. Such as: Hoang-Huu-Nam in the Interior, Tran-Cong-Trung in the Justice, Nguyen-Khanh-Toan in the Education, Cu-Huy-Can in the Agriculture, Nguyen-Van-To (Independent) and Bo-Xuan-Luat (VNCMDMH) were Ministers of Stato.

This Government was completely under communist hands.

Bao-Dai, the ancient king was still Supreme Adviser, but he was in Hong-Kong. (Bao-Dai was sent to China for liaison. He didn't return but fled to Hong-Kong as a refugee).

From June 1945, high-ranking leaders of the VNQDD and VNCMDMH such as Nguyen-Tuong-Tam, Vu-Hong-Khanh and Nguyen-Hai-Thanh were refugees in China. They created on 17.2.1947 a "National United Front" in Nan-King. This front had contact with the Religious sects of Cao-Dai and Woa-Hao and the Social Democratic Party of Mr. Nguyen-Van-Sam in South Vietnam. From the 15th to the 22nd of March these above groups met together in Kouang-Chouu and made a decision to support BAO-DNI. They were to talk with the French in an equal and independent stand.

IV—In summary the experience of coalition government between the Communists and the Nationalists in North Vietnam 1946, gave us this lesson:

1—The communists consented to make coalition with the Nationalists only under strong pressure of China (at this time China had 180,000 soldiers in North Vietnam).

2—Once in coalition, the Communists always find the hidden way to eliminate the Nationalists.

First the Communists exploited the deep hatred of the Nationalists against the French. They let the French come in North Vietnam and utilized them to fight against VNQDD and the VNCMDMH while the Chinese troops still were in North Vietnam.

3—When the Chinese troops withdrew from N.V.M. the Communists openly attacked the Nationalists. To save their lives

the high ranking leaders of these parties were forced to flee to China. The middle ranking leaders were all killed. Some unworthy men were left alive to cover the eye of the people and fill some secondary seats in the government.

A DANGEROUS GAME WITH MILK PRODUCTION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I recently sent to Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin asking that the price support for milk be raised to the full 90 percent of parity. I also reported at that time that the reply from the Secretary's office indicated that the price support level would not be increased because the Department of Agriculture found "price increases to producers as a result of market forces encouraging."

In my letter I pointed out facts which should be well known to Secretary Hardin and his advisers.

The production of milk is down and has been for many, many months. Fluid sales are up and the current price for beef is so favorable that incentives for the culling of herds are strong.

A recent article which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel goes even further, and legitimately asks whether our Government is playing blindman's buff with this Nation's ability to produce an adequate supply of milk and dairy products.

That article, titled "Turmoil in Dairyland—United States Facing New Problems as Milk Production Drops," points out that not only is milk production down, but that a 4-billion-pound deficit is expected this year. It points out that butter production is down, while butter consumption is up, that cheese production is down, while cheese consumption is up, and that powdered milk production is down, while powdered milk consumption is up.

While my reply from the Secretary's office indicates that the Department of Agriculture finds recent price increases to producers "encouraging," the article indicates that the Government also finds some comfort in the fact that 75 percent of all butter stocks are in Government hands.

The relevant fact, Mr. Speaker, is not that the Government owns 75 percent of all butter stocks. The relevant fact is that total butter stocks are down 18 percent, even though Government-owned stocks are up.

Perhaps as the following article says, the administration will panic when they see how serious the present crunch really is and will allow increased imports of beef and dairy products. That would be tragic irony for the American farmer.

I sincerely hope the administration will act now to avoid such a development. What is needed to stimulate domestic milk production is an increase in the milk price support to 90 percent and it is needed now.

CXV—1432—Part 17

I am placing the following article in the RECORD for the review of my colleagues:

TURMOIL IN DAIRYLAND—VI: UNITED STATES FACING NEW PROBLEMS AS MILK PRODUCTION DROPS

(By Gene Divine)

The crunch will be on Wisconsin's 570 cheese factories and 16,999 dairy plant workers in September as a result of federal government policy which is destroying the nation's capacity to manufacture dairy products.

Last year the nation consumed the equivalent of 500 million pounds of milk more than were produced, with imported milk helping fill the gap. And in 1969, with per capita consumption increasing and milk production decreasing, the deficit is estimated at 4 billion pounds.

This will leave little milk at a price which cheese makers can afford to pay. Wisconsin, as America's dairyland, will suffer most. The state made \$414 million worth of cheese last year.

U.S. PRODUCTION DOWN

Milk production nationally has declined for the last six years and in Wisconsin for the last two years. In April milk production was the smallest for the month in Wisconsin in 12 years.

The state agriculture department reports reduced butter and cheese production "due to the smaller supply of milk."

United States milk production in June was the lowest for that month since 1934. June was also the 15th consecutive month that production was below that of the corresponding month of the previous year.

The June output brought production for the first half of 1969 to a rate 2% below the same period in 1968, according to United States department of agriculture (USDA) figures.

MARKET TURNAROUND

A few years ago nobody knew where to go with all of the milk in June when the cows went out on pasture. Last June Wisconsin exported milk to deficient areas.

Wisconsin has a large enough surplus to assure the entire nation of enough milk to drink—if the trucks to haul it are available. A year ago Georgia wanted Wisconsin milk, but there were no extra stainless steel tank trucks in which to haul it.

When most of Wisconsin's milk goes into bottles prices will be so high that most manufacturing plants in the nation won't be able to continue to operate at a profit.

EUROPE HAS SURPLUS

Where will the cheese and butter come from? Europe. Right now in France huge butter surplus stocks are spoiling in warehouses. Last year Russia sent ice cream mix (butter fat) into the United States by having it refined in the Netherlands.

Suffering as a result of the shortage will be not only the 780 licensed Wisconsin dairy plants, but the Wisconsin dairy farmer, because imports will depress all milk prices.

Even now fewer and fewer persons are willing to work seven days a week at the present compensation for milking cows in our otherwise affluent society.

FIGURES SPEAK

This is borne out by the continuing decline in milk production despite government protestations that the current price is "high enough to ensure an adequate supply."

USDA figures show that production of 117.3 billion pounds of milk in 1968 was down 5.6% from the 126.9 billion pounds of 1964.

In 1968 dairy farmers marketed 112.5 billion pounds of milk, but the market consumed 113.1 billion pounds.

The deficit came from storage stocks and imports. Current trends, as reported by the USDA, indicate a 2% increase over 1968 in domestic consumption of milk and dairy products.

BUTTER USE UP

Butter consumption is up 1.5%, and cheese, ice cream and powdered milk use is up 5%.

But United States butter production is down 4%, with Wisconsin down 12%, Minnesota down 4%, and Iowa down 11%. Cheese production is down 6% nationally and 3% in Wisconsin at a time when high meat prices are increasing the demand for the cheaper protein of cheese.

Powdered milk production is down 9%. In Wisconsin, milk production is running 2.2% below a year ago and the number of milk cows on farms is 2% less. High meat prices are encouraging dairy farmers to sell more dairy cows.

STATE EXPORTING MORE

While state production declines, more milk moves out. Normally a period of national surplus, June saw milk moving out of Wisconsin by the 50,000 pound truckload every week during the month.

Drought and extremely hot weather in Georgia and much of the South has resulted in lower milk production than normal there and created a sudden demand for many more thousands of pounds of Wisconsin milk.

Thus far spot shipments of milk have moved out of state at a rate almost double that of the first half of the year in 1968, and the normal months of shortage are yet to come.

The first hay crop in the state was pretty much a disaster for many farmers. This will be reflected during the next winter in less milk production, which in turn will force production costs up.

FARMER COMMENTS

Richard J. Wilhelm of Arpin, a dairy farmer, expressed his concern:

"The poor farmer is getting lost in the mad vicious circle which some seem never to check into until it is too late. . . . Nobody cares until—no milk."

He was referring to the fact that the government refuses to raise the milk price support level on the ground that the milk supply is adequate.

Bureaucrats point to government ownership of 75% of all butter stocks to deny the existence of a serious milk shortage.

BUTTER STOCKS

They are being outsmarted by industry, which must pay 10% interest on short term loans to store butter. By selling to the government Uncle Sam takes the high interest rate and spoils raps, even though reselling for more than the purchase price.

Proof is in the fact that the total butter cold storage stocks are down 18% from a year ago, but government holdings are a larger percentage of the total.

Wisconsin dairy leaders worry that federal bureaucrats and Nixon administrators will panic when they realize how serious the crunch is, and open the gates to South American beef and European surplus dairy products. They see chaos in this country as meat and dairy prices plunge downward.

This would be popular with consumers and foreign nations, but it would leave Wisconsin's farmers and our \$1 billion dairy industry holding the bag.

HAWAII CITIZENS OPEN DOORS AND POCKETBOOKS TO SUPPORT PHILOSOPHERS' "FESTIVAL OF IDEAS"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, East-West dialog found its most recent expression in the fifth East-West Philos-

ophers' Conference in Honolulu, Hawaii, which ended on July 26, 1969.

For 5 weeks, over 100 scholars from 20 countries, including a sizable contingent from Iron Curtain countries and the Middle East, deliberated upon the conference theme of "Alienation and Modern Man." According to Dr. Abraham Kaplan, director of the conference, the participants came to recognize the need for people consciousness and sense of community in receiving each other's ideas. It became obvious to the conferees that in order to understand another person's ideas it was necessary "to understand not his words, but him."

From the potpourri of ideas exchanged at the conference Dr. Kaplan has identified two provocative conclusions reached by the conferees on alienation. First, according to Dr. Kaplan, the conferees agreed that alienation is not about distance between men—since many men, artists, scholars, even average men, like a certain aloofness and distance from their fellows. And second, the conferees agreed that "those who are alienated in our times are not the ones engaged in dissent, but the ones who are indifferent or in despair." In essence, the alienated are not those "people who are doing something, but the ones who do not give a damn, or who think it does not matter a damn."

Much skepticism was also heard at the conference for the technological advances recently epitomized by America's triumphant moon landing. That technology must be "humanized"—that is, made to serve man rather than have man serve it—perhaps most accurately depicts the consensual feeling expressed at the conference. This challenge undoubtedly represents one of the most crucial tests for mankind in the final third of the 20th century.

In evaluating the site of the conference the participants were quick to note the general warmth and openness with which they were welcomed by the residents of my home State. Contributions totaling more than \$100,000 from island individuals and firms made the conference financially possible. Dr. Kaplan paid what was perhaps the most fitting tribute when he said that other communities support drama or music, "but I don't know of anybody else who gives civic support for a festival of ideas."

My heartiest congratulations are extended to my fellow citizens of the 50th State who made possible the success of the Fifth East-West Philosophers' Conference. Believing that my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would wish to read more about the conference, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Wednesday, July 30, 1969, Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and another well-written article by Advertiser reporter Jane Evinger, which appeared in the July 27, 1969, issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 30, 1969]

ALIENATION IN APATHY

In winding up the East-West philosophers' five-week discussion of "The Alienation of Modern Man," Dr. Abraham Kaplan, the conference director, identified two things that alienation is not about.

First, he said, the conferees agreed it is not about distance between men—since many men, artists, scholars, even average men, like a certain aloofness and distance from their fellows.

Second, he said, alienation is not found in dissent. Rather the dissenter is a most unalienated individual passionately involved in society. By his act of dissent he shows optimism that there is a chance for him to succeed.

The true alienated man, said Kaplan, is the apathetic individual who cares not, tries not, sees no hope.

Much of the discussion turned on technology and its dehumanizing effects. There was probably as much skepticism about America's triumphant Moon landing among the philosophers as in any other group of 125 people anywhere.

But even there, among the skeptics, the thinkers, there was no consensus that technological advance should be stopped or the clock turned backward.

Rather, Kaplan suggested, there was agreement that technology must be humanized, made to serve man rather than man to serve technology.

"Humanize technology," said Kaplan, is the phrase that perhaps comes closest to the heart of the thoughts expressed in five weeks of discussion.

Laymen will understand. Many dissenters grasped the point long ago. Politicians have based successful campaigns on it. Even those who are not activists find this an imperative for the years ahead—probably the crucial test for final third of the 20th century: Humanize technology.

[From the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, July 27, 1969]

KAPLAN ASSESSES PHILOSOPHERS' "FESTIVAL OF IDEAS"

(By Jane Evinger)

The value of the East-West Philosophers' Conference, which yesterday wound up five weeks of meetings at the University of Hawaii, lies in the opportunity it gave participants to get to know each other, its director indicated yesterday.

Dr. Abraham Kaplan, taking a backward look at the gathering from the vantage point of the director's seat, said the conference's "value lies in people."

"If someone asked what I got from the conference, I'd have to list a few names—the old friends I came to know better, and the new friends—and basically, this is what I think everybody would say.

"If you haven't got the friends, you haven't got the ideas, because you don't understand them."

Despite his extensive travel, Kaplan said, until the conference, "I think I didn't realize enough how really hard it is to cross the cultural gap.

"In order to be able to understand what anybody says, you have to understand not his words, but him."

Kaplan, who is professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, has been in Hawaii the past year and a half, working on plans for the conference, which is held every five years. More than 100 scholars from 20 countries attended this year's sessions.

Kaplan leaves Hawaii Friday.

Trying to evaluate the conference, he noted that "there is in our time a great deal of distrust of the mind—of the uses of the mind, and of reason.

"When people ask what's the point of coming together for all this talk, it is because they don't trust the mind.

"It's similar to a couple asking 'what's the point of our marriage?'—when they get to that point, you know the marriage is pretty much finished.

"I think the most significant things in human experience are just the ones we don't know how to measure—the growth of love, of understanding, of sympathy.

"Also, the things that are really significant in human experience are often the ones we can't assess until long after. That's why I oppose devices that measure teaching, even though I've come out pretty well on some of them, because most people can't tell who was a good teacher until 20 years after."

As the conference ends, Kaplan said, "I understand better than ever before—and I think a lot of people in the conference do—the importance of being concerned with human problems without necessarily rushing off to accomplish."

He notes that many people "think either you don't care, or if you do, you go rushing off into politics.

"But if you look at somebody engaged in medical research, certainly nobody can say he doesn't give a damn about disease!

"And yet he's not running around with a box of Band-Aids giving first aid to anyone on his doorstep."

Both researchers and practitioners are needed, Kaplan indicated.

At the conference, he said, philosophers "have shown that we care very deeply about the problems that are besetting man today, but we have also felt that our caring is no justification for abandoning our philosophic calling or our role as educators and becoming amateur politicians.

"I repudiate the philosophy that has no room for relevance to human problems, but I also repudiate the conception of relevance that has no room for philosophizing."

Of the conference theme, "Alienation and Modern Man," Kaplan said "we have had 100 people and 200 ideas.

"But I think many of the conferees would agree with me that those who are alienated in our times are not the ones engaged in dissent, but the ones who are indifferent or in despair.

"It's not the people who are doing something, but the ones who don't give a damn, or who think it doesn't matter a damn."

The conference for the first time this year included a sizable number of participants from Europe—including some from Iron Curtain countries—and the Middle East.

It also included a number who were not technically philosophers. They ranged from psychologists to journalists and a novelist.

Kaplan would like to see both of these expansions taken even farther for the 1974 conference.

"I believe strongly that the next conference should really become, in the true sense of the word, worldwide," he said. "In the years to come we are going to have to recognize the growing importance of Latin America and Africa.

"And we must recognize that philosophy is not limited to the professional card carriers of the departments of philosophy.

"Maybe the sixth one can be called the East-West-North-South Conference on the Human Mind and Human Problems."

The conference faced some handicaps, Kaplan said.

"Communication ultimately depends on community, and I think it unfortunate that we didn't have the physical facilities for everyone to stay in one place.

"A third of the participants were in Wai-kiki and two-thirds were in four different locations on campus. There was no single roof under which we could meet and conveniently for meals."

While the community and the University administration were helpful, Kaplan said, "not all parts of the University recognize a sense of common purpose, of shared goals.

"In many areas, I was surprised that the University seemed to be at loggerheads with itself."

He had to buy eight University parking passes out of conference funds, and also used the funds to pay a number of parking tickets for participants who'd parked in places not authorized for pass holders.

Kaplan said it also was "difficult to get

the auditoriums we needed on campus. We were in four different ones, and they were not always suited to our needs. It is like the interservice rivalries which weaken national defense."

Kaplan's major feeling however, he stressed, is that "I think this was a memorable experience for many, many people."

"If you asked the conferees to tell you the single most impressive thing, the answer would be the hospitality—the way the community opened its arms" to them with lunches, dinners, excursions and other offerings.

A delegate from behind the Iron Curtain, he noted, plans to take back with him, as a souvenir, his invitations to the Governor's reception honoring the participants.

He wants to show it to his own university as an indication of the way philosophers are valued in Hawaii.

Island individuals and firms contributed more than \$100,000 to make the conference possible.

"When all is said and done, I feel it is fantastic that the citizens of Honolulu and Hawaii have made this possible, not just the funding, but the way they opened their arms to the conferees," Kaplan said.

Other communities support drama or music, he said, "but I don't know of anybody else who gives civic support for a festival of ideas."

CAN OUR ASIA POLICY BE MADE "CRYSTAL CLEAR"?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's pronouncement of our Asia policy, as gleaned from his recent speeches in Guam, Thailand, and Vietnam, has evoked considerable editorial comment across the Nation.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin has joined in this journalistic inquiry to ascertain the nature and extent of this, the most important foreign policy statement to be made to date by the present administration. In behalf of my constituents, I urge the President to clarify his position on Asia and make it "crystal clear," if that is possible. His recent statements have confused even those who have stood by with him and supported him.

I believe my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find of interest the editorial entitled "Nixon's Asia Policy," which appeared in the July 30, 1969, issue of the Honolulu daily. The editorial follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
July 30, 1969]

NIXON'S ASIA POLICY

President Nixon's speeches in Thailand and Vietnam (the latter just after a unit of Ninth Division troops was flown out to Hawaii) perplex more than they enlighten.

The obvious contradiction in President Nixon's newly-expressed Asia policy is so great that it is bound to leave his own people wondering, not to mention the countries it otherwise affects.

The President has pledged "no more Vietnams." He has told the leaders of Thailand that the 47,000 U.S. airmen and support troops in Thailand will be gradually withdrawn as the war in Vietnam comes to a close.

Yet at the same time he says "the United States will stand proudly with Thailand

against those who might threaten it from abroad or within."

What does he mean by "stand proudly" with Thailand? To the Thais the insurgents whose arms and supplies come from Red China are not to be dismissed lightly. Nor are the Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese forces in Laos.

It can hardly be overlooked that our involvement in Vietnam began by "standing" with the late President Diem. When he was assassinated we supported his successors as the Viet Cong threat increased. Then the North Vietnamese entered the country in force and our commitment grew apace.

There is little reason to doubt that, once we have left Southeast Asia, the same procedure will be repeated by North Vietnam against Thailand. How do you "stand" with a friend without providing men and weapons, assuming the enemy proves strong?

No doubt when President Nixon has returned to Washington he will report to his constituents on this Asia policy which seems to be unfolding as he travels. The policy is badly in need of explanation.

Meantime Hawaii wishes aloha to its new home division—the Ninth, back from a Vietnam tour that earned deserved official praise.

AWARDS OF THE ROBERT F. KENNEDY MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation was founded after Senator Kennedy's death for the purpose of furthering the ideals for which he lived. One of its activities is to recognize those individuals and organizations that have made the greatest contributions in the mass media to the realization of those ideals, particularly in the reporting of poverty and discrimination. The first of these annual awards were announced recently by a panel of four distinguished judges, John Chancellor, of NBC; Michael Harrington, author; Hugh Sidney, of Time-Life; and Bill Small, of the Washington bureau of CBS.

The awards and their recipients were: For best network broadcast coverage: CBS News, for the documentary, "Black History, Lost, Stolen, or Strayed," written by Perry Wolff and Andrew A. Rooney, directed by Mr. Rooney and Vern Diamond, and narrated by Bill Cosby. The award cited the network for "an honest, eye-opening account of what white America has done to rewrite and distort the black American's place in history, produced with a freshness and creativity which capture the viewer's attention from the very outset."

For best newspaper coverage: Mr. Nick Kotz of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, "For continuing coverage of hunger and rural poverty in America, exposing the mismanagement of Federal food programs, and focusing attention on the contrast between the large Federal subsidies given to wealthy farmers and inadequate assistance given the hungry black poor who live on or near subsidized plantations."

For best magazine coverage: Mr. David Nevin of Life magazine, for his article,

"These Murdered Old Mountains," "a compelling and infuriating article about the destruction of the beautiful mountains and hardy people of eastern Kentucky by strip mining."

For best local broadcasting: Radio station WMCA of New York City, on whose behalf its distinguished President, Mr. R. Peter Straus, accepted the award. The citation read:

For continuing special coverage of the problems of poverty and discrimination in New York City and New York State, including special programs on conditions of migrant farm workers, consumer frauds, and misuse of legal processes in the ghetto, and on feelings of black America toward white America following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, and for the service rendered in establishing "Call For Action," a volunteer ombudsman service to help people find their way through government bureaucracy.

I include in the RECORD, at this point, two of the editorials that have made WMCA such a beacon of courage and social concern and have gained it the gratitude and respect of concerned men and women throughout the Nation:

GRAPE BOYCOTT

The farm workers who pick table grapes in California are on strike. They want the same legal rights that industrial workers have had for 30 years. Until they've won those rights, we're not buying grapes.

We're not—but the Defense Department is. In the last six months of 1968, grapes were shipped to Vietnam at seven times the level of the previous year.

The Pentagon doesn't have any real explanation for their sudden love of grapes, except to say that their policy is not to get involved in labor-management disputes. But we don't see how the government can buy more and more grapes—and still claim to be neutral.

At the very least, Washington should cut back its grape-buying to the pre-strike level. And if it must take sides, we think it should support the workers, not the growers.

GRAPE BOYCOTT

The Defense Department is fond of saying that it doesn't take sides in labor-management disputes. Yet last year it increased grape shipments for Vietnam to seven times the previous rate.

Now, California grape growers are involved in a bitter—but so far non-violent—labor-management dispute with striking farm workers. We think buying more grapes is taking sides. What's more, we think the Pentagon has taken the wrong side.

Defense spokesmen give three "reasons" for sending more grapes to Vietnam. One is "high troop acceptability." Two is a dearth of "export-quality" oranges. Three is better refrigeration.

If these are reasons at all, they are reasons why the Pentagon can ship more grapes to Vietnam. We have yet to hear one good reason why it should.

Nothing is more important in these times of great national difficulties than that the mass media display courage and integrity in exposing and documenting instances of misery and injustice wherever they may occur. That is why these awards are so worthy of note, that is why we salute with our grateful best wishes those individuals and organizations that earned these honors, and that is why we thank the foundation itself for its initiative and vision in bestowing such awards. We take this occasion too

to pledge that we will increase our efforts to achieve the goals of Robert F. Kennedy, even as we find ourselves missing his leadership and strength more each passing month.

CONGRESS HAS SPOKEN CLEARLY
TO DISTRICT ON SUBWAYS AND
HIGHWAYS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, there exists in this Capital City the sad and intolerable situation of a public body, the District of Columbia Council, which, while appointed to be broadly representative of the District of Columbia community, continues to take a position on highways and rapid transit that is not only contrary to the best interests of the residents of the District of Columbia but as evidenced by a recent poll commissioned by the chairman of this body is also contrary to the wishes and desires of those residents.

The Congress directed in clear and unequivocal terms in the 1968 Highway Act that the District of Columbia build roadways required for the Washington metropolitan area, and on two subsequent occasions reemphasized its position that Three Sisters must be built by refusing to appropriate subway funds to the District until it proceeded with the highway construction. However, notwithstanding directives from Congress, the District of Columbia City Council continues to ignore those wishes because, in their view, people of the District of Columbia do not want more highways. And how does the Council obtain its enlightenment on this question?

From a small but vocal anti-highway group whose main power of persuasion comes from its ability to take over with impunity the proceedings of the Council and then to threaten further public disturbances and possible riots if their unreasonable demands were not granted. In brief, in reaching a decision of this question of such great importance to the whole community, the District of Columbia Council has, in the main, followed the unreasoned direction of a small but vocal group of activists.

There has finally come to light two polls, taken in an orderly and professional manner, which indicate that the

majority of the District's citizens agree with the Congress on the need for additional highways. Both of these polls, one commissioned by the chairman of the Council and reluctantly released by him, make it abundantly clear that the people want these highway projects. With such evidence before it, I fail to see how the District government can now continue its refusal to comply with the wishes of both the Congress and the citizens of the District of Columbia. If they continue to do so, grave doubts must be raised as to the ability of the District to function under the present form of government.

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL—VIII

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic denial of freedom to parents and children continues to kindle repercussions in my district, and rightfully so, for what thinking American today can conceive of our Government callously denying freedom to a segment of our people—of all races.

The empassioned disenchantment of taxpaying American citizens who are the parents of little children is best evidenced by a petition directed to all constituted authority by thousands of citizens of Washington Parish, La.

The question is no longer, "How far will you be pushed, Mr. and Mrs. America?"—it is now, "How long will the American people tolerate tyranny such as this from their own Government"—and that under perversion of the very Constitution adopted to prevent exactly such tyranny.

And to our colleagues who still live in areas of relative freedom, I can but remind you that if our bureaucrats can take such extreme action against the children of my area, it is only a matter of time until your parents and children also will be affected by this erosion of individual liberty—and will cry to you for help.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the petition from citizens from one school district in Louisiana:

A PETITION TO ALL CONSTITUTED AUTHORITY

We, the undersigned citizens of Washington Parish, Louisiana, urge our officials, appointive and elective, local, state and national, in the executive, legislative, and ju-

dicial branches of our Government, to hear and to consider our plea for help as we approach a time of desperation and impending chaos in the problem of public education. We employ the simple petition as the right of citizens to "petition for redress of grievances" for it seems to embody the spirit that motivated the early founders of this nation. It is respectfully urged that it be received and considered in the spirit that it is submitted.

In the passing of time and the ultimate easing and settling of the current imposing social and racial problems, history will note that we inherited and did not create the dilemma with which we are confronted. In spite of past history, our heritage and environment, we do believe that all races and creeds are equal in the eyes of God, and further that all children are entitled to the best education available in institutions supported by the public treasury. However, we believe that student placement should be the right of the parent, subject to reasonable and necessary regulation by local school authority.

Our parents, our children and our teachers are bewildered; they are burdened and grieved beyond words in anticipation of the chaotic conditions expected at the beginning of the school year, just a few weeks hence. Our children weep because of the burdens and frustrations imposed on them in the closing of their schools, the prospect of their daily transportation to schools distant from their homes, and in the prospect of being dealt with as displaced persons. They cannot understand; nor can we.

We love our country, some of us have fought for it; some have lost family members as they fought under our Flag; we are dedicated to the obedience of the laws of our land, even though we cannot understand the enforcement practices and policies as currently applied in certain areas.

We love our homes and our environment. We love and cherish our system of public education, and reflect upon the fact that it has brought instruction and a yearning for knowledge to many who would have been denied opportunity. It seems that the public school system is now being undermined; it staggers under the burden of divisive influences and orders; it is on the brink of crumbling. This we seek to avoid.

During the past school year our public schools operated on an integrated basis and in an atmosphere of comparative harmony; in our entire area we have experienced an atmosphere of relative calm, order and mutual helpfulness as between the races; this relationship we seek to maintain; we do not desire to regress in racial relations.

In this hour of comparative harmony, hopefulness and progress, we sincerely question the disruptive changes that are in the process of being made in our public school system. We earnestly plead for a moratorium of reasonable duration, or whatever action is necessary to give us more time within which to adjust to whatever may be eventually imposed upon our public school systems and upon us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, August 7, 1969

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Reverend James Edmund Schneider, Bethany and Browne Memorial Methodist Churches, Jersey City, N.J., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious God, we commit ourselves to Your loving care. Bless the deliberations of this hour. You do not belong to us, dear Father, we belong to You. Help us to walk with You—not ahead or behind—but with You. Bless these law-

makers gathered together and bring them an understanding of the sacred privilege they have as servants of the people. We commit to Your loving care the souls of those who have made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of their country in the cause of freedom. Bless the President of these United States and all those who are in this great assembly. May peace soon reign throughout the world, and may Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JAMES EDMUND SCHNEIDER

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)