

vent the use of and eliminate stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons."

In June, the President directed the executive branch to undertake a comprehensive review of all aspects of CBW. However, recent reports from the summer session of the Geneva Conference cast doubt on the sincerity of our commitments.

International skepticism over the U.S. position stems from an important sentence in a statement of the President submitted to the Conference. The sentence in question states:

The specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and repulsion throughout the world.

Indicative of the vacillation of the United States on CBW, the sentence was originally included in the statement, was then deleted, and was finally restored to the text when it was printed.

Furthermore, international skepticism over America's CBW position was deepened because of events in Vietnam.

The United States is using defoliants and anti-crop agents in Vietnam. These gases have been justified on the basis that they isolate victims from unwarranted suffering.

However, Dr. Jean Mayer of Harvard University, now a Presidential consultant, and Dr. Victor Sidel, his colleague on this report, have disclosed:

It is not that innocent bystanders will be hurt by such measures, but that *only* innocent bystanders will be hurt.

In the case of defoliants which destroy food, it is the women and children, the sick and the elderly, not the soldiers, who first succumb to starvation.

To begin to harness this potentially destructive force, to halt the proliferation of CBW weapons to small countries, and reestablish our international credibility, we must act with all speed.

We must impose control on the further production of chemical and biological warfare.

We must ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

We must act to impose a ban on open air testing.

We must require the Pentagon to disclose its total CBW expenditures to Congress.

The time for secrecy and decision-making independent of Congress must come to an end. Congress must reassert

its control and its authority. We must not be led into an apocalypse resulting from disease started because of policies we could not control. The dangers from inaction are too great for the people of the world, for the citizens of America, and for our children.

This is a glorious moment in the history of mankind. We have recently set foot upon the moon.

We took every precaution to prevent the contamination of the moon. We must now take every precaution to prevent the uncontrollable contamination of the earth.

THE ABM DEBATE EXTREMELY USEFUL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I believe the spirited debate on the ABM issue has created the false public impression that the U.S. Senate is now irrevocably split along partisan lines. No one can deny that the arguments were heated. But they were also extremely useful. They have united the Senate in its resolve to give the most scrupulous consideration to the proper balance between the needs of national security and our duty to promote just and progressive domestic programs. Now that the vote has been taken, let us all move "forward together" to the many urgent tasks still at hand.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I issued yesterday following the voting on amendments to President Nixon's Safeguard proposal be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

The defeat of the Hart-Cooper amendment indicates that the President's Safeguard System will be approved finally by Congress. I do not believe the division in the Senate on this issue is as sharp as some might think. This is not a black-white issue, although the public debate hastened to portray it as such.

The contending opinions are actually not so far apart. Everyone agrees that the President must provide for our Nation's defense. The question on ABM was whether we should have continued research and development only, or limited deployment of a prototype system at two sites only.

I opposed the Sentinel System proposed by the previous Administration because I believed it would magnetize our cities. Presi-

dent Nixon's proposal is a responsible and flexible approach. He has the option to scale down the program if the Soviet Union cooperates in disarmament talks, and it gives him the necessary lead time to develop responses to future Soviet threats in the 70's should they materialize. It is a modest program and, in my opinion, it is the very least we can give our President at this time.

I believe this debate has been useful to everyone involved. Certainly it has alerted the Administration and the Pentagon that defense proposals are due, and will receive, the same scrutiny by Congress that all other programs receive.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, August 8, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 7 (legislative day of August 5), 1969:

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Louis R. Bruce, of New York, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice Robert LaFollette Bennett, resigned.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate August 7 (legislative day of August 5), 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

George E. Woods, Jr., of Michigan to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Lawrence Gubow, resigned, sent to the Senate May 16, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DUNES TORPEDO FIZZLES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD the following editorial dated July 26, 1969, from the South Bend, Ind., Tribune entitled "Dunes Torpedo Fizzles":

DUNES TORPEDO FIZZLES

The attempt by Rep. Earl F. Landgrebe, R-Valparaiso, to torpedo the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore along the lines approved by Congress two years ago apparently has been blocked.

The Landgrebe torpedo was in the form of an amendment to an appropriation bill carrying \$10 million in funds and contract authority for land acquisition. In effect, it would have whittled the size of the lakeshore recreation area by approximately 6,000 acres.

Fortunately, the amendment went down to defeat in a voice vote in the House this week. Moreover, there are indications that another

Landgrebe bill aimed at curtailing the dimensions of the park will never get out of committee.

Had Mr. Landgrebe succeeded in destroying the compromise under which both the Burns Harbor and park projects were authorized, it most certainly would have returned the issue to the hot coals of controversy.

Controversy over the park proposal and port-industrial development raged for years before the sensible compromise was reached to permit both.

Rep. John Brademas, D-South Bend, fought the Landgrebe attack on the park plans. After the appropriation bill amendment was beaten, he hailed the action as

"clear evidence that Congress won't stand for any further land-grab assaults on the Indiana dunes." We hope he is correct.

More than 500 acres already have been acquired by the federal government for expansion of the park to an envisioned 8,300 acres. Mr. Landgrebe might better apply his energies in seeing that none of the federal money is wasted, rather than seeking to rip up the plans.

TVA PAYMENT EXCEEDS APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 10th anniversary of the enactment of the present arrangement for financing the electric power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It is interesting to note that during the current fiscal year the TVA will pay into the U.S. Treasury almost half again as much as has been requested for appropriations.

The power program will pay into the Treasury more than \$72 million this year. The TVA's appropriation request for the current year is less than \$50 million.

There is, of course, no direct relationship between the TVA payments and the request for appropriations. The payments are related exclusively to the electric power operation of the TVA, which is now self-financing, while the appropriation request provides for the other activities for which the TVA was chartered by the Congress.

These other activities include navigation, flood control, other water resources developments, and fertilizer and munitions development—all of which have already returned to the people of the United States far more in benefits than the total investment.

Additional information about the TVA payments to the Treasury are provided in the weekly newsletter of the agency. So that my colleagues will know of this program, I submit for inclusion the newsletter in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point:

WEEKLY NEWSLETTER

More than \$72 million will be paid to the U.S. Treasury out of Tennessee Valley Authority power revenues during the fiscal year that began July 1, TVA said today. This is \$4½ million more than payments in the year just ended, continuing the upward trend of recent years.

TVA payments into the Treasury have been rising sharply, while appropriations from the Treasury for TVA regional development programs have been falling because of the overall effort to limit Federal budgets. As a result, the \$72 million TVA will pay the Treasury this year is about half again as much as the agency's appropriation request now before Congress, which totals just under \$50 million.

The new year's total payments will include a \$15 million repayment of Federal appropriations previously invested in TVA power facilities, and record dividends of over

\$57 million on the remaining appropriation investment in the TVA power system.

The rate of return paid to the Treasury by TVA is based by law on the interest cost of the U.S. Government marketable debt as of the start of the fiscal year. That rate was 5.232 percent on July 1 this year, compared to 4.757 percent a year ago.

Rising interest rates on Treasury securities have boosted the dividends paid by TVA by \$21 million a year since 1962, even though the Federal investment on which they are paid was whittled down by repayments of \$100 million during that time. This appropriation investment in TVA power facilities now stands at about \$1,102 million.

Construction of TVA power generating and transmission facilities is now financed from power revenues and borrowings, rather than from appropriations.

The Federal legislation that established the present TVA power financing program was enacted ten years ago this week. The interest cost on the U.S. Government marketable debt, established in that legislation as the basis for the rate of return paid by TVA, was then less than 3 percent, compared to the 5.2 percent rate this year.

The amount of the annual repayment by TVA, also established by law, will increase from \$15 million to \$20 million starting in 1971.

SOVIET FLEET IN CARIBBEAN

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, David Lawrence has recently warned that the presence of a Soviet naval fleet in the Gulf of Mexico has dampened the cause of peace. Mr. Lawrence points out that the course of this fleet, just a few miles from the territory of the United States—a fleet that has the capability of firing missiles—is a provocative act.

He contrasts this with the recent voyage by American destroyers to the Black Sea. The destroyers sent to the Black Sea carried no missiles. They cruised in collaboration with the ships of Turkey. Turkey is a member of NATO, and the exercises were a part of our NATO obligation.

Mr. Lawrence points out that the Soviet presence is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that the Soviets have no right to their present stronghold in Cuba. By contrast, the Soviet occupation of Eastern Europe is in defiance of the World War II settlements.

Mr. Lawrence says:

The time has come to make clear to the government in Moscow that it must detach itself not only from Cuba but from any other country in this hemisphere. For the principles behind the Monroe Doctrine are still valid as a means of protecting the peoples of the Western Hemisphere against military conquest by any European or Asian power.

I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Soviet Naval Moves Dampen Peace," written by David Lawrence, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), July 15, 1969]

SOVIET NAVAL MOVES DAMPEN PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

The cause of world peace is not helped by the presence of a Soviet naval fleet in the Gulf of Mexico just a few miles from the territory of the United States. The task force is capable of firing missiles. It consists of eight ships—a guided-missile cruiser, two guided-missile destroyers, a submarine tender, two diesel submarines and two oilers. Some reports say that the Moscow government has sent the ships to this area because a few American destroyers have been patrolling the Black Sea.

Whatever the reasons for the Soviet maneuver, it certainly has created uneasiness here and accentuates the importance of the proposed talks with the Soviets on arms limitation.

Every country has a right to send its war vessels into any ocean as long as they remain beyond the three-mile or twelve-mile limit prescribed. Thus far, the Soviet fleet has stayed at least 75 miles west of Key West, Fla., and is planning to go to Havana, presumably to attend the celebration of Cuba's National Day on July 26.

So far as is known, the destroyers sent into the Black Sea by the United States carried no missiles. They have been cruising in collaboration with ships of Turkey, which also borders on the Black Sea and is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The exercises are part of the obligation of NATO to prepare for the defense of that country against potential aggression.

President Monroe, 146 years ago, proclaimed the doctrine that the United States would not tolerate the establishment of a foothold in this hemisphere by any European country. The Monroe Doctrine, as it is called, was respected for many decades. But within recent years, the Soviet government has defied it by establishing a foothold in Cuba.

The Russians may argue that they have a right to keep any country from establishing bases in Europe and that, in effect, if the United States is to have a free hand in keeping other nations from setting up bases in this hemisphere, then America ought to be prohibited from doing the same thing in Europe.

But the truth is that the Soviet government maintains armies of occupation in the Communist-bloc countries of Eastern Europe in defiance of the settlements reached at the end of World War II. The United States would be glad indeed to abolish NATO and pull its troops and naval fleets back home if the Soviets withdrew their armies and released from bondage the peoples of East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

In the crisis that arose in 1962, President Kennedy insisted that Soviet missile sites in Cuba be dismantled. Reports have recurred since then that secret bases have nevertheless been maintained. A close relationship between the Cuban government of Fidel Castro and the Moscow government has continued. A few days ago a London dispatch attributed to diplomatic sources a statement that as much as \$2 billion had been advanced to the Castro government by the Soviets in the last few years.

Intrigue has been carried on by the Communists in several of the Central American and South American countries. There is evidence of Communist plotting and collusion with some of the rebel movements in Latin America. Except in Cuba, however, no military installations have been set up by the Russians.

The time has come to make clear to the government in Moscow that it must detach

itself not only from Cuba but from any other country in this hemisphere. For the principles behind the Monroe Doctrine are still valid as a means of protecting the peoples of the Western Hemisphere against military conquest by any European or Asian power.

There can be little trust in Soviet pledges about maintaining peace while funds and military equipment are being shipped to Cuba, and a Soviet fleet cruises in waters off our shores with vessels capable of firing missiles which could easily destroy American lives and property. Still, there are people in Congress who keep saying that the Communist threat is just a "myth" and that the deployment of anti-ballistic missiles inside the United States as a deterrent to enemy attack is really unnecessary.

HOWARD A. COLEMAN, JR., IS
PRESENTED CITATION

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this period of time in our country when young persons are facing many challenges and difficult decisions, it is gratifying to learn of a young man who met a tremendous challenge and responded unselfishly.

Learning of his action was an unusually pleasant one for me, in that the young person referred to is both an acquaintance and constituent of mine. I am sure that my fellow Members of Congress will join me in giving recognition to Howard A. Coleman, Jr., of Brockton, Mass.

Mr. Coleman, who is 21 years old and an employee of the Whiting Milk Co., Inc., in Massachusetts, was employed last summer as a special delivery driver while between semesters of college. While en route to his employer's branch at Duxbury one afternoon last summer, Mr. Coleman's attention was directed to an automobile which had gone off the road, partially up a steep hill and lodged between two large trees.

Without concern for his own safety, Mr. Coleman ran to the vehicle, which by that time had caught fire and was ablaze. Because the trees prevented the car door from opening, Mr. Coleman broke a window to get to the occupants. Inside the smoke-filled car, he found a mother and two children, ages 7 and 6. He extricated the two children from the car, then went back to remove the mother who was injured and unable to move.

He believed that was all of the occupants. However, while Mr. Coleman was carrying the mother from the vehicle, she pleaded with him to save a third child, a 10-month-old infant, still in the car. By this time the car was filled with smoke and the flames were extensive. Unable to see the child, Mr. Coleman felt on the seat and the floor of the car, found the child, and took him to safety. The car exploded within seconds.

A happy conclusion to this incident is that all four persons in the car recovered.

For his heroic efforts, Mr. Coleman was

awarded the 1969 Pasteur Medal by the Milk Industry Foundation, national trade association of milk processing companies. The foundation has presented this award annually for the past 35 years. It is for heroism by a milk company employee while on the job.

It was my great honor yesterday to personally present the medal to this fine young man. On behalf of the citizens of Brockton and the dairy industry, which sponsors this award, I wish to add my congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Coleman for his courage in performing this act of heroism.

I would like to take this time to call to the attention of the membership of the House, various newspaper articles commending Mr. Coleman's heroic act, an official report of the incident, as filed by Officer Francis Guilderson, Duxbury Police Department, and a letter from Mrs. Consolino.

SAVES FOUR FROM FLAMING AUTO

DUXBURY.—Prompt action by a Brockton man saved a Pembroke woman and her three children from death when they were trapped in their burning car after an accident on Elm St., Tuesday afternoon. Howard Coleman, Jr., 20, of 77 Pondview Circle, a driver for Whiting Milk Co., rescued the four, getting the baby out of the car seconds before it exploded.

Mrs. Kunie Consolino, 76 Wampatuck St., is in "fair" condition at the Jordan Hospital in Plymouth, while her children, Catherine, 7; Marie, 6, and Joseph, Jr., 10 months, were discharged after treatment.

Coleman was returning from making a special delivery in Duxbury when he saw a woman standing by the side of the road, waving her arms. He stopped the truck and she pointed to the wrecked car a short distance away, which was on fire. Coleman ran to the car and got the two older children out of the rear seat without difficulty.

Coleman was unable to open the front door, however, and had to smash the glass and pull the woman out through the window. He carried her a short distance away. He stated that she was mumbling something and he finally caught the word "baby."

Coleman then ran back to the car and reached in through the window as far as he could. He could see nothing in the heavy smoke but groped around until his hands finally encountered the baby on the floor of the car. He pulled the infant to safety and had taken only a few steps when the car exploded.

Duxbury firefighters and police then arrived on the scene and took the mother and children to the hospital. Police reported that Mrs. Consolino told them that the accelerator of her car stuck, causing it to go out of control and crash off the road.

SOCIETY HONORS THREE AREA MEN FOR RESCUE WORK

BOSTON.—Three area men have been honored by the Humane Society of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts rescue operations performed during the past year.

Bronze medals were awarded to Howard A. Coleman Jr. of 77 Pondview Circle, Brockton, and Alfred DeTullo of 27 Hamilton Place, Needham. Mr. Coleman pulled a mother and her three small children from a burning car in Duxbury, July 23. Mr. DeTullo rescued Michael A. Cavanaugh of Newton, April 16.

Robert A. Cushman of 32 Gifford St., Brockton, was awarded a certificate, for rescuing Theodore A. Hancock, who fell through thin ice in Brockton, February 19.

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Daily Evening Enterprise, Feb. 18, 1969]

EAGLES CIVIC SERVICE AWARD RECEIVED BY RESCUER OF FOUR

Presentation of the annual Civic Service Award of the Brockton Aerie of Eagles 617 to Howard Coleman, Jr., of 70 Pondview Circle highlighted the 65th annual banquet of the aerie Saturday night at the unit's quarters, 46 Green St.

The occasion also produced a surprise as, in addition to the award from the Eagles, Coleman was presented a letter of commendation from Gov. Francis Sargent by State Sen. James F. Burke.

Coleman was honored for his courageous action in saving Mrs. Kunie Consolino of Pembroke and her three children after their car crashed and caught fire in Duxbury on July 23 last year.

Past Pres. George E. DeMullis, master of ceremonies, pointed out that a committee selects possible recipients for the awards and the final three names are voted upon by the entire membership.

DeMullis read a letter from Whiting Milk Co., for whom Coleman was working at the time of the incident, commending his action and also stating that he was being recommended by the company for the Louis Pasteur Award, an annual national award for heroism by a milkman. DeMullis also pointed out that Coleman, 20, was the youngest recipient of the award by the local aerie.

Sen. Burke stated that he was delighted, honored and privileged to have a part in the program. He pointed out that at a time in our society when unrest and riots were in the news, it was fine to see a young man honored for a deed of heroism. He congratulated the Eagles for making the award.

Sen. Burke then made the surprise announcement that he had been directed by Gov. Sargent to present a letter of commendation from the commonwealth. In the letter, signed by the governor, he commended Coleman for his "swift, courageous and selfless action" as an example of the real concern for all people.

Sen. Burke also presented the Eagles Civic Service Award which cited Coleman as one of the individuals who made his home town a better place in which to live.

Thomas Brennan, representing Whiting Milk Co., read letters from the Duxbury chief of police and from the officer investigating the accident, as well as from Mrs. Consolino. The letters pointed out that the car was 64 feet up a banking and wedged by trees so the doors could not be opened.

They added that Coleman was stopped by two women and informed of the accident, went to the car, pulled the two older children, Catherine 7, and Marie 6, from the rear seat; broke a window to pull Mrs. Consolino, who had an injured back, to safety and then, when informed her baby was still in the car, reached in and groped around the front seat in the smoke until he found Joseph, Jr., 10 months, and pulled him out. The car exploded when he was only a few feet away after rescuing the baby.

Brennan congratulated Coleman on his achievement and also congratulated his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Coleman, Sr.

Greetings of the city were brought by Councilor James J. Adams, representing Council President Arthur M. Crowe. He congratulated the Eagles on their work and on their choice of the young man to be honored. He expressed the personal greetings of the Mayor and Council.

President J. Edward Donovan greeted all present and welcomed them to the 65th anniversary program. Vice President Richard Wheeler, chairman of the banquet committee, also extended his thanks. President Ger-

trude Johnson of the Eagles Auxiliary thanked the committee for her invitation and wished the aerial many more years of continued progress. She also pointed out that Mr. and Mrs. Coleman "must be very proud of their son."

State Vice President George Marcotte brought the greetings of the State Aerie. He applauded their choice of a recipient for the Civic Service award, pointing out that good deeds and work by young people frequently goes without mention.

Marcotte said he was greatly impressed by many of the actions of young people. He spoke briefly of coming Eagle activities, including a conference at Boston March 8, the State Ball on March 22 at Rockland and banquets at Hyde Park and Middleboro next Saturday night.

Atty. Basil W. Flynn, a friend of the family, spoke briefly on the excellent job done by young Coleman. He pointed out that the youth, who attends Bryant and Stratton College, had been honored by the VFW and the Mass. Humane Society for his heroism. He praised the action as a real act of heroism and congratulated his parents.

Coleman spoke briefly to thank the Aerie for his selection and to thank all who attended.

Head table guests introduced were: Howard Coleman, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Howard Coleman, Sr., Sen. and Mrs. Burke, Councilor Adams, Pres. Donovan, Vice Pres. and Mrs. Wheeler, Toastmaster and Mrs. DeMullis, Aux. Pres. Johnson, State Vice Pres. Marcotte and Atty. Flynn.

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Daily Enterprise, Nov. 25, 1968]

HOWARD COLEMAN, JR., IS PRESENTED CITATION

Howard Coleman, Jr., 22, of 77 Pondview Circle, was presented gifts and a savings bond by the Brockton Post 1046, VFW, as a feature of the recent State Commander's Banquet of the VFW at the Hall in the Fargo Building, Boston.

Coleman was honored for his heroic rescue of a mother and her children who were trapped in a flaming car after an accident last summer. Cmdr. Fred Smith and PC Paul E. Maliska related the reasons for the award to the audience, quoting from an Enterprise story and letters from Whiting Milk Co. officials, young Coleman's employers.

Present for the ceremonies were the youth's parents, Howard, Sr., and Mary Colman and officials of the milk company, along with a large delegation of members of Brockton Post, 1046, Plymouth District 12 and other posts. The affair was attended by more than 15,000 persons, who gave the youth a long ovation. The banquet honored State Commander James A. Peoples. The Brockton youth was unaware of his part in the program until the presentation.

TOWN OF DUXBURY, MASS.,
POLICE HEADQUARTERS,
January 24, 1969.

Re Pasteur Medal Awards—1968.
Att. Miss Geraldine Walsh.
MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: On July 13, 1968 Officer Francis X. Guilderson responded to the call for police assistance at scene of accident on Elm Street, Duxbury, Massachusetts.

In this accident were a Mrs. Kunie Consolino and her three small children.

Enclosed please find Officer Guilderson's copy of his Officer's report submitted to this Department.

Yours very truly,

HENRY P. McNEIL,
Chief of Police.

DUXBURY POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICER'S REPORT

Subject—Rescue of 4 Persons from a Burning Vehicle.

Date—September 9, 1968 Time 5:00 p.m.
On July 23, 1968, at about 3:33 p.m., I was called to cover an accident on Elm Street, Duxbury, Mass. Upon arriving at the scene I found a car totally engulfed by flames. Several persons at the scene pointed to a young man as the one who pulled out 3 children, and the female operator from the burning car. After handling the traffic, I spoke to this man and learned his name: Howard A. Coleman, a milkman from Whiting Milk Company, Duxbury, who was returning to the Plant when stopped by 2 women who pointed out the burning car, off the road, 64 feet up the banking. He ran to their assistance, broke a window to open the door to get out 2 children and their mother. While carrying the mother away she cried "Get my baby, it's still in the car!" Coleman ran back to the burning car and felt with both hands (he could not see because of smoke and flames) on front seat and on floor of car and found the small, 10 mos. old baby and brought the child to the injured mother. Also, I talked with a Daniel Anderson, 3rd of Marshfield, who verified Coleman's actions. Mr. Coleman almost apologized for breaking the car window.

FRANCIS X. GUILDERSON.

JANUARY 31, 1969.

ROBERT H. NORTH, Executive V.P.
Milk Industry Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing this letter, so that you and the judges for the Pasteur Awards program may become fully aware of the heroic action of Howard Coleman an employee of the Whiting Milk Company.

My children and I were out shopping on July 23, 1968 when I lost control of my auto and it crashed into a tree off the road and up on a hill. The auto caught fire and because of its position (being wedged between trees) we were unable to open the doors. Mr. Coleman came over and helped my 2 children Catherine 7 and Marie 6 to get out. Then he dragged me from the car. (My back was broken as I found out later.) I kept asking for my baby Joseph Jr. 10 months old and Mr. Coleman went back to the auto which by this time was full of smoke and pulled Joseph out. I believe Mr. Coleman's life was in extreme danger all during the rescue, because the car could have exploded at any moment. I was told later that the fuel pump had broken when the car crashed and the gasoline got on the hot engine and this is how the fire started. It was an extremely hot fire and the car was totally destroyed. If Mr. Coleman didn't come along and help us out of the car, I'm sure we wouldn't be alive today.

Sincerely,

MRS. KUNIE CONSOLINO.

A LA CARTE

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Nation's No. 1 baseball fan recently held a reception attended by about 450 of the most prominent men in baseball.

President Nixon, according to newspaper reports of the reception at the

White House, displayed an able knowledge of the game of baseball and thoroughly enjoyed himself in the company of the sports figures. They, in turn, enjoyed the hospitality of the White House, according to the reports.

One of those present on this occasion was Al Cartwright, sports editor of the News-Journal newspapers in Wilmington, Del. Mr. Cartwright, I believe, captured the spirit of the occasion in his column in the Morning News of July 23. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cartwright's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

SKINNER GETS ADVICE: YOU SEE, RICHIE?
EVEN NIXON CARES!

(By Al Cartwright)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The President of the United States said to the manager of the Philadelphia Phillies, "Now let me tell you about Richie Allen . . ."

Bob Skinner leaned against the bar in the Green Room of the White House and relayed the conversation. "He really didn't care. My first thought was 'Oh, no, not here, too.' But I kept it to myself and Mr. Nixon went on and he was most interesting and you could tell he had a genuine interest in baseball and sports.

"What he said was that he thought it was a mistake for athletes like Richie Allen and Joe Namath to think about going into the restaurant business or acting or anything else full-time before they had gotten total fulfillment from their sports careers. He said he thought they owed it to themselves to play in the big leagues as long as possible."

Skinner had just gone through the reception line in the east room. His was one of 450 hands that President Nixon shook as he entertained the All-Star Game players, the Hall of Famers, all-timers, club officials and some members of the press in a remarkable session that, even for the All-Stars, has overshadowed the big game that was to be washed out until today.

As Mr. Nixon squeezed hand after hand and chatted with each visitor with great warmth and unflagging patience, rain was beating on the White House. The reception was scheduled for 4 to 5 p.m. but it was close to 6:30 when the last stragglers left.

We wound up in the reception line in back of Earl Weaver, the manager of the Orioles, and Gaby Hartnett, just elected the all-time catcher of the Chicago Cubs.

A white-uniformed military aide took your name. He had a microphone strapped around his neck. This was so a tape-recorder could list the sequence of guests, to correlate with pictures that were being taken. You gave him your name and he announced it to Bowie Kuhn, the baseball commissioner, who completed the double play by passing the name to Mr. Nixon.

"Ever hear of it?" we asked the attache after identifying our town as Wilmington, Del.

"Yes, sir," came the smiling reply. "Twin bridges there."

We were about at the 250-person mark in the line, but Mr. Nixon was as gracious as though he were facing the leadoff man.

How often do you get a chance to say hello to a President? We decided to milk the issue, and bayonet us if you must, Secret Service.

"Did you agree with the election of Babe Ruth as the all-time all-timer?" we asked.

Mr. Nixon led off with his copyrighted sentence. "I would have to say yes." And he

took the time to explain his thinking: "This is because Ruth was a great pitcher as well as a great hitter, and he was an adequate fielder, too. He was sort of a double threat to make the all-time team. Yes, I would have voted for Babe Ruth."

Another set of white uniforms directed you to any one of several rooms—it seems the group had the run of the first floor and the lower floor. Several bars were going, with the hard stuff. Somehow, we had expected punch and cookies, but Mr. Nixon apparently knows his receptions.

Taxpayers savored their memorable introductions to the President.

Gene Mauch looked for a place to stash a cigaret butt. "I don't want to make a mistake and disgrace baseball. The President told me to hang in there, that all Montreal needed was a little pitching. He said he didn't think it would take me as long to win as it did in Philadelphia."

Mike Burke, the president of the Yankees, divorced himself from a conversation with Billy Graham and Bob Carpenter.

"I told Mr. Nixon we missed him at Yankee Stadium," said Burke, one of the hits of last winter's sportswriters banquet in Wilmington. "The last few years, when he was back in the law business in New York, he came to quite a few of the games. I would always put him and Mrs. Nixon in my private box upstairs, but after a few innings he would get fidgety and go down and sit near our dugout."

"Then he would feel guilty and rejoin his wife. I remember one time he came back upstairs and somebody hit a long, high fly that hugged the foul line and he stood and grabbed a pipe and leaned over the front of the stand, following the flight of the ball. We almost lost a president right there."

When Frank Cashen, vice president of the Orioles, was introduced by Kuhn, the President said: "You have nothing to worry about not with that lead."

"I asked him please not to say anything like that," smiled Cashen. The Oriole veeps visit was not all pleasure. He noted that the beer of the day was Miller's. His boss, Jerry Hoffberger also owns National Brewing.

"But I'm still having a good time," Cashen insisted.

As White House receptions go—we guess—it was a gas. Toots Shor, the rather hard-to-take New York celebrity pursuer, went through the reception line twice, looking rather the worse for wear. You could hear Mr. Nixon say to Joe Di Maggio, "how are you, Joe?" and this conversation went on for several minutes.

As Harry Walker, the gabby manager of the Houston Astros neared the platform, Tim McCarver of the Cardinals called out just loud enough "Hey, Harry, don't tell him how to hit, or we'll be here all day."

It was generally agreed that Mrs. Jim Lonborg, miniskirted, beautifully equipped all around, was the nicest thing to hit the White House since Dolly Madison. Lefty Grove's wheels gave out and he sat on a blue satin chair with an eagle woven into it, right under a portrait of Harry Truman. Grove flashed white socks in the red room. Lloyd Waner parked beneath a painting of Marquis de Lafayette.

Bob Carpenter, Skinner and John Quinn represented the Phillies. Cashen, Weaver and personnel director Harry Dalton were there for the Orioles. You would have thought it was the lobby of a World Series hotel.

Things were that loose, that baseball-ish. The Marine Corps Band played pop music. Even the leader, Capt. Dale Harpham, got with the relaxed atmosphere.

"You spell the name like harp played by a ham," he told us, "I've been in the corps 34 years and with the band 20 years. If I like it

this year, I'm going to seriously consider it for a career.

The President's bash for baseball was informally beautiful, the greatest thing that has happened to the game since Ruth, Eisenhower and golf—Nixon and baseball.

THE FOREST INDUSTRY TODAY AND TOMORROW

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, "The Forest Industry Today and Tomorrow," was the subject of a speech some time ago by the then-president of U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Gene C. Brewer. I believe that all concerned with the timber supply and conservation questions should know the positions taken, and that the speech be included in the RECORD:

THE FOREST INDUSTRY: TODAY AND TOMORROW (Remarks by Gene C. Brewer, president, U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, New York City, before the Rocky Mountain Forest Industries Conference, Laramie, Wyo., March 28, 1969)

Governor Hathaway, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon.

May I express my warmest personal greetings to all here, and extend my sincere thanks for being invited to address this vital conference.

It is heartening to be among people who have a positive interest in the timber industry today, and who are concerned that the timber industry will have a tomorrow. Indeed, our industry may be likened to the college president depicted in a recent cartoon in the New Yorker Magazine. It showed his secretary reciting his schedule for the day in this fashion:

"You have a confrontation with the trustees scheduled for ten o'clock. At eleven, you have a confrontation with the student council, and at twelve you have a confrontation with the faculty."

It is very easy for anyone in the timber industry to substitute other nouns for trustees, student council and faculty, and to sympathize with that embattled educator.

We as an industry are having our share of confrontations. They have as much emotional fervor as those of our youthful protesters on college campuses throughout the nation. And ours are growing in numbers and in diversity too.

The sort of confrontations the forest industry are embroiled in may have a precedent in the Greek mythology, which describes an historic confrontation of another sort involving Hercules and a giant named Antaeus. This giant derived his strength from the earth, and in his wrestling match with Hercules, Antaeus would repeatedly be hurled to the ground. But each time he touched the earth he would spring up revitalized, ready to renew the battle.

Finally, Hercules had to hold him aloft and choke him to death.

We, too, like Antaeus, derive our sustenance and our strength from the earth. We too face strangulation, unless we can revitalize ourselves through the proper use of the land.

For years we have argued that the nation cannot withdraw acre after acre of woodland from the timber supply and curtail cutting on the remainder while continuing to enjoy an ever-rising degree of wood product use.

Unfortunately, our message seemed to fall on deaf ears.

Since the establishment of the national forest in 1897, under a law which stated as its purpose, and I quote, ". . . To furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States," some 16 million acres of producing timberlands have been closed to harvesting.

Since 1964, in the 12 Western States alone, one million, nine hundred and nine thousand acres, representing almost 21 billion board feet of timber, have been lost to harvest.

Over the next five years in those same Western States, it is contemplated that another nine million, seven hundred thousand acres will be taken out of production, not including scenic trails and wild rivers which were the subject of special legislation last year. This will represent a loss, over the next five years, of almost 31 billion board feet.

This has taken place while the demand for wood and paper products continued to soar. As far as the forest products industry was concerned, our American timber base, which we tended to regard as a fixed and immutable asset was actually shrinking instead. Last week news from Washington made it appear that finally our message was getting through.

On March 19, President Nixon ordered an increase in the sale of timber on publicly owned lands. The Federal Forest Managers were told to allow the harvest of publicly owned timber to rise by more than one billion board feet over the next 15 months.

The President acted primarily in response to a short supply of lumber, and plywood and attendant higher prices which quite clearly relate to a timber supply problem. And he recognized too that it is indeed possible to boost timber production on Federal lands without doing the land or the forest the slightest harm.

Mr. Nixon acted well within the boundaries of Federal precedent.

Last January 6th, the president's committee on price stability had recommended that the executive branch "assist in assuring the availability of essential materials at a reasonable price, particularly lumber, of which the Federal Government, through its national forests, is a major supplier."

Indeed, along these lines, let it be stated that the Chief of the Forest Service, our mutual friend, Mr. Edward P. Cliff, is aware that the federal forests are not being utilized to their fullest.

On November 26, at a hearing of the Small Business Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, Mr. Cliff testified in these words:

"On National Forest Lands, in the Douglas Fir Region, for example, preliminary results of a study now under way indicate that the annual allowable cut could be substantially increased gradually over the years. This might be done through an annual program of investing funds to intensify management practices such as commercial thinning, pre-logging, salvage, reforestation and timber stand improvement. Much of this would depend on an access road system to do the work where and at the time it is needed."

Later on in his same testimony, Mr. Cliff added, and again I quote:

"In addition to the Douglas Fir supply study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on national forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of national forest commercial timberlands."

So we see that Mr. Nixon, in his laudable actions, merely acted to avert a short-term

crisis, and that much remains to be done over the long term. Meanwhile, our confrontations are still with us in various forms.

The New York Times recently devoted about a column to the conservationist cause. The story cited the fact that howling wolves still roamed near Winnipeg, while they have been nearly exterminated in the United States.

Its conclusion was that the Canadian situation was the desired one; that America had failed to achieve appreciation of the value of maintaining nature's pristine order.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is one point of view, perhaps an extreme one. And it leads back to the question of how we reconcile use of the land we all need for our revitalization without throwing any single interest to the wolves. After all, the rational use of our nation's forest resources is fundamental to the forest industry: today and tomorrow, and thus to the welfare of our society.

The simplest and clearest articulation of this problem was made by Raphael J. Moses in an article in your most excellent publication, the University of Wyoming Land and Water Law Review. Mr. Moses defined it this way:

"Regardless of the technique employed, it seems apparent that something should be done to restore some measure of balance to the public clamor now heard on every side. Multiple use proponents have a valid case to present and it appears they are overcome by the popular appeal of the preservationist. The nine hundred and ninety nine who really desire multiple purpose use of natural resources need to find spokesmen as eloquent as the spokesmen who speak for the single preservationist."

We try. The forest products industry, and the forest service, have advanced the concept of multiple use as the only way in which this nation, with its fixed land base, can enjoy the forest and obtain at the same time from it the products our society needs. The multiple use concept has been enacted into law and declared to be public policy by the Congress.

But we are handicapped in attempting to reach the public with the multiple use concept, because our statements seem to be self-serving. We are at a disadvantage too because we are talking to a passing parade and not a fixed audience. Simply because forests take so long to grow, it is difficult to show people the concrete results of modern forest management.

Those of us in the business can remember when reforestation was a new concept, back in the '40's. We know of forests once harvested, where the second growth is now yielding a very satisfactory crop. Unfortunately, the general public does not see this. We must somehow manage to dramatize that this slow process is a real one nevertheless; we must accelerate our attempt to reach this passing parade, to get our message across.

And we must include as part of our message the fact that if the withdrawals of land continue this can ultimately work only to the disadvantage of our civilization and will erode our high standard of living. We must remember that, like Antaeus, our fountainhead is the land. That simple factor is not widely recognized at all. It should be. Let us take a moment to look at the role that the tree plays in our everyday lives—in the everyday lives of our 200 million fellow citizens. This is well known to us in the industry but bears reporting.

There are more than five thousand products in everyday use in which wood plays a major role. Some of these products are easily visible—lumber and plywood for homes, offices, schools, churches and commercial buildings.

But there are an equally great number of applications of wood that are not visible. For example, enormous quantities of wood are used in steel making, in coal mining, and by the transportation industry. Without woodbase products, operations in these and many other industries would be more costly, or made more difficult, or slowed in some manner.

Every magazine or book you read, every piece of paper you handle in your business, stems from the tree. We are the world's largest paper consuming country—and its most advanced, and paper use is growing. Office copying machines alone now use 1.2 million tons a year, up from nearly zero a decade ago.

Curiously enough there is a correlation between paper use and a nation's development. The United States, for instance, has a per capita paper consumption of 540 pounds per year. For other advanced countries, such as Sweden and Canada, the figure is also high—over 300 pounds per capita.

But paper consumption in the Soviet Union is only 42 pounds per person annually. And in China, where paper making began, the average consumption is estimated at only 6 pounds per capita.

The timber industry, in a sense, is a steward of these many interests. We have an obligation to make certain that our forest resources tomorrow will be adequate to supply our nation's needs.

Incidentally, when we timbermen speak about our obligation to the future, we are already hard at work on it. It takes 25 to 40 years for the seed of 1969 to become a harvestable tree depending on end use. Right now, when our industry looks to its tomorrow, it is looking beyond the year 2000, by the very nature of the business. The hard economics of plant payout demand long range planning of the highest order.

This obligation we have to the future is the chief reason why the recent actions taken by President Nixon which I already have mentioned, while highly to be commended, are merely a stopgap solution for a pressing crisis. They do not get at the roots of the problem. Just as we have long-range plans for growing trees on 30, 40, or 60 year cycles, we must also have a long-range plan which will assure a future wood supply. Actually, this becomes a question of practicing what already exists, namely multiple use of the land. We have all been frustrated on this score by a lack of public understanding of what multiple use means. We must teach the public by example; by practicing multiple use right out in the open. The need has never been greater. Let us look for a moment at what is involved.

Some arithmetic is sobering. In 1901 there were 11 acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of a population of 77.5 million. At present there are three acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of 200 million citizens. In the year 2000—that is only 31 years away, less time than it takes a tree to grow—it is estimated that there will be only 1.5 acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of more than 300 million people.

Stated differently, the situation can be summed up like this: As population increases, the available supply shrinks, but needs expand.

To meet the future's needs is a rigorous challenge for the timber industry. We are expected to provide the basic commodities—lumber, plywood, furniture, pulp and paper products, cellulose, chemicals, naval stores, you name it, essential for the welfare of all our people. This is the role we have assumed in the free enterprise system, and the people expect us to fulfill that role.

The government expects us to fulfill that role, too. Because we are the outlet for the commercial timber resources of our nation

in public ownership: some 142 million acres and 297 billion cubic feet of growing stock. In essence, private industry converts public timber, owned by all the people, into useful products needed by all the people.

Further, we are told that one of our critical social needs is to overcome the housing deficit in the United States, to replace the slums with adequate housing, to withstand the pressures of population growth by initiating new housing starts and by providing jobs for the people who will form the families who will buy those new houses.

We are told as well that our nation must rally its economic and sociological genius to reverse the outflow of rural population to the urban centers, that we must create new towns which will provide new jobs in rural areas, and that we must strengthen job opportunities in every hamlet and village to keep the rural population there.

The figures are startling. In what the New York Times calls "a social movement ranking in American history with the wave of immigration from Europe between 1890 and 1930 which brought 22.3 million aliens to our shores," it reports that rural population had dropped from 30.5 million in 1940 to 10 million today. Most of these 20 million people who disappeared from the land migrated to urban areas. And while this migration may be nearing its end, its effects will be with us from now on.

We are told also that some of the most pressing needs of the nation are outdoor recreation: Scenic easements for highways, hiking trails, canoe areas and overlooks, and many others. With all of these needs, I agree.

But we are chastized for suggesting that maybe if park areas already owned by the Federal Government were developed for recreation, there would be no need to withdraw more land from private ownership. Moreover we are attacked for urging moderation in removing commercial timber land from national forest multiple-use administration to establish wilderness areas and remote parks.

In brief, we are assigned the task of meeting the material needs of our society on the one hand and damned for doing it on the other.

Our highly urbanized society wants all the comforts and conveniences that the tree provides. And, at the same time, it appears to support those who oppose harvesting trees.

Seemingly, we cannot have it both ways. But, in fact, we can. We can because we must.

The answer is land use planning of a highly sophisticated order to achieve the optimum returns from our forest resources for the maximum number of people.

This requires that the desires of a single group must not be permitted to take precedence over the total public interest.

As I envision the forest of tomorrow—and it is already deeply rooted in the actions we are taking today—I see what would really be a living "factory". I see this living "factory" as constantly renewing itself, under man's prudent management, and yielding its line of "products"—wood, water, wildlife and recreation. These "products," under careful stewardship, will never run out, never suffer a shortage of materials or market glut or any of the other plagues which hamper most man-made factories.

That's because these living "factories", after all, were made by the Supreme Creator. As Bruce Barton once reminded us, "If the tree were invented today, it would be considered the miracle of the ages." That is altogether fitting, because the inventor of the tree is indeed the Creator of all miracles.

Following that premise I believe that God, in His infinite wisdom, created the land, as well as the tree, for use by all. I can't believe the Lord and Nature gave us the tree with its unique and unmatched characteristics,

without intending that its benefits be available to all the people.

That, gentlemen, is multiple use. It has a precedent stretching back to the beginning of man. It would be foolhardy to try to repeal it now.

Multiple use has no greater friend than the forest products industry. This is a matter of well established record.

As an industry, we welcome the camper, the hiker, the hunter, the fisherman, the beauty seekers, the botanist, the bird watcher, and even the sun bather. We make them all welcome, even though we know there are hazards involved. We are, whether we like it or not, in the recreation business, too.

These objectives are also a part of the land management practices of both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. They make sense. They afford the means to enable the land, the natural resource, to yield the most benefit to the maximum number of people.

Still, this is not widely understood. What must be done then to gain the understanding the timber industry needs for its tomorrow?

First, we need a much wider public understanding and appreciation that the forest is a renewable natural resource, that trees grow and that they respond to culture, that trees can be harvested and reseeded or replanted without damaging the on-going continuity of the forest.

This fact cannot be overstated. Coal, oil, iron ore, copper, natural gas—these and all our other minerals—are resources which, once depleted are gone. But the forest responds to cultivation. Moreover, the practice of forestry restores beauty to the land. No other natural resource provides beauty at the same time it provides for the general welfare. Second, we must stress that trees, as living things, are subject to natural enemies. You know far better than I, the problem of loss of timber to beetle infestation and other disease. It is particularly acute here in the Rocky Mountain States.

For example, a recent letter from the acting superintendent of Yellowstone Park indicates that on the basis of aerial surveys, there are about 111,280 acres of bark beetle infestation affecting one billion—700 million board feet of timber. He estimates that of this infestation, approximately 100 million board feet will probably suffer extensive damage.

I cite this, not to open the highly controversial subject of whether or not harvesting operations should be allowed in national parks. Rather, my point is that here in Wyoming "preserved" for all the public to see is a great object lesson in what happens to a forest resource when you do not practice forestry.

Earlier I mentioned land use planning. The timber industry, under the auspices of the National Forest Products Association, took the lead last fall in sponsoring a seminar on land and the American people. It was attended by representatives of nearly 50 land-based industries, educators, land authorities, government officials and individuals.

Out of these discussions came the recommendation that a national land use institute be established as a means toward better public understanding of the U.S. land base and its relationship to the public interest. I support it personally, and I commend it to everyone here.

It is a difficult job to create that understanding. Some seventy per cent of our population now lives on two per cent of the land. As families have moved away from the land, they have lost sight of the fact that land productivity is basic to the functioning of our economic system. Somehow we must reestablish that understanding.

At the same time we strive for that understanding, we must stress that we as an industry have willingly shouldered our obligations.

We realize that we must make the best possible use of every acre. We realize that to meet the obligation of the future we must spend large sums on research, to make drastic improvements in the growth per acre of wood.

We are doing this, through the development of better seed, and fertilization. We are choosing our growth sites as scientifically as we can, with the view of waiting not 40 years for the harvest but possibly 30 or even less. In short—while nature has given us a "miracle" of Bruce Barton's—we must continue to improve on it.

Furthermore, we recognize that to fulfill our function we must use every tree to its fullest potential—we must determine its highest end use and process accordingly.

We also recognize that we have additional obligations—to our employees, our customers, our shareholders as well as to the society to which we all belong. As part of this obligation, we must use the latest in market and product research techniques, to make sure that we are serving our markets as they wish to be served.

Where research is concerned, I am already on record as favoring a system whereby a portion of the receipts from sales of national forest timber would be set aside for this purpose. Such a proposal has aroused some industry opposition, but I still favor it.

In summary then in my view the posture for tomorrow's timber industry runs like this: The knowledge that we as a nation are irrevocably linked to the land; the knowledge that the land must be put to its highest use for the benefit of the majority of the population; the knowledge that just as government has obligations to the private sector, so does our industry have obligations to society as a whole, and to itself as well. Together with government we are the stewards for tomorrow's forests providing wildlife, water and recreation, the products of nature's living factory.

Finally, we cannot lock up our natural resources and treat them as dusty museum pieces. To do so is to doom our civilization to strangulation, just as surely as Hercules lifted Antaeus from the land, and thereby destroyed him. We can and we must manage that priceless heritage, the land and its forests in such a way that the needs of all our people are served. We must maintain contact with all users of our forests and reconcile our viewpoint. A tall order—you bet it is—let's get on with it. It is our responsibility to do just that.

THE LANDING ON THE MOON

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the landing on the moon by two U.S. astronauts has given new hope to the peoples of the world for decisive American leadership. The general acclaim which this feat met in nearly all corners of the world is evidence that men everywhere appreciate a forceful and forward-looking policy under American leadership. Typical of these responses is an article published in Germany by the editor of the Czech newspaper Ceske Listy, George Brada. Dr. Brada is a commentator who is extremely well versed in American affairs and is a great friend of the United States and all that we stand for.

In his article, Dr. Brada makes observations which would be too immodest for

an American to state. Nevertheless, it is highly gratifying to see a citizen of West Germany appraise our policies so highly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Brada, entitled "The Policy of Superiority and Humanity," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE "POLICY OF SUPERIORITY AND HUMANITY"

(By George Brada)

A NEW ERA

The American landing on the moon has started a new era for the world; and it has initiated necessarily a new policy for the United States and the Free World.

The new policy's name is obviously the "policy of superiority."

The American conquest of the moon means that the United States has reached visibly a superiority in science. And under President Richard Nixon, America has reached also a superiority in the political field. This superiority in science and in politics has its counterparts in America's technological, economic, military, moral, and spiritual superiority.

The new "policy of superiority and humanity" will be applied necessarily also towards the Communist countries. It is going to displace the former policies of "bridge-building," "detente," "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition," "confrontation," "containment," "cold war", and even the original "policy of liberation"—or, better said, it is going to modify and combine them from the standpoint of a superior thinking and reason, a superior political and humane morale.

The "policy of superiority and humanity" means that, at the end, Communism will be dissolved and abolished without war.

THE "POLICY OF COMMUNISM"

In a 100% opposition to the "policy of superiority and humanity" stands the "policy of communism," preached in and outside the U.S.A.

The "policy of communism" demands that the United States share its scientific and economic wealth with the other nations, including the Communist States while neglecting its own strong position which had made that wealth possible; that the United States finance all poor people whose numbers are rapidly increasing, while neglecting the pursuance of the progress of its science and its own security; that the United States soft-pedal its scientific progress inside and outside the military field and make agreements to restrain its scientific talents to the level of the Communist States or even under this level; that the United States work to the aim of leveling and mixing of all people, nations and races in one common, communist America and world.

At present, the three or four practical proposals which we hear most often from the adherents of the "policy of communism" are:

America should not promote so much its space exploration but rather help the poor; America should not try to defeat the Communists in Vietnam and America should not build any ABM system but rather develop a welfare program for the poor; America should undertake future space exploration and other scientific projects in common work with Communist Russia.

In the meantime, however, the Soviet Union is arming and promoting its science, while completely and absolutely neglecting the poor—the whole nation of the USSR—in order to conquer and to subjugate all mankind. The Soviet Union wants to tie American hands by various treaties but itself violates any treaty when it suits its interest.

Yes, the Communists also have and profess a superiority: the superiority in in-

trigues, espionage, false propaganda, a superiority in inhumanity. Their main domain within the free countries is—logically—propaganda in newspapers and on television, and schemes in political and economic life.

THE "POLICY OF SUPERIORITY AND HUMANITY"

Let us return to the new "policy of superiority and humanity" which has been started in the United States under Richard Nixon.

This policy means that America—applauded by all freedom-loving men and nations—is going to make a great progress in the scientific and technological field (while excluding also all espionage and other sharing of scientific know-how with the Communists).

America will give assistance to others—but exactly from its position of strength and unbridled superiority. Only this makes such a help possible in the long run. And Americans will encourage, not only in the United States itself but also in all other free nations, the spirit of initiative, enterprise, self-help, independence, freedom, superiority and humanity.

The "policy of superiority and humanity" will use East-West trade, cultural and other exchanges, travels and visits so that it will serve the interests of the Free World.

The scientific progress demanded by the "policy of superiority and humanity" is not identical with huge armaments. On the contrary. The policies of President Richard M. Nixon are the classic example: He wants to test new scientific devices on small projects like the "Safeguard", and not build big armaments which can get obsolete.

And one day, there will be a great breakthrough in science (even outside the military field) which will enable America to exhort the Communist countries to give freedom to their subjects and to end the armament race. Only this will be a real disarmament. There is no other kind of disarmament possible.

Because we must be clear on one point:

It is World Communism, it is the military might of the otherwise poor Soviet Union which presently forces the mankind to divert huge amounts of material resources into armaments. The existence of Communism is thus the biggest obstacle preventing us from helping the poor.

NO DOUBT WHO WILL WIN

Thus the fight goes on presently—inside and outside the United States—between the "policy of superiority and humanity" and the "policy of communism".

There is no doubt about the outcome of this fight.

The progress of the American pioneer human spirit, the progress of the superiority of the human spirit and of humanity cannot be halted by the Communists.

This development cannot be halted. And as it goes on, the Communists will lose more and more their false faith; and the freedom-loving people will win more and more self-confidence, firmness, courage and the feeling of superiority of their spirit and morale. Thus Communism will fade away spiritually before it will die materially.

The American superiority, representing the spiritual superiority of the Free World—the superiority in science, technology, economy, politics, in the military field, in morale, justice and humanity itself—will finally bring about the dissolution of Communism without war, the correct arrangement of relations between nations and races, and the help to those who need it.

The American success is a success of the whole mankind. The step to the moon is also a step to the preservation of freedom of the free nations, and a step to the liberation of Czechoslovakia and all other subjugated nations.

And the nations of the world, those free and those enslaved by Communism, know it.

EMERGENCY DETENTION CAMPS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last month the California convention of the B'nai B'rith Women took a strong stand against the detention camp provisions of the 1950 Internal Security Act—the McCarran Act. I would like to insert in the RECORD that thoughtful resolution at this point for the benefit of all my colleagues:

RESOLUTION ON DETENTION CAMP PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Whereas, Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 authorizes the creation of emergency detention camps and empowers the Attorney General, without due process, to detain therein American citizens suspected of rebellion or insurrection in "aid of a foreign enemy"; and

Whereas, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, of which B'nai B'rith and the Anti-Defamation League are members, opposed and continued to oppose said Internal Security Act as undesirable legislation which is repugnant to constitutional guarantees and the philosophy of a free society; and whereas, our experiences as Americans and as Jews with such concentration camps and the concepts of presumed guilt because of ethnic or racial relationships impel us to be unalterably opposed to such provision for detention even in emergency situations; and

Whereas, there are pending in the Congress of the United States bills to repeal Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that B'nai B'rith Women, District Four, in Convention assembled, wholeheartedly supports legislation to repeal Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as violative of the constitutional guarantees and judicial traditions that are basic to our democratic way of life, and specifically supports S. 4270, and H. 4497-4500, which would repeal said Title II; and

Be it further resolved, that each B'nai B'rith member in the states in this District be urged to write her Senator and Congressman to oppose this type of legislation; and

Be it finally resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Congressman of the States composing District Four.

Adopted this 2nd day of July, 1969, Beverly Hills, California.

Already this session I have sponsored legislation—H.R. 11373—to repeal title II of the act. The section authorizes detention during a presidentially declared internal security emergency of any person, based only on "reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in acts of espionage or of sabotage."

This act, written at a time when the American people were caught up with fear and hatred of the unfamiliar, reflects that irrational mood. It is totalitarian, denying principles of freedom upon which our Nation was founded. No provision in the act guarantees a cit-

izen's basic right to due process of law. A detainee under title II receives no trial; he cannot question his accusers. Burden of proof is upon the accused rather than the Government, and the Attorney General is not even required to produce evidence used to hold the detainee.

It is in no way consistent with the American democratic tradition to allow such a law to remain on the books at a time when rational examination is possible. Until now it has never been necessary to enforce the McCarran Act, and there has been no chance to prove it unconstitutional. Must we wait until even one American has suffered a loss of his rights under this law before we abolish it as a threat to the freedom and security of all Americans?

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR NEEDED RESEARCH INTO NATURE OF SEVERE WEATHER

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, violent weather has been with us from the beginning of time. In Kansas, during the late spring and early summer months, it is not uncommon to have a tornado watch every night for a week at a time. Like others who face the threat of hurricanes and tropical storms, Kansans have learned to live with the reality of severe weather.

Simply learning to live with the problem is not enough; therefore, I am introducing legislation that would increase our knowledge of the nature of severe weather, develop methods of detection and early warning, and establish a national severe storms service as a part of the Weather Bureau.

In the 4-year period 1964 to 1967, tornados and related severe weather resulted in the loss of 789 lives and more than \$2 billion worth of property damage. Tornados have ripped through all 50 States and interrupted countless lives. Severe weather is indeed a national problem.

Last night at least eight tornados raked the lake-dotted resort country of northern Minnesota leaving an estimated 16 dead and at least 100 injured. One of the twisters ripped through a church camp killing at least four.

Our knowledge about the nature of tornados and hurricanes is very limited. Our method for detecting severe weather are imprecise. And the system we use to warn citizens of impending severe weather is only partially effective.

Until the day comes when we can control our weather, prediction and detection of violent weather, coupled with an advanced warning system, is the best means we have to limit the disruption caused by severe weather. Lives can be saved if the warning is sounded early. The importance of developing new and improved means of storm detection warning systems cannot be over-em-

phasized. The value can be measured in lives saved.

I urge prompt consideration and early passage of this legislation which would fund needed research into the nature of severe weather. A national severe storms service with a division for tornado detection and warning would help upgrade existing weather forecasting facilities. It is time that we turned our attention to this critical national concern and face the problem head on. I feel that such a research effort would be warranted and could result in the saving of lives and property.

The "twister" that carried Dorothy to the Land of Oz was a harmless element of a famous fairy tale. The tornados and storms, such as the ones in Minnesota last night, are anything but harmless and very, very real.

The time has come for application of space-age technology to the down-to-earth problem of severe weather.

COWGER VOTES TAX CUT

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted with the majority to pass the most comprehensive tax reform measure enacted in almost 60 years. I wish to commend the House Ways and Means Committee for its diligent work during these past 6 months in providing us with a bill that will give tax relief to the low- and middle-income taxpayer. Substantial aid is given to those at and near the poverty level with relief to the middle-income group by increasing the standard deduction percentage. The 368-page reform package also abolishes some tax privileges enjoyed by special groups. The repeal of the 7-percent investment credit should help to slow down the inflationary spiral. Certainly a cut in the oil depletion allowance and restrictions on accelerated depreciation of real estate were much needed reforms. As the former mayor of one of our largest cities, I am against the curb put on tax exempt municipal bonds. This could, in my opinion, stifle the capital growth of many of our cities. However, I feel that I must vote for and support the full package.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against the closed rule which was passed 265-145. I felt that it was unfair to tack on the surtax extension to this reform bill. I voted against the 10-percent income surtax last year and again this year. It is unwise to try to control inflation through taxation when excessive spending continues unabated.

I am proud to be a Member of Congress and to have had a part in passing tax relief legislation for the average tax-paying citizen. After 6 hours of debate and 6 months of preparation, I think that this bill is a good one that should be concurred in by the Senate. It is the House's constitutional prerogative to initiate tax legislation and I would hope

CXV—1446—Part 17

that the Senate will accept the work of this body.

Tax justice has been long in coming to those who provide the bulk of the Federal budget. Now, I would hope that we will substantially cut the remaining appropriation bills that come to us for approval. The recent announcement that we are enjoying a \$3 billion surplus should motivate the Congress to find more ways to trim expenditures. So far this year I have voted for every recommittal motion to send appropriation bills back to committee for cuts. Inflation feeds on overspending, and not undertaxation. Mr. Speaker, we must establish priorities in all of our programs, both foreign and domestic.

SUBWAY PLANS COULD ONLY BE SAD MEMORY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that for the Nation's Capital to function properly, it is absolutely necessary that the city have adequate access for employees who work here, for visitors who stop here, for residents who live here, and for travelers who make their way through the area.

As a Member of Congress having legislative responsibility for the Nation as a whole and as a local resident of this metropolitan area for the major part of the year, I am doubly concerned over the present critical freeway impasse.

As a legislator, I am very disturbed by the fact that a loud minority resorting to threats has caused the City Council to blatantly ignore the unequivocal voice of Congress, which has directed the city to build the Three Sisters Bridge. The Council's Monday morning quarterbacking are now floundering. The resulting loss of time and the taxpayers' money will have its worst effect ultimately on all the residents and businesses of the District of Columbia, who would otherwise stand to be the greatest beneficiaries of rapid rail transit construction and better road accessibility.

I readily come to one obvious conclusion: If traffic continues to build up at the rate it has in the past 4 or 5 years, even an elaborate rapid transit system such as Metro cannot be expected to cope with travel needs to and from the District in the latter 1970's and in the 1980's without additional river crossings. Bridge construction is unavoidable. Delay in bridge construction now could doom the present attempt to build a subway. Suburban jobs for District residents would then become hopelessly remote in tomorrow's tighter and tighter traffic jams. And the region would never benefit from thousands of jobs directly attributable to subway construction and those generated by the development which is certain to follow the subway's construction.

Metro is ready to become a reality if the Three Sisters Bridge is started; it

could become a sad and costly memory if the Council's endless second-guessing continues.

TAX REFORMS FEARED INFLATIONARY

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the editorial by Columnist David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 6, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Lawrence presents an analysis of the inflationary effects of the tax reform measure, which should be widely read by the people. He clearly sets forth the impact on the national economy which this hurriedly written bill will have unless it is amended by the Senate.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

TAX REFORMS FEARED INFLATIONARY (By David Lawrence)

Instead of curbing inflation, the new tax bill prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee may prove a stimulus for added inflation.

The purpose of the "tax reform" was supposed to be to equalize the burden as between the very rich and the middle-income brackets and to give tax relief to the low-income group. But the net result will be to boost the amounts that millions of citizens will have available for spending.

The tax increases that have been recommended will affect mostly individuals with large incomes, businesses and institutions which normally provide the savings that flow into capital investments. The new tax bill cuts personal taxes by \$9.2 billion.

The bulk of the reduction—more than 50 percent—goes to taxpayers with incomes below \$15,000. Thus, more money will be put into the pockets of millions of individuals with low or moderate incomes who typically spend the greater part of their income. This means that more goods will be purchased, and demand will be substantially increased. When this happens, prices invariably go up, too.

Reforms in personal taxes will increase the rates to be paid by individuals with incomes above \$15,000, and this will furnish the U.S. Treasury with \$1.4 billion more than it collected before.

Other tax reforms, together with repeal of the 7 percent investment credit, will impose on institutions and businesses taxes amounting to \$5.4 billion.

The whole measure means a net loss of revenue to the U.S. Treasury of about \$2.4 billion.

But the figure on which to focus attention is the \$9.2 billion in tax benefits to be given to persons in the low and middle income brackets.

There is, of course, a possibility that the Senate will make some changes in the new tax bill and will try to balance the losses against the gains. The important factor is the way in which the tax reductions are distributed, and how the rates are revised so as to permit more and more spending by a larger number of citizens.

Unfortunately, the tax reform bill was written in a hurry, and its provisions were based largely upon political considerations. It is not often that Congress has a chance in the year before any election to vote benefits to the taxpayers. But this kind of politics

will be far less beneficial next year if America is still in the midst of an inflationary cycle that puts a squeeze on the pocketbook because prices will have advanced faster than incomes.

On its face, the House bill is inflationary, but there is no way to know what the full effect will be until early in 1970. Meanwhile, it may be wondered whether the Senate, which often shows itself to be more conservative in its judgment than the House, will re-examine the House measure and take a look at the problem of income distribution.

As an anti-inflation measure, Congress increased taxes in 1968 by the enactment of the 10 percent surcharge, which is to be continued through this year. After that, in 1970, it appears that Congress not only will end the surcharge but will give additional tax cuts. Then the only remaining force restraining inflation will be "tight money," based upon raising the interest rates so as to discourage many forms of production, particularly in the construction field. But it may be that mortgage money for new homes, even though more expensive, will be sought just the same by many citizens of middle and low income who are benefiting from tax reduction.

What is surprising is that no scientific study of the impact of tax changes on the national economy seems to have been made before Congress delved into the whole subject. The rates of all classes have been tampered with to a large extent without regard to relationships to the problem of inflation. The House bill, designed by Democrats, is devoted primarily to what would appear on the surface, at least, to be good politics. But the new tax bill may turn out to be just the opposite—bad politics—because the inflationary pressures on wages and prices now will be stimulated rather than restrained.

CONCERNING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the comprehensive safety and health plan which the President has presented to the Congress should receive our careful consideration. American workers today are exposed to new hazards about which little is known—and yet thousands are still suffering from age-old scourges of occupational disease whose danger, and prevention have been understood for years.

Silicosis must have afflicted even the Egyptians who quarried stones for the pyramids. In the middle ages, it was recognized as the special disease of grinders. And yet, over 3,000 silicosis cases were reported last year, from exposure to free silica, the major ingredient of all rocks, soils, sands, and clay. Every year, millions of dollars are paid in compensation for this single occupational ailment.

Mercury is a well-known industrial poison which 30 years ago commonly caused disease among felt hat makers. Today, mercury compounds are no longer used in hatmaking, but new uses and new combinations of the chemical, and a failure to apply known protective measures, offer hazards in other occupations.

It is startling that we have not eliminated such long-recognized, and entirely preventable, occupational illness, at the same time that we are faced with a changing industrial situation that daily presents new problems of worker health and safety.

My State of New York has an excellent occupational health and safety program and the occupational safety and health plan proposed by the President would be coordinated with outstanding efforts such as these. Where adequate efforts are not being carried out at present, however, improvements are needed to reduce the occupational hazards for American workers. This is the goal of the President's recommendations.

VIETNAM PROBLEM REMAINS AFTER PRESIDENT'S TRIP

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has just concluded an Asian trip and concluded with a visit to Communist Rumania.

The President had a number of conferences, issued several statements on the trip and received a favorable reception in many areas.

However, as he returned to the White House, his major problem remains. The Vietnam war continues and the North Vietnamese in Paris remain adamant in their refusal to enter into meaningful negotiations.

In this connection and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place herewith in the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of August 5, 1969.

The editorial follows:

VIETNAM DILEMMA LINGERS AFTER PRESIDENT'S TRIP

President Nixon has ended his around-the-world trip, leaving in his wake some nagging questions and confusion about Asian policy and only faint glimmers of hope for improved relations with the Communist bloc.

The President's friendly reception abroad was, to a great extent, the product of the successful landing of men on the moon. It was proof that the epic space voyage has increased American prestige in the world's eye, and the President's desire to use the leverage in foreign policy is understandable.

Such prestige, however, can quickly be overshadowed by events on the earth, and the President left no clear impression about how he intends to cope with those events.

In his now-famous nonquotable press conference on Guam, the President outlined a policy of self-help for Asian nations, stressing U.S. reluctance to become involved in another Vietnam unless nuclear powers were involved.

But almost immediately, he was in Thailand with what seemed like a pledge to support the Thais against internal, as well as external, aggression. With some 40,000 American troops in Thailand—double the initial U.S. commitment in Vietnam—this seemed to have ominous overtones.

From there it was only a short trip to Saigon, where President Nixon lent moral support to the badly-stained regime of Presi-

dent Thieu. And Americans at home were amazed to hear that the Vietnam debacle is their finest hour after being told days before that there would be no more Vietnams.

The ambiguity of Vietnam policy was further emphasized at home by figures which show that there are more American troops there now than when President Nixon took office, despite the much-publicized withdrawals.

While Americans were preoccupied with Vietnam, the President emphasized in his visits in India and Indonesia his willingness for neutral powers to pursue their own course without outside interference. To nations which remembered the previous Republican administration's hostility toward neutralism, this could have only been welcome encouragement.

The Rumanian visit seemed to be a calculated diplomatic gamble. While it ruffled the Soviet Union, it was a signal to the increasingly independent Communist nations that the United States is ready and willing to promote good relations between the East and West.

The visit may result in the future in the relaxation of trade barriers and other efforts at cooperation, not only by Rumania but other Eastern European Communist nations. It was, at any rate, a signal that an American President with a reputation for hardline anti-communism is using a more moderate approach.

The Russian response to this is still to be seen in the coming talks on disarmament and the possibility of easing East-West tensions. The Soviet Union has been sounding more friendly, but in their view they have seen President Nixon trafficking with a satellite nation and, at home, pushing for a new weapons system in the arms race.

The circle of the globe may, in the coming months, bring results and new directions in foreign policy. For the moment, however, it produced no answer for the President's most overriding problem, the dilemma of Vietnam.

FROM THE WRIGHT BROTHERS TO THE MOON—A SALUTE TO NORTH CAROLINA'S CONTRIBUTION TO AVIATION AND SPACE EXPLORATION

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, throughout aviation's brief but glorious history, North Carolina has made many contributions, and I take special pride in noting today that the relationship between the Tar Heel State and the age of aeronautics in this era of space exploration is as close and harmonious and fruitful as ever.

Just as North Carolinians for six decades have had a hand in the development of aviation, North Carolinians are doing their share in the space effort, and certainly few would question that "Tar Heel" tracks lead directly to the moon.

North Carolina's flight partnership goes back to that December day in 1903 when Wilbur and Orville Wright used a Carolina sand dune to launch the aeronautical age. Twenty years later, from a landing field in the same county, Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell demonstrated the effectiveness of airpower by bombing battleships off the North Carolina coast.

In two world wars, North Carolinians proved the value of airpower, and pioneered in its development.

Young Kiffin Y. Rockwell, a Tar Heel pilot who died in combat less than 13 years after the Wright brothers soared into history, was the first member of the famed Escadrille Lafayette to shoot down an enemy plane.

And in World War II, Col. George V. Holloman made significant breakthroughs in developing automatic devices for airplane control, while his fellow Carolinian, Maj. Gen. William C. Lee, organized the Army's airborne units.

As North Carolinians have advanced the cause of aviation, so have they advanced the course of interplanetary exploration.

Batteries manufactured in Raleigh by the Exide Missile & Electronics Division of ESB, Inc., supplied the packaged power in the command and service modules of the Apollo moon vehicles and their Saturn V boosters. Other ESB batteries were aboard the Mariner 6 and 7 space probes which sent back the amazingly detailed photographs of Mars. Today, technicians among ESB's 400 Raleigh employees are engaged in research and development of batteries to power even more spectacular missions in the solar system.

At least 20 North Carolina-based industries are making notable contributions to the space program. Among them are:

A-B Emblem Corp. of Weaverville, which produced the insignia worn by the Apollo 11 crew.

Riegel Paper Co.'s Industrial Products Division of Matthews, which produced a stainless steel and plastic laminate for heat resistance aboard the Apollo capsule.

Other industries have produced space needs ranging from electronic parts to textile and fiber materials.

North Carolinians have taught the astronauts, including Neil Armstrong, celestial navigation at the University of North Carolina's Morehead Planetarium in Chapel Hill. NASA receives appreciable aid in the form of research projects at North Carolina State University and Duke University.

On a mountaintop in isolated Transylvania County, more than 450 miles across Tarheelia from the birthplace of powered flight, data from space satellites is gathered by NASA from its mammoth tracking station.

Apart from the products and services which bear a distinct "made in North Carolina label," the State has made notable contributions in space leadership. NASA laid claim to two who have taken prominent positions in the space program—Oxford's James Webb and Charlotte's Julian Scheer.

Mr. Speaker, "We the People of North Carolina," the official publication of the North Carolina Citizens Association, lists eight industries in my district alone which currently produce products for the space effort. In addition to ESB, these are Payne & Associates of Raleigh, IBM of the Research Triangle Park,

Sperry-Rand Electro-Components of Durham, Burlington Industries, Cornell-Dubilier of Fuquay, Wilmore Electronics of Durham, and Corning Glass of Raleigh.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in saluting these Tar Heel contributors to our space program, and I am certain my colleagues will understand why I am filled with more than lyric pride whenever I point to a full and radiant "Carolina Moon."

BREAK DOWN OUR IRON CURTAIN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last February, this country was once again embarrassed by the State Department's refusal, on security grounds, to allow Mr. Carlos Fuentes, a leading Mexican novelist long identified with leftist causes, to enter this country. In this particular incident, Mr. Fuentes was traveling by passenger ship from Barcelona, Spain to Veracruz, Mexico. The ship docked at San Juan, P.R., and Mr. Fuentes, on preparing to leave, was met by immigration officials who tore up his transit card and, Mr. Fuentes reported, treated him "like a common criminal." The Justice Department later said that the author had been denied entry because he is an "undesirable alien," and declined to explain further. Mr. Fuentes has been refused a visitor's visa in the past on the grounds that he was a possible Communist.

This latest incident has been met with outrage in literary, academic, and international circles. In a highly critical editorial, the New York Times commented:

One sure way to tarnish the United States is for some bureaucrat to decide that a writer, painter or other artist is an "undesirable alien" because of his works or beliefs. Politicizing literature is a common practice for authoritarian governments; it should not become one for this country.

Mr. William D. Rogers, former head of the Alliance for Progress and now president of the Center for Inter-American Relations, wrote to Secretary of State William P. Rogers that, and I quote:

The notion that Fuentes's presence among us could in any sense damage our national interest is unworthy of serious discussion. To the contrary, it is his rejection which will cause us immense harm. It will be interpreted by the youth and intellectual community in Latin America as meaning that our commitment to free expression is superficial and will confirm the impression to some that we are timid and fearful of criticism of Latin-American writers.

Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Mr. Fuentes' U.S. publishers, called the act "absolutely outrageous." Columbia University officials, who have invited Mr. Fuentes to lecture there next year, protested to Attorney General Mitchell. Telegrams and letters to high Government officials are reported to have been sent by a number of literary organizations, including a resolution signed at the

National Book Award ceremonies by more than 200 authors, publishers and critics declared the United States was, and I quote, "secure enough in its democratic values," and urging abolition of immigration restrictions against foreigners on the basis of dissenting political views.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by repealing section 212(a)(28) and section 241(a)(6). These two subsections provide, respectively, for prevention of entry and deportation on the grounds of a person's past or present membership in certain organizations, or, more nebulously, their past or present allegiance to certain beliefs. This includes members of the Communist Party and affiliated or front organizations, members and associates of any other totalitarian government, and anarchists.

The inappropriateness of such a restriction is emphasized by our exchange agreements regarding visitors from Eastern European countries. The combined effect of these agreements and section 212(a)(28) is to make it easier for Soviet and satellite nationals to visit our country than it is for citizens of unorthodox political views from free world countries. In 1967, just 2,000 of the approximately 3,000 "28" cases, as they are known in the State Department, who received waivers allowing them to come here were from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides ample protection against undesirable aliens, without the subsections which my bill would repeal. Elimination of these subsections would in no way endanger the security of this country. This is not my opinion alone. Let me quote briefly from a letter written in September 1967 by the then Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

We do not believe that section 212(a)(28) makes any substantial contribution to the internal security of the United States. To be sure, selectivity may be exercised under section 212(a)(28) in determining which of the aliens falling within the categories enumerated therein are to be admitted under waivers and which are to be excluded. Section 212(a)(27) and 212(a)(29), however, are more directly aimed at preventing the entry of individuals who present any substantial threat to the national security. Subsection (27) prohibits the issuance of a visa to any alien who the consular officer or Attorney General has reason to believe is entering "solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States." Subsection (29) bars entry to all aliens who the consular officer or Attorney General has reason to believe would engage in activity "subversive to the national security" or who would "participate in the activities" of any subversive organization. These specific provisions, which impose an ineligibility that may not be waived, appear to provide ample protection for the national security without affecting, as section 212(a)(28) does, the travel of a host of individuals whose purpose is entirely innocent

and whom we would welcome to this country as tourists or businessmen.

To prevent people from entering this country on the basis of what they believe, or have believed in the past, is to implicitly endorse thought control, and to confess that we are afraid of other people's ideas. Far from protecting our national security, section 212(a) (28) has repeatedly embarrassed this country, making us appear both ridiculous and repressive. Mr. Katzenbach wrote in the letter I just quoted from that—

Section 212(a) (28) has the unfortunate effect of presenting a damaging picture of this country as one fearful of opposing views. We have nothing to fear in this regard and much to gain by offering citizens of other countries a look at the free institutions of the United States.

The New York Times aptly noted in its editorial on the Fuentes incident that—

The basic problem is that the immigration law on exclusion is a vestige of the restrictive era of the nineteen fifties.

Section 212(a) (28) is an ignominious reminder of the times which produced it—1952 and the McCarran-Walter Act, a bill which Congress enacted over President Truman's veto and of the McCarthy era then just beginning.

In 1965 we abolished the highly discriminatory national origins quota system which for decades had formed the basis of our immigration policy, and which the 1952 act reinforced. It is surely time to repeal this provision of our immigration legislation which prohibits entry on the basis of a person's beliefs.

The national security of this country would be no more endangered by a visit from a celebrated leftist Mexican novelist than it was by the visit in 1961 of Khrushchev's son-in-law and the then editor of *Izvestia*, Aleksey Adzhubi and Khrushchev's press secretary, Mikhail Kharlamov. They debated Harrison Salisbury of the Times and Pierre Salinger, then President Kennedy's press secretary, on NBC-TV's "Face the Nation" on the subject, "Free Press in an Open Society." During the next year, in April 1962, Mr. Fuentes applied for a temporary visa in order to participate in an NBC-TV debate on "How Progress Can Best Be Achieved in Latin America," with Richard Goodwin, then Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. The State Department refused to grant Mr. Fuentes a visa on the grounds that he might be a Communist. Mr. Fuentes' visit certainly posed no more of a threat to this country than did that of the two well-known Communists the preceding year. Further, Mr. Fuentes himself posed no more of a threat to the security of this country in 1962 or 1969 than he did in 1961, 1964, and 1966, years when the State Department saw fit to issue him a visa. This irrationality in the State Department's treatment of Mr. Fuentes underlines the arbitrariness with which this provision is enforced.

I urge that we pass legislation as soon as possible to repeal it and save the country from future embarrassing inci-

dents which, at best, make us look foolish and, at worst, seriously damage U.S. foreign relations.

TVA RATE INCREASE REGRETTABLE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has just announced its second increase within 2 years in its charges to customers for "low cost" electric power.

This decision and this announcement are indeed to be regretted. It is unfortunate that TVA which was created to supply residential, commercial, and industrial users in the Tennessee Valley with economical electric power, has found it necessary to establish this rising trend of rates.

This is especially true in view of the fact that TVA has also announced previously that sales and revenues from its power system reached new highs in fiscal 1969. Sales to 160 municipal, cooperative, and private distribution systems rose 10 percent over the corresponding period for the previous year and sales to large industries increased 5 percent.

TVA has also announced that a record 618 new industries and plant expansions occurred in the Tennessee Valley region in 1968.

With this expansion in TVA power requirements and with TVA's volume of power considered, it is difficult to understand why TVA cannot make some internal adjustment to avoid the latest rate increase. TVA's operations are self-sustaining, self-operating, and self-liquidating.

TVA in its announcement insists that the rate increase is necessary because of higher fuel costs for its steam plants and increases in interest costs on money it has borrowed to finance additions to its system to meet demands for additional power. TVA also points out that the cost of power for residential use in the Tennessee Valley region will remain less than half the national average.

However, there is some question as to what the rate increases mean in terms of industrial expansion. The Tennessee Valley Industrial Council, which is composed of 23 major companies in the Tennessee Valley, has insisted that rate increases are pricing TVA out of the competitive power market. Some leaders in public power challenge this statement, but nevertheless the fact is that TVA is changing its image from one of economical power to one of escalating power costs.

As a longtime friend and supporter of TVA, this development disturbs me. I want TVA to maintain its image as the yardstick for economic public power.

TVA would do well to review this entire matter and its decision to increase rates and, if at all possible, reduce rates rather than increase them.

POINT REYES—A NATIONAL PARK OR A SUBDIVISION?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a growing sense of alarm that I rise today to remind my colleagues of the dangers which currently threaten the Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

This haven of nature, aptly described as "the gem of the peninsula—a biological jewel," has thus far escaped man's apparent desire to make his environment unlivable but the day when bulldozers will shatter the irreplaceable tranquility of Point Reyes rapidly approaches. Unless Congress appropriates immediately the funds necessary to claim lands originally conceived to be a part of the national seashore when it was created in 1962, this invaluable and probably ir retrievable land will be subdivided by real estate interests.

In my opinion, it would be an unpardonable sin for a nation that can apparently afford to spend \$24 billion to put a man on the moon and \$80 billion for defense to allow one of nature's most precious handiworks to be destroyed by failing to spend the \$37 million needed to assure its protection.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is of nationwide concern. I insert into the RECORD at this point an article from the August 5, 1969, issue of the New York Times relating to Point Reyes:

POINT REYES IN CALIFORNIA A PATCHWORK PARK IN TROUBLE (By Gladwin Hill)

POINT REYES, CALIF.—This dramatic promontory just north of San Francisco is at once a monument to natural beauty, to man's aspirations and to governmental confusion.

Its future as one of the nation's choicest preserves hangs in the balance at this moment, clouded by the financial and administrative problems that beset, if less acutely, many other segments of the national recreation system.

President Kennedy, on Sept. 13, 1962, signed a bill creating the "Point Reyes National Seashore," the third such preserve in the national park system.

The name is misleading on two counts. Far more than a beach, Point Reyes is a 100-square-mile peninsula encompassing an unusual array of fascinating and beautiful terrain, flora and fauna.

CATTLE, FIRS, DUNES, CANYONS

Pastoral countryside dotted with dairy herds merges magically into a "Black Forest" of towering Douglas firs. The forest gives way to moors, dunes, estuaries, granite headlands and plunging canyons. California poppies and lupine, wild roses and lilac carpet the slopes. Between the tidelands and ridges are creatures ranging from oysters and elephant seals to mountain lions, cormorants and egrets.

But the name "Point Reyes National Seashore" is deceptive also in its connotation of a unified preserve. Its statutory boundary embraces nearly all of the peninsula. But in reality the Federal reservation is still only a patchwork of 10 scattered parcels of land, comprising less than half the peninsula.

The rest, contemplated as part of the park, is still in private holdings, the choicest of which are in imminent danger of falling under subdividers' bulldozers.

Under Secretary of the Interior Russell Train conceded recently that the existing reservation was too "fragmented and scattered to be regarded as efficiently administrable" and noted that its existence had not yet been formally pronounced in the Federal Register.

\$20 MILLION SPENT SO FAR

The nation's taxpayers have put nearly \$20-million into Point Reyes. Some 575,000 persons visited the preserve last year, touring its roads, hiking its 50 miles of woodland trails and enjoying its beaches. But the nation still does not have an officially acknowledgeable park at Point Reyes.

Why not?

The answer is a tortuous saga of bungling—not so much by any individuals as by the system under which the Federal Government is struggling to catch up in recreation facilities with the explosive growth of population and urbanization.

It was more than 30 years ago that Conrad Wirth, then director of the National Park Service, said that Point Reyes should be a national park.

The peninsula has been described as "an island in time," geographically sociologically and ecologically. Its mainland edge follows precisely the great San Andreas fault. (When San Francisco was rocked by an earthquake in 1906, the whole peninsula moved northward 30 feet.) The peninsula's most spacious bay is believed by many to be the place where Sir Francis Drake refitted the Golden Hind in 1579.

ESCAPED URBANIZATION

In recent years, because it consisted of only a few large landholdings, the point managed to ride out urbanization although it is only 30 miles north of San Francisco. It retained most of the pristine charm of the era when its original Indian inhabitants greeted early explorers from Europe.

The 1962 act, excluding from the park boundaries only a few peninsula fringe communities and a state park, envisioned the Government's acquiring about half of the 53,000 acres by purchase, condemnation or exchange, leaving the rest with agrarian owners.

A total of \$14-million was appropriated as supposedly adequate. But speculators swarmed in and land prices soared, just as has happened on many Federal reservation projects.

The most critical land exchange, to obtain the strategically situated 2,500-acre Lake Ranch, described by naturalists as "a jewel," fell through when Gov. Mark Hatfield of Oregon made a political issue out of the use of Federal timberland there in the trade.

In 1966, \$5-million more was appropriated. With the aggregate \$19-million, the Government has acquired 22,000 of the 53,000 acres—in the "unadministrable" patchwork. It is impossible to traverse all the segments without crossing private land.

"People are always trespassing," a rancher said, "letting our cattle loose, wanting to use the bathroom. They don't know what's park and what isn't."

Mounting land prices and taxes have shattered the original idea that some 26,000 acres could be left in its pastoral state, under private ownership, to complement the Federal preserve.

The problem is illustrated by the Lake Ranch, which is owned by William A. Sweet, a pleasant, soft-spoken Coos Bay, Oreg., lumberman.

"It's a shame," he says. "It should be in Government ownership. We've been trying

to sell or swap the ranch with the Government for 10 years. But we just can't afford to wait any longer. We paid about \$22,000 in taxes last year and took in about \$2,400 in leases. We just don't have the assets to continue."

So surveyors and road builders have been tromping over the Lake Ranch, laying it out in 40-acre tracts, which will go on the market to subdividers any day.

Owners of another 2,500-acre ranch covering the whole northern end of the peninsula say they are faced with the same exigency.

EIGHT BILLS INTRODUCED

The best estimates are that it will take \$38-million more for the land purchases necessary to round out the Point Reyes National Seashore. The \$57-million total will be four times the original contemplated cost. There are eight bipartisan bills before Congress to appropriate the additional money. But the prospects of getting it are problematical.

The House of Representatives has just voted appropriations totaling only \$17-million for land acquisition for the entire national park system for fiscal year 1970, which opened last July 1. The figure is less than 12 cents for each person in the country, and less than half what is needed for Point Reyes alone. The money was earmarked for eight units in the 44-unit park system, with none for Point Reyes.

The main reason the amount was not bigger was that such acquisition money has to come out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which annually is divided among the states and several Federal agencies. The fund, which Congress in 1968 said should be \$200-million a year, was cut back by the Nixon Administration to only \$124-million for fiscal year 1970.

The Point Reyes predicament was agonized over by the House Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation at a hearing May 13.

The director of the National Park Service, George B. Hartzog Jr., propounded to the subcommittee a "controlled development" plan, under which some 16,440 of the 53,000 acres would be kept in private farm operation under a special arrangement with the Government, and 9,200 acres would be sold off for residential use under restrictions "compatible" with the park.

Part of the land in each category is now in Federal hands and part would be obtained by condemnation, netting the Government a profit of some \$10-million.

The residential-use idea was rejected by key committee members both on esthetic grounds and in the belief that turning a quick profit through condemnation and resale would be unfair if not illegal.

Aside from that, hearing participants concur, the only solution seems to be "legislative taking." Under this procedure Congress simply declares an entire area a national preserve, in being, as it did with the National Redwood Park.

Compensation to private owners is pegged at the land valuation of that moment, eliminating the price escalation during the actual takeover period. The disadvantage for the Government is that this forces appropriations to be made quickly, since interest fees to landowners start running at the time "taking" is declared.

"I think 'legislative taking' is the only way you can be assured that you're going to wrap up the Point Reyes project within the figures we have given you," Mr. Hartzog told the committee.

"But," he added, "if Mr. Sweet subdivides his property, then I think all bets are off insofar as our estimates are concerned. We will have opened up a Pandora's box again."

Ironically, the Point Reyes crisis peaked just as Secretary of the Interior Walter J.

Hickel was ordering the National Park Service to give top priority to development of parks near big urban centers.

"Time is of the essence in formulating an action program," he said. "Opportunities are being lost daily to acquire such lands. Once lost, these opportunities can seldom be retrieved."

WORSHIP SERVICES IN THE WHITE HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who came from my district, Wright City, Warren County, Mo., has recently written an article which should attract general interest, whether or not it attracts general agreement. Since the full text of yesterday's Associated Press dispatch describing his article did not appear in either the New York Times or the Washington Post, I enclose the AP dispatch in full in the interest of freedom of information:

NEW YORK.—President Nixon's worship services Sundays in the White House defy church-state separation and amount to installing a "tamed religion" uncritical of his policies, says a prominent American theologian.

Writing in the interdenominational journal "Christianity and Crisis," the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr states that "President Nixon has turned the East Room into a kind of sanctuary and, by a curious combination of innocence and guile, has circumvented the Bill of Rights' first article."

Dr. Niebuhr found fault with both Nixon and Billy Graham, the evangelist and close friend of the President. He said that through semiofficial invitations to ministers of various religions, "of whose moral criticism we were naturally so proud Nixon has established a conforming religion."

"Some bizarre aspects have developed from this new form of conformity in these weekly services," said the 77-year-old political philosopher and retired Union Theological Seminary professor.

"Most of this tamed religion seems even more extravagantly appreciative of official policy than any historic establishment feared by our founding fathers."

"It is wonderful what a simple White House invitation will do to dull the critical faculties," Dr. Niebuhr added. He said the apprehension of millions of persons about the antiballistic missile issue is evaded and Vietnam policy is bypassed.

The services bring to mind a key figure in them, he wrote, "Our great evangelist Billy Graham, a domesticated and tailored left-over from the wild and woolly frontier evangelistic campaigns."

Dr. Niebuhr, who was founding editor of the influential liberal biweekly magazine, noted that Nixon had told the press he started the Sunday services to further the cause of religion, especially in the eyes of the Nation's youth.

"He did not specify," commented Dr. Niebuhr, "that there would have to be a particular quality in that religion if it were to help them. For they are disenchanted with a culture that neglects human problems while priding itself on its two achievements of technical efficiency and affluence."

The theologian said the "Nixon-Graham doctrine" has two defects:

It sees all religion as "virtuous" in guaranteeing public justice, without any dis-

inction between radical religious protest and a conventional religion which "throws the aura of sanctity on contemporary public policy whether morally inferior or outrageously unjust."

It assumes that "a religious change of heart, such as occurs in an individual conversion, would cure men of all sin."

SIGNIFICANT STUDIES OF THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, I was pleased to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. One of the most important pieces of legislation reported from that committee in that Congress and subsequently enacted into law was a bill establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission, charged with the responsibility of reviewing all of the public land laws of the United States and the rules, regulations, policies, practices, and procedures involved in their administration.

The act creating the Commission requires that a report be submitted to the Congress and the President recommending such modifications, if any, that may be necessary in existing policy in order to assure that—

The public lands of the United States shall be (a) retained and managed or (b) disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public.

The Commission's report must be filed no later than June 30, 1970.

When the Commission organized it chose the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to also be the Chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission. Under the leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, the Commission and its staff have been engaged in the tasks assigned to it.

The manner in which the Commission is going about its work, the scope of its study program, and the potential significance of the Commission's recommendations are contained in an article that has come to my attention, prepared by its Director, Milton A. Pearl, and appearing in the current issue of "The Guarantor," which is published by the Chicago Title & Trust Co. I commend the article to my colleagues.

LAND FOR GROWTH
(By Milton A. Pearl)

Today, as it has throughout the history of the United States, the public domain land represents the greatest opportunity for fulfillment of the American dream whatever it might be at a particular moment in our history.

When we sought new trading areas, it was onto the public domain; when we sought new territories, it was onto the public domain; when we sought new states, it was onto the public domain. No matter the expansion, the land base was the public domain.

The public domain represents that land owned by the United States that has never

been in private ownership. Although more than one billion acres out of our total land mass of 1.8 billion acres that were once in the public domain now have passed to non-Federal ownership, we have 765 million acres of land still in Federal ownership, of which 711 million acres are in the public domain. Covering more than one-third of the land area of the Nation, even though one-half of it is in Alaska and 91% of the other half is in the 11 western states, this acreage will be significant in fulfilling the future land needs for an ever-increasing population that requires recreational areas, forests, parks, new towns, forage for wildlife and domestic livestock, and increased mineral production.

We are told by respected demographers that by the year 2000 our population will exceed 300 million persons, or increase approximately 50 percent above the present total. Personal income will rise correspondingly, resulting in a growth that will impose an increasingly heavy burden on all of our natural resources, including those producible on or from the public lands.

While we recognize that today the livestock industry dependent on the Federal public range contributes less than 3 percent of the meat requirements of the United States, we know that, even if the proportion remains the same, there must be increased production to meet the demands of an expanded population at the beginning of the next century, just 31 years away. Estimates for overall future requirements for forage range from 104 percent to over 140 percent above that we now have. And the need for increased production is not confined to food products; the demand for iron ore, for example, is predicted to increase somewhere in the neighborhood of 390 percent for domestic use.

As intimated above, let us not forget also that more people mean more visits to recreational areas on Federal lands. Actually, the combination of an expanded population with increased leisure time tends to propel the recreation demands to ever greater heights. Projections indicate that the total recreation use of national parks, national recreation areas, national forests, and wildlife refuges will in the year 2000 be five times as great as it is today.

The public lands must also contribute to other uses. Wilderness, preserved in its pristine state for scientific research and for those who seek its solitude, can only be carved out of the public lands. Other public lands must be capable of producing timber in increasing volume to meet the need for more homes and other buildings. Then, one asks: Where will all these buildings go? How many new urban centers or suburban dwelling areas must the public lands accommodate?

To develop the facts and seek the answers to these and many other questions, Congress has established the Public Land Law Review Commission. In response to a broad charge to review the public land laws and the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures involved in the administration of the laws, the Commission has undertaken a comprehensive review. All the public lands are being studied, along with their resources, to provide data on which the Commission can make recommendations for policy guidelines to assure "that the public lands of the United States shall be (a) retained and managed, or (b) disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public." The Commission's report is to be submitted to the Congress and the President by June 30, 1970.

The Commission is composed of 19 members: 6 appointed by the President of the Senate; 6 by the Speaker of the House of

Representatives; 6 appointed by the President of the United States; and a Chairman elected by the 18 appointed members.²

Assisting the Commission is an Advisory Council composed of 25 representatives of interested land users and 8 representatives of Federal departments and agencies having responsibility for the management and disposition of public lands. Also, the Governor of each of the 50 states has appointed a representative to work with the Commission.

In addition, to assure that we have the views of all concerned with the public lands, the Commission has held meetings in every region of the country. Testimony has been received from more than 900 witnesses, some of whom represented large organizations or groups.

Information received from the Commission's official family and from public witnesses has contributed significantly to the development of our comprehensive study program. In response to a requirement from the Commission that we prepare or have prepared all material that the Commission will need to formulate its decisions and recommendations, we have identified 34 subjects³ on which manuscripts will be written. Most of these cover conventional subjects and are being accomplished under contract; others are being accomplished in-house. In each case, the studies will include an examination to provide an understanding of the existing law.

Many of the subjects identified for study will have significance to the real estate community. As we see it, however, two will be of particular significance and interest because of their potential impact. These are studies of regional and local land use planning and of use and occupancy of the public lands.

Our planning study is designed to put the spotlight on the extent to which Federal departments and agencies coordinate land use planning with each other and with state and local governments. We will not only look at the laws and regulations, but we will make an intensive field examination of actual practices in four separate regions of the country involving 156 counties and 14 states.

We are aware of how Federal policy concerning the use of Federal lands might influence activities of state and local governments. Police protection, access roads, sanitary facilities, and similar services may be required to service the Federal or nearby privately owned lands that become more desirable because of their location. Our planning study will be the primary source of information on which the Commission will determine whether it should recommend new and improved procedures for coordination among the various levels of government, as well as within the Federal establishment.

The study of "use and occupancy of public lands" is devoted to an examination of the need for additional areas for residential, commercial, and industrial use, as well as for various types of rights-of-way and other miscellaneous uses that do not fall in specific categories such as recreation and timber production.

We know that some Western communities cannot expand unless public lands are made available for them. Likewise, we are all familiar with the problems of the metropolitan areas where over 75 percent of our population lives. Suggestions have been made to the Commission that the public lands be made available to once again lure great numbers of our populace to the wide open

² At its organizational meeting July 14, 1965, the Commission elected Representative Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) Chairman; a Presidential appointee, H. Byron Mock of Salt Lake City, Utah, Vice Chairman; and the author as Director.

³ A listing of the subjects appears at the end of this article.

¹ Act of Sept. 19, 1964 (43 U.S.C.A. § 1391). § 1391).

spaces. Recognizing the desire of people in this era to live in urban-type communities, the suggestions have taken aim in that direction.

Under one recommendation, the United States is urged to open land for settlement under an urban homestead procedure comparable to the Agricultural Homestead Settlement Act of the last century. A homestead land grant would be given to those who build on selected sites in accordance with prescribed architectural and landscape standards.

Another suggestion would provide grants for establishment of new towns that would be self-sufficient or self-contained.

The Act creating the Public Land Law Review Commission cites the fact that our present land laws are not fully correlated with each other. We have no evidence that there was any planning in framing the fabric of the various settlement and sales laws. The current effort is built on the concept that all aspects of public land management and use must be considered at one time by one group so that there may be a cohesive, logical pattern established concerning the future retention and management or disposition of the public lands.

While we cannot hazard a guess as to the Commission's ultimate recommendations, we do know that the Public Land Law Review Commission does not plan to recommend that all the Federal Government's public land be sold or that all of those lands be retained and managed under Federal ownership. So, many of the Commission's recommendations can be expected to be devoted to policy guidelines to govern determinations for selection of lands to be retained and lands to be disposed of to non-Federal owners.

We have built our study program in an effort to provide the Commission with the tools it needs, with the data required to understand fully the various public land possibilities. Guidelines for management under Federal ownership or for disposition should incorporate the best techniques of land use planning, and it is for this reason that we welcome suggestions from all who may have them.

AMVETS—25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago a new national organization was formed which took on the name of "American Veterans of World War II," better known to all of us as AMVETS.

I congratulate the present leaders of this organization, as well as those who in the past have lent their hand and gave of their time to bring into being an organization of comradeship and service.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to meet with many of the AMVET delegations who came before our committee to discuss their programs. In all these discussions, I have found that what the AMVETS had programed for the betterment of their membership was something worthy of our support. The AMVETS have become known as one of the most devoted organizations in furtherance of our national security, domestic programs, and in our foreign relations. The New Jersey department com-

mander of the AMVETS is a constituent of mine and a longtime friend. I wish to congratulate Mr. Frank Ruggiero upon his leadership at the time when the AMVET organization is celebrating its silver anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include, as part of my remarks, an article which appeared in the August 7, 1969, edition of "The Stars and Stripes," a national publication representing the voice of the veterans of the United States.

The article follows:

AMVETS CREATION CAME AT CRUCIAL TIME IN WAR

August was a high point month in World War II. On this date—August 7—German generals on Hitler's stubborn command launched a counter attack against the Americans who had just broken out of Normandy. They succeeded in penetrating the American lines, but the salient they created built a trap for themselves. Encircling U.S. troops aided by British and Canadians closed a vise around two German field armies. Thousands were killed. Fifty thousand were taken prisoners.

Half way around the world, U.S. air, land and sea forces were smashing at the Japanese, by this date 25 years ago, the Philippine Sea and the air above it along with Saipan, Tinian and Guam were under American control. The Japanese defense perimeter was irretrievably broken. The Tojo government was out of power. The end was no longer over the horizon. It was in sight.

Such was the status of the greatest war in all history when AMVETS was about to be born 25 years ago.

When the hundreds of delegates gather in Detroit next week for the annual convention of AMVETS, one can bank on spirited reunions of comrades of World War II as they relive some of their experiences of 1941-45. In their ranks will be a substantial number of men who fought later in Korea, and still more recently in Viet Nam, for the organization some years back opened its membership to these men of later combat.

Like other veterans' organizations before it, AMVETS' history is dramatic reading.

On July 15 of this year, Representative Glenn M. Anderson of California inserted in the Congressional Record a historical background of AMVETS. Anderson is a member of Culver City, Cal., post No. 2.

Excerpts from Representative Anderson's statement follow:

Two independent veterans clubs in Washington, D.C.—one formed on the campus of George Washington University, the other among veterans employed by the government—joined together to sponsor a servicemen's party. By September 1944 others such veterans clubs organized throughout America—in California, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Texas. On November 11, 1944, Veterans Day, an article entitled "12,000,000 in Search of a Leader" appeared in Collier's Magazine. This story, written by Walter Davenport, introduced the clubs and outlined their mutual aims—1. To promote world peace, 2. To preserve the American Way of Life, and 3. To help the veteran help himself. In December, 18 leaders, representing these nine groups, met in Kansas City, Missouri. There a national organization was formed, and it was on December 9, 1944 the name "American Veterans of World War II" was chosen. The word AMVETS, coined by a newspaper reporter, soon became the official name. The "White Clover," a flower which thrives in freedom throughout the world, is symbolic of the struggle during World War II and is the adopted flower of AMVETS.

In October 1945, two months after the end

of World War II, the first national convention was called in Chicago. In 1946 AMVETS petitioned Congress for a federal charter. On July 23, 1947, President Harry S. Truman signed AMVETS charter. The words of the Senate Judiciary committee echoed throughout the land: "the veterans of World War II are entitled to their own organization" and AMVETS being "organized along sound lines and for worthy purposes . . . having demonstrated its strength and stability, is entitled to the standing and dignity which a national charter will afford." President Truman also commented, "Were I a veteran of this war, I would prefer to have a veteran of World War II looking after my affairs than a veteran of some other war." To this day no other World War II veterans group has been so honored.

KOREAN VETS ADDED

When war broke out in Korea in 1950 and again during the Viet Nam crisis in 1966, AMVETS requested Congress to amend the charter so that those serving in the Armed Forces would be eligible for membership. On September 14, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the bill redefining the eligibility dates for AMVET membership—"Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940 and on or before the date of cessation of hostilities as determined by the government of the United States is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation."

The first National Headquarters for AMVETS was rented quarters at 724—Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Then on April 18, 1952 President Truman dedicated the first AMVETS-owned National Headquarters. This building, a five-story townhouse, was located at 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. For fifteen years this building served Headquarters and the National Service Foundation. In 1965 AMVETS moved to a temporary location, and the historic townhouse was torn down. On the same site appeared a modern three-story structure of marble and glass. On the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Congressional Charter, July 23, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson dedicated the new building. During the program a beautiful life-like bronze bust of the President was unveiled by Mrs. Johnson. All AMVETS take pride in the Headquarters for the executive offices and conference rooms are most attractive and functional.

Hourly from Headquarters a Carillon, donated by Shulmerich Carillons, Inc., chimes and then at specific times musical classics resound through the area. These bells are significant of the other AMVET Carillons throughout the United States. The Memorial Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery to honor the memory of those who died in the service of their country was the first installation. This console is in the Arlington amphitheatre overlooking the Tombs of the Unknowns. It was on December 21, 1949 that AMVETS presented the Carillon to the nation with the message: "While these bells ring, safely rest, freedom lives." AMVET Carillons also are now located aboard the USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, at the Garden of Patriots at Cape Coral, Florida, Truman Library in Missouri, Jefferson Barracks in Missouri, State Capitol in Salt Lake City, Utah, the Golden Gate National Cemetery in California.

OTHER ENDEAVORS

The "Green Hats" of AMVETS have served the hospitalized veteran, the retarded child, the shoeless orphan, and the lonely serviceman. However, the granting of scholarships has been a major endeavor of AMVETS. Each

year many scholarships are awarded deserving students. This program, originated in 1952 and has awarded \$250,000 in study grants.

In 1954 the first AMVET Silver Helmet Award—a replica of the G.I. helmets of World War II—was presented to General George Marshall for his "enormous contributions to the United States in war and in peace." Subsequently Silver Helmets have been presented to other great Americans. Recipients include Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Kennedy, Nixon, Comedian Bob Hope, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Dr. Ralph Bunche.

A network of trained National Service Officers across the country provide free expert advice to veterans and veterans' dependents.

WATCHFUL EYE

AMVETS keep a watchful eye and take an active part in the legislation on "The Hill". Action on pending Congressional bills is based on the assumption that the "veterans will ultimately benefit from any measure that benefits the nation and, conversely, any program not good for the country as a whole cannot be good for the veteran." AMVETS are especially proud of their roles in the enactment of the "Korean G.I. Bill of Rights" and the "Cold War Bill of Rights." Domestic issues, national defense, and foreign relations are issues of importance and grave concern to AMVETS.

AMVETS offers to its members many personal services. Life insurance, hospital coverage, discount drugs, and travel tours are such programs; however, the associations and friendships of fellow-AMVETS is without doubt the most valued benefit of AMVET membership. AMVETS is truly a family organization. Wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of AMVETS are eligible for membership in AMVETS Auxiliary, while sons and daughters between 7 and 17 years of age may join Jr. AMVETS. The Fun and Honor Group of AMVETS is known as the Sad Sacks, while its counterpart in the Auxiliary is the Sackets.

Time marches on, and AMVETS continue to work to attain world peace so that every man can live fearlessly under free skies, to make the United States an ever-better land of "freedom for all", and to help the veteran, his widow and orphan live happily as contributing members of society.

RALLY BEHIND THE PRESIDENT ON SAFEGUARD

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the victory the President won yesterday on the Safeguard vote has a significance that affects not only the world today but also may decide the shape of the world for future generations.

That there were honest and legitimate differences about the merits and the costs of Safeguard was shown by the closeness of the vote. But, Mr. Speaker, where the safety of this Nation may be at stake and where the President believes something is necessary to that safety, it seems to me there can be valid reasons to question but little excuse to deny the President what he seeks.

How do you measure cost, even \$10 billion, against lives?

How do you equate money with peace or a chance for successful disarmament talks.

There is no way.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to quit talking about Safeguard in political terms, on monetary terms, in terms of victory or defeat. The time has come, instead, to rally behind this President, as we have rallied all others, when the fate of our Nation and of the world were the issues.

INCOME DISCLOSURE FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS URGED

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in the cosponsorship of a bill introduced by my colleague, Representative GLENN M. ANDERSON, Democrat of California, aimed at making it mandatory for all of us in Government service who share in these gravest of times the responsibility for shaping the laws of our land to make full disclosure of their financial standing.

For some time now I have been deeply disturbed by the growing disillusionment felt by the people of the Nation over their leaders here in Washington. Public confidence in public officials has been severely jolted time and time again by such episodes as the recent one involving Abe Fortas. Because of these incidents, the image of Government has been badly tarnished, sometimes unjustifiably so because all the facts were not made known.

This bill would require full income disclosure by all Congressmen, Senators, Federal judges, including those on the Supreme Court as well as the President and the Vice President. Also coming under its provisions would be candidates for President and Vice President, Cabinet officers, and employees of the House and Senate as well as the executive branch making \$18,000 a year or more.

Those of us in positions of legislative and judicial trust have a deep obligation to do everything we can to restore public belief in the objectivity of their representatives, elected or otherwise, especially in cases where individual integrity arising from possible conflicts of interest is in question. I would be less than honest with myself, my constituents, and my colleagues here in the House if I did not demonstrate by deeds how strongly I feel that such a course of action is vital now. Therefore, I ask that the following notarized statement of my financial standing be made a part of the RECORD:

AUGUST 7, 1969.

I, James F. Hastings, Congressman representing the 38th Congressional District of New York State, do solemnly swear that the following is a true and accurate statement of my financial standing as of this date.

I have no ties with firms doing business with the government and own no capital stock or bonds. As of the end of July 1969, I severed connection with the real estate and insurance firm of Hastings & Jewell, Inc.,

63 West Main Street, Allegany, New York, of which I had been a partner. I had been contemplating this move for some time because of the pressure of Congressional duties but the necessary legal work could not be completed until last month. I still retain ownership of the building but expect to sell it before the end of August 1969. I value the building at \$11,000. It has a mortgage of \$7,500.

I consider my major asset my home at 124 Second Street, Allegany. I figure its worth at \$28,000. It has a mortgage of \$2,900. I have not purchased a second home in Washington, D.C. I live instead in a two-room, \$230 a month apartment two blocks from my office in the Longworth Building.

I have an \$8,000 equity in the Wellsville Land Company which owns property for home building but the Company holds a \$4,900 note from me. I have no savings account. My checking account has a current balance of \$3,800.

Additional debts are a \$6,500 bank loan; a \$4,500 loan from the New York State Retirement Fund and personal bills amounting to \$1,800.

My insurance has a loan value of \$5,000 and I own one-twelfth of a share of a summer lodge in Allegany. The value of the share I put at \$1,500.

JAMES F. HASTINGS,

Congressman, 18th District, New York.

INCOME TREATMENT OF NON-PROFIT FOUNDATIONS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from Miss Sylvia Helen Forman, a constituent of mine from Berkeley, Calif., detailing her views on proposals to amend the income treatment of nonprofit foundations. This letter raises several very interesting points and it is deserving of wider attention.

Accordingly, I include Miss Forman's letter in the RECORD at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

Berkeley, Calif., July 28, 1969.

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: I write you with regard to the recent tentative recommendations of the House Committee on Ways and Means that treat control of the activities of foundations.

The curbs on foundations proposed by the Ways and Means Committee have been the subject of much anxious discussion among the students and faculty members of my acquaintance. I myself am quite concerned about these proposals, in part because I am presently supported in my graduate studies by a Graduate Fellowship from the Danforth Foundation (of St. Louis, Missouri)

I understand, and deplore, the actions of some foundations that operate for private rather than public good. However, it seems completely obvious to me that the wholesale application, to all foundations, of the recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee would have a detrimental effect on the public good by unnecessarily and arbitrarily restricting the beneficial works of those foundations (the majority, I would think) which do not ever engage in underhanded activities.

The proposals of the Committee do not differentiate "good" foundations from "bad" ones and thus, if enacted into law, would amount to "throwing the baby out with the bath water." This criticism does not apply, of course, to the proposed prohibition against self-dealing between a donor and a foundation, or to the proposed requirements for prompt use of income, and for an annual public report of activity. But I note, for example, that the Danforth Foundation not only publishes such a report, but even sends it to the Fellowship holders!

The recommendation that foundations be taxed strikes me as being very poor, for two reasons. One, it simply reduces the sum of money available to a foundation for expending to the public good. Two, it threatens the whole idea that non-profit organizations of a public nature can be tax-exempt, thus creating the possibility that many highly beneficial institutions would be restricted in their operations and, perhaps, restricted in their incomes, through loss of the "tax-deductible" incentive to donations.

Yet, the potentially most damaging recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee is the one that proposes to prohibit any activity, however minor, on the part of any foundation to influence, either directly or indirectly, the decisionmaking of any governmental institution. This concept is qualitatively different from forbidding foundations to "lobby" or to try to influence elections. Almost any study that might be undertaken with financial support for research expenses from a foundation could, and, in so far as it is a high quality and factual piece of research, *should* influence governmental policy decisions. The ideas of this recommendation would not have to be pushed very far in order to amount to total repression of studies of any social, economic or political phenomena. In essence, it says that actions aimed at influencing national policy are permissible on the part of profit-making, vested-interest organizations, but not on the part of non-profit, public-interest organizations. Do those men who are responsible for making this recommendation actually adhere to the dogma that "what's good for GM is good for the country?" Is the American Cancer Society less qualified to support research into causes of lung-cancer than the tobacco interests, or to report such research in a manner that will receive both public and governmental attention? Are anthropologists, such as myself, whose work is often supported by grants from foundations, not to be allowed to make public reports on such items as conditions on American Indian reservations for fear that they might influence the decisions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

I should hope that the Ways and Means Committee, and the men I have helped elect to their positions in the Congress, would be able to write legislation that would curb and control abuses by foundations of their protected positions without threatening or damaging the capabilities of foundations to continue in their service to the nation through their support of disinterested and objective investigations of any and all problems that interest, challenge or trouble us. The present proposals would not fulfill this goal.

Yours very truly,

MISS SYLVIA HELEN FORMAN.

THE ABM

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's victory for the proponents of the ABM,

was, despite its narrowness, victory of substantial proportions because the implications are so vast.

Certainly it was no partisan victory and no partisan loss.

Though the President led the fight, men of both parties rallied to his banner; rallied, if you will, in the cause of peace.

ABM is more than just another weapon in our defensive nuclear arsenal. Its existence is not only a deterrent to the rash but also truly a safeguard against attack by the irrational.

ABM is in fact a trump card for the hand of the President in his quest for peace.

With approval of the ABM, the President can negotiate from a standpoint of strength.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States should always be in a position to negotiate from strength.

Our thanks go to those who have made this possible.

MORE SUPPORT—COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, both the need for and the advantages of having computer capability for the Congress has been pretty well documented by those of us who hope for early legislative action to "bring us up to date."

I was delighted to see that the State of Massachusetts, acting on the recommendations of its own legislative data processing committee, has joined Pennsylvania and other States in entering the computer age.

An article from the State Legislative Leader of July 1969, describing the action of the Massachusetts Legislature is included herewith for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATION SHARES A COMPUTER

(By Stephen C. Davenport)

As a result of a study and recommendations by its own Legislative Data Processing Committee the Massachusetts Legislature is sharing the State Comptroller's new third generation computer (RCA Spectra 70) in the present session. Current plans call for development of a bill status system, utilization of statutory retrieval and provision of some budgetary information.

The decision to share a computer was made by a special committee of five Senators and seven Representatives who had been researching data processing for over a year. The committee had the benefit of consulting advice from a national accounting firm and on-site observation of what had been accomplished in the Florida, New York and Pennsylvania Legislatures. The committee was also aware of the utilization of data processing by other states through the testimony of major manufacturers.

It was the unanimous decision of the committee, strongly supported by the legislative leadership, to begin to utilize data processing. The committee was well aware that persuasive arguments can be made that the cost of utilizing data processing as a legislative tool is not justified by results

attainable at its present state of development. However, it was thought that methods of input and output have sufficiently improved, so that experience with the systems presently available is almost a prerequisite for moving ahead as refinements become available.

The major reasons that the committee's decision to share a computer was unanimous were:

(1) The possibility that improvements might be slow in developing.

(2) The cost factors involved.

Actually the decision to share the State Comptroller's computer (which had not been selected at that time) was simple, because it was the only equipment which would be available with the capacity to be shared. In addition, it also provided the possibility of sharing certain budgetary information which would be constantly available beginning with the new fiscal year starting in July of 1969. The budgetary information on video data terminals available to the financial committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate will have limitations in its initial stages, but the potential is unlimited.

The statutory retrieval application is scheduled to be available in our state by the end of the summer. A few years ago, a study commission in Massachusetts purchased the Massachusetts Statutes and Constitution tapes from the University of Pittsburgh, Health Law Center. These tapes have been updated through 1968 and the Aspen Systems Corporation, successor to the University's Health Law Center has agreed to provide the program so that these searches can be conducted here in Massachusetts. Preliminary searches produced by Aspen have indicated that this can be an extremely useful tool for study commissions, Legislative Counsel and for drafting complicated legislation. However, at the present time, our experience with the system is limited.

A bill status system has been showing the history of more than 6,700 separate documents processed so far in the current session. Ten separate video data terminals rapidly display this information in locations that are continually under review based on usage. Five of these terminals have teletype printers attached, and they have proved to be extremely useful as an aid to legislators in answering their mail. Printed copies of the entire bill history are distributed to other areas in the legislature at the beginning of each week to further disseminate the history of bills.

Our bill status system is an integral part of the House and Senate Clerks' offices. Information is fed into the computer by employees of these offices. The integrity of the information on the terminals and the consistency of the operation of the terminals has been excellent, but it is a continuing process to improve the system. It is estimated that about two years operation are needed to develop fully a bill status system adapted to the procedure of our state with close cooperation of the Clerks in both branches. An important part of the bill status system is a Bill Index generated by the computer and available in printed form at the terminals.

To coordinate the data processing function the Massachusetts Legislature employs a Director, who works closely with the manufacturer's representatives, and a programmer assigned by the Comptroller's Office to implement the data processing applications presently planned. They also work closely with the Special Legislative Committee on future enhancements of the legislative systems.

In order to give data processing a fair chance the Massachusetts Legislature has concentrated on keeping the cost of its applications at a minimum, and this can be a difficult task when dealing with people possessing the enthusiasm and optimism of data processing personnel. However, legis-

lators are realists when it comes to weighing cost factors and this same realism would admit, I believe, that computers are a permanent part of the legislative process.

A HUGE GAP IN OUR NARCOTICS LAWS

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report a most serious situation.

We are all aware of the mammoth narcotics problem in this country. The rising tide of drug addiction, especially among the young, now threatens to engulf our society.

Law enforcement officials from all parts of the Nation report an alarming increase in the availability of addictive drugs to young people. Narcotic drugs are pouring into the States at an unprecedented rate.

Acting on these highly disturbing reports, I have made a detailed examination of our penal structure as it relates to the control of narcotics trafficking and to the incarceration of dope peddlers. This examination has yielded a shocking result.

I have learned that there is currently no Federal law which makes it illegal to transport narcotic drugs across State lines. Even worse, there is no Federal law which makes it illegal to employ juveniles in an illegal drug transaction.

These frightening facts indicate a huge gap in our criminal law which must immediately be filled.

Our city and suburban sidewalks literally bulge with Devil's tradesmen who deal in death and destruction. Yet, we have allowed a situation to develop in which our criminal machinery seems impotent before these merchants of menace.

The drug addicts are not the root of our problem. When we take note of the rise in drug abuse, we must keep in mind that the dope peddlers are the true villains of the peace. These are the malicious individuals who rape our neighborhoods and defile our society. The addict is usually the helpless victim of the pusher's evil.

The perversity of dope peddling requires no sermon. But it boggles the mind to realize that now our schoolyards have become centers for the distribution of narcotic drugs. It is not a pleasant thought that our children walk to the waiting arms of a dope pusher when they walk to school.

But, the demon they meet at school is not a leering adult pusher; the adult dope peddler is too smart to appear in person. Rather, narcotics seep into the schools usually through the hands of youngsters themselves who are corrupted and exploited by the adult pusher. If and when these youngsters are apprehended, literally nothing can be done to get at the true criminal, for it is the youngsters who are found with the illegal product and who are caught in the illegal act. That is why we need legislation which would enable law enforcement officials to

knock out the adult who employs or enlists the employment of juveniles in illegal drug transactions. The States have a definite responsibility in this area as well; yet, at the present time, only six States—Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas—have laws forbidding the employment of juveniles in illegal drug transactions.

The problem of interstate transportation of narcotic drugs is another area where legislation is required. Local law enforcement agents are already overburdened by local crime problems. We need a means of bringing Federal agents into the picture. The situation demands not a usurpation of State jurisdiction, but an addition to the criminal machinery. Federal agents, carrying with them the threat of stringent Federal penalties, can make a significant contribution in the war against dope peddlers. State officers have made great progress in this battle, but their jurisdiction as well as their number is limited.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these considerations, I am introducing legislation which will attach a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, and a minimum term of 10 years in a Federal penitentiary, to those who, while nonaddicted themselves, transport narcotics across State lines. My legislation will impose the same penalties on those adults who employ or seek to employ juveniles in illegal drug transactions.

The situation cries out for remedy. We must aim our heaviest artillery at the nonaddicted junkies. The hooked pusher is, in a sense, caught up in the same vicious cycle as the addict; he is under some compulsion to pursue his wayward course, and is in need of help and therapy. But, the nonaddicted dope peddler is a different sort of creature. He is a predatory beast who willfully plans his vile activities with full cognizance of the consequences. It is this monster that the law must cage.

It is this twisted animal that rests at the root of our crime problem. Most of our crime in the streets can be traced directly back to the trafficking in illegal drugs. Prostitution, muggings, larcenies—these are all linkable to the dope trade. The addict in need of a fix is the addict who will do almost anything to get that fix. And to whom does the addict owe his misfortune and his tribute? The poison peddler who dines at the table filled with the products of human misery.

When dealing with this type of beast, we must have every available means within the law of destroying his activities. That is why we must take action now, before the beast destroys us all.

The administration has publicly stated that it is up to this Congress to seize the initiative in the war on narcotics. We dare not shrink from the challenge or the responsibility. Let us decide to junk the junkies for once and for all.

The gauntlet has been tossed, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that this Congress will take up the standard. We must move now, before the flow of deadly narcotic drugs becomes a deluge.

I call upon this House to take quick, positive action on the legislation I have discussed today.

MONSANTO LEADS THE WAY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the American people are greatly concerned about the future of our country unless water pollution and air pollution are brought under control. This morning, I joined 118 of my colleagues in the House in urging an appropriation of \$1 billion for the fiscal year 1970 for the construction grant program of the Clean Water Restoration Act. I urge Congress at this session to appropriate these funds as every single day counts in the fight for pure water and pure air.

Mr. Speaker, Monsanto Co. is setting a splendid example in promoting clean air and pure water. I commend to the attention of my colleagues and our people everywhere the following excellent article which appeared in Time magazine on August 8:

THE AIR: FROM POLLUTION TO PROFIT

Dirty air decays buildings, cracks rubber tires, ruins nylon stockings and worsens all sorts of human ailments. According to one Government study, air pollution costs Americans an average \$65 a year; the figure may hit \$200 in particularly filthy cities like New York and St. Louis. Even so, most citizens have a lot to learn about pollution. When a sampling of St. Louis residents were polled on how much they would pay in higher taxes to clean up the air, they reckoned that the effort might be worth 50¢ a year, at most \$1. Ignoring their own auto-exhaust fumes, they also insisted that dirty air is primarily industry's problem.

Not quite—but in St. Louis that view is understandable. One reason: the National Lead Co.'s titanium pigment plant routinely emits a sulphuric acid stench that is downright sickening. The city is also a booming center of the chemical industry, prolific source of exotic effluents like phthalic anhydride and chlorinated phenolic compounds, which make the eyes water and smell like the medicines children swallow while holding their noses. All too often St. Louis stinks, as one resident says, "like an old-fashioned drugstore on fire."

Quick sniffers. Now one of the key villains is trying hard to turn hero. Until two years ago, Monsanto, the nation's third largest chemical company, paid little attention to the effects of the more than 300 products it makes at its headquarters plants around St. Louis. Then the city enacted some of the toughest air pollution ordinances in the U.S. Monsanto not only obeyed the laws—it set out to become a model antipolluter.

Monsanto has studied every vent in its four huge plants in the area, evaluating every chemical process, and monitoring the effectiveness of "scrubbers," "eliminators" and other controls. "What the company is doing is very complex and very expensive," says Charles Copley, Commissioner of the St. Louis air pollution control board.

Though its workers become indifferent to chemical odors, Monsanto itself goes to the opposite extreme. As soon as any employee smells something bad, he is asked to dial A-I-R on the factory phone. If the problem is serious, expert "sniffers" hurry to the scene, ready to bottle the air, analyze it and repair the leak. Elaborate ductwork in one factory connects the points where noxious phenols might be emitted and whisks them to a scrubber system that removes the odor with absorbent filters. Since 1967, Monsanto

has spent almost \$3,000,000 to curb pollution in St. Louis, plus another \$12 million at its other plants across the nation.

Booming Business. As it turns out, the spending has produced profits as well as civic status for Monsanto. The company's industrial efficiency has been increased by the constant monitoring of all its processes. In addition, it is now recapturing some valuable chemicals that previously went up the stacks, while selling a new line of pollution-abatement equipment to other industries. Thus Monsanto has moved into a growing market that it estimates may soon reach \$6 billion a year. "By 1975, we hope to be doing \$200 million a year in such business," says Leo Weaver, general manager of Monsanto's new department, Environmental Control Enterprises.

As Weaver sees it, the antipollution business is almost limitless—provided Congress increases tax incentives for installing pollution control devices and municipalities enact and rigidly enforce firm minimum standards. With a glint in his businessman's eye, Weaver also notes: "There is no such thing as a perfectly clean environment." Even while technology tames current pollution, the U.S. is likely to produce more and more new kinds of garbage, such as plastic containers. When such substances are incinerated, the "smoke" is odorless and almost invisible. Is it harmful? No one is yet sure; but if it is, Monsanto and other pioneers are determined to devise more ways to clean up both air and money.

CONGRESS AND COMPUTERS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, many of us on both sides of the aisle believe that if Congress is to play its full and proper role when making public policy and overseeing its administration, we must have adequate access to up-to-date, accurate information.

By comparison with the executive branch of the Government, Congress is today at an enormous disadvantage in this respect.

For example, this year the executive branch of the Federal Government will be using over 4,600 computers at an annual cost of \$2 billion while Congress has only three computers: One in the House for payroll and accounting purposes, one in the Senate for speeding internal mail delivery, and one at the Library of Congress to keep track of the status of legislation.

It is for these reasons that many Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, have urged that steps be taken to move Congress to modernize its operations and bring the legislative branch of Government into the 20th century.

It is for the same reason that I prepared a resolution, which was adopted on February 19, 1969, at the regular monthly caucus of Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, which resolution urged Democratic Members of the House to give full support to the House Committee on Administration in efforts to improve the efficiency of operations of Members of the House, including the use of computers and a centralized mail processing system.

I hope very much that we shall see fur-

ther progress made along these lines.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I read a most interesting article by one of the most widely respected writers in this field, Prof. John S. Saloma III, an associate professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, discussing the relationship between Congress and computers.

This article, published in the June 1969 issue of the Ripon Forum, was adapted from a forthcoming book by Mr. Saloma entitled, "Congress and the New Politics."

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the article from the Ripon Forum entitled, "Congress and Computers," at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS AND COMPUTERS: COMING SOON: "SYSTEMS POLITICS"

(NOTE.—Despite all the talk about the electronic age, the computer era is not really upon us yet. Its arrival awaits reductions in the net costs of acquiring, processing, storing, retrieving, and using information. As the next five or ten years witness the beginnings of this process, government as well as the rest of society will begin to feel the results of this new technology which will make possible an advance in human intellectual capacity comparable to the invention of language, arabic numerals and calculus.

(The consequences of computerization for the American system of checks and balances will of course be fundamental. With systems analysis will come "systems politics." John S. Saloma III, former president of the Ripon Society and associate professor of political science at M.I.T., working under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to the American Political Science Association, has been studying the likely impact of a computer technology on the governmental decision-making process. His fascinating discussion of the potential changes in the balance of power among the Congress, the President, and the bureaucracies that computers may spur is adapted from his book *Congress and the New Politics* published by Little, Brown and Company this month.)

(By John S. Saloma III)

Is the demonstrated success of the computer and the new information technology in business, industry and private institutions transferable to the arena of public policy? If Congress embraces the computer, the really significant result will be improved techniques of decision-making—operations research, mathematical analysis, systems modeling and simulation—used in conjunction with computers and a more adequate data base.

No matter how conservatively one views the future, computers, by virtue of their ability to store and process enormous amounts of data, to calculate at lightning speeds, and to simulate human and organizational decision-behavior, provide man with an intellectual tool of almost inconceivable power. Almost certainly the application of the computer will introduce a new era for both the social and political systems. There will be cumulative improvement in information processing and computer-assisted techniques for analysis. Together, these advances will dramatically alter the decision-making context. Looking at the massive information problems in government today suggests the potential.

Information provides the premises for decision or action. By one definition, decision-making is simply "the process of converting information into action." Yet in a political system where information is a form of power, there are many limitations on acquiring the right information. The political decision maker needs, broadly speaking, two types of information: *technical* information defining the content of a policy issue and *political* information concerning the relative strength

of competing claims and the consequences of alternative decisions.

CONGRESSIONAL DATA WOES

The Congress suffers from several specific information problems. It is dependent on the Executive bureaucracy, and that bureaucracy often cites Executive privilege as a justification for withholding information. In addition the widespread secret classification of material under the mantle of "national security" raises another powerful barrier to Congressional access to needed information.

Also, the individual member of Congress groans under a glut of paper and strains to acquire specific, reliable information as anyone familiar with "the Hill" will testify. Not surprisingly, a variety of simplifying devices are substituted for individual decisions: following party leadership, deferring to the judgment of the responsible committee, voting with state delegation, consulting members who are expert on the subject under consideration, etc.

The point is clear. Most of the limiting conditions that act to constrain decision-makers in a world of imperfect information are abundantly present in the contemporary Congress. Congressmen and Senators muddle through as best they can.

The question of interest to us is what difference will the new information technology make for the decision-making process in government. First we shall examine a range of technically feasible change; then, some of the political factors that will condition such change in the American political system.

One of the most obvious advances that will be made possible by the new information technology is increased quality of information (including factors such as relevance, precision, completeness, and timeliness) and quality of information processing (accuracy, speed, ability to handle complex relationships, inflexibility, and potential for codification in standard rules).

But, with the computer the problem of information overload will be more subject to the control of the individual decision-maker. He will have the potential to get "on top" of his work. The computer can be programmed to provide top decision-makers with "exception" information demanding attention or action.

Decision-makers may specify in advance what types of information they wish to receive on given subjects of interest as new information becomes available. Central libraries or document centers can then service the individual decision-maker according to his "interest profile" through a technique of "selective dissemination of information."

Instead of being a largely passive recipient of information, the decision-maker will be able to interact with the data system using it as an active search mechanism.

IMPORTANT CONTROLS INTRODUCED

Congressmen may continue to tap a variety of information sources on a random basis to obtain political information, but improved selective processing of relevant technical information (and even political information on their constituency) should significantly change the problem of information overload. The individual legislator will have an important degree of control over the amount and nature of information he receives.

The legislator will be provided with the capacity for systems thinking and systems analysis—that is, the dynamic behavior of complicated systems and the analysis of multiple variables. Such simulations will permit the preparation of major contingency plans. A lengthened time perspective, and a greater opportunity for strategic planning will replace the "remedial" orientation of incremental policy-making with orientation toward the future. He will be able to think ahead more, instead of exhausting himself just trying to keep abreast.

The incrementalist's view that "public policy problems are too complex to be well

understood, too complex to be mastered" and that decision-makers develop "a strategy to cope with problems, not to solve them" will be replaced with a more optimistic perspective. The decision-maker will be "on top" of information. He will have analytical techniques and information processing capabilities that will give him new understanding of governmental and social systems and with this a sense that he can manipulate and control them. Where the incrementalists have rejected the impossible prescription to be comprehensive in favor of a more manageable strategy of "outright neglect." The new information technology will enable the decision-maker to develop a more rational and aggressive strategy of problem-solving.

But perhaps the greatest long-run contribution of the computer to man's problem-solving capacity will be its ability to facilitate two types of breakthrough in collaborative research. The first of these gains is the cumulative storage and preservation of solutions—a kind of division of intellectual labor. Since a computer never forgets, all gains or improvements in computation or analysis, no matter how incremental, are preserved until better techniques are perfected and may be retrieved, used and refined by contemporary and future generations of decision-makers.

One does not have to be a technological radical to appreciate the cumulative potential of computer programming. If most human decisions have an underlying structure, as disjointed, incremental, restricted in scope as that structure may be, in time computer programmers and analysts will discover and program the implicit decision techniques, rules, and coefficients. Already computer programs based on the analysis of past managerial behavior have proved more efficient than continued management practices (*i.e.*, rules of thumb) based on experience. Most computer experts do not expect the computer to replace the human decision-maker but rather to extend his planning and decisional capacities through the continued refinement of man-machine interaction. The computer will thus absorb the incrementalists in its inexorable accumulation of intellectual power.

ON-LINE COMMUNITY

Even more significant than the steady development of computer programs is the advent in prototype form of "the on-line intellectual community" based on man-computer interaction and computer-facilitated cooperation among men in a university setting. Carl F. J. Overhage and R. Joyce Harman describe the potential breakthrough based on the experience of Project MAC (research and development of Machine-Aided Cognition and Multiple-Access Computer systems) at M.I.T.:

"Because communication among men is fallible, and because heretofore men did not have effective ways of expressing complex ideas unambiguously—and recalling them, testing them, transferring them, and converting them from a static record into observable, dynamic behavior—the accumulation of correlatable contributions was opposed by continual erosion; and the melding of contributions was hampered by divergencies of convention and format that kept one man's ideas from meshing with another's. The prospect is that, when several or many people work together within the context of an on-line, interactive, community computer network, the superior facilities of that network for expressing ideas, preserving facts, modeling processes, and information and the same behavior—those superior facilities will so foster the growth and integration of knowledge that the incidence of major achievement will be markedly increased."

Comparable networks will in time be available in business and government and among sectors of each of these communities with overlapping research interests. The potential of man-machine interaction for pure and applied research is one of the scarcely

realized but most staggering potentials of the new information technology.

Before examining the overall significance of these factors on decision-making in government, it would be wise to examine some reservations about the revolutionary impact of information technology.

DILEMMAS PERSIST

Lessening the information constraints on and increasing the potency of the analytical tools available to decision-makers will not remove the dilemmas of decision-making. There are limitations that go well beyond information *per se*. As the information constraints on decision-makers are eased, other limiting factors and decisions will come into play:

1. The problem of values. If we define politics as a struggle for control stemming from conflict over the direction of social life and public policy, it is clear that the central problem of politics is one of values, not information. Decision-making involves values at all stages. Choice activity especially requires value criteria for decision. For instance, budgeting is a political activity and the problem of choice or allocation ultimately remains one of values.

2. The political use and abuse of information. Information systems in government may be used to serve the political purposes of the political actors who have the resources to control them. How then can one prevent the President or program-oriented bureau chief from consciously or unconsciously biasing an information system that Congress must use?

3. Cost factors. Government (and the taxpayer) must pay the bill for the computers, their programming and the personnel to man them. Balanced against this cost is the problem of final payoffs: how much tangible difference will all this new equipment make?

Acknowledging these reservations, however, we still believe that the combined and cumulative impact of the new information technology will bring some radical changes in the environment of governmental decision-making.

Mid-1970 is only six years away—it is impossible that improvements in the legislative process from wide use of advanced data systems will actually be achieved by 1975? Studies by Rand Corporation experts suggest that by the early 1970's computers will be small, plentiful, and inexpensive. Computing power will be available to anyone who needs it, or wants it, or can use it either by means of a personal console connected to some large central facility, or by a small personal machine. Additional projections foresee, by 1975, a computer that will make possible automatic libraries able to look up and reproduce copy; by 1978, automated looking up of legal information, and the widespread use of automatic decision-making at the management level for industrial and national planning. By the mid-1980's, the computer will begin to realize its potential as a research tool through modeling and experimentation, as an integral part of the educational system, and in areas such as medicine and biological sciences.

Assuming that the projected technology is largely realized within the Executive branch by the mid 1970's, we shall examine some of its consequences within the Executive and then go on to examine the potential impact on Congress.

NEW BUREAUCRATIC CLASS

First, there will result a centralization of effective decision-making authority at the Presidential and departmental levels. As the compartmentalized information resources of individual agencies are integrated into comprehensive information systems, political executives will have greater leverage over the bureaucracy. At the same time fewer people will be involved in policy decisions. The likely long-term trend in the Federal government is toward the development of highly trained professional "analyst" staffs within the

Budget Bureau and at the departmental secretary level. The power of the analyst within the Executive branch will pose new problems for Congressional watchdogs. Congress must define new points of access and review in the decision-making process if the historical concept of balance is to be maintained.

Secondly, there will develop a more explicit, candid style of politics which may complicate the problem of achieving political consensus. The above point to important secondary consequences for Congress.

THE IMPACT ON CONGRESS

In January, 1968, the Legislative branch acquired its first Analysis and Data Processing (ADP) installation directly; involved in aiding the legislative process. The new on-line terminal system, installed in the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, now enables LRS to record and store on magnetic tape descriptions of all bills and resolutions introduced in the 90th Congress. The system will comply by computer the "Digest of Public Bills" and eventually allow random recall of bills by number, title, and word descriptions, at the request of a Congressional office or committee. (Upwards of 26,000 bills and resolutions were introduced in the 89th Congress—an indication of the scale of the project.)

Congressman Robert McClory (R-Ill.) who in the 89th Congress introduced the first bill in either House directly applying ADP techniques to the work of Congress, has been the most articulate spokesman for Congressional action. Congressman McClory, concerned by the growing "information gap" between the President and Congress, proposed to equip the Congress with "an identified capability, based on automatic data processing devices and procedures, to retrieve selected information that is of priority value to the Members and committees."

After viewing the new system, Congressman McClory anticipated that some of the next ADP applications might be:

- (1) Daily printouts summarizing the previous day's Congressional action;
- (2) An automated index of congressional documents and legal periodicals;
- (3) Up-to-the-minute information on legislative issues scheduled for debate;
- (4) Vote summaries on bills already passed;
- (5) The status of legislation pending in committee;
- (6) Description of information stored on computer files in the Executive departments.

THE WIND IS SHIFTING

A quiet revolution in thinking appears to be taking place on Capitol Hill. Members privately express the desire to be aware of coming problems so they can "gear up" for them. A few Senators and Congressmen already sense that information technology is the "coming thing" and are investing their own time as well as that of their committee staff and/or their office staff in developing a greater familiarity with information systems.

A wide range of Congressional committees have been studying a variety of related problems (and educating their members in the process): the implementation of (PFBS) the Planning-Programming Budgeting System pioneered by former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara; the development of social indicators and a system of social accounts; copyright legislation relating to information retrieval; the application of the systems approach to urban problems and environmental pollution; and, the consequences of computer technology for individual privacy. The committee publications of the Congress—hearings, staff reports and memoranda selected documents—already constitute one of the most comprehensive and relevant sheafs of facts on the social and political implications of the new information technology.

While most Congressmen and their staffs

have had only a brief introduction to information technology and its potential, a start has at least been made. The real change in Congressional attitude and skills will probably not be felt, however, until a new wave of political talent with practical experience with computers—through universities and the private sector—is elected to Congress. Some of the IBM experts have already turned up in the halls of Congress. One of them; formerly employed by the International Business Machines Corporation and a candidate for the Doctorate in Business/Government Relations from the Harvard Business School (then) freshman Congressman Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (R-Mich.), caused somewhat of a stir in Washington in the fall of 1967 by sending then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara a request for a matrix of 85 specific data items for which he (Riegle) had written a computer program. Another freshman Senator with a combined engineering and law background, Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr. (R-Tenn.), lectured the Association for Computing Machinery about the impending nuclear power breakthrough in breeder reactors that could produce power at almost zero fuel cost and the need for a much broader Congressional overview and plan for the technological and social revolution that this implied. Senator Baker has been an articulate spokesman for a new Senate Select Committee for Technology and the Human Environment.

Impressive as these individual examples may be, Congress as an institution has yet to experience the potential of information technology. Widespread Congressional interest suggests a greater receptivity toward computers and information systems than might at first inspection have been anticipated. It is still likely, however, that Congress will lag behind the Executive in fully accepting the new technology.

HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE

How great a lag will exist by our projected date of 1975—assuming that Congress permits the Executive to implement the new technology without hinderances? We may posit three points on a continuum from (I) *Congressional resistance* to computer technology, notably the failure to fund any central computational facility for use by the Congress, the failure to budget any allowance for Congressmen to utilize other facilities, and the failure to provide analyst staff for the use of the committees and/or members; through (II) *limited Congressional acceptance* of computer facilities and analyst staff with access tightly controlled by the individual committees and/or party leaderships; to (III) *open Congressional acceptance*, with all members enjoying "free" use of computer facilities and full access to staff and data resources. According to our projection, Congress could have moved all the way to Situation III by the mid-1970's. A more realistic estimate would place it somewhere between Situations II and III. Ultimately, in our estimate, Congress will operate in Situation III although the exact institutional form in which it organizes and applies these new resources remains to be determined.

Accelerating the acceptance of innovation are the built-in tensions between authorizing and appropriations committees both eager to control program decision; the publicity incentive for committee and subcommittee chairmen generally to identify themselves with innovations and the perennial Congressional fear that Congress is yielding initiative and authority to the President; party competition; and, the generational divide between "activists" and high seniority Congressmen.

Indeed, once he had access to the new data processing and systems analysis tools, the contributions of the individual legislator would be considerably enlarged. We have noted the contribution of individual legislators to Congressional initiative in legislation and investigation. Although only a minority

of Congressmen will choose to play the role of legislative inventor or watchdog, the effectiveness of such members will be enormously increased by computer-assisted techniques of search and analysis. Members will be free to "browse" through the data archives in developing and assessing legislative alternatives. Some legislators will hire professional analysts on their office staffs or acquire analytical skills themselves. While such legislative diligence will still be the exception, one can readily foresee a Congressman sitting at a console in his office poring over a computer print-out into the late evening hours and cutting through the paper arguments and justifications of Executive programs with penetrating lines of questions.

In addition, *ad hoc* congressional study and work groups would freely form and disperse as new challenging tasks arose at the interstices of committee power. The work of such study groups would be "collateral" to that of the standing committees but would introduce a needed flexibility into the Congressional organization.

CAN DEMOCRATIZE COMMITTEES

While information systems afford new possibilities for specialization and increased committee power—especially in the area of legislative oversight or control of the Executive bureaucracy, they should also afford possibilities to "democratize" committee power. Where limited information previously conferred important advantages on those few individuals who had the legislative seniority and central committee positions to accumulate such information, now generalized availability of information and program analyses would enable junior committee members and interested Congressmen not on the committee to gain a better understanding of the issues involved. The majority would have greater opportunity to influence committee action and to prevail against the committee on the floor when its action was not representative of the views of the entire membership.

Generalized information systems should enable Congress to satisfy both the necessity for specialization and the goal of comprehensive policy reviews. Where information on Executive agency activities has been compartmentalized within the Executive budget and the Congressional committee system, it would now be available to any curious Congressman. The "special analyses" of the federal budget already being developed by the Bureau of the Budget are a prototype of the kind of comprehensive information that Congressional committees will be able to tap. Individual Congressional committees, no longer limited to information within their agency jurisdiction, could become important loci for government-wide program review and coordination. Where the President alone has had the information to develop a measure of agency coordination, Congressional committees would now share that information, and the authority to use it, subject to the majority support of Congress.

NEW BALANCE OF POWER

While the application of information technology in government will have its greatest immediate political impact within the Executive (with important secondary consequences, as we have observed for the Congress), the longer term consequences of better information in government raise fundamental questions about the American system of separated powers. Congress and legislative bodies generally need *not* lose power to the Executive. The potential advance in information technology is theoretically equally accessible to both the President and Congress, with Congress standing to enhance its powers versus the Executive considerably. The thorny question of how power should be organized in the American political system will be faced once again.

Beginning roughly with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and including the

establishment of the modern Executive bureaucracy, the Executive staffs to the President, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there arose a specialization of roles—Executive leadership and Congressional review or oversight. The model of "Executive-centered" government while tending to enhance the power of the President and reduce the autonomy of Congress, was based on a rationale that differentiated roles for President and Congress.

Simply stated, the President set the agenda for legislation; the Congress reviewed, amended, and passed legislation; the President supervised the execution of the laws by the federal bureaucracy; and the Congress reviewed administrative performance. Executive-centered government, however, conferred important relative information advantages on the President. The President was closer to the day-to-day operations of the Executive bureaucracy. He had access to the detailed information generated by the budgetary cycle and the numerous intelligence activities of the general bureaucracy. Moreover, the budgetary process and supporting central staff gave him a continuing framework for decision.

BLURRING DISTINCTIONS

A second major rationalization of authority has begun with the new emphasis on program budgeting and information systems in government. As this rationalization proceeds many of the assumptions underlying specialized roles for the President and Congress will have to be re-examined. The distinction between Executive decision-making and broad policy oversight will become increasingly blurred as the time perspective of governmental decision-makers is lengthened. As improved information systems yield better indicators of performance, reduce the time of the management information cycle, and permit real-time monitoring of governmental activities, the Congressional role of "oversight" (review after the fact) will be supplemented by new possibilities for "control" (legislative decision or activity prior to the relevant administrative action). The policy or control functions of the President and Congress will become less distinguishable as both develop the capacity to ask program questions and undertake analyses of data from the same generalized information systems or specially developed systems for their own use.

One restraint on a fully developed Congressional policy role in the past has been the unwillingness of Congress to build a parallel legislative staff bureaucracy. As a result, Congress has often had to "second guess" the Executive without the information to back its hunches. Now, as technology generalizes the availability of information, Congress can tap into Executive-based information systems, establish quality controls, and develop more limited information systems for its own specific requirements. Congress will review, evaluate, analyze and make its own determination of priorities. The process of making choices and analyses more explicit enables Congress to participate much more intelligently and vigorously, with a *limited* staff, in the decision-making process. In fact, there may even be a danger of too vigorous participation.

The new definition of the separation of powers that will evolve is a matter for speculation. If we assume the trends that we projected earlier, distinctive Presidential and Congressional biases may soon develop in the decision-making process. We might expect the Executive to overemphasize the benefits of rationalization in program formulation and administration, to overvalue economic and technical criteria of performance. If the new information technology leads to an increasing separation between operating missions, life styles, and social roles for those institutions and individuals involved in rationalized activities compared to those involved in nonrationalized ones, Congress,

representative of a society embracing both lifestyles, would inherit the difficult task of mediating the impact of the former on the latter and restraining the tendency toward irrational and frustrated response. Congress would add elements of "political rationality," considerations of human costs and benefits to the decision-making process.

SYSTEMIC DISSONANCE

In this context, one rationale for the separation of powers—"systemic dissonance"—takes on new significance. We have suggested through this discussion that the revolution in information technology represents an almost immeasurable potential increase in man's knowledge—especially in his understanding of and ability to control his environment. The intelligent use of that knowledge and the power it confers is an awesome responsibility. In the United States it involves the democratic consideration of emerging technological possibility and consequences. The multiple perspective of the American system, the numerous points for developing, testing, and advancing ideas may ultimately prove to be one of the greatest assets of American democracy in the future.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PARALLEL CHESAPEAKE BAY BRIDGE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Baltimore Sun which I should like to share with my colleagues in the Congress. Mr. William T. Snyder, a Baltimore resident, has offered one of the most comprehensive and persuasive arguments against the construction of a parallel Chesapeake Bay bridge which I have ever read.

The material follows:

OBJECTIONS TO THE PARALLEL BRIDGE

SIR: I hope it's still not too late to issue a last gasp plea for rationalism, and some concern about the needs of motorists related to spanning the Chesapeake Bay.

True, much work has been done, and contracts have been let—work has even begun on our new twin bridge from Sandy Point to Kent Island. But, my question is, "Why there?"

So far this year I have made more than 50 crossings of the existing Governor Preston Lane Bridge—most of them on weekends. Perhaps my luck will not continue to hold, but for the present I want to congratulate bridge officials on their excellent handling of traffic. At no time have I been held up more than five minutes at either bridge approach. On several occasions we have been traveling on the bridge at 35 m.p.h. or faster while an announcer on the car radio was describing "long delays at the Bay Bridge."

Unfortunately, I cannot boast of similar good fortune on the approaches to the bridge. Many times it has taken us well over an hour to get from the intersection of Routes 50 and 2 to central Baltimore; and on at least six occasions we have been delayed from 5 to 20 minutes by the opening of the drawbridge over Kent Narrows.

If we continue to build a twin bridge, capable of meeting maximum anticipated needs, how will motorists be served, if the system on the Western Shore continues to be tightly bottled up; and access or egress on the Eastern Shore can be completely stopped by a drawbridge which is operated without any schedule, and at the convenience of boat owners?

Even if the maximum load of 30,000 vehicles—attained only one day this year—

should become the average, income from tolls at present rates would require about 10 years to pay published costs of the bridge. This figure does not include the new high interest rates on bonds, salaries, maintenance or other certain new costs. At the average toll income for the first half of this year more than 40 years will be required to meet the cumulative costs of this additional span at a location where access is already overloaded.

Further, if high speed roadways are actually part of our nation's defense system, isn't it logical to assume that a single area of twin bridges will offer a far easier target for a potential enemy's attack than several individual bridges?

I wonder if any real thought has been given to the interests or convenience of the bridge users. The only time the public was permitted to register an opinion that could be accurately measured, a referendum clearly showed that voting Marylanders did not want a new bridge parallel to the existing one.

Charts and studies have conclusively proved that residents of Southern Maryland and the national capital metropolitan area would save time and mileage if the bay were spanned between Calvert and Dorchester counties. All other parts of the Western Shore would be more conveniently served by a span from Baltimore county to Kent county. Residents of Delmarva would be greatly aided by having alternate routes to use.

Even considering the present investment, can we eliminate additional waste and use some rational attitude for total economy and service, convenience to motorists, and a great chance of continued transportation if our nation should ever be attacked from the air?

WILLIAM T. SNYDER.

BALTIMORE.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars will celebrate its 70th anniversary this month. Although its existence under the present name dates from 1914, its predecessor organizations came into being in 1899. These groups were State organizations in Colorado, Ohio, and Pennsylvania that united 15 years later as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Under the charter granted by Congress on May 26, 1936—Public Law 74-630—the Veterans of Foreign Wars declared that:

The purpose of this corporation shall be fraternal, patriotic, historical, and educational; to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead, and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the government of the United States of America, and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American Freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever.

Membership in the organization is limited to officers and enlisted men who are either on active duty in the armed services or have been honorably discharged, and who have fought in a for-

ign military campaign of the United States. Included in the membership are veterans of the Spanish-American War, both World Wars, the Korean war, the war in Vietnam, the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, campaigns on the Mexican border, and Nicaraguan expeditions.

The total membership today is 1,800,000. Millions of fighting men have been members during the seven decades that have elapsed since 1899. Present and former members include President Richard M. Nixon and former Presidents Lyndon B. Johnson, John F. Kennedy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Harry S. Truman. A majority of the Members of this great body, as well as a majority of the Members of the other body, belong to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Since its beginnings in 1899 and continuing through 70 years of war and peace and of prosperity and depression, this great nonpartisan, nonsectarian, and nonprofit organization has written an impressive record. While working in the interests of those who belong to it, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has also labored mightily for the Nation and its thousands of local communities. It is truly a grass roots body in which policy is formulated through the democratic process and not dictated from the top.

The VFW sponsors oratorical competitions for scholarships, as well as scouting and athletic activities and rifle tournaments. It promotes responsible patriotism to counteract treason and subversion through its Loyalty Day parades, dinners, and speeches, thus offering a constructive alternative to the Communist observance of May Day. It maintains a national home for the children of deceased veterans at Eaton Rapids, Mich. The VFW has performed magnificently in carrying out Abraham Lincoln's injunction "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

As the Veterans of Foreign Wars observes the 70th anniversary of its birth, I have every confidence that its members will continue their fine work on behalf of their fellow-veterans, as well as for their communities, their States, and the great Nation for which they have fought.

DRUG LAW OVERHAUL URGED

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HUGHES, spoke out at a hearing of his Special Committee on Alcoholism and Narcotics to urge an overhaul of existing drug legislation. I am including in the RECORD today an article that appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post reporting on Senator HUGHES' subcommittee activities dealing with this most pressing problem.

Significantly, Senator HUGHES pointed out that since a White House conference held 6 years ago, four major national

groups have made recommendations for drug law reform. "Why" he asked his committee to discover, has "so little been done to implement those recommendations?" I ask the same question, and pose to my colleagues an additional one: How long do you think we have before the problem becomes insoluble?

Gentlemen, time is of the essence. We must act now for every day of delay condemns not only socially deviant members of our society, but also many young people throughout this land. I, therefore, request the Congress most rapid enactment of the Comprehensive Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Care and Control Act of 1969 introduced by me and 24 cosponsors in the House and by Senator YARBOROUGH and 15 cosponsors in the Senate. Our bills provide for not only educational programs and research, but also for construction of treatment facilities, training of personnel, and revision of existing laws to more accurately reflect the realities of the problem. Our approach, as pointed out recently in the Washington Post, does not vent anger; rather it offers help.

The article follows:

SENATOR HUGHES URGES DRUG LAW OVERHAUL

Senator Harold E. Hughes (D-Iowa) yesterday condemned the "unbelievable mis-handling of the drug problem" in America and called for a sweeping overhaul of drug-control laws.

Marijuana is the starting point for a fresh look at drug laws, said Hughes, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics.

Since a White House conference six years ago, Hughes said, four major national groups have made recommendations for drug law reform. He asked the panel to discover "why so little has been done to implement those recommendations."

"Why, instead of following sane and professional recommendations, do we continue a system that busts up kids' lives, makes treatment of addiction impossible, and over-punishes the nameless, wretched addict or pusher, while channeling easy profits into the hands of the underworld?"

There has been growing support recently for legalizing marijuana, or at least removing it from the list of "hard" narcotics and reducing penalties for its sale or possession.

The latter course was endorsed yesterday by Larry Alan Bear, commissioner of the Addictions Services Agency of New York City's Human Resources Administration.

He opposed legalization of marijuana. Society has a right to express its value judgments through the law, Bear argued, and therefore prohibitions should be continued. But he said the severity of present penalties was unrealistic.

Use of marijuana, he testified, "does not lead inevitably to heroin addiction or crime." But on the other hand, he added, "I can truly say that in all my experience with drug abusers, I have never seen a single case where marijuana use has been responsible for producing a more mature, well balanced, productive or even happier human being."

Although marijuana is not physiologically addictive, Bear explained, some persons become physically dependent upon it. "The marijuana user is in serious trouble when he reaches that point where he is utilizing a chemical to escape from the necessity of dealing with his anxiety," Bear told the committee.

In answer to a question from Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.), Bear agreed that similar arguments could be made about alcohol. "I personally think there should be more control" of alcohol, he said.

The committee received an illustrated

lecture on marijuana and narcotics by Dr. Sidney Cohen, director of the Division of Narcotics Addiction and Drug Abuse of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Cohen showed samples of marijuana leaves, "downer" (depressant) pills, narcotics in powder form, airplane glue ("the effects, I can assure you, are not benign"), LSD, "Speed," and equipment used by addicts to take drugs.

THE OCEANS: OUR LAST FRONTIER

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford, Conn., Times of August 4, 1969, entitled "Earth's Last Frontier Awaits Exploitation."

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Oceanography, under the very able chairmanship of the Honorable ALTON LENNON of North Carolina, has been holding hearings on the report of the Marine Science Commission issued recently under the title "Our Nation and the Sea." The Commission has recommended that the United States undertake research and exploitation of the oceans and their resources, which I gladly support.

The editorial I am inserting into the RECORD similarly supports this proposal and generally discusses the problem in a knowledgeable way. I take issue, however, with one suggestion in the editorial; namely, that "the ocean should be controlled and protected by the United Nations." It would be practically impossible to obtain international agreement for control of the oceans by the United Nations, at least in the foreseeable future, as the editorial itself acknowledges.

We cannot afford to stand still, however, and let the last great frontier on earth remain in its present dormant state. We must move forward in the conquest of this frontier. We must undertake the exploration and exploitation of the oceans for the benefit of mankind. I feel certain that we shall find such explorations very rewarding in the form of food, minerals, medicines, and energy. This we should do without delay.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues. It reads as follows:

EARTH'S LAST FRONTIER AWAITING EXPLOITATION

Hearings were scheduled to be resumed in Washington today on national involvement in an effort that is potentially more rewarding than space science: the exploration and exploitation of the ocean.

The Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been holding hearings off and on since April 29 on a report by the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. The commission was created by Congress for the purpose of making this report and the studies preliminary to it.

The commission urged that the United States make a major investment in understanding, exploiting and preserving the ocean through research, conservation, development and the participation of industry.

As Dr. Paul M. Fye, president of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, pointed out in testimony at an earlier hearing, the re-

port calls for a national, not merely a federal, effort. To achieve what the commission calls for would involve the states, the academic community, private enterprise and the federal government.

There are two chief considerations. One is that the report calls for an independent agency with responsibility for the study and use of the oceans, reporting directly to the President. The other is that of all the 22 bureaus in nine federal agencies now involved with the ocean, not one is ready to give up its limited sovereignty for the sake of a united effort toward a most important goal.

A California congressman, Bob Wilson, testified that only the firm support of President Nixon could bring about the formation of the agency. (It already has a suggested name the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency.)

Unfortunately, unless Mr. Nixon can be convinced of the importance and perhaps the expediency of involving himself, that is not likely to happen. Vice President Agnew, speaking before the Marine Technology Society in June, hinted that the President had other priorities in mind and was not going to get into the fight to exploit the ocean.

The ocean is the last frontier on the Earth. It is a storehouse of wealth beyond imagining. As a source of food, it is used in a primitive, wasteful and damaging way. (In the use of ocean food, man has not yet progressed from hunter to farmer.) It contains medicines, minerals, and energy. It is the great reservoir of water.

But we use it chiefly as a highway to haul heavy bulk cargoes from one place to another; as a hunting ground, and as the dead end of the world's sewers. That last use—a place to dump garbage and poisons that are awkward to handle—will surely cost us heavily if we don't stop.

It has long been The Times' policy that the ocean should be controlled and protected by the United Nations.

The National Oceanographic Association disagrees, holding that the United States should go ahead with great projects in the ocean.

Perhaps it would take too long and be too hard to get international agreement on how best to study and use the ocean, but it would be worth a try in order to avoid the inevitable conflicts among nations in the waters beyond their land frontiers.

Whether we press for international control or not, the United States should surely begin its own national involvement in the ocean. Mr. Nixon could, if he chose, make his name glorious to posterity by sponsoring the involvement as President Kennedy did with his commitment to reach the moon in this decade.

CONGRESSMAN RYAN'S HOUSING LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1949, Congress passed a housing act which set as its goal "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." But this goal was not reached.

In 1968, Congress passed the Housing and Urban Development Act which set as its goal the construction or rehabilitation of 6 million low- and moderate-income housing units in a 10-year period. There should be no question that we can do in the next 10 years what we have been unable to do in the past.

We can and we must. We have shown that the United States can go to the moon and back. If we can accomplish such a tremendous feat in such a short period of time, we should be able to adequately house our fellow countrymen.

We must commit ourselves to the task of ridding our Nation of inadequate housing with the same fervor with which we dedicated ourselves to the moon flight.

I include in the RECORD my statement of July 29, 1969, before the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee. It summarizes some 24 bills I have introduced in the 91st Congress, which I feel will help alleviate the housing crisis facing this Nation:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, JULY 29, 1969

The Congress, in passing the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, set as a ten year goal the construction or rehabilitation of 6 million low and moderate income dwelling units. That number of Federally assisted units must be built if every American family is to live in an affordable, decent and safe home. The Housing Act of 1949, some twenty years ago, also set a goal which was, you will recall, "the realization as soon as feasible of . . . a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. Unfortunately, the last twenty years did not prove to be a feasible time period, since that goal has not been attained. The passage of the 1968 HUD Act was a reaffirmation of Congress' intent, and a rededication of our efforts in the field of housing. It is of utmost importance that the goal for the next ten years be achieved. Much has been promised to our low-income population in their attempts to obtain decent, safe and sanitary standard housing; but little has been delivered.

In 1969 there are still some 7.8 million American families who cannot afford to pay for standard housing which would cost no more than 20% of their incomes. The President's Commission on Urban Housing in its recently issued report states:

"We concluded that new and foreseeable technological breakthroughs in housing production will not by themselves bring decent shelter within economic reach of the millions of house-poor families in the predictable future. To bridge the gap between the market place costs for standard housing and the price that lower-income families can afford to pay, appropriations of Federal subsidies are essential and must be substantially increased."

The task before us is clear. We must effectively and adequately meet the needs of our population for adequate housing for all income levels. We must insure that no family, no person, no child lives in squalor, and filth—without ventilation, plumbing or heating. This country is too wealthy to allow almost 3 million families to live in substandard and unsanitary dwelling units.

In each session of Congress since my first election I have introduced bills to attain the goals first set forth in the Housing Act of 1949. Today I want to discuss my package of housing proposals which I feel will serve to improve the legislation already passed by Congress and will help to insure that the goal of 6 million low and moderate income housing units in the next ten years becomes a reality.

The basic housing tools which we have entrusted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development lies in two areas: 1.) low and moderate income rental housing, low income public housing, rent supplements, and Section 236; interest subsidies; 2.) low and moderate income ownership—

Section 235 interest subsidies and rehabilitation. My package of housing proposals represents an attempt to tackle each of these areas bearing in mind the needs and gaps in existing programs.

The Administration has come up with a housing package. The package may be nicely wrapped, but inside there is only a small can of paint which, we are told, will make the 1968 Act a little prettier. While the structure needs additional beams, supports, and buttresses, all we find is paint. Admittedly, the paint will be useful, but there is so much more to be done.

Many sections of the Administration bill are welcome, as far as they go. Increasing the aggregate amount of contracts which may be entered into under the Section 235 homeownership and Section 236 rental housing assistance programs is a good, albeit short step. Much the same may be said for the increased authorizations for model cities. But, in examining the sections regarding public housing, the weakness of this bill is clear.

I have been particularly concerned with the public housing program. This program has promised much to our low-income families, but in terms of actual production its record has been poor. By 1969 only 755,545 units were under management across the country; while the Housing Act of 1949 proposed the construction of 810,000 units in 6 years. The public housing program has never been very popular. It has been termed institutional in nature, unsafe and a poor environment for children. To some extent, these criticisms are justified. In large measure, however, many of these criticisms are the direct result of Congressional actions and restrictive limitations on the program. Congressional pressure has resulted in high-rise, high-density, minimum amenities projects. Tenants are stigmatized, and Congress has seemed to lack an understanding that adequate housing means more than four walls, a roof, and a door.

Public housing is only an example. All our housing programs must be viewed in terms of the primary purpose of meeting the housing needs of today's urban poor.

Many of the nation's middle-income residents oppose the public housing or rent supplement programs because they consider them as unwarranted subsidy for the poor. At the same time these middle income citizens ignore the fact that they benefit from Federal housing subsidies as well as income tax deductions on their mortgage payments.

As the Kaiser Committee report states: "On balance, this country supplies much greater housing subsidies for middle-income people than for the poor, but in ways that seldom strike the public consciousness."

Furthermore, just the continued existence of slums does impose certain costs on our entire society—including the middle-income section which could be avoided if the slums were eliminated.

It is becoming increasingly clear that inadequate solutions to housing problems are intensifying other urban problems and for that reason, if for no other, we must give greater attention to the far reaching effects of the urban housing crisis. Housing means more than just the provision of an adequate, decent, and sanitary standard dwelling unit; it means the chance for all persons—black or white—to have access to good schools, adequate public services, and job opportunities, and to choose where he wishes to live, and what amenities he wishes to obtain from his environment.

However, black people and Spanish speaking people too often must choose between crowded, unventilated or unheated units that contain faulty wiring and lighting. For too long, our country has attempted to improve housing in isolation from other factors. The public housing program was originally put forth as the salvation to the

slums; it was felt that if only the low-income dweller moved into decent, safe, and sanitary housing, all his problems would disappear. History has shown this to be untrue. While studies have shown that improved housing reduces the incidence of illness and death, housing without the necessary community development factors such as parks, recreational, and commercial facilities, will not have a significant impact on the lives of people now living in inadequate housing.

Those living in poverty must devote a substantial amount of their incomes to housing. This has long been acknowledged. The Congress over the last 20 years has given generalized expressions of noble intentions without actually committing itself to a specific goal or a specific point in time. The result has been overlooked, forgotten, and unfulfilled housing goals as shown by the Declaration of Policy in the Housing Act of 1949 for a "decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family." The 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act once more reaffirmed this goal but the traditional attitude towards housing for low and moderate income housing held way as shown by what happened to the 1968 Act in the appropriations process.

We do not acknowledge that housing interacts with other elements of the social and physical environment in influencing patterns of human behavior; we do not even acknowledge that the existence of slum housing imposes large social costs on our society. Yet we decry crime in the streets, soaring welfare costs, and the physical decay of our major urban centers. It is time for this nation and this Congress to attack on a broad and multifaceted scale the problems of inadequate and unfit housing and the related social and economic costs. Unless we undertake such an attack, there is a growing likelihood that the poor will be further isolated from the rest of society, physically, socially, and culturally.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968 and its fair housing provisions would contribute immeasurably to improved living conditions for blacks as well as countering the patterns of segregation that the practices of the Federal Housing Administration have generated over the last twenty years. But Congress gave HUD only \$2 million to enforce this program during the 1969 Fiscal Year. Effective enforcement of fair housing will enable minority groups to move freely throughout urban areas, and enable them to take full advantage of vacancies where they exist in order to meet their pressing housing needs.

President Johnson's January 16 Economic Report to Congress stated:

"With the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 we set the goal of eliminating all substandard housing in the next decade. We must back that commitment with the needed resources—financial, technical, and human. First priority must be given to the needs of the poorest of the poor through the Model Cities Program, rent supplements, homeownership, and public housing."

If we compare for the fiscal years 1962 through 1967 the amount of expenditures for various Federal programs we find that while \$356.3 billion was spent for national defense, \$33.2 billion for stabilizing farm prices and income and \$24.2 billion for space exploration, only \$8.1 billion was spent for Federal housing subsidies. Clearly, this nation has failed to devote a proper share of its national resources to the problems of housing and the cities. However, it has not been reluctant to grant huge sums of money for the military, space exploration and farm subsidies.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Public housing remains a sluggish instrument of national housing policy. While in many cases this has been due to Congressional limitations and restrictions on program operations, the Housing Assistance Ad-

ministration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been somewhat unresponsive to changing or increasing the program's operation.

Unlike other housing programs, the public housing program is operated on the basis of contract authorization provided by the Congress. Through Fiscal Year 1969 the contract authority available to HUD to enter into annual contributions contracts stood at \$754.26 million; by Fiscal Year 1970, it will stand at \$804.5 million. Yet in terms of actual payments made—which is after public housing projects are completed—the comparable figures were \$350 million (plus a supplemental request of \$16 million) for Fiscal Year 1969 and a budget request for appropriations for Fiscal Year 1970 of \$473.5 million. The large discrepancies between authorizations and appropriations in the public housing program results in the inadequacy and slowness of the program's operation.

And this lack of speed is not only characteristic of the present. In 1966 and 1967 new starts for public housing stood at 23,000 and 40,000 respectively, while 60,000 units could have been started under the authorization figures for those two years. The President's National Commission on Urban Problems has concluded:

"Any blame for the late slowdown therefore cannot properly be charged to Congress."

The Commission also gave this criticism of public housing operations:

"An excessive and at times a disgraceful delay in the planning, approval, and construction of projects."

It has been estimated that the average total time for completion of a conventional public housing project is three to four years.

It is tragic that HUD cannot, or will not, increase production of public housing units when the need is so great. In November 1967, there were 193,000 applicants for public housing across the country—an average ratio of 28 applicants to every vacancy. In New York City alone there were 117 vacancies and 80,000 requests for admission—a ratio of 752 applicants to every vacancy. Today there are 135,000 New York City residents on the waiting list.

The Public housing program has also tended to be unresponsive to the need for housing large low-income families. Rather HUD has increasingly used the public housing program to serve the needs of our elderly population which is most important. From January 1960 through June 1968, 110,000 public housing units for the elderly were under construction which amounted to 43% of the total of 256,000 units being built during this time period. Since 1965 public housing starts for the elderly were running at the rate of 57% of the total units being built. Another way to put it is that in 1960 the elderly occupied only 14% of all public housing; by 1965, 29%, and by 1967, 33%.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 made clear the need for this country to provide additional housing units for low-income families. At the same time the Douglas Commission states:

"The actual situation is, in fact, worse than the figures indicate, for more than half of the total units built in recent years were specifically for the elderly. Moreover, a large portion of the remaining number intended for families were built in the smaller cities, which either had a comparatively small Negro population or had very few previous units of public housing. Thus the great need of the large central cities for housing for poor families was largely unmet."

This Congress must insist that HUD use the public housing program to serve the needs of large, low-income families. The Department of Housing and Urban Development must also increase the production of public housing units at least to the level authorized by Congress.

I have introduced a number of bills to insure that the public housing program is reflective of the needs and demands for the program.

The key to meeting these needs is by increasing the amount of Federal subsidies which the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to allocate to local public housing agencies.

Operating expenses to the federally-aided public housing program in New York City have increased to such an extent that tenants are facing increased rentals beyond their means. Given the limited financial resources of most cities, this problem can only be alleviated by increasing the amount of Federal subsidies which the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to allocate to local public housing agencies. So that you will have a better understanding of the need for a new subsidy formula, and not just clarifications of existing authority, let me discuss this situation in relation to New York City.

According to the New York City Housing Authority, routine operating expenses to the federally-aided public housing program in New York City have increased 123% since 1932. Rents paid by tenants, related to their incomes have increased 72%. The deficits to the public housing program which have resulted have grown so acute during the past few years that it has been necessary for the Housing Authority to withdraw funds from its reserves. Under established procedures, the accumulated reserve funds for the New York City Housing Authority should currently amount to somewhat more than \$30 million. But the present balance, as of March 1969, is only about \$12 million. Chairman Albert Walsh of the New York City Housing Authority has indicated that he expects complete exhaustion of reserve funds before the close of 1970, unless rents of tenants are substantially increased without regard to their ability to pay.

The alternative for New York, then, is total exhaustion of reserve funds in 19 months or an increase in rents that most tenants simply will not be able to meet.

At the present time, the Department of Housing and Urban Development contracts to pay annually to the New York City Public Housing Authority only the sum actually required for debt service on bonds issued for the capital cost of each public housing project. Although it is my interpretation, and the interpretation of New York City Housing Authority Chairman Albert Walsh, that HUD presently has authority, under section 10(c) and (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to pay the debt service plus two percent of the operational cost of a public housing project, HUD apparently takes the position that the basic statute needs to be clarified. Accordingly, HUD has recommended the clarifying language which is contained in Section 5 of S. 527 and Section 204 of S. 2620. HUD seems to believe that in order to pay the two percent specified in section 10(c) and (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, it is necessary to have language which specifies that the annual contribution under any contract is not limited to debt service requirements.

In other words, the amendment requested by the Administration would merely state that HUD has the authority to do what I believe it already has authority to do under the existing statute. This is clear from the testimony of Secretary Romney on July 15 before this subcommittee in which he said: "The amendment (Section 284 of S. 2620) would not, however permit the annual contributions to exceed the statutory maximum now established by the United States Housing Act of 1937."

I have previously called upon Secretary Romney to increase the subsidy for public housing in New York City to the statutory maximum through administrative action. Instead of asking for an increase in the statu-

tory maximum, which is essential, the Administration is proposing "clarifying" legislation in order to do what it has the power to do administratively.

In light of the increasing operating costs which many public housing agencies are experiencing, I believe that more clarifying language is an insufficient remedy for the problem. What is required is an increase in the present statutory limit.

In order to achieve that end, I have introduced H.R. 10194, which changes the present subsidy formula so that the formula would specifically include debt service plus one percent and an additional amount "to the extent required to permit low-rent housing to continue to fulfill its goal of providing housing at rents which families of low income can afford to pay, taking into account such routine operating costs of the projects involved (including the cost of providing adequate security for tenant) as may be necessary or appropriate for the purpose."

In effect, H.R. 10194 would make it possible for the Secretary to determine the subsidy formula required to maintain rents at a level which low-income families can afford, taking into account normal operating expenses and particularly the cost of police protection for tenants, which, in most large cities is urgently needed. Rising crime rates in public housing projects in New York City are alarming—so much so that tenants feel compelled to organize volunteer groups to protect themselves.

Section 2 of H.R. 10194 would permit the Secretary to increase the cost limitations to the extent necessary to reflect increases in construction costs for a particular geographic area. In New York City, where construction costs are skyrocketing, this flexibility is essential if the demand for public housing is to be met.

Section 3 of my bill makes it clear that the new subsidy formula set forth in the bill would apply to existing projects as well as projects completed after the enactment of this legislation.

In view of the escalating costs of public housing agencies, I believe it is imperative that this body adopt a formula such as the one embodied in H.R. 10194. To accept only a "clarification" in language which I believe already gives clear authority to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to pay debt service requirements plus two percent of operating costs falls far short of what is required.

By permitting the Secretary to increase cost limitations to reflect increases in construction costs in a particular geographic area, H.R. 10194 would serve to counter the rising costs of housing construction which will otherwise virtually eliminate the possibility of building adequate and attractive public housing. Since 1946 the residential construction index has gone up by more than 90%. Section 205 of the Administration's bill will only allow a 45% increase instead of the present \$750 increase. If we fail to raise realistically the cost limitation on public housing, we will be forever plagued by the argument that they are unattractive, institutional structures.

I would also recommend that HUD change its administrative limit of \$20,000 per unit, including land acquisition and development and acquisition costs. Per unit costs which have been established by HUD mean that in high cost areas such as New York City, the only way projects can be built within the overall per-unit limitation is by restricting the number of rooms. This means that public housing falls to adequately provide for the needs of large families in such areas. And it is such families who most desperately need public housing. Congress must make clear its intent to HUD that a sizeable proportion of low-rent public housing units should be constructed to accommodate large families. The Douglas Commission points out:

"If public housing is to serve the people who need it most, a far larger proportion of the apartment units should have three and four bedrooms, with some five and six to effect this, the Administration ceiling on the cost per apartment should be withdrawn and forgotten."

The President's Committee on Urban Housing has also recommended that HUD cost limitations on design and amenities be changed.

H.R. 601 would amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing 15 per centum limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for low-rent public housing in any one state. Public housing should be built where the need is greatest and not on the basis of an artificial quota system. The Douglas Commission report concluded that the smaller nonrural places were getting a disproportionate share of public housing units.

H.R. 602 would remove the existing dollar limit on the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This bill would also serve to insure that the program is based on the demand and need for the program rather than a statutory contract authority limitation. With so many of our low income people living in substandard housing and with inadequate funding by the Congress of the complementary rent supplement program, it is essential that the public housing program be utilized in relation to the need and demand for low income housing.

H.R. 604 would amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted without a public hearing. Present legislative and administrative regulations for the program do not require that a tenant be given the opportunity to due process of law and the opportunity to formally present his case. H.R. 604 is consistent with the American ideals of justice and asks only that a public hearing be given a tenant regarding his proposed eviction, that the decision of the local public housing agency be based on the record of the hearing, and that such decision be subject to judicial review in the courts. It is hardly necessary to state that it is only fair that public housing tenants be accorded the same standards of justice that exist for those more fortunate.

The Urban Coalition has also proposed that local housing authorities be required to give reasons for evicting tenants and the establishment of a Board of Tenant Affairs in public housing programs.

H.R. 607 would broaden the opportunities under the Housing Act of 1937 for occupants of dwelling units in low rent housing projects to purchase such units. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, Section 205 states that tenants can purchase public housing units only if "the property to be acquired is sufficiently separable from other property retained by the public housing agency to make it suitable." My bill would also permit purchase as well for "the disposition of all or part of the project to (and the operation and management by) a nonprofit cooperative housing corporation or trust formed by occupants of the project." Thus H.R. 607 would make it possible for all or part of a public housing project to be converted to a nonprofit cooperative housing corporation or trust fund formed by occupants of the project.

The President's National Commission on Urban Problems has recommended in its report to the President:

"The Commission recommends not only that residents of public housing projects be permitted to purchase their units in single-family semi-detached and other 'suitable' structures, but that they be encouraged to enter into cooperative ownership in multi-family structures as an alternative to eviction when income rises above eligibility limits."

Why should low income persons not be

allowed to purchase units on the same basis as middle-income groups do through condominium or cooperative arrangements?

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Since the Rent Supplement Program was first authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 this program has been starved for funds, and each year its supporters have had to fight valiantly to help keep it alive. As of January 1 of this year only 4,500 units in 146 projects had been completed and occupied while 28,000 units were ready for, or under construction; and another 27,000 units were under program reservation. Yet during the Fiscal Year 1969 this program began to pick up momentum as witnessed by the fact that by March, 1969, it used up its contract authorization. This is an encouraging development for it will mean that many more units will soon become available to low-income families.

But this program also is difficult to undertake in our larger metropolitan areas such as New York where the maximum income limits for eligibility for rent supplement payments is \$6,100. Many needy low-income families are not eligible to participate in this program because HUD has determined administratively that the maximum income limit is \$6,100. Thus, in New York City the highest income of any rent supplement tenant now is \$5,450 with a family of seven.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 608, to amend Section 101 of the 1965 HUD Act to provide increased rent supplement payments in the case of tenants with larger families. The bill causes the annual payments which a tenant makes on his house to reflect the size of his family by providing that the portion of his income which is taken into account in determining his rent supplement is reduced by \$200 for each member of his family (other than himself and his spouse) who has no income. This bill is consistent with the recent recommendations in the report of the National Commission on Urban Problems which called for additional subsidies for the abject poor and the large poor family based on annual income and size of family. My bill would help to alleviate the situation under which the rent supplement program presently operates, which does not adequately take into consideration large income families, especially in our larger metropolitan areas.

Another problem facing the rent supplement program is the fact that most projects are 90% or more rent supplement units. The rent supplement program, when originally introduced, had as a goal economically integrated projects. However, due to Congressional regulations on the limits for maximum fair market rentals and specific dollar limits on construction costs, builders are somewhat reluctant to build projects which will attract a broad economic spectrum of clientele. The result, in some cases, has been that rent supplement projects offer few amenities and do not meet the goal of integrated projects. Congress should remove these limits on maximum rents and on construction costs.

URBAN RENEWAL

A persistent misunderstanding which I have encountered repeatedly—from both practitioners and academicians—is that the urban renewal program is not related to housing. However, the recently released report of the National Commission on Urban Problems (the Douglas Commission) stated:

"That misunderstanding is that urban renewal is not essentially a housing-oriented or a housing-related program. Put another way, it is said that in Title III (Low-Rent Housing) of the Housing Act of 1949, Congress improved and strengthened the public housing program set up by the Act of 1937. In Title I it then undertook, as a separate and only indirectly and distantly related program, to encourage rebuilding slums and blighted areas in non-housing and upper-income housing uses."

That Commission went on to point out that the Housing Act of 1949 gave three purposes for urban renewal: clearance, providing low-income housing through acquisition and preparation of land sites, and private enterprise participation in re-development of cities.

We know from 20 years experience that most of the land that has been utilized for the urban renewal program was originally occupied by low- and moderate-income housing. We also know from 20 years experience that the urban renewal program has been essentially irrelevant to the needs for housing of the poor and near-poor. We know that the 810,000 units of public housing proposed in the 1949 Act have still not been completed by 1969. We know that very little in the way of housing re-use for urban renewal sites has been undertaken except for some luxury housing. That is why the program has popularly been called by some of our inner city dwellers as "Negro removal."

The Douglas Commission undertook a survey of 1,555 renewal projects across the country. Of the total surveyed 67% were predominately residential before renewal was initiated. After urban renewal, only 43% were predominately residential. And what happened to the original residents? The Commission states:

"The rents for most of the new housing units created on the urban renewal sites were so high that the vast majority of the original occupants could not afford to return. They were priced out of their old quarters. The majority of those displaced were poor and most of the remainder were either in the 'near poor' class or in the lower middle class."

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development figures, 400,000 dwelling units have been demolished in urban renewal areas, of which a majority were for low and moderate income families. However, of the 195,999 dwelling units being planned for these same sites, only 18,766 or less than 10% will be public housing. On the other hand, 62.3% of the planned units will be for the relatively well-to-do. As can be seen, the original intent of the Housing Act of 1949—to provide low and moderate income sites—has been distorted in practice. Why has this been so? The President's Commission on Urban Problems concludes:

"The principal reason for the failure of this program, over its first eighteen years, to fulfill the clear intentions of the Housing Act of 1949 is that too many local and Federal officials in it and too many of their allies and supporters either did not understand its major purposes or did not take them seriously. Instead of a grand assault on slums and blight as an integral part of a campaign for 'a decent home and a suitable living environment' for every American family, renewal was and is too often looked upon as a Federally-financed gimmick to provide relatively cheap land for a miscellany of profitable or prestigious enterprises."

The urban renewal program has neglected the housing needs of poor people not only in action but also in the planning and administration of the program. It has miserably failed those persons most in need of housing and most likely to be hardest hit by renewal—the poor. To quote the Douglas Commission, "But urban renewal has in the past gone on its way relatively oblivious to the housing needs of the poor."

To insure that the urban renewal program does not continue to operate oblivious to the housing needs and gaps facing this country, I have introduced H.R. 597, to amend Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the re-development of urban renewal areas. My bill would go beyond the requirements set forth in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 which requires that a majority of housing units in renewal projects within a community be for low and moderate income families and that at least 20% be low income.

H.R. 597 would insure that all the housing built on renewal sites be low- and moderate-income in nature. This Congress and this country are being self-contradictory if on the one hand they state (as they did in the 1969 HUD Act) that we must achieve the goal of six million units of low- and moderate-income housing in the next decade, and then on the other hand, allow the renewal program to be utilized for the construction of luxury housing which can be provided through the private marketplace and which furthermore, is not a critical need at this point in our history.

I urge the Congress to pass this vitally needed piece of legislation if we are to achieve the goals of the Housing Act of 1969 for the elimination of slums and the provision of adequate, decent shelter for every American family.

H.R. 606, which I have introduced, would amend the Housing Act of 1949 to remove the 12.5 percentage limit on the amount of grant assistance which may be provided under urban renewal for any one state. I have introduced a similar bill, H.R. 601, to remove the state limitation on grant assistance for public housing. The need for urban renewal is found to be most crucial in the heavily industrialized and crowded cities and urbanized states; and this program should reflect the need, not on an artificial, geographic basis, but on the basis of the actual urban crisis.

RELOCATION

One of the most often criticized aspects of the urban renewal program has been its relocation procedures. Seven bills, H.R. 597, H.R. 598, 599, 600, 609, 10266, and 10651, which I have introduced would substantially improve these procedures and insure that relocation is carried out in the future on a fair, just and humane basis. Too often in the past renewal administrators have allowed the poor and displaced to bear an unnecessary and unwarranted share of the costs—both human and financial.

My bills are consistent with the recent recommendation contained in the report of the President's Commission on Urban Problems which stated:

"The Commission suggests further, however, that the time has come to reassess relocation policy and practices in broader terms. For it seems hard to escape the conclusion that the primary purpose of relocation practices, if not of announced policy, has changed but little. In the earliest stages of renewal it might be summarized: get the site occupants out of the way of project construction with as little delay and outright hardship as possible. More recently a clause might be added to the preceding sentence—and with as much improvement in their housing as market conditions allow and with some respect for their dignity as human beings."

H.R. 598 would amend Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects. The major provisions of this bill would: 1.) insure that no property on an urban renewal site was disposed of until relocation and replacement sites of standard housing had been completed; 2.) relocation would be carried out by the local public housing agency without contracting their relocation to private agencies, institutions, organizations.

In far too many cases, a local public agency does not have adequate standard housing available for displacees but will move such persons out regardless. The tendency has been for public agencies to view relocation as a "ground-cleaning operation" rather than as an essential and important part of the total renewal operation—that is, to both renew and to provide adequate housing. Local agencies have for too long failed to realize that relocation is a component in the na-

tional housing policy for adequate housing for every American family. H.R. 598 also would require local public agencies to undertake relocation rather than some less responsive or detached private organization undertaking such a contract for profit.

H.R. 599 would amend Title I of the Housing Act of 1969 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the renewal project area after its redevelopment. Generally, renewal has meant the displacement of the poor and near-poor by upper-middle and upper-income groups. As I stated earlier, a basic intent of the Housing Act of 1949 was the provision of low- and moderate-income housing through the redevelopment of land sites. The 1968 HUD Act reaffirmed our efforts to provide decent and safe housing for these income groups. H.R. 599 would insure that those displaced by renewal have priority of opportunity to return and relocate in the renewal area after redevelopment. This is a companion bill to H.R. 597 which would require only moderate and low income housing on renewal sites. These two bills together would insure that we make steady progress toward the national housing goal of 6 million new or rehabilitated low and moderate income housing units over the next ten years.

H.R. 600 would amend Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas. The important provisions of H.R. 600 is that the provision of losses and expenses to tenants and business concerns be equal to actual losses rather than a statutory payment limitation as exists now. Tenants should be paid an amount equal to the difference for one year between original rent and rent paid for accommodations at the replacement site. Small business concerns could include an amount equal to their loss of profit for the first year after relocation; also, they could, after reasonable efforts to obtain a suitable replacement site failed, include an amount equal to the fair and reasonable market value of their trade or business unless they are offered a priority of opportunity to purchase or lease substitute facilities to be constructed or provided in connection with the development project.

The present method of relocation payments unjustly penalizes the poor and small businessman who find that inadequate payments drive them into either overcrowded and substandard housing or bankruptcy and foreclosure. The primary policy objective of relocation should be to make it possible for a family or a business to move into decent homes and business sites with a minimum of sacrifice on their part.

H.R. 600 would insure that such a policy objective could be achieved. It would also effectively implement the proposal of the President's Commission on Urban Problems, that: A large and steadily increasing proportion of those displaced, including those of low-income should be able to go directly into a decent home and a suitable living environment regardless of who or what displaced them.

H.R. 609 is also related to relocation, but to relocation as it is applied to all Federal and Federally aided programs. This bill would amend Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments, to extend the requirement of such payments to persons displaced under all Federal and Federally aided programs and to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a central relocation agency which will actually make relocation payments and provide assistance to displaced persons in obtaining them.

H.R. 609 would include the provisions contained in H.R. 600 for payments to individuals and businesses. H.R. 609 is similar in nature to the recommendations contained in the report of the President's National Commission on Urban Problems.

The Commission recommends the following features:

Federal legislation to provide for uniform relocation policies for all Federal and Federally-aided programs: (ii) allowance of compensation beyond fair market value for owner-occupants so they can purchase a similar home elsewhere without capital loss; (iii) provision of relocation adjustment payment paid either as a lump sum over time for tenants who must pay higher rents because of relocation or who must move more than once; (iv) the requirement that adequate quality housing be available for those displaced by any demolition before the demolition takes place and at prices they can reasonably afford . . .

These seven bills dealing with relocation would insure fair, just, and humane relocation procedures. It would strengthen the capacities of local agencies to deal with relocation problems and it would provide those displaced with the resources to improve their homes and living environment.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED HOUSING PROGRAMS

I have been concerned about the attitude of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) toward the new programs authorized in the 1968 HUD Act. For example, mid-way in the fiscal year only \$499,000 of a total appropriation of \$25 million had been spent by FHA for the Section 235 homeownership program. My fears have also been buttressed by a reading of the recently issued report of the President's National Commission on Urban Problems. I believe that their comments are most important, and should be given greater public attention.

The comments of the Douglas Commission are made in the context of the previous record of FHA, but these comments are important as they apply to FHA's administration of low- and moderate-income housing programs contained in the 1968 HUD Act.

The Douglas Commission report states:

"The main weakness of FHA from a social point of view has not been in what it has done, but what it has failed to do—in its relative neglect of the inner cities and of the poor, and especially the Negro poor. Believing firmly that the poor were bad credit risks and that the presence of Negroes tended to lower real estate values, FHA has generally regarded loans to such groups as "economically unsound" until recently. Therefore, FHA benefits have been confined almost exclusively to the middle class, and primarily only to the middle section of the middle class. The poor and those on the fringes of poverty have been almost completely excluded. These and the lower middle class, together constituting the 40% of the population whose housing needs are greatest, received only 11% of the FHA mortgages."

While it is true that Congress has in the past served to give support to this conservative insuring policy of FHA, it must also be related to the fact that FHA itself has been somewhat lethargic and, at times, reactionary force in the solution of urban housing problems.

The FHA, as the Douglas Commission points out in its report time after time, is hesitant about new programs and any programs involving the poor. The rent supplement program is an example. Congress has criticized the slow production schedule of the program as well as the program itself. Opponents of this program until recently had little to worry about because the rent supplement program is mainly carried out at the local and regional levels—where FHA inaction and resistance have been strong. The Douglas Commission has expressed concern about this problem.

With a new Administration in power, fears were expressed about the future of the new FHA programs of housing for low- and moderate-income families. While it is true that Sections 101, 105 and 106 of the Administration's bill promise to maintain the insurance

and contract authority of these programs, our fears are not assuaged or diminished. Increased contract authority is fine, but stands in sharp contrast to the actions of Secretary Romney who, less than one week after taking office, announced a hike on FHA mortgage interest rates from 6.75% to 7.5%. This has a drastic effect on government subsidy programs such as rent supplement and Section 236. Each percentage point increase costs the middle-income home buyer \$10 per month more on a \$15,000, 30-year mortgage. But for the government-subsidized housing programs the costs are far greater—for it will mean an increase in governmental outlays for subsidy payments and fewer units which can be covered under existing appropriations for decent housing for our poor population. The middle-income dweller will have to pay more per month; the low-income person will remain in squalor and filth, without decent heating or lighting along with overcrowded and unbearable living conditions.

It is unfortunate that the Administration did not give some thought to the recommendations of the Douglas Commission:

"The Commission recommends that machinery be devised in the Executive Branch of the government to insure that when basic economic decisions are made, their effects on housing construction and housing construction goals be clearly and deliberately considered. The Commission further recommends that the President and his Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury Department, and other departments and major agencies of the Government, be required to state what effect any major change in economic policy (e.g., interest rate changes, tax reductions or increases, balance-of-payment proposals) would have on the successful building of the number of housing units set by the President in his annual housing construction goals message."

Secretary Romney, in the raising of FHA mortgage interest rates, made no statement on the specific effects of his action on the Sections 235 and 236 programs and the rent supplement programs. It would appear that the action of the Secretary, which will please many in FHA, was made without adequate consideration of low-income people or the needs facing this country for low-income housing.

I concur wholeheartedly with the statement of the President's National Commission on Urban Problems:

"Nothing could do more to stimulate housing, reduce the cost of subsidies, and achieve the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, than a reduction in the general level of interest rates. We are aware of the nation's balance of payments difficulties and of inflationary pressures at home. But we urge the solution of these problems by means other than a major reliance on monetary policy and rising interest rates, which have had such a negative effect on housing production for the most needy families in the country."

COOPERATIVE HOUSING

A cooperative is a consumer enterprise owned and operated by its members on a non-profit basis. It offers a rather unique form of homeownership that could not only benefit middle-income groups but also lower-income as well. The Douglas Commission found that cooperative housing could be constructed at some of the most economical costs for comparable facilities encountered by them. Cooperative housing in the United States first began in New York City more than forty years ago. Today there are cooperative units throughout the country.

Cooperative housing offers many benefits including income tax deductions for tenants' share of local taxes and interest on mortgage, building up equity, little or no losses from vacancies and collection difficulties, cheaper maintenance costs that cannot be done under conventional rental housing.

I have introduced two bills, H.R. 51—the

Cooperative Rehabilitation Housing Act—and H.R. 596, to deal with cooperative housing. The Cooperation Rehabilitation Housing Act would provide Federal assistance to enable tenants of multi-family housing in low- and moderate-income urban areas, organized as cooperatives to acquire and rehabilitate such housing. This Act would further the opportunities for homeownership similar to the provision for Section 235 homeownership for lower-income families programs authorized in the 1968 HUD Act.

This Act would enable local groups to rid the slums of absentee landlords who have failed to keep up their properties while at the same time charging exorbitant rentals. As the Act states, "It is the purpose of this Act, by providing Federal financial and other assistance, to enable the occupants of multi-family housing in low- and moderate-income urban areas to acquire and rehabilitate the structures in which they live." The bill provides a low-interest, revolving fund for acquisition and rehabilitation. It enables tenants to negotiate a sale directly with a private owner or to acquire the dwelling from a municipality. There are also incentives for municipalities to acquire, through condemnation or otherwise, dwellings, which are in repeated violation of local building codes or health codes, for the purpose of eventually transferring them to resident cooperatives.

H.R. 51 also has a provision for a technical assistance service in HUD to facilitate the organization and management of such cooperatives. Presently, tenants are unable under existing Federal programs to form cooperatives and receive Federal assistance for rehabilitation. Given the present economics of slum housing it is unlikely that the absentee owner will take advantage of Federal assistance for rehabilitation under Section 312.

Rehabilitated public housing forms the greatest single category of successful rehabilitation efforts. Approximately 20,000 rehabilitated public housing units are currently under contract. The average development cost was \$12,822 per unit in Fiscal Year 1966, substantially less than comparable new housing construction. As successful as the experience in rehabilitated public housing may have been, it has none of the advantages associated with ownership. The familiar effects of pride of ownership improve maintenance and reduce costs. The Parchester Cooperative in Southeast Washington is a good example.

H.R. 51 is also important because it proposes a direct loan fund. I have long held the belief that direct loans are insufficiently utilized in Federal housing programs. The success of New York's Mitchell-Lame law demonstrates that direct loan programs are able to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income housing.

H.R. 596 would amend Title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences. This bill would heighten the probability of low-income public housing occupants and middle-income persons becoming homeowners. Through long-term, low-interest loans insured by FHA, cooperative apartments could be made available, thus promoting the concept of homeownership.

LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING

Lead poisoning is a major disease affecting thousands of young children presently living in the slums of substandard housing in our urban areas. Curing this disease, which the New York Scientists' Committee for Public Education has labeled a "silent epidemic," does not need to wait for any miraculous scientific breakthrough. The disease is not caused by some obscure virus. It is most often caused in small children when they eat

bits of paint and plaster that peel and fall from the walls and ceilings in dilapidated housing. Although the more recent coats of paint in such apartments are usually lead-free—in New York City lead-based apartment paint has been outlawed for some time—the lead content from paint applied in past years frequently comes to the surface when outer coats of paint peel off interior surfaces.

To deal with this problem, I have introduced three bills, which would accomplish the following:

H.R. 9191 establishes a fund in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from which the Secretary may make grants to local governments to develop a program to identify and treat individuals afflicted by lead poisoning. \$7.5 million would be authorized for this purpose annually for three years.

H.R. 9192 is directed at the problem of slum housing itself and the need to eliminate the cause of lead poisoning—the peeling of lead-based paint from interior surfaces of dilapidated housing. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of HUD to make grants to local governments to develop programs for the detection of the presence of lead-based paints and to require that owners and landlords remove it from interior surfaces. \$13.5 million would be authorized for this purpose annually for three years.

I have also introduced H.R. 11699 which would require the local governments submit and have approved by the Secretary of HUD an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning as a prerequisite to receiving federal funds for housing rehabilitation or for code enforcement. This would generate pressure on local governments to develop effective programs for removing the lead-based paints which cause lead poisoning from the interior surfaces of dilapidated housing.

The elimination of lead-based paint poisoning, and the tragic effects it has for so many children requires that Congress approve a national program for identifying and treating existing cases of lead poisoning and, more basically, to eliminate the lead-based paints which cause the disease from inner city housing. The approach proposed in H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699 would, I believe, achieve these goals.

OTHER HOUSING PROPOSALS

Adequate maintenance of low-income rental property

H.R. 605 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multi-family structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such a structure. This bill is designed to take the profit out of the slums. As it exists now, slumlords can fall adequately to maintain their properties while still receiving a depreciation allowance for that property. The owner wins on both ends: the tenants pay exorbitant rents for unsuitable structures and the government gives him an allowance. H.R. 605 would also require demonstration by the taxpayer that the reserve fund is being used for the intended purpose. In this way, landlords will be discouraged from making a profit by permitting the deterioration of homes in which low-income people must live.

Federal interest subsidies for State and municipally aided housing

Section 236 interest subsidy and rent supplement programs of the HUD Act of 1968 included amendments which I introduced which make interest subsidy and rent supplements available to State and locally financed middle-income housing approved for such programs prior to construction or rehabilitation. However, housing projects in existence prior to the 1968 Act are not covered and are not eligible to receive the assistance they need in order to keep rents, carrying

charges, and interest rates within reach of middle-income residents. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 49 and H.R. 4308, with co-sponsors, which extend the section 236 interest subsidy and rent supplement programs by making them available to existing State or locally financed middle-income housing projects even though construction of these projects was completed prior to the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act.

The purpose of these bills is to provide relief to States and local programs which have been severely undercut by spiraling interest rates. High interest rates have resulted in increased mortgage interest rates, increased carrying charges, and increased rents for publically assisted middle-income housing programs. The consequences for middle-income families have been alarming.

Seven states—New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—have programs which would be affected and which would benefit from this legislation. In each of these states, rents in state assisted middle-income housing are becoming so high as to exclude the very families with moderate incomes that the projects were designed to aid.

Under the Mitchell-Lama program New York State floats bonds, the proceeds of which may be lent to sponsors of middle-income housing at current rates. In order to borrow funds under the program, a sponsor must agree to limit his rate of return on the housing facility. The abatement of real estate taxes also helps to keep the costs down.

New York City has a similar program for which average costs have risen steadily from \$26 per room in 1961, to \$38 per room in 1968. The costs are constantly rising, and I might mention that the middle-income tenants of these projects are not standing still for these increases.

H.R. 49 makes limited-profit state and locally financed programs eligible for the interest rate reductions now authorized by section 236. For those projects approved for Federal assistance, it would help to keep carrying charges and rents at levels commensurate with the incomes of the tenants.

An important advantage of this proposal is that in terms of the expense involved to the Federal Government, it would cost less to subsidize the interest rates on Mitchell-Lama type housing down to one percent than it would cost to subsidize a privately financed project down to an interest rate of one percent. This is because interest rates for the Mitchell-Lama program are already lower than those on the regular market rate.

If relief is not promptly provided to housing programs currently threatened by skyrocketing interest rates, thousands of families may be forced to vacate their apartments. It is essential to the vitality of our Nation's cities that they retain middle-income population. If middle-income families are to continue to live in our large urban centers, such as New York, the cost of housing must remain within their financial ability.

The availability of space for construction in our crowded cities lessens daily. H.R. 12462, which I co-sponsored, would ease the scarcity of space by making possible the construction of low- and moderate-income housing, of the type covered by a mortgage insured under Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, or low-rent housing assisted under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 in the air space over any public building of the Federal Government. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer such airspace without consideration whenever he determines that it is not needed to carry out a governmental function. Thus, the air space over Post Offices, which often are structures with few stores, could be utilized to provide much needed housing.

In the President's first Annual Report on National Housing Goals, which was referred

to this Committee on January 23, the use of air space above public construction sites is recommended, and suggested, as a "feasible" plan.

BONDING FOR CONTRACTORS

H.R. 649 deals with the problem of minority group contractors who are unable to obtain bonding. It would authorize the Small Business Administration to indemnify corporate sureties on bonds covering contracts of sound small business concerns. H.R. 649 would help minority contractors to satisfy certain legal requirements in order to participate in the construction of moderate and low income housing—thus providing job opportunities and minority entrepreneurship in the housing area.

Housing programs should be used to encourage the development of minority group entrepreneurs to promote both neighborhood stability and provide jobs for area residents. Negroes, for example, account for 11 percent of the National population but only 3.2 percent of self-employed persons. Housing programs contained in the 1968 HUD Act would be especially useful in developing entrepreneurial opportunities for contractors and subcontractors. Presently minority group entrepreneurs are not accepted for bidding on large scale jobs and may not have the necessary experience in contract estimation, manpower scheduling, and job supervision. Many have problems in posting surety and performance bonds. H.R. 649, would help alleviate this situation.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This country has built generously for the more prosperous half of the nation while in the process destroying more housing for the poor than has been built. This Congress must make every effort to insure that we provide enough decent housing for those—the poor and near poor—who have in the past been left out of our national housing policy.

Today, about a third of the families in this country cannot buy or rent decent housing at market rates by paying a reasonable proportion of their income for shelter. In the major cities the problem is particularly serious due to acute shortages of both low- and moderate income housing and the necessary facilities and amenities to support viable communities. In our large urban centers there is a continual overcrowding in the use of mass transit and other public facilities, high land prices, and a sense of estrangement and isolation from the mainstream of American life. Our national commitment must be to provide decent housing for all Americans.

President Johnson in his message to Congress on the Fiscal Year 1970 budget stated:

"The massive housing needs for our growing nation can only be met through a major commitment by governments at all levels working with private industry and labor to provide suitable housing for all Americans—and to eliminate the rat-infested city slum and the dilapidated shacks which dot the countryside. We have not made such a commitment."

The bills I have introduced will help to insure that the goals of the 1968 Act become a reality. The experience of the past is not encouraging. Yet survey after survey of the poor themselves shows that housing is placed near the top of the list of the worst problems facing the poor.

The 10 year housing goal is nearly a 40 percent increase in the current housing stock, and better than 10 percent more than the total housing production for the 20 years from 1940 to 1960. It is 70 percent more than the total production for the decade of the 1950's. It will require not only a commitment to build but the actual carrying out of a worthwhile and important endeavor by all levels of government and industry.

In speaking of commitment and reality, we would be perpetuating the cruelest lie if

we pretended that perfecting the existing programs and designing new ones are the only hurdles to be overcome in the housing crisis. The plain fact is that all of our plans are castles in the sand if the Congress fails to appropriate the money that is needed to make a dent in our housing shortage.

The goals are worthwhile and essential. The programs are promising, creative and constructive. But they are starved. The people of this Nation who live in inadequate, unsafe, and unsanitary housing have thus far been given no more than promises—promises which provide no shelter. The budget for fiscal year 1970 exemplifies this sad fact.

The hopes of millions for a decent home are inflated by the goals we pronounce as essential and by the programs we propose to meet these goals. But year after year these hopes are dashed by the cutting edge of minimal appropriations. This endless cycle of promise and disillusionment can only result in the most bitter frustration. How long can we ask anyone to retain faith in a pledge if time and again the pledge is proven to be hollow? The people who occupy our Nation's slums did not require Congress to inform them that their housing is inadequate. When the Congress showed signs of recognizing this reality, the expectations arose throughout the country that something would be done to solve the problem. With appropriations such as those recently approved by the House, who would not be made cynical?

There are several other areas of concern to me in the housing field, and I shall suggest several proposals that this body should further investigate.

First, legislative authority for housing programs should be sufficient to provide continuity of action and money. In order that we can meet the national housing goal, Congress should authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to enter into contracts and obligations for at least three years into the future without further authority from the Appropriations Committee.

Second, if after fiscal year 1970 it is found that state and local action is falling to make substantial progress toward meeting the needs for 6 million low- and moderate income housing units in the next decade, Congress should authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to become the bulder of last resort. Congress should also authorize as the President's Committee on Urban Housing has suggested, the Secretary of HUD to plan and construct low-income housing if local public authorities so request.

Third, Congress should enact legislation that would provide that all financial assistance programs (including grants, loans and loan guarantees) administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development be conditioned upon the existence within the local government of an enforceable open occupancy ordinance or enforceable state legislation for open occupancy. If we are to insure that fair and open housing is to become a reality, steps must be taken to insure that local communities also understand this national commitment. An essential component of low- and moderate income housing is the freedom to choose where to live. Programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development must be consistent with these goals.

Fourth, the President's Committee on Urban Housing had recommended that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development undertake a joint study on patterns of family expenses, to determine the percentage of income the poor should be expected to allocate for housing. The study should determine how housing expenses are affected by such variables as age

and size of families and the household's location in metropolitan or rural areas. I endorse this recommendation. In major metropolitan areas such as New York City the existing income limitations and rent charges for low- and moderate-income housing have tended to be unreflective of existing local conditions.

Fifth, Congress should enact legislation to provide for direct grants for the provision of social services in FHA-financed low- and moderate-income housing. Section 106 of the 1968 HUD Act makes provisions for loans for seed money and also empowers the Secretary to provide advice and technical assistance for activities such as social services, but no direct grants for social services are allowable costs in FHA-financed programs. It is important that counseling, services, and other self-help activities be provided to those moving into such projects so that they eventually become economically self-sufficient and full contributors to the community.

Sixth, Congress should amend the 1968 HUD Act to permit through the Comprehensive Planning or Urban Information and Technical Assistance programs, as eligible applicants, non-profit metropolitan area housing information centers to aid families in finding decent housing. Such centers would list available housing, assist low-income families in moving to areas with which they are unfamiliar, provide inspection services, and educate the community to the need for more low-income housing. The Urban Coalition in its report, "Agenda for Positive Action" has endorsed this idea.

The bills and suggestions that I have stated here are essential elements to this country's attainment of the goal stated in the Housing Act of 1949, "the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." I urge this Committee to give serious attention to the problem of low- and moderate-income housing and to make every effort to insure that this country at long last can realistically say that no one lives in squalor and sub-standard housing.

AMA-AAMC BACK STUDENT LOAN FUND

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the House recently approved the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including funds for the health professions student loan fund.

My colleague from New York, Mr. REID, and I, offered a floor amendment to that bill to increase this loan fund to allow loans to be given in the coming school year at the 1968-69 level. To our great distress, that amendment failed.

There was an unfortunate and perhaps, inadvertent, suggestion in the report of the Appropriations Committee on that bill that the American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges support the reduced loan fund. Exactly the opposite is true.

In a joint statement issued by AMA-AAMC on July 18, 1969, these groups present their positions on financial support of medical schools by the Federal Government. The section on student loans said:

Student loans should be increased in accord with identified need, keeping particu-

larly in view the efforts of schools to accept students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Even the maintenance of existing student enrollments will be difficult, and much more so their expansion, if student aid is not forthcoming in amounts related to need.

So far this aid is not forthcoming. HEW has already advised the medical schools that their allotments of loan funds for next year will be reduced by an average of 50 percent. This reduction will have serious, even drastic, effects on both the lives of individual students and on physician production. Neither consequence should we accept with resignation or equanimity.

The Senate will soon consider the Labor, HEW appropriations bill. The new Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, is expected to testify at the Senate hearings on this bill. I hope that Dr. Egeberg, who has a long and intimate understanding of medical education, will see in that appearance the appropriate, if belated, hour, to speak about the medical students loan fund and its prospects for 1969-70.

DR. FARRELL THOMAS GALLAGHER RETIREES AFTER 50-YEAR CAREER

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland is recognized as one of our Nation's foremost medical centers. One of the most outstanding surgeons who has served the Greater Cleveland area is about to retire after one-half century of service. Mr. Bob Seltzer, feature writer for the Cleveland Press, described some of the highlights of Dr. Gallagher's distinguished career in the following article:

SURGEON ENDS 50-YEAR CAREER

Dr. Farrell Thomas Gallagher, a surgeon of international eminence, will retire this fall after nearly 50 years of coping with human problems, unrelenting pressures, and life-or-death decisions.

"I will withdraw in November, after the golf season ends, do some traveling, and be available as a consultant," said Dr. Gallagher, 74, born on Main Ave. in the periphery of "the Angle," and now dean of West Side surgeons.

Dr. Gallagher, ramrod straight at 6-foot-1 and 175 pounds, was director of surgery at St. John Hospital from 1951 to 1955 and visiting surgeon for 44 years. He also was a member of Lakewood Hospital's surgical staff from 1941 until he reached 65 in 1960.

The ruddy, freckled Dr. Gallagher, a general surgeon, urbane and witty, has practiced for 40 years at 14805 Detroit Ave., Lakewood. (I am personally indebted to him for saving the life of my twin daughter.)

"People are living longer, and, naturally, we are finding more diseases common to old age," Dr. Gallagher said. "We operate on people in their 80's and 90's. We get people in the optimum stage for any type of surgery. Each succeeding generation of surgeons feels it has gone through the golden age of surgery."

"Medicine will go to the moon when it solves all the organ transplant problems. Radical procedures in surgery have become more extensive, and there is no limit on surgery."

Dr. Gallagher is a past president of the Academy of Medicine, a member of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He has been a trustee of the Catholic Charities Corp. for 10 years, and is a past president of the Cleveland Surgical Society and past trustee of the Cleveland Hospital Council.

The veteran surgeon received his pre-medical training at John Carroll University, his medical degree from Western Reserve University, and took postgraduate work in fractures at Harvard University. He served his internship at Lakeside and St. Vincent Charity Hospitals. During World War I, he was a member of the Medical Officers Reserve Corps.

Dr. Gallagher's inspiration to study medicine came from two surgeon cousins—Drs. J. V. and Frank Gallagher. His brother, Msgr. Daniel T., retired in April as pastor of St. James Parish, after 54 years in the priesthood.

Dr. Gallagher's wife, Martha, is active in the Cleveland Mental Health Assn. She was president of the women's board of St. John Hospital 14 years, and is past president of the women's auxiliaries of the Academy of Medicine and the Ohio State Medical Assn. His secretary, Mrs. Clarence J. Oviatt, joined him during college vacation in 1937 and has stayed 32 years.

A golfing buff, Dr. Gallagher shoots in the low 80's at Westwood Country Club. In 1964, he made a hole in one, and in 1934 he was the southpaw golf champion of the district. The Gallaghers are parents of Mrs. Garcon Weiss, Mrs. William E. Kaiser, Mrs. James Ware of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Farrell T. Jr., a Lakewood dentist. The Gallaghers live at 22157 Hilliard Rd., Rocky River.

CHICAGO OBSERVES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently we observed Captive Nations Week throughout the United States. Thanks to the efforts of Mayor Daley, one of the most impressive observances was held in Chicago by the Chicago Captive Nations Committee, whose chairman is Mr. Viktors Viksnins.

It was one of the most moving demonstrations and I should like to place in the RECORD today the resolution adopted at the luncheon which followed the parade and the copies of the proclamation issued by Mayor Daley and Governor Ogilvie.

The documents follow:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States of America to proclaim a Captive Nations Week, and whereas the Russian and Chinese communism continues to build up its vast colonial empire and threatens the peace, security, and independence of the Free World, carrying out subversive conspiracies in Latin America, Africa, and even in our own country, conducting open, aggressive warfare in South Viet-Nam, neighboring countries of Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, having made deep inroads into the Arab countries, and building up its threatening military power in the area of the Mediterranean;

Now, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Proclamation of Captive Nations Week, we feel a particular urgency and

a sacred obligation to speak on behalf of the millions of human beings under the tyranny of the communist colonial empire,

Therefore, be it resolved by the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, to urge the United States to assume the role of leadership by taking a course motivated by the most sacred human obligations; the horrible fact that one-third of mankind is already enslaved by the communist imperialism necessitates a new policy which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of all enslaved peoples by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom;

Be it further resolved, that in view of the indivisibility of freedom and peace, the restoration of the sacred rights of all the nations based on principles of democracy, self-determination and sovereignty within their respective ethnic boundaries, is of paramount importance to establish freedom, security, and stability of the entire world. Consequently this policy is in the best interest of our country for the present and in years to come,

Be it further resolved, that we at this very critical and perhaps fatal moment for the entire free world support unreservedly the United States' resistance to Communist aggression in South Viet-Nam and the building up of forces of freedom in that part of the front of the free world; in this spirit we salute the members of the United States and Allied Armed Forces,

Be it further resolved, that following the anniversary year of the Proclamation of Human Rights and in view of the flagrant violations of these same rights by the Soviet Union through the suppression and occupation of Czechoslovakia during that very year, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations place on the agenda of the United Nations the following demands:

1. the abolishment of slave labor, mass deportations, all concentration camps, and all forms of genocide,
2. to guarantee a free return to their countries all the deported and exiled who survived the communist ordeal,
3. free elections for all enslaved nations under the supervision of the United Nations Organizations,

Be it further resolved, that we oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations Organization;

Be it further resolved, that we oppose "One-way Bridges" and the opening of a Russian Consulate in Chicago;

Be it further resolved, that since every nation has the right for self-determination this right belongs also to the Biafrans; in the name of humanity we most urgently appeal to the United States government to help the suffering and starving human beings being murdered in masses by the Nigerian aggressors, armed by the Russian barbarians and the British labor government,

Be it further resolved, that special efforts must be made by the United States towards an awakening and strengthening of all moral forces, particularly at a time when we are warned by the burning martyrs in the interest of freedom; it is frightening that at this time we are faced by an unparalleled loss of ethical concern and incredible callousness towards the enslaved, abandoned to their ordeal,

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop building up the communist empire, particularly the Soviet military power by selling it important military equipment,

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop trading with the communist countries because in so doing, it helps them to tighten their grip on the enslaved; whatever is gained at great risk by the desperate, enslaved men and women

through sabotaging Soviet economy is completely destroyed through trading,

Be it further resolved, to appeal to the United States authorities to undertake utmost efforts in the interest of the sacred values in cultural, social, and educational institutions so vital for the preservation of freedom. It is appalling to see how free men let themselves be used in the portrayal of anarchism, nihilism, defeatism, amorality, pacifism, and atheism in the service of the blood-stained Red Empire,

Be it further resolved, that this Committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy; there is a desperate need for a forum in which the freed world would have confidence; the U.N. has failed to be such a forum to handle the issues of injustice and crimes against humanity; the recent appeal of 54 citizens of the USSR which has been ignored up to this day speaks for itself; the Unesco's decision to commemorate the centenary of Lenin by peddling this criminal as a humanist is an insult to the civilized world community and reveals the real interests of this organization; by the establishment of a trustworthy forum, the United States will prove to the entire world that it will not cease in its efforts until all the Captive Nations are able to enjoy their God-given rights in their sovereign states.

VICTORS VIKSNINS,
General Chairman.
ULANA CELEWYCH,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF CHICAGO.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 36-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

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

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969 as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 19 at 12:00 P.M.

Dated this 26th day of June, A.D., 1969.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led to the enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others, and

The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communistic leaders to initiate a major war, and

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

The Congress of the United States has by unanimous vote declared the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week so that the people of the United States may express their sympathy with, and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 13, 1969 to be observed as Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and I call upon our citizens to observe this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol, in the City of Springfield, this twenty-fourth day of June, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and fifty-first.

RICHARD V. OGILVIE,
Governor.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S DIPLOMACY IS SLIPPING A TRIFLE

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members' particular attention to the second paragraph of the following release:

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOTICE—CHANGE OF SCHEDULE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS,

August 5, 1969.

Our normal Wednesday morning briefing this week will necessarily have to be rescheduled for 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. on the following day, Thursday, August 7 in Room 2200 Rayburn Building.

At that rescheduled time, Acting Secretary

Elliot Richardson will discuss the President's trip and other current foreign policy problems.

The reason for the change in schedule is that on Wednesday, August 6 at our normal briefing time, Acting Secretary Richardson has been asked to attend a Cabinet meeting at Camp David, and on Thursday our normal 9 to 10 a.m. scheduling conflicts with the arrival ceremonies which the Acting Secretary must attend for German Prime Minister Kiesinger.

We very much regret the inconvenience to Members resulting from this change.

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN OUR COURT SYSTEM

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues are concerned about the administration of criminal justice in our court system. When the Supreme Court of the United States pronounced the landmark decision on Gideon against Wainwright, attention centered anew on the indigent defendant charged with crime and his entitlement to legal assistance under the sixth amendment to the Constitution.

Following Gideon, other Supreme Court decisions heralded a new era of justice in our court system by insuring to any person charged with the commission of crime, not only representation by counsel, but also able and competent counsel, in the area of criminal law. This high degree of responsibility imposed upon the legal profession caused grave concern amongst many jurists in our Nation. A concomitant responsibility was imposed upon the courts to see that all defendants were given a fair trial. Inadequacy of counsel in many cases resulted in determinations by appellate courts that the defendant was denied a fair trial.

This concern of jurists throughout our Nation to respect the dictates of our Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court, has been accepted by a Cleveland jurist in a manner which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

Judge Bernard Friedman, presiding judge of the criminal branch of common pleas court, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, has initiated an innovative and exciting program to fulfill this responsibility in his jurisdiction.

Judge Friedman brought to criminal court the experience acquired over a long and distinguished judicial career, and just last year was the trial judge whose decision was sustained by the Supreme Court in the landmark "stop and frisk" case, *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

From his extended experience on the bench, Judge Friedman had found that there was no dearth of requests from young attorneys to handle criminal cases. The problem was that few, if any, of

these volunteers had the necessary and requisite training for competent criminal defense work. Consequently, representation was not of a high quality, many applications for new trials arose, and an inordinate number of cases resulted in guilty pleas or convictions.

As a result, Judge Friedman, with the assistance of several prominent lawyers in the field, undertook to set up through the court, a series of three 3½-hour criminal law seminars covering all aspects of legal procedure in the courtroom. The lawyer's role in everything from preliminary investigation to indigent appeals was thoroughly discussed. The response to the program was overwhelming. No less than 120 young lawyers attended each seminar—a great majority of whom had little or no experience in criminal cases.

In addition to the seminars, Judge Friedman took it upon himself to contact several of the larger downtown law firms and to request that they assign several of their brightest young men to participate in this program. This proposal was met with equal enthusiasm, and the dedication of these young men, after the assignments were made, was total.

Additionally, many distinguished members of the bar who were experienced practitioners at criminal law are to be commended for their participation in this program as lecturers and panelists. The program outline is included here for the benefit of my colleagues and the jurists in their districts who may wish to avail themselves of a similar program:

DEFENSE OF THE POOR

An outline for a Seminar to be given on three successive Saturday mornings at Criminal Court.

FIRST MEETING: HON. BERNARD FRIEDMAN,
PRESIDING

9:00-9:40 Professional Responsibility to the Client: Where it begins, where it ends—Gerard Messerman.

9:40-10:20 Introduction to the problems of defending the indigent—Elmer A. Gulliani.

10:30-10:50 Investigation: The Key—S. J. Young.

10:50-11:30 The decision to plead—A. B. Fink.

11:30-12:00 Probation: Role of the Court, Role of the Attorney—Charles Fleming.

SECOND MEETING

9:00-9:30 The decision to charge—Clarence Rogers.

9:30-10:00 Bail and Bail Reduction, Personal Bond—Herman S. Pressman.

10:10-10:50 Search and Seizure: Posing the Problem—Bernard Berkman.

10:50-11:30 Admissions, Statements, Confessions—J. Carroll.

11:30-12:00 Discovery, Depositions—F. Mandel.

12:00-12:30 Line-up Procedure—James R. Willis.

THIRD MEETING

9:00-9:30 Post-Conviction Remedies, Extradition and Probation Revocation—Carol Emerling.

9:30-10:20 Plea Bargaining, Pre-trial Procedure—Prosecutor to be named.

10:30-11:00 Plea Bargaining, Defense—Seymour Terrell.

11:00-11:30 The Indigent Appeal—Edward R. Brown.

11:30-12:00 The Trial, An Overview—John Butler.

DINERS CLUB CREDIT CARD

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include the following two letters of correspondence between the Diners Club of America and the Honorable Anthony O. Friedman in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 4, 1969.

Mr. ANTHONY O. FRIEDMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for applying for membership in Diners Club.

Your application indicates that you have considerable potential and almost all the credit references needed to qualify for the Diners Club. But at this stage of your career we feel you need additional experience to build the calibre of credit history we require for our worldwide unlimited credit card.

However, we have a recommendation for promising individuals like yourself to speed up the qualifying process and enable you to receive our membership card almost immediately. It is through the Executive Society of America.

With membership in the Executive Society of America as a reference, you will be entitled to prompt issuance of a Diners Club credit card.

The Executive Society of America is an organization which was created to assist young career people like yourself through teaching "what it means to establish a good credit name in today's business world, and the huge financial rewards possible to those who maintain a perfect credit record." We at Diners Club heartily endorse these objectives and have taken the liberty of enclosing a copy of the Society's literature for you. Fill in the application blank and send it in today.

Very truly yours,

FRANK P. RITCHIE,
Director, New Accounts.

FEBRUARY 19, 1969.

FRANK P. RITCHIE,
Director, New Accounts,
Diners Club,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. RITCHIE: I am pleased and honored that you find me "almost" qualified for a Diners Club credit card. Thank you for informing me of my heretofore unrealized lack of "additional experience." I find it most difficult to believe, however, that a fifteen dollar membership in an unknown organization immediately grants me the innate shrewdness necessary for proper and responsible handling of the Diners Club card.

I am frankly disappointed in your organization, for which I previously had enough respect to use for my credit business.

In the course of a days work an enormous quantity of "junk mail" crosses my desk, and I accept this as part of my job; in some cases even admitting to a grudging respect for the slick handling of worthless promotions with high sounding names. But when such as this blatant sham has the approval and endorsement of the Diners Club, I am disappointed.

I have long desired a Diners Club card for the convenience it offered in the world I was striving to enter. And after all the years of schools, dead end jobs and veterans checks carefully husbanded to achieve that end, you say fifteen dollars paid by me to your friends is a better index into my character. From starting at the bottom with local charge plates, no-name oil companies and junky unsolicited cards, to raise my income

and credit rating until worthy of the *BIG ONE*, and have Diners Club insult my intelligence, my contemporaries and my career with this outlandish trash is a bitter blow.

The entire "Executive Society of America" has as much value as a used envelope and all the exclusiveness of a laundromat. I am going to demonstrate, Mr. Ritchie, that I have the experience to build the calibre of my credit history you require by returning this garbage to you and refusing to lay fifteen good dollars on the line as an outright bribe. Thanks but no thanks, Mr. Ritchie . . . I'll take my business to American Express.

For the tender expression of your "Executive Society . . ." friends' need for fifteen dollars,

ANTHONY O. FRIEDMAN.

CAPT. WILLIAM HIXON, USA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend a hearty "well done" and a sincere "welcome home" to U.S. Army Capt. William Hixon, recently returned from combat duty in Vietnam.

A recent article in his hometown newspaper, the Mansfield, Ohio, News Journal, pointed with understandable pride to the achievements and leadership of Captain Hixon, who, while in Vietnam was awarded the Silver Star, four Bronze Stars, an Air Medal, Army Commendation for meritorious service and the Purple Heart. He is also among the select group to receive the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry and Staff Honor Medal.

It is revealing of this man's nature and leadership that, as the article indicates, he was interested in discussing the outstanding service of the men under his command rather than his own awards and medals. He seems even more proud of these troops than the people of the Mansfield area are of him. It is especially gratifying for me to see this man gain such success since he was one of the first young men nominated by me to the Military Academy when I came to Congress.

I hope no one escapes the realization that Captain Hixon and the men of his command, as well as all the fine servicemen of our Nation, are part of the vast reservoir of young Americans who lead today and will continue to lead in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

IN VIETNAM: CAPTAIN CALLS YOUNG TROOPS "UNBELIEVABLY COURAGEOUS"

A Mansfelder fresh from combat in Vietnam's Mekong Delta doesn't try to conceal his pride when he tells of the courage shown by the young infantrymen he led in battle.

But Capt. William Hixon, 26, a 1961 graduate of Ontario High School and a 1966 graduate of West Point Military Academy, is not as ready to talk about the array of American and Vietnamese medals he has been awarded.

In talking about his men, he said, "These 18, 19 and 20-year-old soldiers are courageous—unbelievably courageous. They may complain back at base camp when they are

relaxing but they never question when it is time to advance against the enemy.

"I've seen these men—with enemy fire coming from all directions—disregard their own safety to rush right out to jump on top of a Viet Cong bunker.

"They want to capture prisoners. The prisoners can tell you so much. A captured man—especially one who has been wounded, evacuated, fed and treated humanely often is willing to provide valuable information.

"What depresses our men most is news of the senseless things going on at home—like demonstrations and riots regardless of their cause," he said.

"I've had occasion to recommend entire squads of men—instead of individual soldiers—for awards for their brave actions."

Capt. Hixon has been awarded the Silver Star, the third highest award given by the United States government; four Bronze Stars (two for valor, one for service and one for achievement); an Air Medal with an oakleaf cluster; an Army Commendation for meritorious service and a Purple Heart. He was wounded in the forearm, chest, shoulder and back last October near Dong Ton.

He is one of a select group to have received two Vietnamese awards—the Cross of Gallantry with palm, the highest honor the Vietnamese government can bestow and a Vietnamese staff honor medal.

The officer, now the guest of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Tobertge, 115 Clare Rd., also served a year in Korea followed by four months as a basic training instructor in Ft. Knox, Ky. He will report to Brooklyn, N.Y. Aug. 12 to be an ROTC instructor at Pratt Institute.

Capt. Hixon supports national policy concerning the withdrawal of American soldiers from Vietnam.

"I agree wholeheartedly with the gradual pullout of troops now that we essentially have won the ground war in Vietnam. The Vietnamese are making great strides at taking over. They are doing a fine job.

"I believe our men are being taken out of the right areas," he said.

Capt. Hixon described the Viet Cong as small, well disciplined people, lacking in fear and with uncanny aptitude for hiding in reeds or mud of the country.

"You can walk right on them without seeing them."

He told of the valuable role of rehabilitated former VC's called Tiger Scouts.

"They know the lies their political bosses have told them. They know the customs of their people. They know where they might hide themselves, their ammunitions, food and medical supplies. They speak the language fluently.

"We use Tiger Scouts, or an interpreter, to read surrender appeals over a bull horn when we get within 100 meters of the enemy," he said.

He showed a card printed in Vietnamese and with English translation of the appeal his company read calling for surrender. The appeal began by greeting the enemy officers and their men as "friends". It called for them to save their lives by holding weapons above their heads with both hands and advancing in the direction of the Allied Forces. It concluded with the poignant plea "Your men want to see their families again. Give them that chance."

THE GALS TAKE OVER CHICAGO'S CITY NEWS BUREAU

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very popular Chicago Tribune columnist, Rob-

ert Wiedrich, has called our attention in his column, the "Tower Ticker," that women have taken over that staid and historical citadel of masculinity—Chicago's City News Bureau.

Mr. Wiedrich points out that for the first time women have taken over several key spots at the Chicago News Bureau.

Mr. Wiedrich's column follows:

TOWER TICKER

(By Robert Wiedrich)

It's almost a woman's world: Surviving members of the 10,000-strong City News Bureau of Chicago alumni might like to know that for the first time since the World War II male shortage, feminine news hawks have taken over a number of key spots here.

Liza Smith, previously an assistant city editor, is now reported on the important City Hall beat, an all-time first for women. And Pamela Zekman is making the rounds at the federal courthouse while Sandy Dabovich serves as radio-TV editor and Sharon Iloway burns the midnight oil on the city desk.

In addition, several other lovelies are regarded as "heavies" on the day and night rewrite desks at City News, a place we personally regard as the world's best journalism trade school.

Guess things sure have changed since over two decades ago when we labored there at 25 bucks a week, lived on bologna sandwiches, and never dreamed of seeing a pretty face around the place, much less one atop a miniskirt!

DOMESTIC COMMUNIST COALITION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, daily our people read and hear of violence and acts of destruction about us; however, because they do not hear explanations that these episodes are sabotage—premeditated and interconnected—the average citizen is not aware of the overall increasing threat against our country.

The American people are being constantly subjected to fourth-dimensional warfare—a psychological offensive to delude them to tolerate anything done in the name of peace or social progress as being justified to bring about some emotional goal of a created reform.

Few Americans have been alerted to what can be anticipated when these armed terrorists align themselves with the fund raisers and the cannon fodder in a united front controlled and disciplined by the international Communist movement in its unwavering objective—to overthrow constitutional government and our free enterprise economic system.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Frank Cappel's Herald of Freedom for August 8, 1969, containing an interesting report on "The American Liberation Front" as a portion of my remarks:

THE AMERICAN LIBERATION FRONT

Because the "Black Revolution" evidently cannot succeed without the help of the white "brothers and sisters" (formerly known as "comrades") a united front is now in the process of formation. The start was made by the Black Panthers who were co-sponsors of a Revolutionary Conference for a United Front Against Fascism in America. The other

sponsor, according to the Communist newspaper, *Daily World*, was the International Liberation School and the conference was organized by the National Committees to Combat Fascism. This national revolutionary conference took place July 18-21, 1969 in Oakland, California. The *Daily World* states that more than 40 organizations sent representatives, including the Communist Party, Students for a Democratic Society, Youth Against War and Fascism and Veterans and Reservists To End the War in Vietnam. Attendance (70% Whites, mostly students) was estimated at 3,500 to 4,000, and pro-Peking, pro-Moscow assorted "New Left" and Trotskyite Communists began their move toward unity.

According to the Communist paper, local chapters to "combat fascism" are to be built across the country and then, at a conference in late October or early November, these activities will be coordinated into a full mobilization. "Panther spokesmen expect 'workers participation' in that meeting." The word "fascism" has long been a Communist epithet applied to anything which is anti-Communist. Anyone who has actively opposed Communism and comes face to face with one of the "comrades" has probably heard the word "Fascist!" hissed at him in glaring fervor.

The current meaning for "fascism" would seem to be "law and order" with the police and their supporters as chief fascists. Therefore a companion project of the conference to fight fascism is to secure "community control" of the police. For this purpose petitions are to be circulated, each one hand tailored for the locality in which it is to be used. The brochure and application for registration at the UFAP conference states:

"Petition statement for community control of police—Summary of Police Control Amendment That Must be Established in the Cities and Communities of America to End Fascism:

"This amendment to a city charter would give control of the police to community elected neighborhood councils so that those whom the police should serve will be able to set police policy and standards of conduct.

"The amendment provides for community control of the police by establishing police departments for the major communities of any city: the black community, the predominantly white area, the Mexican American communities, etc., etc. The departments would be separate and autonomous. They can, by mutual agreement, use common facilities. Each department will be administered by full time police commissions. (Not single police chiefs.) The commissioners are selected by a neighborhood police control council composed of fifteen members from the community elected by those who live there. Each department shall have five community council divisions within it. (Or number of departments ratioed to population.)

"The councils shall have the power to discipline officers for breaches of department policy or violations of law. (Against the people.) They may direct their police commissioner to make changes in department-wide police policy by majority vote of the said department commissioners. The council can recall the commissioner appointed by it at any time it finds that he is no longer responsive to the community. The community can recall the council members when they are not responsive to it.

"All police officers must live in the department they work in, and will be hired accordingly."

It is obvious that such police departments would be of no use in enforcing the law since their only job would seem to be to please the particular segment of the population they were selected to "serve." Police harassment by unfavorable propaganda and publicity ("Police Brutality") and by the establishment of Civilian Review Boards is to

be replaced with police control by "the people," most of whom know nothing and many of whom care nothing about the law. This would mean the collapse of our last line of defense—the local police.

The Black Panthers consider themselves the vanguard of the revolution and have now abandoned their "racial insularity" in favor of a coalition of negro and white militant and radical organizations. Their "historic" conference received greetings from Moscow, sent by William L. Patterson, member of the national committee of the Communist Party, USA and of the Communist Party's "black liberation committee." Patterson, who was visiting the Soviet Union, regretted that he could not be present at the conference although he was one of the sponsors and stated:

"I am sending greetings from afar to all who have gathered to establish a united front of action to beat back the monstrous forces with which reaction is seeking to create a police state and usher in an American brand of fascism.

"Especially do I greet the Black Panther Party's initiator of that historic conference. The conference call issued by the BPP is consistent with the needs and demands of this momentous hour, when police terror is rampant and assassination of progressives has become a way of life.

"The call is unique. What a magnificent step your party has taken!

"For the first time in the history of our country an organization led by black citizenry has moved to the forefront of American progressives and launched a call to labor, youth, the church, all minorities, and peace forces, regardless of creed, color or political persuasion, to close ranks against the growing menace of reaction.

"The murderous course projected by those who have made of law and order a mandate for terror is proof of the timeliness of your call. You have lifted the fight against racism to its highest level. You have revealed the black liberation movement's vast potentialities as a driving force in the life and death conflict to save our country by putting an end to the fascist drive of monopoly and to the mounting dangers of a Third World War.

"The conference can sound the death knell of racism, for all fascist trends feed racism and are fed by it.

"May your conference sow the seed for a monumental anti-fascist united front of the American people in September. Your conference cannot help but strengthen the national morality. May you launch a new battle song of freedom. March on!

"The eyes of the progressive world are focused on the conference. It will watch what you do to follow through and will render every possible aid.

"The evil forces of fascism in the U.S. can be beaten by a unified people locked together in a monumental anti-fascist united front of struggle. Salute."

Speaking at the conference was Herbert Aptheker, top Communist historian and theoretician. While the public meetings were being held, important private meetings were going on. In closed meetings lawyers were developing plans to enlist "a thousand lawyers to fight this fight against racism," according to Charles R. Garry, a lawyer who defends Black Panthers and other radicals. Plans were made to prepare lawyers across the country to handle cases of various types of radicals involved in the "revolutionary movement" who run afoul of the law. During the next sixty days special lectures are to be set up across the country by the National Lawyers Guild to train lawyers to handle these types of cases. The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as subversive and the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Helping to develop seminars to train lawyers for these cases will be William M. Kunstler of New York who also specializes in

helping radicals. He recently received a favorable write-up in *Life* magazine which pictured him as the "soul brother to radicals of many colors," who trust him because of his ten years of involvement with "civil rights from Martin Luther King and the Freedom Riders in the South to Malcolm X and Rap Brown." The article states that Kunstler, whose middle name is Moses, receives no fees from most of his clients "but is financed by a number of private, anonymous donors."

It was suggested by a Panther backer that they will probably change their name as they bring together a "united front" and will become the "American Liberation Front." This was announced before the conference by Prof. Donald Freed, founder of the organization known as "Friends of the Panthers." He expected that the name would be formally announced at the conference, stating: "This is a revolutionary conference which will be the beginning of the American liberation movement." He stated that Panther organizers have been working from Harlem to the Mississippi Delta, as well as in Appalachia, where poor southern whites are being organized around local issues. The organizers are also working with Puerto Ricans, American Indians, the Yippies, college students and urban gangs, all to be drawn into the ALF.

The Communist Party gave the directives to the comrades for cooperation and involvement through the words of Carl Bloice in the *People's World* of June 14:

"Two remarkably similar soundings were made during the last week of May.

"In the Bay Area, the Black Panther party issued a call for a 'Revolutionary Conference for a United Front Against Fascism.'

"In Edwards, Miss., about the same time, the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF) observed, 'A repressive fascist-like society and police state is an ominous, threatening possibility.'

"The SCEF statement continued: 'Let us all who advocate social change reject factionalism and infighting and unite instead against the common foe of reaction and repression in all its guises.'

"It is for these reasons that the Panthers and the SCEF leaders are to be highly commended for their call for unity in the face of reaction. All people of good will, sanity and good intention should respond immediately and favorably. (These are Communist Party orders—Ed.)

"It is both refreshing and relieving to hear militant forces call for the kind of united mass action designed to draw in greater numbers of working people and their organizations. It would be truly wonderful if these forces—which have proved they do not shrink before terror—speak loudly enough and persistently enough to minimize the advocates of adventurist acts by a handful of 'theorists'—separated from working people—in the face of the power of the state.

"Of greatest importance and urgency at the moment is action to halt and turn back the reactionary offensive. . . . Every militant must be defended with a massive show of force and power—regardless of his or her political position.

"These things will not be accomplished by insisting on ideological purity on the part of those in struggle, but rather on commitment to do these things and to work with others dedicated to these tasks.

"Dimitroff wrote, 'Whoever does not fight the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie and the growth of fascism at these preparatory stages is not in a position to prevent the victory of fascism, but, on the contrary, facilitates that victory.'

The Black Panther, organ of the party of the same name, also quotes Georgi Dimitroff in the center fold of its June 7, 1969, issue: "Incipient American fascism is endeavor-

ing to direct the disillusionment and discontent of these masses into reactionary fascist channels. It is a peculiarity of the development of American fascism that at the present state it appears principally in the guise of an opposition to fascism, which it accuses of being an 'un-American' tendency imported from abroad. In contradistinction to German fascism, which acts under anti-constitutional slogans, American fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian and 'American democracy' . . .

"And what would the success of fascism in the United States entail? For the toiling masses it would, of course, entail the unrestrained strengthening of the regime of exploitation and the destruction of the working class movement. . .

"It is perfectly obvious that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay. It must at the proper time find ways and suitable forms of preventing fascism from winning over the broad discontented masses of the toilers. And here it must be said that under American conditions the creation of a mass party of toilers, a 'Workers' and Farmers' Party,' might serve as such a suitable form. . . . Such a party, of course, will be neither Socialist nor Communist. But it MUST be an anti-fascist party and must NOT be an anti-Communist party. . . .

"It goes without saying that such a party will fight for the election of its own candidates to local offices, to the state legislatures, to the House of Representatives and the Senate. . . . The question of forming a "Workers' and Farmers' Party," and its program, should be discussed at mass meetings of the people. We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it. In no case must the initiative of organizing the party to be allowed to pass to elements desirous of utilizing the discontent of the masses which have become disillusioned to both the Bourgeois parties, Democratic and Republican, in order to create a "third party" in the United States, as an anti-Communist party, a party directed against the revolutionary movement. (Excerpt from speech delivered at the seventh world congress of the Communist International July 24th, August 20th, 1935, by Georgi Dimitroff)"

Always in the last stages of revolution, the Communists plan, promote and organize a united front or people's front of all left groups. Under these circumstances, and in these final stages they no longer quarrel among themselves and are willing to overlook differences. This was manifest in the attempted take-over of the Dominican Republic a few years back when Castroites, orthodox Communists, Maoists and Trotskyites all worked together under a single leadership. The Panthers are being used as the catalyst to unite these dissident radical forces here in the United States. Tom Hayden, conference leader and SDS founder, admits the new "United Front" is patterned after the Communist United Front of the 1930's.

In an interview with "six young black men" who came into the New York office of the Communist paper, the Daily World, Margit Pittmen learned their plans and wrote:

"All six are leading members of the Black Panther Party, who devote their full time to 'the revolution.'"

"In recent months, a period of stepped-up police attacks, the Panthers have increasingly felt the need for alliances with other groups. We hope that the conference will unite all radical and liberal elements," said Ray 'Masai' Hewitt. . .

"We want to embrace all progressive elements," I was told, "all national group minorities. We appeal to every liberal and progressive. . ."

"The Panthers hope that the July conference will result in another, larger gathering later this year so that, in the words of

one of our visitors, it can unite all forces that are anti-fascist but not anti-communist."

The Panthers' Minister of Information, Eldridge Cleaver, was not present at their July conference as he has fled the country to escape prosecution. He was in Algiers at the time of the conference where he and his wife were the guests of the Algerian government. They were there to attend an African Cultural Festival and were joined by two other officials of the Black Panther Party, Emory Douglas (Minister of Culture) and David Hilliard (Chief of Staff) they were also joined by Robert Scheer, editor in chief of Ramparts magazine who said that Cleaver was the magazine's foreign editor. Cleaver was quoted as predicting that violence in the United States would increase stating: "We have a war going on in the United States and the casualty rate is rising," and adding that the capitalist system in the United States "must be dismantled over the dead bodies of its supporters."

Cleaver has previously been quoted as stating: "We are revolutionaries, and as revolutionaries our goal is the transformation of the American social order. In order to transform the American social order, we have to destroy the present structure of power in the United States, we have to overthrow the government. . . . Revolutionaries must have their minds centered on destruction. We're out to destroy the present machinery of the ruling class, that is our task and that's what we must be about. And we say that we will do this by any means necessary. . . . The only means possible is the violent overthrow of the machinery of the oppressive ruling class. . . . We must destroy their institutions from which they derive their power. . . . We must not get into a bag of thinking that we're involved in a game. A revolution is not a game; it's war. We're involved in a war—a people's war against those who oppress the people, and this is the war in the clearest sense of the word."

The slogan of the National Conference for a United Front Against Fascism was Power to the People—Panther Power to the Vanguard. At the opening of the conference they shouted it, at the closing of the conference they shouted it. "Power to the people," they shouted. "Power to the people." They made it a chant and they used it again and again. When they did, their arms shot into the air with their fists clenched. . . . N.Y. Times 7/20/69.

The first meeting was held in the Oakland Auditorium with Black Panther guards on duty. All persons were searched before being permitted to enter thus delaying the start of the meeting for over an hour. Starting the next day public meetings were held in Bobby Hutton Park, named for a 17-year-old Black Panther killed in a shoot-out with the Oakland Police. According to "observers," the choice of this site was interpreted as a move to bring whites and blacks together in a common cause. There seems to be a psychological reason for everything the Communist-led radicals do. The Black Panthers "breakfast for children" program is "socialism in action." The Berkeley park struggle caused people to see themselves attacking private property. These things condition the unwary to things they would not otherwise accept. The proposed "North American Brigade to Cut Cane in the 1960 Sugar Harvest in Cuba" will condition them even further. Their experience in Cuba is expected to help them "develop ways of combatting anti-communism." They are expected to "gain a practical understanding of the creative application of communist principles on a day-to-day basis." Nothing is left to chance with the Communist—everything is scientifically planned.

What it's all about can most clearly be seen from the Statement of Revolutionary Youth Movement (SDS):

"(1) Oppose white supremacy. Full support to the National Liberation struggles of

the oppressed peoples against U.S. imperialism. . . . We recognize and support the struggle of the Vietnamese people, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh and the NLF as the spearhead of all anti-imperialist struggles in the world today.

"As revolutionaries within the oppressor nation, we unhesitatingly assume our responsibility to carry the struggle against U.S. imperialism through to the end by linking our fight to the international struggles of the oppressed peoples by consistently opposing white supremacy . . . and by giving concrete support to the struggles of Black, Latin and other oppressed peoples within the U.S. for democratic rights. . . .

"As revolutionaries in the oppressor nation, we recognize our responsibility, in the name of proletarian internationalism, to support and learn from the proletarian forces within the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples.

"(2) Oppose male supremacy. . . . We support the struggle of women for control over their bodies, and demand the removal of all legal and financial restrictions on abortions, and the providing of free birth control for those women who desire it. . . . We demand complete legal equality for women, and oppose existing marriage and divorce laws, prostitution laws and other reinforcements of the subjugation of women. . . .

"(3) Support for armed struggle. Recognizing that U.S. imperialism is the most voracious beast that ever stalked the earth, that it is engaged in crimes of blood against humankind, and it can only be destroyed by the people of the world picking up the sword and fighting it, we affirm the right of all revolutionary peoples and classes to wage armed struggles for liberation, we commit ourselves to give concrete aid to these struggles where they arise, and we undertake to educate the U.S. people and prepare them and ourselves to wage a determined struggle with arms in hand to destroy U.S. imperialism in its lair.

"(4) Exclude anti-communism. Recognizing that anti-communism is a main weapon of the ruling class to weaken the ranks of the people, we absolutely reject it, exclude it from our movement, and defend the right of people to organize themselves into disciplined collectives based on Marxist-Leninist principles, and to advocate and fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"(5) Fight for socialism. Recognizing that only through socialism, the public ownership of the means of producing wealth, can the people be freed from misery, we declare ourselves a socialist movement, and undertake to conduct propaganda among the people to win them to the need to establish socialism."

This is pure Communism in action. The beasts are joining hands with the planners. The Black Panthers and affiliated Negro groups will use the guns and supply the terror; the S.D.S., DuBois Clubs, etc. will raise the funds and involve the students; the "New Left" (750,000) like sheep will follow the leaders; and behind the scenes the International Communist Conspiracy will plan and direct the action. The open revolution is close at hand.

MITCHELL BLOCKED FINCH'S MOVE ON ANTI-INTEGRATION PRO- POSAL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, if the thesis of the article by columnists Rowland

August 7, 1969

Evans and Robert Novak in Wednesday's Washington Post is accurate, further serious questions about the intentions of the Nixon administration—particularly Attorney General Mitchell—on civil rights matters is raised. These columnists report that the decision of the administration to refrain from taking a position on the anticivil rights provisions written into the House-passed Labor-HEW appropriations bill was the work of the Attorney General.

Assuming the article's accuracy, we have once again witnessed a capitulation by this administration to the forces of segregation and reaction. If the administration must give away Federal equal-opportunity programs as a political payoff to the South for votes in last November's election, it at least should not publicly compromise its integrity by saying one thing on civil rights while doing the opposite.

The evidence is mounting, Mr. Speaker. The Nixon administration is compiling an anticivil rights record which threatens to wipe out many of the hard-won gains of the past decade. One might have expected more from a President elected under the banner of the party of Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on national television last Sunday, I am terribly disappointed by the decision of the administration not to take a public position on the Whitten amendment. There is no question that the provisions of that measure are intended to cripple the school desegregation program carried out under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Adoption of the provision would perpetuate unequal educational opportunity and continue the shortchanging of black children—especially in the South. I would hope, therefore, that the administration will realize the folly and immorality inherent in this decision, reconsider the matter, and publicly oppose the Whitten amendment while the bill is being considered in the Senate and later during the conference committee sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks, the Evans and Novak column to which I have referred:

MITCHELL BLOCKED FINCH'S MOVE ON ANTI-INTEGRATION PROPOSAL

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The reason why the Nixon administration tolerated house passage last week of an amendment designed to cripple school desegregation was the undercover intervention of Atty. Gen. John Mitchell, the strong man of the Cabinet.

Mitchell blocked a move by Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), to put the Nixon administration on record against the anti-integration proposal of Mississippi's Rep. Jamie Whitten. In fact, Mitchell made a special, highly secret visit to Capitol Hill to make sure that Republican leaders did not turn against the Whitten amendment. Because of this, the Whitten amendment narrowly carried.

The upshot transcends just one more victory for John Mitchell and one more defeat for Bob Finch inside the administration. Rather, this is a necessary triumph for Mitchellism—the attorney general's grand design of combining the 1968 Nixon and Wallace votes into a national Republican majority. Vital to Mitchellism is a civil rights

policy that placates the South but does not offend northern whites.

Whitten's rider to the educational appropriations bill fulfills that requirement. While ostensibly aimed against busing school children (which arouses equal outrage in North and South), it would hamstring the Federal Government in forcing southern desegregation through withholding of federal money.

In preparation for last week's battle, pro-civil rights Republicans in the House some two weeks ago requested help from Finch's HEW. They were assured aid would be forthcoming—a public statement to be issued by Finch. Indeed, White House lobbyists expected to be working against the Whitten amendment.

A statement by Finch opposing the amendment was drafted at HEW on Friday, July 25, and—because the Justice Department shares responsibility for school desegregation policy with HEW—sent to Justice for Mitchell's co-signature. There it stopped cold. On Monday, July 28, Mitchell not only refused to sign the statement but prevented it from seeing the light of day.

That put the administration into a position of benevolent neutrality toward the Whitten amendment. Paying an unusual visit to a secret meeting of the House Republican leadership on Tuesday morning, July 29, in the minority whip office just hours before the appropriations bill came up on the House floor, Mitchell explicitly pronounced this position: the administration would not interfere with the Whitten amendment.

That doomed any hope of defeating Whitten. When liberal Republican congressmen asked what had happened to the promised statement from Finch, they were told lamely that Finch was in California (true enough) and unreachable (highly implausible). One such congressman pleading for help against the Whitten amendment was told by Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan: "If it goes to a roll call, it's going to embarrass a lot of guys."

Thus attempts to reject the Whitten amendment were beaten on Thursday, 158 to 141, on a teller vote where no record is kept—thereby avoiding a roll call. Had the administration and Republican leadership taken a position, Whitten unquestionably would have been beaten.

This has left a wretched taste not only with the splinter of Republican liberals but such moderate conservatives as William McCulloch of Ohio, Albert Quile of Minnesota, Tom Railsback of Illinois, Edward Blester of Pennsylvania, and one member of the party leadership caucus, chairman John Anderson, Illinois (who spoke eloquently on the House floor against the Whitten amendment.)

Such Republican discontent plus the absence of Finch in California and President Nixon in Asia when Mitchell was laying down policy provides a little hope for civil rights forces at HEW. At any rate, Finch now intends to fight the Whitten amendment in the Senate.

But even if the Whitten amendment does not make it all the way through Congress, Mitchell's benevolent neutrality toward it is in itself of great significance. "I believe a fundamental decision has been made," says Congressman Anderson. That decision: the courts, not the executive branch will be given the job of enforcing school desegregation—a concept fully compatible with the Whitten amendment.

This historic shift means not only that the pace of school desegregation will slow dramatically (the Nixon administration's Georgia court suit will take years to settle) but that the federal judges, not President Nixon, will be blamed when it finally comes. These results could help satisfy the crucial but vulnerable requirement of Mitchellism that the Nixon administration please 1968 Wallace voters enough to enlist them in a new majority.

MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEMS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, I had the great privilege and pleasure to address a meeting of the Seafarers International Union gathered here in Washington for a week-long annual convention. Because I believe a strong, expanded merchant marine is vital to the economy and growth of our Nation, I would like to share with my colleagues a portion of the remarks I made before that convention last Thursday. I want to bring these remarks and the facts therein to the attention of my colleagues, because I believe the decline of the merchant marine is a national tragedy and the problems of the merchant marine are the problems of the Nation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

I am very happy to be here with my friends of the Seafarers International Union. I feel at home with the Seafarers because I come from a seafaring district in a seafaring State. The economy of Massachusetts was originally based on sea trade and the most exciting history of the colonies in the early days of the Union stemmed from shipping and sea trade. I am particularly happy to see here Paul Hall, your great President, the leader of the Seafarers, a man who knows the problems and potential of the Merchant Marine. I am also very happy to be here with my good friend, Phil Carlip. Phil, I think, is probably the greatest advocate that the Seafarers and all the maritime trade unions could possible ever have. He knows about everything connected with the Merchant Marine. He persuades, argues, defends and when necessary, attacks. He is a valued friend because he is a loyal friend, and he is a valuable source of information because the facts are always with him, always dependable and always documented. Phil Carlip is to the maritime trade what Martin Luther King was to civil rights. The Speaker and I, and all those concerned with the problems of the Merchant Marine, consult him often and look to him for sound advice.

It seems to me, when I am talking to my colleagues or to the public, that I should not have to go into long, detailed discussions about the needs of the Merchant Marine—the situation is clear, the problems are obvious. And yet there must be a great deal more talking done because we have been unable to change the great decline of the Merchant Marine. There is no doubt about it—the Merchant Marine *must* have a new program, *must* have funds and *must* have more defenders.

Today the Merchant Marine is less than one fifth the size it was twenty years ago. Today, almost 95% of all our foreign commerce is carried by ships flying foreign flags. Today four-fifths of American merchant ships came out of shipyards during World War II—that means they are at least twenty-five years old, and today the American shipbuilding industry is 14th in the world ranking. That is where we are. And there may be those that think it matters little, but I think the Merchant Marine is of great importance to the Nation. I have always considered it to be the fourth branch of our defense effort. We know from prior and almost bitter experience that these ships can fill defense needs and are easily converted to serve in time of war. With the current "balance of terror," strength will not be measured in more and more nuclear weapons, but in a

strong, healthy population and a strong, healthy economy. A large, expanded, active and powerful Merchant Marine is the one factor that is missing from our economy. Without such a Merchant Marine, we will lose more and more of the world trade and our balance of payment problems will be aggravated.

We must act now. Shipyards are closing. Those that were thriving twenty years ago have been closed down. We are losing men with vital skills to other jobs and to other fields. It is reasonable to expect that if there is no work for them, they will leave. And if we wait too much longer, we won't have people around to teach a new generation of workers these vital skills. Men can't afford to stay in the maritime trades because they love the sea and their jobs, they still must feed their families. They will go wherever the work is. We will lose these men. When we need them, we won't be able to call on them.

If we don't act now, we will have a technological gap. Shipyards of other Nations are using and will utilize modern technology; the competition will get fiercer and fiercer. If we don't move now, if we don't start using this modern technology, we will be farther and farther behind.

So, my friends, I say the problems are obvious and the need for a solution is obvious. So what must we do? First, of all, I believe we need an independent maritime administration with a maritime policy. The maritime administration must not continue to be the step-child of Departments that consider its needs last. It must have independent status, and it must have a program—a full both short and long-term program to rebuild the Merchant Marine and bring it back up to where it ought to be. We must develop maritime technology. There should be research in the development of small atomic reactors for merchant ships. We must modernize the naval yards. We must investigate, research, improve and use modern means of shipbuilding. We must provide new merchant ships to the unsubsidized fleet as well as to the subsidized. That way we will liven the industry with competition. We have looked at and know we must change the cargo preference laws. We want the industry to grow, we want more ships and we don't want to give all the cargo to just a few of these. For if we carry out all these programs, there will be plenty of cargo to go around for a fleet five times that of today.

This is what has to be done. What have we done so far? Last year we debated, persuaded, argued, fought, and finally succeeded in passing a bill to create an independent maritime administration. We passed it overwhelmingly, and we lost it to a pocket veto. We will try again. President Nixon appears not to have any maritime policy—although the Republican Platform promised us the world. But we will try again. We had a strong merchant marine program in the Democratic Platform, too, and the Democrats in the House of Representatives intend to see that the promises in that Platform are honored.

One hundred and forty Members of the 91st Congress have sponsored legislation to create an independent maritime administration. The Omnibus Maritime legislation introduced last year has been reintroduced and will hopefully be enacted in this Congress. There has been a great deal of varied legislation to stimulate growth and competition in the shipping industry. I am happy to tell you that in the Military Construction Appropriations of 1970, which was just before me in the Rules Committee, we are providing the first funds for shipyard modernization. Not enough funds, I contend, but a commitment at least, a start. Much more needs to be done, and I call on you to help see that it is done.

Keep the pressure on, keep information coming in. Remind your Representatives that other world powers, especially Russia, are building Merchant Marines as if it were the only mode of transportation left to the world. We should do the same. Hold the parties to their campaign platform. Don't let up. Don't give up. Together I hope and believe, we can bring new life to the Merchant Marine. Not life in some distant future, but here and now.

VIOLENCE AND EDUCATION

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, during these days of chaos and crime in our streets, it is refreshing and interesting to hear strong but sensible words from our Nation's foremost law-enforcement officer. A recent speech by Los Angeles County District Attorney Evelle J. Younger should be carefully listened to by every American.

Mr. Younger was elected as district attorney in November of 1964 and was reelected in June of 1968.

He has served as both a practicing attorney and a law instructor. He has additionally authored numerous articles and has been active in many community volunteer fields.

It is with a great amount of pleasure that I present the remarks of District Attorney Evelle Younger:

VIOLENCE AND EDUCATION

(By Evelle J. Younger, district attorney of Los Angeles County, at the Law Day exercises, Glendale Civic Auditorium, May 1, 1969)

Ten years ago, violence was one subject, education was another. Today, unfortunately, this is no longer true. We all must be shocked, amazed and discouraged at the present state of affairs. How did it come to pass? In my opinion these are the ingredients that produce violence and destruction on campus at all levels of the educational establishment from grade school through graduate school.

First, we live in a permissive society. Many Americans have apparently believed that the best way to preserve our ideals and institutions is to constantly attack them. I believe, in recent years, we have been unduly tolerant toward those in our midst who perpetrated illegal and often violent acts. There has been a tendency on the part of many an individual to act as though he was his own Supreme Court. Many persons have adopted the attitude that they will obey such laws they like and ignore those they don't. Assaultive behavior has been permitted on many a campus that would not have been tolerated on skid row. The college newspaper at one of our great universities editorially urged students to smoke marijuana in defiance of a law making such an act a felony. Prominent professors, ministers, and professional men have repeatedly urged young people to disobey laws they consider to be immoral. Is it any wonder that many young people are convinced they can make their own rules?

And the irony of it—a professor in our community has for several years advocated that violence was justified if the end that was being sought was a noble one. During a recent incident at one of our local colleges in Los Angeles County, he took shelter in his

locked office as rampaging students took over the building. He was among the first of the faculty to phone and demand police protection. He is brilliant in some respects but too confused to appreciate the possible connection between his earlier pronouncements and present student misconduct.

Secondly, we must face the fact that some of our schools are substandard. Our educational system isn't perfect. Education isn't always relevant, if I may borrow a word used with monotonous regularity by the militant often without knowing what it means. Many times when students protest and demonstrate, they have a legitimate beef. Unfortunately, our worst schools are often in areas where they need the best facilities and teachers. In Los Angeles County in some of our low income areas, attended mostly by children of minority groups, the dropout rate is extremely high. Rarely does a student go on to college. Apart from considerations of humanity and justice, we cannot afford to allow this to continue. Ninety-five per cent of the inmates of prisons throughout this land are high school dropouts. A dropout with no salable talent is most likely to end up on relief or in trouble with the law. Enlightened self-interest should compel us to take whatever steps are necessary to insure that every youngster in our nation gets a good enough education to allow him to get and keep a job.

In that connection, it is not possible; but, it would be logical if we could move say, Beverly Hills High School, to East Los Angeles and one of the schools in the eastside to Beverly Hills. With the superior facilities and personnel, we might raise the educational level on the eastside without doing major damage to Beverly Hills youngsters. Beverly Hills youngsters generally come from successful families where there is no language problem. When those students start to school, they have pride and ambition; and relatively speaking, they will do well in any educational institution. A child from a depressed area, from a family with limited education and an unstable employment history at best (often, parents on relief or in penal institutions, at worst), starts school with little chance, hope or even desire of getting that high school diploma. If you add a language problem, the child's chances are nil.

Thirdly, administrators, from the college president on down to the junior high school principal, are, generally, untrained and completely unqualified to cope with the problems they are facing today. As one high school principal stated the other day, if he wanted to fight, he could join the army. In virtually every major university in the country today, armed guards are on duty at the entrance to the president's office. This is disturbing and not at all in keeping with the traditions of scholarly life. Historically, one going into the teaching profession had reason to expect a relatively tranquil existence. The teaching profession has never paid a lot of money and professors don't expect to get rich. But they generally have, in the past, found happiness and gratification in what was a relatively calm and peaceful existence providing opportunity to serve and enrich our nation by imparting knowledge. That is all changed. Teachers now are frequently the victims of assaultive behavior—often the subject of violent obscene behavior and criticism from those they serve. Even if a teacher could physically cope with some of the problems, his or her right to do so has been eroded in recent years.

By the same token, we haven't trained many principals or college presidents in such subjects as mob psychology, guerrilla tactics and such things as they may necessarily have to know now if they are now to be effective. Being untrained in this regard it is natural that many sometimes exercise poor judg-

ment. For example, there is a general tendency to underreact to violence and threats of violence. Too often a college administrator will hesitate to call for police assistance in the early stages of a potentially violent situation when violence might be prevented. Too often, professors or students advise, "Don't call the police, you will just antagonize a great many students and make the situation worse." Well, I recall the first time that approach was used. The then Chief of Police, William Parker, Head of the Los Angeles Police Department, was told, just prior to the Watts Riots by a number of ministers and others who considered themselves community leaders, that they would keep the situation calm and reduce tensions if only the Chief would not move his forces into the area. The Chief certainly and understandably wishing to avoid violence if possible and believing that the community leaders might have some influence on the situation (which as it developed, they didn't), accepted the advice and kept the police forces out. That decision may well have been the major cause of the Watts Riots. Looking back now, all law enforcement in our community is in general agreement that it was a mistake not to apply massive but restrained force—police force—to the area immediately. Let me add, I am not criticizing Chief Parker. After all, he had no experience handling a major riot. Neither had any other chief of police in the nation at that time. We learn by our mistakes in the past. Hopefully and presumably, our police forces would not underreact if a similar situation arose again.

Presumably, after learning the hard way, a high school or college administrator would call in police forces at an appropriate time without waiting for the situation to get out of hand. In that connection, academicians, who generally and properly abhor violence and shun the physical as opposed to verbal approach, seem to be learning that there is no such thing as an insignificant crime. There is no such thing as a harmless violation of the law. If you permit students to lock a college president in his office without punishment, where do you draw the line? Do you allow a student to physically attack a teacher if he only breaks a nose and causes no permanent injury? Will he be permitted to set fire to the administration building so long as he does damage to only one or two offices? How many buildings must the students occupy before action is taken? College presidents and academicians generally would answer these questions a lot differently today than they would have ten years ago. I believe that most people have come to realize that while dissidents have a right to be heard, they do not have a right to accomplish by force what they fail to accomplish by persuasion. I believe the tragic death of Senator Kennedy may have persuaded many who were not previously convinced that violence cannot be tolerated. It is frighteningly obvious that a political assassination is a logical extension of blocking doorways, destroying property, or setting fire to school buildings. The only difference between hitting a teacher in the nose and killing a United States Senator is one of degree.

As a matter of fact, it is apparent that many persons, with responsibilities in connection with their educational institutions in this country, would like to have a chance to do some things over that they did some time ago. The Regents, for example, at the University of California, would certainly vote differently today than they did vote five to ten years ago on certain major issues. A member of the L.A. City Board of Education, who shall remain nameless, made a confession to me the other day. Some months ago, when we indicted certain individuals, including one school teacher, for what we charged is a criminal conspiracy in connection with the eastside school blowouts, the teacher was

suspended from teaching duties which was the procedure up to that time. There were a number of demonstrations and sit-ins and the Board was subject to a good deal of pressure by a militant minority of students and adults from the eastside. As a result, the Board voted to reinstate the teacher. This was clearly a victory for the militants. This Board member told me that he now realizes that he made a mistake and would like to have a chance to vote over on the issue.

The fourth ingredient that goes to make up the total picture are the teenagers. Today's teenager is different than any of his predecessors. Teenagers today are firmly convinced that they know more than their parents or adults generally about the problems that confront us. You say, "So what's new, I thought the same thing when I was a teenager." Well, the thing that makes the difference is the fact that today's teenager may be right. The knowledge gap between today's teenager and the adult population is narrower than it has ever been before. To put it another way, we have produced the best educated teenage generation in this or any other country since the beginning of time. And, of course, as might be anticipated, while they are generally willing to admit their brilliance and high level of education, they give no credit or see no causal connection between that happy state and the much maligned educational system which produced them; and they certainly give no credit to that much maligned group, their elders, who financed it. In any event, while they are highly educated, their judgment probably is no better than my judgment or your judgment was when we were teenagers. So you start with that and add to it the time factor. Today's teenager not only has the educational background, but he has the opportunity and time required to critically examine all of the adult institutions and activities. We certainly give them plenty to criticize because we have made many mistakes. There is much wrong with our society. We have had over fifty wars of varying sizes and shapes throughout the world since World War II ended and we are now engaged in a very difficult and unpopular war in Vietnam.

Today's teenager has lived constantly with the knowledge that if World War III breaks out, our nation, the most powerful in the history of the world, might see 50 million of our countrymen killed. The draft and an 80-100 billion annual military budget seem to be permanent fixtures. We have social problems throughout our nation, problems in big cities that seem insurmountable. There is no question but that we have done less than a perfect job in solving the problems that beset us. I don't think we have done any worse job, of course, than our fathers or our grandfathers or our great-grandfathers did in problem solving; but, as I say, we didn't have as much time, when we were teenagers as does the present teenage generation, to critically examine the mistakes that were made by the adult establishments.

You must understand that I am not one of those who believes that a student ought to be forced to walk six miles to school through high snow drifts in order to become a worthwhile individual. I, for example, grew up in Hastings, Nebraska, and I delivered the Omaha World Herald at five o'clock in the morning, winter and summer, sometimes when the temperature was ten or fifteen degrees below zero, and I don't think it did a darn thing for my character. I think I would have been better off home in bed. I would have made better grades and learned more in school. The fact is that I had to work my way through school as did most of you. Today's teenager, today's college student, is usually either receiving a generous allowance from home or is on a full tuition scholarship with his education being financed by the Federal government, state government or some private foundation. In any event, he has time

to study; he has time to contemplate; and he has had time to develop the art of criticism as it has never been developed before.

So, you have the highly-educated teenager with time on his hands and a high degree of social consciousness and impatience with what appears to be too slow progress in solving people problems, and you have a group of teenagers that are easy prey to the professional troublemakers.

That is the next ingredient, the professional troublemakers. You find them on every campus either as students or as persons from off campus who have just come to help the students resolve some of their problems. You will find them involved in every act of violence, every campus disturbance. If, for example, you have five hundred students in a belligerent mood, marching toward the administration building, you will find these professional troublemakers in front of the five hundred. Who are they? Well, a very few will be professional, dedicated Communists who know exactly what they are doing. They are highly trained, motivated and are carrying out preconceived plans to disrupt the campus and all parts of the educational and governmental machine. There are not many of them and they couldn't carry off a violent demonstration by themselves unless they were backed up by a great many young people whose hearts are pure, whose motives are of the highest, whose judgment is faulty and who have somehow become involved in violent and criminal conduct without knowing really quite how it happened. Alongside the Communists, you will have a few professional revolutionaries—a few hate-filled, dedicated extremists—who couldn't care less about communism. But, they are headed in the same direction as the Communists. They want to destroy our governmental and educational systems. They regard our society as a racist society and they argue that it can't be changed, that it can only be destroyed.

The Communists and the revolutionaries alone can't do much damage. Out of a group of five hundred, there will probably be a very small percentage that will fit into those categories. The vast majority, probably 475, are young people, mostly students, who, if they survive these dangerous days and these traumatic experiences without any serious injury or prosecution, will become responsible, productive adults, productive in the sense of contributing to society. I am not talking in terms of money. Most of them will eventually get married and settle down and start thinking in terms of buying their own home and raising a family and putting a little aside so that the kids can go to college. This is part of the traditional American dream. Man has been thinking along those lines since he first moved out of the trees into caves. But, meantime, these are trying times for the youngsters as well as the adults. They are impatient, they are frustrated, they are discouraged, they are anxious to contribute, and, as I say, they too often fall easy prey to professional troublemakers.

To all of this we add one other ingredient and it is the fact that if teenagers are different today, so are teachers. Traditionally, a teacher was completely devoted and dedicated to the profession. It was regarded as a high calling. No amount of deprivation or discomfort was unbearable to a dedicated school teacher. Salary was of little consequence. If adequate physical facilities were not available, the teacher suffered but didn't quit, didn't protest unduly. Those days are gone forever. Now, teachers are demanding, and I think properly so, that they be paid a decent wage and be given reasonable working conditions. They, too, ought to be able to own a home and send their kids to college. And like nurses and members of other professions that traditionally have never organized on the basis of self-interest, they are now doing so; and in certain cases,

where it is necessary, some of them are even going on strike. The problem is often that you will have a teacher's strike and a student demonstration going on at the same time and the situation is that much more dangerous and explosive.

You put these all together and they spell trouble, big trouble; trouble that is not going to be ended soon. I think I have described the problem accurately. I have raised the questions. I wish I could describe the solution as well as I can describe the problem. There is no simple, easy solution. I do, however, suggest one thing. We must adopt an attitude without which there can be no permanent solution. I suggest that this attitude will have to reflect the firm convictions of all the responsible citizens. Maybe commitment is a better word than attitude but we must be completely and utterly devoted to the proposition that we are going to achieve needed social reform and, at the same time, insist upon obedience to the rule of law. There is no question but that social progress has been slow and must be speeded up. There is no question that there has been prejudice and discrimination in many areas, including the educational field, which must be eliminated, completely and quickly. We must admit our mistakes and our shortcomings and pour the necessary money, talent and dedication into a massive effort to effect necessary changes. But, we must, at the same time, recognize that there can be no social progress except in an environment where law and order prevails. It is equally true, of course, that without social progress we cannot maintain permanent peace and tranquility in our nation. We cannot hire enough policemen to provide security unless we take steps to eliminate the basic causes of much of the dissatisfaction felt by the young people and other citizens today. While admitting our shortcomings, and acknowledging the necessity for improvement, we are going to get rid of our inferiority complex and stop apologizing to students and everyone else when we call for an application of police power to maintain law and order.

The law enforcement profession is the second oldest profession. As soon as man started to move around and meet other men from other tribes, he found himself vulnerable. There was always somebody with a bigger club or with a stronger arm to take his wife or cave away from him. So people hired policemen to do for them what they could not do for themselves. Police are still performing the same function today. They are protecting lives and property. Were it not for the police, a man with the toughest gang or the most guns could take our lives or our homes or our property. The police prevent it. The police preserve and protect lives and property and their obligation doesn't end at the edge of the campus. Lives and property on campus are just as precious as off campus. Furthermore, we must get rid of our inferiority complex and our guilt feeling about something that happened many years ago. We must insist that everyone, whatever their color, whatever their religion, no matter that they may have been the victim of prejudice or discrimination, notwithstanding the fact that our great-great-great-grandparents may have been cruel to their great-great-great-grandparents, obey the law. We must say, "We are sorry and we are going to try to solve some of our problems. But while we do, everyone—man, woman and child, black, brown, yellow or white—is going to follow the rules. And where there is a violation, we will move promptly and vigorously to apprehend and prosecute the persons who commit the violation." In other words, we are making a total commitment to social progress within the framework of law and order.

And our citizens, particularly our young citizens, will face a brighter future because of our insistence upon obedience to the law.

The world they take over will be a better world. It certainly is an imperfect world now; our government is not a perfect government—it is just the best ever devised by the mind of man. And our educational system isn't perfect; it is just the best in the world. We educate more people and educate them better than in any other place in the world. We recognize shortcomings and will try to improve them. But we are absolutely committed to the proposition that improvement will take place within the framework of law and order. No one ever improved an educational institution by burning down the buildings on campus. No youngster ever got an education carrying a sign on the sidewalk in front of his school.

THOMAS E. McNETT—VICTIM OF
BURBANK TRAGEDY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a shock-tragic occurrence on July 30 in Burbank, Calif., took the life of Thomas E. McNett, president of district 727 of the AFL-CIO International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Union.

In the space of a half hour in a senseless and brutal act, Tom McNett and two workers at the Lockheed-California plant were shot by Isaac Jernigan, Jr., a templatemaker at Lockheed and a member of district 727 union. Jernigan descended on his Lockheed supervisor, Howard Domonoske, at the plant; shot and killed him. Eluding police units who were searching for him, he made his way on foot to union headquarters where Tom McNett and Leonard Nolan were sharing after-meeting refreshments with about 75 members of the district's retirement club. Jernigan shot McNett three times. He lived but a few moments. Nolan died instantly while attempting to halt the killer.

Jernigan had been charged with repeated safety violations by his supervisor, Domonoske. The union had intervened in his behalf with Lockheed. On the morning of the tragedy he had been reprimanded for still another safety violation. Apparently, his grievances against these charges triggered his deranged mind and led him to commit these murders. He is being held by the local authorities.

I had no personal acquaintanceship with Nolan and Domonoske, but I knew Tom McNett well. I am pained at their deaths and terribly distressed over the way they had to die. Mr. Speaker, it is fearful to contemplate the ease with which an unbalanced person can find the means to commit such a horrible deed. One can only hope that preventive action can be taken in some way to keep guns out of the hands of unstable people.

Tom McNett was a wonderful person. For 35 years he labored in the service of the International Association of Machinists. Just a few days before his death he had received word of his appointment to the grand lodge staff of General Vice

President Robert Simpson. He was to assume his new duties on August 15. In the years that he served district 727, real progress that substantially benefited the membership was made under his leadership.

In commenting on the tragedy, the officers of Lockheed, in a special bulletin, said that they "have always had the highest regard for Tom McNett, considering him an outstanding union leader—that his loss will be felt personally by many members of the organization." Other messages of condolence and respect poured in from union members, and Government and community leaders throughout the Los Angeles area.

Tom McNett's death is a sadly tragic, untimely, and unnecessary loss to his family, friends, and associates. He will be sorely missed in the community. His devoted and effective efforts in behalf of the union membership will always be remembered. The remarkable leadership qualities which he possessed and his outstanding capabilities made it possible for the union and the management of the aerospace industry to work in harmony and in the best interests of all concerned.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to his family, with the hope that time will lift their sorrow, and that the memories of an exceptional person will bring solace to them.

ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE POLLUTION:
A NEW THREAT TO SANITY

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as we focus attention on the traditional values of clean air, pure water, and beautiful scenery, and as we determine to protect and to improve these aspects of our environment, there is one element we may neglect—that of quiet.

Dr. Donald F. Anthrop, an active conservationist and distinguished chemist, has been analyzing the stresses of noise on persons and on property and investigating means of noise abatement.

In the May 1969 bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Dr. Anthrop reminds us how insidiously noise has invaded our homes, our cities, our highways, and the space above us. He cautions especially about the noise hazards of the supersonic transport plane and the offense our military authorities perpetrate in refusing to follow civilian efforts to lessen aircraft noise levels.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Dr. Anthrop's article at this point of the RECORD, and hope that it will receive my colleagues' careful attention:

ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE POLLUTION A NEW
THREAT TO SANITY

(By Donald F. Anthrop)

(NOTE.—Standards developed by the U.S. Air Force (the largest employer in the country with a very noisy environment) have led to a recommendation that ear "defenders" be worn if the noise levels exceed 85 decibels. What is not generally recognized is that the level of "ordinary" noise in a

community frequently exceeds the 85 decibel level—which has been found injurious in industry. And the end is not even in sight. Just over aviation's horizon is the supersonic transport airplane and its sonic boom. Dr. Anthonis is a research chemist at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, California. He is a conservationist, and is doing research in noise abatement.)

The sources of noise today seem almost limitless. From the kitchen in the modern home comes a cacophony that would require ear defenders in industry to prevent hearing loss. In a series of measurements made in one kitchen, a dishwasher raised the noise level in the center of the kitchen from 56 to 85 decibels, while the garbage disposal raised it to more than 90 decibels. A food blender produces about 93 decibels. Power lawn mowers and leaf rakers, outside air conditioners, and power tools such as saw contribute to the noise in the home. But for most Americans, construction and transportation sources, particularly trucks, motorcycles, sports cars, private airplanes and helicopters as well as commercial jets and military aircraft, are the most serious offenders.

CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Particularly in large cities, construction noise is a very substantial and seemingly continuous nuisance. This noise can be substantially reduced with existing technology and without great cost. In December 1967, Citizens for a Quieter City in New York demonstrated a muffled air compressor developed in Great Britain and used there for the past five years which reduced the noise level from 86 to 79 decibels at a distance of 25 feet. The compressor is enclosed in a plastic housing lined with foam plastic. This organization also demonstrated a muffled jack hammer which produced significantly fewer decibels. Tests at the British Building Research Station have shown that jack hammer noise can be muffled considerably without any great impairment of performance. Many European cities are already using muffled jack hammers and air compressors equipped with sound attenuating devices. Some of the techniques that can be employed were illustrated by the Diesel Construction Company in the construction of a 52-story office building in lower Manhattan. Foundation blasting was muffled with special steel wire mesh blankets, demolition was done during late hours and weekends when few people were in the area, and steel beams were welded rather than riveted together.

MOTOR VEHICLE NOISE

Transportation constitutes the principal source of noise in most American cities. There are now 81 million privately-owned passenger cars in the United States compared with 25.5 million at the end of World War II. Each year seven million of these wear out or are junked, but in the past few years an average of 10 million new ones have been produced or imported each year. Thus, the number of automobiles is increasing at the rate of nearly four per cent a year. As if 81 million automobiles didn't create enough congestion and noise, there are also 2.4 million motorcycles and 16.5 million trucks.

Motor vehicle noise has been primarily an urban problem. In a recent study of noise in Boston schools, a mean reading of 78 decibels was recorded in a school playground in downtown Boston. In Wellesley, a suburb of Boston, the noise level in the school playground was only 58. Thus, children in the city school were exposed to a noise intensity 100 times greater than the suburban Wellesley children. But the rapid increase in the number of motor vehicles, the production of larger noisier trucks, the construction of the interstate highway system, and the exodus of people from city to suburb has increasingly brought noise pollution to suburban areas and the countryside.

One of the most comprehensive noise sur-

veys ever made was the London survey in 1961. Noise measurements were made at 540 locations in central London, and 1,400 residents at those locations were interviewed. At 84 per cent of the points traffic noise predominated. About one-third of the people specifically mentioned motor vehicle noise as a major irritant. Furthermore, traffic noise appeared to be as important an annoyance as all other noises together.

A number of surveys have established beyond doubt that the noise problem near high-speed highways arises principally from trucks, motorcycles and sports cars. In 1964 the California Highway Patrol conducted a series of tests along California highways in which noise levels of 25,351 passenger cars, 4,656 gasoline trucks, and 5,838 diesel trucks were measured. Noise levels of the passenger cars, measured 50 feet from the road, varied between 65 and 86 decibels with the average falling at about 76. On the other hand, noise levels for diesel trucks ranged from 68 to 99 decibels with the average at about 87.

ANTINOISE LAWS

The results of these various surveys demonstrate quite clearly that in order to achieve quieter living conditions, cities must reduce motor vehicle noise. Yet governments at all levels have thus far failed to achieve any meaningful reductions. In 1965 the State of New York enacted a law limiting the noise a motor vehicle can produce at a distance of 50 feet to 88 decibels while traveling 35 miles per hour. In 1967 California enacted legislation which sets a limit of 92 decibels for motorcycles and trucks of three tons gross or more, traveling at speeds above 35 miles per hour. All other motor vehicles are limited to 86 decibels. That these limits are much too high is suggested by the fact that in 1961 California hired an acoustical consulting firm to make a survey of motor vehicle noise and to recommend limits consistent with existing technology and currently available noise measuring techniques. The firm recommended maximum limits of 87 decibels for trucks and motorcycles and 77 for other motor vehicles.

Even these lower limits were deemed to be easily attainable with existing technology. Furthermore, no valid argument has been advanced to justify higher noise limits for motorcycles than for passenger cars. There is no reason why a 50-horsepower motorcycle should be allowed to make as much noise as four 300-horsepower Cadillacs. Yet the new California noise law permits precisely this situation. Worse yet, the law is not being enforced, particularly with respect to motorcycles, which have become a real threat to sanity in city and back-county alike.

A substantial fraction of the motorcycles being operated in California today have altered mufflers or no mufflers at all, and many bear no registration plates. All such motorcycles are being operated in violation of the state motor vehicle code irrespective of any noise laws. The unwillingness of some local governments to use the tools already at their disposal to achieve quieter communities is a hindrance to the enactment of more effective noise control legislation.

The future of our cities depends in no small measure on how successful we are in reducing traffic noise and congestion. Three approaches are open to us: (1) reduce the noise of the source; (2) eliminate the source through the use of quiet, underground mass transit systems; (3) reduce the noise near freeways by depressing the roadway or constructing a sound barrier along the right-of-way.

While highway design features can greatly reduce the noise nuisance in communities near freeways, motor vehicle noise in our existing cities can only be reduced by quieting or eliminating the source. The origins of noise in motor vehicles are primarily direct radiation from the exhaust, inlet, engine, transmission and tires, and complex vibra-

tions of the outer surfaces of the vehicle. The exhaust is the predominant source of noise in an unsilenced internal combustion engine. It has been demonstrated that complete silencing of the exhaust of a 10-ton diesel truck by means of a series of large mufflers reduces the noise 10 to 15 decibels in the low frequency range. Silencing of the engine inlet produces a smaller noise reduction but over a wider frequency range.

Control of noise produced by the engine structure is somewhat more difficult. One approach has been to build an acoustically-lined enclosure around the engine. In any case, the noise level of nearly all motor vehicles could be reduced by 10 to 15 decibels in the near future at small cost.

Finally, substitution of electrically or steam-powered vehicles for the internal combustion engine would not only result in a major reduction of urban air pollution, but would enormously reduce traffic noise. The brightest hope for the future clearly lies in such vehicles coupled with underground systems for the movement of goods.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

Since there are now nearly 1,200 jet airliners, about an equal number of piston aircraft, and more than 100,000 private airplanes in service in the United States, the aircraft noise problem has become very widespread. Today millions of Americans are affected by this aural assault: Congressmen Benjamin Rosenthal and Herbert Tenzer whose Long Island communities lie under the flight paths for La Guardia and Kennedy have warned that the mood of their constituents has become one of desperation, not just unhappiness.

The courts have held that insofar as the operation of aircraft is concerned, the federal government has preempted the field. A 1963 ordinance of Hempstead, Long Island which regulated the altitude and flight path of aircraft while over the city was ruled invalid in a 1967 court suit. Ordinances such as the recent one passed by the city of Santa Barbara banning supersonic flights over the city also would probably be declared invalid in a court test.

Noise levels in some communities near our major airports have become so intolerable that many residents cannot continue to live in those communities. Lawsuits totalling \$200 million are pending in the courts. A few people have been awarded damages where it was shown that property values had declined or where some directly measurable economic penalty had been incurred. But generally, the private citizen has been able to get little compensation for the abuse he has suffered. Recently the airport operators, who consider the reduction of aircraft noise to be primarily the responsibility of the manufacturers, charged the airlines and manufacturers with smokescreen tactics on the noise abatement problem and withdrew from the industry-wide National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council.

One does not have to be directly under the flight path of a large jet on take-off in order to receive an ear-splitting roar. When a 707-320B jet is four miles from the point of brake release at the end of the runway it has attained an altitude of about 800 feet and the noise level on the ground one-half mile on either side of the flight path is approximately 85 decibels.

FEDERAL EFFORTS

Federal officials should not be surprised by the magnitude of the present problem. In 1952 President Truman received a report, "The Airport and Its Neighbors," from his Airport Commission. The Commission said greater consideration should have been given residents living in an area when airports were first built and that civil and military officials should make much greater efforts to reduce take-off noise over residential areas.

But federal officials are just now beginning to do something about the problem. In

August 1968, President Johnson signed into law a measure requiring the Federal Aviation Administration to undertake control and abatement of aircraft noise. The FAA was not particularly eager to have this responsibility, for the law appears to make the FAA liable for damage suits arising from aircraft noise.

The FAA has initiated noise control procedures at some airports, but until quieter engines are built, there is not a great deal it can do with regard to jet transport noise. The noise control procedures that have been implemented are directed almost solely at reducing the noise level in communities lying directly under the flight path while the plane is at low altitude. While reductions have been achieved in such communities, the result has often been to spread the noise around to other communities. This is precisely what has occurred at the Washington, D.C. National Airport where the FAA requires departing aircraft to climb as quickly as possible to 1,500 feet and then cut back the power and follow the Potomac River northward. Flights over the White House, the Capitol, the Washington Monument, and the U.S. Naval Observatory are prohibited. But since Washington National Airport is just across the Potomac River from the Lincoln Memorial, central Washington is still bombarded by the constant roar of jets, and communities such as Georgetown are now directly under the flight path. Why should residents of Georgetown be subjected to the noise while congressmen on Capitol Hill are protected from the din? If the congressional office buildings rather than residential communities were under the flight path, Congress would long ago have taken steps to end the nuisance.

The solution to the aircraft noise problem in the District of Columbia is to close Washington National Airport. Few people presently use Dulles because it is so far from the city, but it would be much more attractive if a rapid transit system connected the airport with downtown Washington. Furthermore, a substantial percentage of the traffic at Washington National Airport consists of Washington-New York and Washington-Boston commuter service. If high-speed rail service were available between these points, this traffic could be almost eliminated.

GETTING AT THE SOURCE

While flight procedures can bring relief to some communities, the only solution to the aircraft noise problem lies in quieting or eliminating the source. NASA is financing research and development to develop a new "quiet engine." Preliminary tests indicate the new quiet engine will reduce take-off noise by 15 decibels. In static tests with a Pratt and Whitney J-57 engine, Boeing claims to have obtained a noise reduction of nearly 40 decibels by use of acoustical linings in the engine. There are reports that the proposed European airbus will use advanced engines which will produce a 75 decibel noise level on take-off. For comparison, the Boeing 707-320B in normal operation (that is, in the absence of FAA noise control procedures) produces about 107 decibels on take-off. Clearly, then, the manufacturers can build quieter aircraft if they are forced to do so. When can we expect some relief? Manufacturers say the giant Boeing 747, scheduled for late 1969, is already in production and cannot be fitted with new engines even if they were available. The 747 is expected to produce a 100 decibel noise level on take-off. The airlines argue that to retro-fit existing turbojets with the new quiet engine would cost \$6 million per plane and that they cannot afford it. Thus, if the present trend continues, we cannot expect any relief before the late 1970s. But by that time any noise reduction will be partly offset by the doubling of air traffic expected between now and 1975. The fact is that the present exasperating noise problem exists because the aircraft manufacturers

and the airlines have operated on the basis of their own short-range economic interests and have failed to devote the efforts and resources needed to solve it.

If the already grave situation is not to become worse, some bold steps will have to be taken:

1. The federal government should provide a greatly increased funding level for quiet engine research so that take-off noise will be reduced by 40, not 20 decibels.

2. Whenever a substantially quieter engine is developed, the FAA should require existing aircraft to be retro-fitted with the new engine. If the airlines cannot afford the cost without increasing fares, then fares should be increased. The small percentage of the population that uses the airlines should be required to assume part of the burden for providing a livable environment for the millions of people who suffer from the noise but derive no economic benefit from it.

3. Particularly in densely populated areas such as the Northeast Corridor, the Chicago-Pittsburgh region, and the San Diego-San Francisco corridor, high-speed rail transportation could substantially reduce air traffic.

4. Future airports should be planned according to the principles used at Dulles International Airport and the new one now being planned for Dallas where 18,000 acres are being purchased to prevent encroachment of residential dwellings.

5. New airports should be located 20 or 30 miles from the metropolitan area, as Dulles International Airport is, and serviced by high-speed surface transportation.

FAA AUTHORITY

When Congress passed the Aircraft Noise Abatement Act, the FAA was clearly given authority to regulate noise from private planes. Yet the FAA has so far done nothing about this growing menace and has indicated little interest in doing anything. The light planes of today are more powerful and far noisier than they were a decade ago. Worse, there are a lot more of them. One can reasonably ask why a single businessman in an executive plane should be allowed to create a noise nuisance that irritates literally thousands of people in the communities along his flight path? Furthermore, noise from private planes is becoming a frequent intruder into the solitude of national parks and wilderness areas.

The present noise levels produced by light aircraft are quite unnecessary. The FAA should prohibit private planes from flying below 8,000 feet over populated areas and should require that all private planes be equipped with mufflers and acoustical materials to reduce engine noise.

While a feeble first step has been taken to reduce the noise produced by civilian aircraft, the deafening roar of military planes continues unabated, for the FAA does not have jurisdiction over military planes or flight operations. The Department of Defense has made no effort to develop quieter jet aircraft claiming that it cannot afford the weight penalty that quieter engines would impose. Instead of making a serious effort to reduce noise levels in communities near military installations, Defense has embarked upon a public relations campaign to convince the American public that they should not only tolerate but welcome this assault on their eardrums because the military establishment is defending them. This country's military brass seems quite willing to destroy our environment in the name of defending it.

A case in point is the Alameda Naval Air Station which lies adjacent to the city of Oakland, California in the very heart of a metropolitan area. Over 1.75 million people live within 12 miles of the runway. Berkeley and Oakland residents frequently find themselves rudely awakened early Sunday morning by jets streaking over the East Bay hills with afterburners blazing. If an aroused pub-

lic demands the closure of some of these poorly situated installations, perhaps the Defense Department will be motivated to develop quieter aircraft.

SONIC BOOM AND THE SST

The worst is yet to come when—and if—Boeing's supersonic transport (SST), built with federal financing, goes into service in the 1970s. Whenever a plane flies faster than the speed of sound (about 344 meters per second) it generates shock waves which trail out behind the plane on both sides of its path. When these shock waves intercept the earth, they produce the thunderclap we call "sonic boom." Typically the boom is felt along a belt that extends 40 miles on each side of the plane's flight path. The severity of the boom depends on the plane's size and altitude, but there is no known way to eliminate the boom itself. There exists a common misconception that this sonic boom is produced only once when the plane first exceeds the speed of sound. In fact, it is produced continuously along the plane's path while it is in supersonic flight.

The whole SST program places in serious question the commitment of the FAA, the Department of Transportation and Congress to noise reduction. Thus far, Congress has appropriated \$653 million for SST. Worse yet, on July 11, 1968 the Senate defeated an amendment to the Aircraft Noise Abatement Act which would have prohibited the SST from flying at supersonic speeds across continental America. The proponents of SST in Congress argued that prohibition of overland flights was unnecessary because the FAA probably would not permit such flights anyway. But the very fact that Congress was unwilling to legislate against sonic boom indicates overland flights by the SST are anticipated. And since the FAA is the agency responsible for the direction and funding of the entire SST development program, asking it to regulate sonic boom is like putting the fox in the chicken coop. The attitude of the Department of Transportation on the sonic boom issue is illustrated in a statement made by Major General Jewell C. Maxwell, the chief of the SST program: "We believe that people in time will come to accept the sonic boom as they have the rather unpleasant side effects which have accompanied other advances in transportation."

This is a myth which so far has survived scientific evidence to the contrary. Aircraft noise studies have shown that people become more intolerant of jet aircraft as the number of fly-overs or the duration of each fly-over is increased.

In order to assess public acceptance of sonic boom, the FAA conducted tests in Oklahoma City in 1964. During a six month period, 1,253 supersonic flights were made over the city. Oklahoma City was one of the most favorable locations the FAA could have chosen to get public acceptance of sonic boom since nearly one-third of the city's residents depend on the aviation industry for their living. Furthermore, no sonic booms were made at night—the really critical test. Yet 27 per cent of the people said they could never learn to live with the sonic boom and over 4,900 residents filed damage claims against the FAA. Most people found the booms more irritating at the end of the tests than at the beginning.

Operation of the SST over continental United States would not only shatter the solitude of nearly every park and wilderness area in the country, but could do extensive damage to some of these places as well. Between August 11 and December 22, 1966 some 83 sonic booms, several of which caused extensive damage, were recorded in Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Arizona. One of these booms loosened an estimated 80 tons of rock which fell on ancient Indian cliff dwellings and caused irreparable damage. Damage has also been reported in Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah.

Canada has already banned the operation of supersonic aircraft over its provinces. Both Switzerland and West Germany have indicated they will prohibit supersonic flights within their borders if their citizens complain.

BOONDOGGLE PROGRAM

The whole SST program is an economic boondoggle, the prime beneficiary of which is the aircraft manufacturing industry. The FAA has committed \$1.3 billion or about 83 per cent of the estimated development cost and Congress has already appropriated half this amount. But low cost estimates and delays in the program now indicate the cost to the federal government will be at least \$3.5 billion before the first plane is sold. The FAA talks glowingly of estimated sales between \$20 and \$48 billion, but not long ago the Institute of Defense Analysis issued a report which indicated that if supersonic travel were restricted to overwater flights, there would be a market for only 279 planes and the whole project would become an economic disaster.

Even if the SST is initially operated at supersonic speeds only on overwater flights, mounting economic pressures to expand the market for the plane will almost certainly result in overland routes across the United States. Former Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd has said: "I think it will be entirely possible to operate a route over the Plains area and possibly across the Canadian border without discomfort or inconvenience to people on the ground."

The operation of such a route would reduce the flying time between Chicago and San Francisco only about 30 minutes. If supersonic flight on overland routes is not restricted, 150 SSTs may be in domestic operation by 1990. Must 50 million people be subjected to perhaps 30 booms a day so that a few can reduce their travel time by 30 minutes?

While the abatement of much of the noise that presently plagues our society is in part a technical problem, both the impetus and the money for solving it must come from the political arena, and the sonic boom problem is entirely political. A quieter society will only be achieved when a concerned public demands a new system of priorities from the politicians.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE HANDICAPPED

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, delivered an outstanding address at Aiken, S.C. in my congressional district on July 22. I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people the splendid and timely address of Mr. Russell:

ADDRESS OF HAROLD RUSSELL

It's a real pleasure for me to be here in Aiken, for at least half a dozen reasons.

First, I just like it here. I like your hospitality. I like your gracious ways. I hope I'll have many occasions to come back.

And second, I'm proud of South Carolina. Your State has the honor of being the first State in the Union to pass a law eliminating architectural barriers against the handicapped from all buildings constructed with State funds.

You started the bandwagon, and so far more than forty other States have jumped

aboard with similar laws. And last year the Congress of the United States enacted a law calling for the elimination of architectural barriers in all buildings erected with Federal money.

And third, I've always been impressed with South Carolina's vocational rehabilitation program; with its innovations; and with its leadership, under Dill Beckman.

The fourth reason I'm glad to be here has to do with the Governor's Committee itself. Under the leadership of Chairman Dill Beckman of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and Executive Secretary Kathryn Lewis of the State Employment Service, this Committee has made a great impact on your State. It has built a favorable climate for the handicapped. It has stirred up interest. It has led the way to more jobs for the handicapped.

The fifth reason is your own Rehabilitation Workshop in Aiken, and all the fine things it has been doing to help the handicapped gain independence.

And the sixth reason—a very important one—is the part this workshop plays in the community. It is not isolated. It is not off by itself, apart from the mainstream. It is very much a part of Aiken's mainstream. The evidence is today's meeting—a "mix" of businessmen and professionals, of community leaders and workshop leaders. This is a "mix" that can only take place when a workshop has earned the support of the community.

This kind of a "mix" holds out much hope, not only for the handicapped of Aiken, but for all the handicapped of this country. Let me explain.

For some time now, I have been worried about a slow-down in our communications with one another—with a growing series of short circuits in our lines of communications.

Very often, government agencies seem to have trouble communicating with voluntary agencies, even those performing similar services. Sometimes this profession doesn't seem to be able to communicate with that profession. Sometimes labor can't communicate with management. Sometimes management can't communicate with labor. Sometimes professionals can't communicate with the community. Sometimes the community can't communicate with the professionals.

And sometimes none of us seem to be able to communicate with the handicapped themselves—to let them know about available services, to give them courage.

As a result of this Tower of Babel, sometimes the handicapped get hurt. They don't know where to turn. They find people tugging at them in all different directions. They find that very often nobody tugs at them at all; they end up as the Forgotten Men and Forgotten Women in a community filled with non-communicators, filled with the hot air of thousands of words signifying nothing.

I realize that some speakers have a tendency to "view with alarm," to paint black and forboding pictures. I am not one of them. This slow-down in communication is really having an effect on the handicapped. If you want evidence, let me cite an attitude survey of America, conducted by the well-known research firm of Roper Associates. They took a cross-section of a thousand American families and probed their attitudes about the mentally retarded, the blind and the crippled. Listen to the results:

Eighty-four percent of the families thought that the retarded belonged in institutions or at best in sheltered workshops—but certainly not in the regular labor force along with other workers.

Fifty-six percent thought the blind belonged in institutions or workshops, but not in the labor force.

Sixty-four percent thought the crippled should be in institutions or workshops, but not in the regular labor force.

Eighty-four percent, fifty-six percent, sixty-four percent.

Do you know what these people are really saying, when you look beneath the surface of their responses? They are saying: "We reject the handicapped. We don't want them around us. We want them away somewhere, anywhere—but away."

And do you know why this attitude of rejection is so prevalent in America? It ties in with the short-circuits in our communications systems.

When we stop communicating with one another, when we stop exchanging ideas with one another, when we board ourselves up in our own ivory towers—that's when we stop understanding one another. And when we stop understanding one another, we also stop accepting one another. The result: rejection. The result: the kind of disturbing findings the Roper survey found.

What's the cause of all this?

I think the cause is tied in with the times we live in. Ours is an age of specialization. Ours is an age of a knowledge explosion we haven't learned to deal with.

Knowledge keeps piling up on knowledge to the point where we need computers just to catalogue it. This growing mountain of knowledge has forced us to become specialists. We find we're spending all our time just keeping up with our own specialties, no matter what they might be. We find we don't have the time to lift our heads to see the rest of the world.

This age of specialization has led to an age of fragmentation. Very often we stop seeing whole people. We see parts of people, relating to our own specialties. We tend to de-humanize our fellow human beings.

Take the field of medicine. There are brain specialists and eye specialists and nose specialists and throat specialists and heart specialists. You name it; there's a specialist for it.

Or take the field of the handicapped. There are employment specialists who are concerned only with the nine-to-five jobs of the handicapped. And recreation specialists who are concerned with after-five-o'clock recreational needs of the handicapped. And prosthetic specialists more concerned with a man's limbs than with his heart.

When we tend to fragment people in this way, we tend to stop seeing them as whole people. Instead, we see them as creatures bearing the tags of "retarded" or "blind" or "crippled." It's easy to reject these tags. But it is not easy to reject those we get to know as total and complete human beings.

And so, for the sake of human understanding and human acceptance, somehow we've got to break out of our straitjacket of specialization. Somehow we've got to make a complete turn-about, to begin seeing people as they really are. We've got to do it for the sake of the handicapped—and for our own sakes.

But how . . . ?

We can do it by leaving our own sheltered backyards and visiting other neighborhoods, other worlds. We can do it by making a conscious effort to communicate with one another—labor with management; professional with volunteer; young with old; all of us with the handicapped.

Communicate. Break out of our bonds. Lift up our heads. Cross over the lines that separate us. Forget our specialties. Forget the tags of disability we attach to people and, instead, see the people themselves, the living people.

That brings us to this Rehabilitation Workshop in Aiken—and to the entire sheltered workshop movement in America.

We've all heard plenty of words spoken about the role of sheltered workshops in this country—as a means of preparing the handicapped for outside employment; as a means of providing jobs for the handicapped who cannot hope to compete in the outside

world; as a means of evaluating the work potential of the handicapped; as a means of providing rehabilitation and work conditioning and training, and all the rest.

But I see another role for workshops—a role that is admirably being filled by this Rehabilitation Workshop in Aiken.

It is the role of the "Common Meeting Ground." It is the role of a place where diverse interests, diverse forces, diverse people, can meet. It is the place where businessmen can rub shoulders with rehabilitation people; where volunteers can rub shoulders with professionals; where all sorts of groups can come to escape their specializations, and mix with others.

Most important, it is the place where all segments of the community can come to see handicapped fellow-citizens as they really are—men and women, with human hopes and human aspirations and human abilities. It is the place where the handicapped can shed the "tags" that set them apart, and reveal themselves as our brothers and our sisters.

Workshops can serve as great forces for human understanding in this country. And this Rehabilitation Workshop, with its emphasis on reaching deep into the community, can point the way.

And the results . . . ?

The results will be a new day dawning for the handicapped—a day when they will be accorded the treatment they really want.

You see, the handicapped don't want to be treated as "different." They don't want to be shunted to the sidelines because of "difference." Neither do they want special privileges because of "difference."

They want to be treated as people—purely and simply as people. They want the chance to rise or fall on their own merits. They want the chance to prove themselves—a chance that should be a birthright of all Americans. They want the chance to be looked upon not as "retardates," not as "the blind," not as "crippled"—but as people. What a beautiful word: *people*.

This is our goal, here in Aiken, and in cities and towns all over America. It is our goal, not only for the handicapped but for all human beings. It is the goal of the equality of all mankind—the goal expressed so well in a certain document in the Archives Building in Washington, which says that all men are entitled to certain unalienable rights, among these being the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

All men. The handicapped, too.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during Captive Nations Week, the Chicago Captive Nations Committee adopted a resolution, which I feel should be of profound interest to our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution of the Chicago Captive Nations Committee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the official proceedings of the U.S. Congress—at this point:

RESOLUTION, JULY 19, 1969

Whereas, the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States of America to proclaim a Captive Nations Week, and whereas the Russian and Chinese communism continues to build up its vast colonial empire

and threatens the peace, security, and independence of the Free World, carrying out subversive conspiracies in Latin America, Africa, and even in our own country, conducting open, aggressive warfare in South Viet-Nam, neighboring countries of Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, having made deep inroads into the Arab countries, and building up its threatening military power in the area of the Mediterranean;

Now, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Proclamation of Captive Nations Week, we feel a particular urgency and a sacred obligation to speak on behalf of the millions of human beings under the tyranny of the communist colonial empire.

Therefore, be it resolved by the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, to urge the United States to assume the role of leadership by taking a course motivated by the most sacred human obligations; the horrible fact that one-third of mankind is already enslaved by the communist imperialism necessitates a new policy which would encourage the aspirations and movements for national self-determination of all enslaved peoples by an expressed and unequivocal commitment of the United States of America to support, by all means possible, such aspirations for national freedom;

Be it further resolved, that in view of the indivisibility of freedom and peace, the restoration of the sacred rights of all the nations based on principles of democracy, self-determination and sovereignty within their respective ethnic boundaries, is of paramount importance to establish freedom, security, and stability of the entire world. Consequently this policy is in the best interest of our country for the present and in years to come.

Be it further resolved, that we at this very critical and perhaps fatal moment for the entire free world support unreservedly the United States' resistance to Communist aggression in South Viet-Nam and the building up of forces of freedom in that part of the front of the free world; in this spirit we salute the members of the United States and Allied Armed Forces.

Be it further resolved, that following the anniversary year of the Proclamation of Human Rights and in view of the flagrant violations of these same rights by the Soviet Union through the suppression and occupation of Czechoslovakia during that very year, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations place on the agenda of the United Nations the following demands:

1. the abolishment of slave labor, mass deportations, all concentration camps, and all forms of genocide,
2. to guarantee a free return to their countries all the deported and exiled who survived the communist ordeal,
3. free elections for all enslaved nations under the supervision of the United Nations Organization,

Be it further resolved, that we oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations Organization;

Be it further resolved, that we oppose "One-way Bridges" and the opening of a Russian Consulate in Chicago;

Be it further resolved, that since every nation has the right for self-determination this right belongs also to the Biafrans; in the name of humanity we most urgently appeal to the United States government to help the suffering and starving human beings being murdered in masses by the Nigerian aggressors, armed by the Russian barbarians and the British labor government.

Be it further resolved, that special efforts must be made by the United States towards an awakening and strengthening of all moral forces, particularly at a time when we are warned by the burning martyrs in the interest of freedom; it is frightening that at this time we are faced by an unparalleled loss of

ethical concern and incredible callousness towards the enslaved, abandoned to their ordeal.

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop building up the communist empire, particularly the Soviet military power by selling it important military equipment,

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop trading with the communist countries because in so doing, it helps them to tighten their grip on the enslaved; whatever is gained at great risk by the desperate, enslaved men and women through sabotaging Soviet economy is completely destroyed through trading,

Be it further resolved, to appeal to the United States authorities to undertake utmost efforts in the interest of the sacred values in cultural, social, and educational institutions so vital for the preservation of freedom. It is appalling to see how free men let themselves be used in the portrayal of anarchism, nihilism, defeatism, amorality, pacifism, and atheism in the service of the blood-stained Red Empire,

Be it further resolved, that this Committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy; there is a desperate need for a forum in which the free world would have confidence; the U.N. has failed to be such a forum to handle the issues of injustice and crimes against humanity; the recent appeal of 54 citizens of the USSR which has been ignored up to this day speaks for itself; the Unesco's decision to commemorate the centenary of Lenin by peddling this criminal as a humanist is an insult to the civilized world community and reveals the real interests of this organization; by the establishment of a trustworthy forum, the United States will prove to the entire world that it will not cease in its efforts until all the Captive Nations are able to enjoy their God-given rights in their sovereign states.

WITH BARE HANDS?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the President's Violence Commission to remove more than 90 percent of the 24 million handguns from private citizens has generated a new wave of concern across the country.

In a recent editorial from the McKeesport Daily News, John Orr raises some very pointed and thought-provoking questions on this issue.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the editorial and submit it for the RECORD at this time.

The editorial follows:

WITH BARE HANDS?

Should the American be deprived of the means of defending his home and family?

This is the big question raised by Chairman Milton Eisenhower and the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in the report made public this week.

The commission claims a "domestic arms race" has turned many homes into arsenals and created a situation so dangerous that governmental action is necessary. It estimates that 24 million pistols now are in private hands.

In order to meet this problem, the commission would have the government make

possession of such weapons illegal and spend a half billion dollars in claiming them. The states ought to be prodded to act, the commission says and, if they fail to do so, then Uncle Sam should step in.

But are pistols in the homes of law-abiding citizens the real problem concerning violence? Or is the problem in the lawlessness that has made many people afraid even in their own households and induced them to arm themselves? The Eisenhower commission would better have served the nation if it had concentrated its attention on what has made so many citizens want guns.

The commissioners should know that any law restricting the possession of firearms operates against the decent, well-behaved person and in favor of the lawbreaker. The criminal will not obey a gun law anymore than he obeys other laws and, therefore, he will end up armed with his law-abiding and thus gunless victim placed more at his mercy.

Violence in our country is not the result of the good citizen having a handgun in his home. It is the result, instead, of a combination of governmental faults ranging from official paralysis in the presence of rioting to the coddling court decisions which have hampered the police.

The Eisenhower probers should have gotten at the heart of the matter instead of subscribing to that questionable proposal of the extreme leftwingers that the people should be disarmed, an idea that is being pushed at every opportunity here as it was pushed in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia when the dictators took over. Why do millions of Americans now believe they need a gun in their homes? What has scared them? The Eisenhower report evades these questions in order to come down hard on the side of the gun controllers.

We quote one part of the report:

"At least in major metropolitan areas, the federal system should not consider normal household self-protection a sufficient showing of need to have a handgun."

What, indeed, would constitute a greater "showing of need" than the safety of a person's household? Would Mr. Eisenhower and his colleagues have an American stand helpless at his doorstep? Would they have him sacrifice rather than defend his family in case of danger? Or would they expect him to meet with bare hands an attack by armed intruders? Their report makes you wonder.

THE COLLEGE LOAN CRISIS

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I read the following article in the August 4, 1969, edition of the Washington Evening Star. I think it is of extreme importance to all of us who are interested in higher education and in the crisis on the college campuses today. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

COLLEGE LOAN CRISIS AT HAND, ACTION LAGS
(By Barry Kalb)

The impending crisis in the higher education loan situation contains all the elements for magnificent congressional debate, but there is no time for it.

At present, there is almost as much talk on Capitol Hill about getting students into college—by enabling them to secure guaranteed loans—as about kicking some of them, the disrupters, out.

But only nine days remain before Congress

adjourns for its summer recess, and when the lawmakers reconvene Sept. 3 it will be too late to provide much help for student loan applicants.

By that time, college registration will have begun, and tens of thousands of marginally affluent college hopefuls will find their educational experience limited to a lesson in the politics of economics.

The situation in the Washington area is indicative of the overall problem. The District government has a record amount available for guaranteed loans this year, but fears the ever-increasing number of college students will overwhelm the fund. Maryland is barely holding its head above water. It must make special payments to banks for each student loan. Virginia students are having a particularly rough time obtaining loans.

The crisis was triggered by the rise in the prime interest rate, the interest banks charge their best customers.

Every state, and the District, has a system for guaranteeing loans to students. In some cases the state guarantees the loan, in others the federal government insures the loans, and in still others, a private organization called the United Student Aid Fund makes the guarantee under contract with the state.

Lending institutions contend that they make less money with their money if they lend it to students, because of high handling costs. But because the guarantee system assures them of getting their money back, even if the student defaults or dies, the institutions are willing, in their words, to "perform this public service."

They do insist on breaking even, however, and this is a major factor in the crisis. The amended federal Higher Education Act of 1965 cannot guarantee a loan over 7 percent interest, and the prime rate is currently at 8½ percent.

The result: Lending institutions are claiming they cannot afford to lend money at 7 percent, guaranteed or not, and young applicants are receiving rejection notices instead of money.

Congress is debating remedies to the situation. But observers are afraid that all manner of outside factors—student unrest, fiscal economy, spending priorities, federal subsidies to banks and the like—will be brought into the argument, and nobody sees much chance of legislative relief before the recess.

It is difficult at present to measure the full impact of the crisis, since many students are still in the process of applying for loans. But things are already beginning to look bleak.

The National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs estimates that between 150,000 and 200,000 students will be unable to obtain loans if the government does not act promptly.

This is not necessarily an accurate measure of how many will be denied college, since many of these students can be expected to obtain aid elsewhere or squeeze through on a reduced budget.

Nonetheless, things are at a critical point. Allen Vanderstaay, assistant director of the division of student finance for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, says banks all around the country are tightening their loan policies.

This is taking two major forms, he says: Some banks are not granting loans to new borrowers, which means incoming freshmen are bearing the brunt of the loan cutdown. And some banks are granting loans only to students whose parents have had long-standing accounts.

Some banks are applying both of these measures, he says, and some have cut off even those students who have borrowed from them in the past.

Washington-area schools have already begun to receive letters from desperate students, although none is willing yet to predict just how bad things will become.

A Georgetown University law student has been unable to obtain a loan from a Maryland bank which has lent him money for the past two years; a George Washington University senior from Costa Mesa, Calif., has been getting the runaround from a bank he has borrowed from for three years and his father has dealt with for 25; a Casper, Wyo., man accepted by GW law school was told the state was unable to guarantee his loan.

Col. Tom W. Sills, director of student aid at American University, says the situation is the worst he's seen in his seven years at AU. William Patterson, Sills' counterpart at GW, says simply, "Things are real tough."

The universities say the general loan situation in the District, Maryland and Virginia is "fair to poor," although the loan directors of the three jurisdictions minimize the difficulties.

Robert A. McCormick, director of the District Loan Insurance Program, says a record \$2.4 million is available this year for guaranteed loans, but he still fears demand may exceed supply.

The District program was begun during the 1967-68 school year, and 1550 loans for a total of \$1.7 million have been made since. These 1550 students represent 99 percent of eligible applicants, he says.

The District is unique in having a pool of money, contributed by local banks and disbursed directly by the loan office. In effect, each bank holds a piece of each loan.

Originally, 12 of the city's 14 banks participated, but two have recently dropped out. To make matters worse, McCormick complains, none of the city's savings and loan companies will participate in the pool, even though all are authorized by law to do so.

Maryland, according to James Leamer, executive director of the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corp., has been able to hang on because of a special provision, enacted the first of last month, which allows the state to pay a \$25 "incentive" fee to banks that agree to make loans.

"This is the only reason we're holding our heads above water," Leamer says. "We're still going to see what crunch develops about the middle of this month."

Virginia is another story. GW's Patterson labels the state "simply terrible." Charles Hill, director of the Virginia State Educational Assistance Authority, is a little less harsh, but not much.

"Our lenders are being selective, no doubt about it," Hill says. "There's continued (bank) activity, but not at the level we'd like."

Hill says all Virginia banks for the last two years have restricted loans to students whose families are already customers. In addition, the state's banks grant loans only to students attending school in Virginia.

The scramble for guaranteed loans has been increased by a shortage of money available for National Defense Education Assistance loans. NDEA money, which is aimed at low-income students, is allotted to individual colleges after state finance experts determine how much each college in their state needs.

Statistics tell the NDEA story. During the 1968-69 school year, the states requested a total of \$247 million in NDEA money. The government appropriated \$190 million.

For the coming year, the states have requested \$273 million. The outgoing Johnson Administration budgeted far less than this, and the Nixon Administration reduced Johnson's figure even more—to \$155 million. The House on Wednesday raised this figure by \$40.8 million, but this still leaves only \$5.8 million more than last year, and a Senate action on this budget before the Aug. 13 recess appears slim.

This throws an increased burden on the guaranteed loan program, and any help here must come from the federal government. The only method seriously considered

at this time is for the government to give banks a 3 percent "incentive payment" on each loan, over and above the regular 7 percent interest rate.

U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, in testimony before the House Special Subcommittee on Education, said the administration favors this method over simply raising the interest ceiling for several reasons.

For one thing, the government would assume any payment over 7 percent, thus relieving the student of additional financial burden. If the interest ceiling were simply raised, the student would be saddled with the entire amount.

Allen also pointed out that the incentive payment rate "may be adjusted accordingly. This avoids locking in both the government and the student to what may be artificially high interest rates."

In addition, he said, this plan is "the least expensive method of the alternatives we have examined."

But some congressmen are unlikely to be impressed. If the administration bill ever gets to the House floor, it may well be blocked by such men as Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., a longtime foe of federal subsidies to banks.

Patman testified against raising the interest ceiling from 6 to 7 percent last year to meet a similar prime rate rise (it was done anyway). "The banks are so heavily subsidized anyway," said a member of Patman's office, "he feels 7 percent is plenty."

The bill may encounter the same kind of opposition in the Senate. If the bill makes its way through the Senate Education subcommittee to the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, chairman Ralph Yarborough of Texas, who agrees largely with Patman on the issue of bank subsidies, may block it.

"The idea of subsidies to the bank instead of the student doesn't especially appeal to us," a Yarborough staff member says.

Harry Hogan, counsel to the House special education subcommittee chaired by Rep. Edith Green of Oregon, notes another potential stumbling block to passage of the bill. Some liberal congressmen, faced with a further amendment to the Higher Education Act, may try to enact changes throughout, such as raising the \$1,500 limit on a single guaranteed loan, he says. Debate on such measures could slow things down.

But the bill may never progress even that far. Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., chairman of the Senate Education subcommittee, is reportedly not particularly enthused about the bill, and may take his time in sending it along to the full committee.

A first step towards alleviating the crisis took place today when the Green subcommittee reported out an amended version of the administration's bill, to the full Education and Labor Committee.

The major change, written in by Rep. John Erlenborn, R-Ill., would be to adjust the incentive rate every three months, instead of every six months as recommended by the administration.

The full committee is scheduled to meet Wednesday morning.

The subcommittee sent a recommendation along with the bill that the committee take steps to rush the bill to the floor.

Banks are repeating their policy of last year and making loan commitments in anticipation of federal action, Vanderstaay says.

"The banks (last year) had every expectation that something was going to be done and went ahead and made the commitments. But they didn't make disbursements (before action was taken). So we're not sure how many of these present commitments will become disbursements," he said.

Is the situation as bad as it looks? Vanderstaay thinks so. "I'm hard put to prove it today," he says, "and I'm afraid we won't be able to prove it until it's a bit too late."

INDIAN EDUCATION AND SENATOR MONDALE AT ROUGH ROCK

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the *Twin Citian* magazine contains a fascinating account of Senator WALTER MONDALE's visit earlier this year to Indian schools in the Southwest.

As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Senator MONDALE has been particularly concerned about the need for greater control by the Indian people over the schools that are intended to educate their children.

The article is written by Gerald Vize- nor, an American Indian and one of Minnesota's most talented journalists.

Because of this article's significance, I am taking this opportunity to have it reprinted in the RECORD:

INDIAN EDUCATION AND SENATOR MONDALE AT ROUGH ROCK

(By Gerald Vize- nor)

"You damage a child still more when you destroy his first stone of identity, when you tell him his language is no good, when you tell him that his color is not right or imply it by surrounding him with people of a different color, habits, and status. You tell him that what his parents have taught him is no good, that he should not do so and so, or be what he is."—Karl Menninger, psychiatrist and chairman of the board, Menninger Foundation, in testimony before the Senate subcommittee on Indian Education.)

"These children aren't as unhappy as people say they are . . . they're only lonely for about a month." The principal of the Tuba City, Arizona, Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school was speaking, first brushing the ubiquitous Arizona dust off his desk.

"Senator, look out here," he said, next brushing the dust from his hands, "do you see any lonesome, poorly kept children?"

Outside, a neat column of Navajo children moved past the window. The March wind tossed their hair. Nothing else seemed spontaneous.

One thousand Navajo children attend the Tuba City boarding school. Less than half speak English when they arrive, but their native language soon becomes secondary . . . something less than English. The Indian parents have no voice in the way their children are efficiently centralized, processed and alienated in a white school environment. Happiness and education are systematically measured by career bureaucrats, many of whom have no sensitivity or training in education. Cultural brutalization begins.

Minnesota's Senator Walter F. Mondale, a member of the special Sub-committee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had been told that the Tuba City school was one of the worst in the federal system. He went to Arizona specifically to compare federal schools to the Rough Rock Navajo Demonstration School which is entirely run by the people—that is, the Indians themselves.

The Tuba City principal, leading Mondale on a tour of the classrooms, pointed with pride to a plywood hogan built in the corner of one room. The *togon* hogan, you might say. "You know," the principal ventured pleasantly, "it sure is interesting how the children first use the modern kitchen play things and then inevitably return to the hogan."

Later in the day Mondale flew over Black Mountain to meet with the all Navajo elected school board at Rough Rock. He was accompanied by a member of his staff, a reporter, and Dr. Robert L. Bergman, Public psychiatrist on the Navajo reservation.

Four of the five Navajo school board members at Rough Rock do not speak English and have never been to a formal school. Through an interpreter, Mondale learned about the people's school.

"When I travel here I see the mountains," said school board member John Dick, "and I cannot see what goes on in Washington . . . They have been operating schools for over one hundred years. We have never been part. The school here is open to everyone . . . you'll see the difference.

"We have four kinds of schools—long coats schools, Washington schools, white schools, and the people's schools . . . In our school here we talk about the identity, the Indian identity. Children knowing who they are, that's what's important. They will be better off in the world . . . This is good for the people."

Through the interpreter Mondale told John Dick that his description was the best he had heard. "Until parents feel it is *their* school we will not reach anyone. You have done us a favor showing America the truth about education. Your school is a symbol of quality in Indian education."

Mondale asked the school board members if they would trust the Bureau of Indian Affairs if the Bureau admitted it had been wrong about education and said it would change. The laughter needed no interpretation.

During the five hours the board and Mondale met, more than fifty parents and teachers gathered to listen. John Dick invited Mondale to continue the late hour discussion in a traditional sweat house. "We could both use it," Mondale said, slapping his stomach. But there wasn't room for an interpreter in the sweat house. Next day Mondale attended a sand painting ceremony at the hogan of John Dick held in honor of a child who had laughed for the first time.

Rough Rock was originally built by the Bureau of Indian Affairs but, before it opened, it was turned over to the Navajo in 1966. It had been operated by the people on an experimental basis for two years. Funds are provided by the Bureau, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and private foundations.

The curriculum is based on the people's language and heritage. The comforts of education are identity. Students are encouraged rather than punished for speaking their native language. The more than four hundred students at Rough Rock receive instruction in both Navajo and English, since in Arizona it is unlawful to teach in a foreign language unless it is a second language. The principal at the Bureau school at Rock Point, the third institution Mondale visited, said the Bureau attitude is that it does "not intend to be an ambulance for a dying language." Contrary to Bureau tradition, the principal *has* made an effort to teach Navajo in his school.

Medicine man and board member Ashie Tsosie said: "We like the older folks to teach our children philosophy." Medicine men can train students at the Rough Rock school. In every classroom there is a Navajo mother at a loom. While the women weave and tell the legends of the people, the children listen and learn in the Navajo tradition by watching.

At the Tuba City boarding school there are only two Navajo teachers. The Agency Superintendent, who is not an educator, said they have a problem getting qualified Navajo teachers "because they get the bright lights in their eyes and stay in the cities." At Rough Rock more than half of the teachers are qualified Navajos.

Board member Yazzie Begay told Mondale that the Navajo teachers came to Rough

Rock because "they don't have traditional things in other schools."

About half of the employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs are of Indian descent. Only sixteen percent of the teachers are Indian. Less than five percent of those teachers are assigned to teach in their own tribal groups. Federal civil service requires efficient random placement of teachers.

At Rough Rock the parents take an active part in the school and work in the dormitories. The principal at Tuba City said some parents visit. "We have an open door policy, but they don't often stay over night because they want to get back to the sheep."

When Mondale left, the Tuba City boarding school classes were over for the day. The recreation room was closed and the playground was empty. The only children in sight on a warm Spring day were those doing exercises in front of a dormitory.

Two weeks later, during a session of the sub-committee on Indian Education, Mondale told the Commissioner of Indian Affairs what he saw and felt at Tuba City and Rough Rock.

"It was the difference between a semi-military setting and a setting which was the kind that one would want to educate his own children in," Mondale told Commissioner Robert L. Bennett.

"In the Bureau of Indian Affairs system I found only two Navajo teachers . . . In the smaller Rough Rock school, I found ten Navajo teachers . . . in the dormitories in Tuba City, I found cold, really humane structures for these children . . . at Rough Rock . . . they used the mothers and parents of the community to live with the children so that they had a friend, a supporter, counselor and adult, just like every child needs at that age.

"They have a permissive environment . . . the parents were encouraged to sleep over night with the kids. Wherever you went, Navajos were moving freely in and out of the classrooms. I didn't see any of that at the Tuba City school.

"I saw an exciting bi-lingual program at Rough Rock . . . Navajo textbooks developed by Navajo illustrators and under the supervision of Navajo leadership. I saw the creative use of local Navajo talents, so that side by side with the white teacher or with the Navajo teacher there was a mother teaching arts and crafts and telling the traditional stories of Navajo lore.

"I saw exciting adult education systems at Rough Rock, not at Tuba City.

"I saw a system at Rough Rock where they hired and fired the teacher, where the school board determined the policy, what I hear at the Tuba City school was all to the contrary.

"More than all of that and in an indefinable way, I saw a spirit and pride and excitement of people, who realized for the first time they had something to say about their own lives.

"I think the difference was the difference between night and day. I am not an expert in the field, but I think I know how to assess human feeling. I came away from Rough Rock committed to doing the best I could to tell the American people what I saw."

Commissioner Bennett quickly agreed with Mondale, but in the same sentence he defended the Bureau and testified that the sub-committee should also look at public schools where Indian children are educated and supply the Bureau with more money to do the job right.

"I don't have any argument at all . . . because this is the same goal to which we are working as far as the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools are concerned," Bennett testified.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, which operates through Division of Land Management under the Department of the Interior, has been laying the quins of an inflexible bureaucracy for more than a century. Indians expect to see the day when there will be

more Bureau employees than Indians. Indians frequently contend that if all the Indians left the United States it would take the Bureau a century to phase itself out of existence.

The total annual budget of the Bureau next year will be \$265 million. To operate 72 boarding schools, 18 boarding dormitories and 175 day schools on or near reservations, the Bureau will spend \$110 million of the total budget. The total budget does not reflect building funds. The tradition of the Bureau has been to build large efficient schools and ship children thousands of miles from their homes for a centralized education.

Bennett said he graduated from a federal boarding school and has worked for the Bureau for thirty-six years. He is of Indian descent. In a speech in Minneapolis three years ago, shortly after he became Commissioner, he was not critical of the Indian policies of the past because, he said then, he thought the "policies of the past were well intentioned."

"The motivation was good and so were all the people. There is no question that the decisions which were made many years ago were the best that could be made at that point in history."

The Commissioner probably did not intentionally mean to include the autonomous authority of Indian agents on the reservation, inhuman tribal relocations, exploitation of Indian land, suppression of Indian language and religion, and cultural genocide.

Now that the dominant society seems bored with suppressing Indians and making them white, the Bureau stands between the people and their ambition to run their own lives. The burdens of the people are many, but Rough Rock is a symbol that Indians are alive and breathing on at least one reservation.

Testifying before the sub-committee last March, Bennett said he believed "there had been" an attitude of paternalism by the Bureau, but he stated that "this was one of the attitudes which had to be eliminated . . . and for three years I have worked on it. . . ."

"We are performing to the maximum of our ability with the resources that are available," he testified, adding that he believes the Bureau can manage the problems of Indian people.

Before the sub-committee Bennett took credit for creating a full division of education within the Bureau; he was agreeable to criticism of the Bureau from members of the sub-committee, but blamed everything on the "various winds" and unthinking critics.

"Indian needs are so many and varied one scarcely knows where to begin . . . we get swept around by the various winds and currents of the national policy," he told the sub-committee.

Bennett himself is symbolically the best measure of the Bureau (as Rough Rock is of what Indians can do) and its relationship to Indians. He side steps criticism, speaks like a bureaucrat carrying out policy directives on the one hand, and pretends that Indians are planning and making the decisions for the Bureau on the other. He is not unkind, but defensive, confused, inconsistent and difficult to follow. Indians educated by and working for the Bureau strongly support him, others want to believe him because he is an Indian, but Bennett is unclear. His language shows his own identity problem.

He refers to the "profoundness" of the Indian in his testimony, but it would take more than a profound Indian to unravel the policies and guidelines of the Bureau.

Bennett does not question the intentions of his administrators and seems to believe that the Bureau has never made mistakes. He testified that "The current critics in Indian affairs tend to blame the education programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for all the social, economic and political ills of Indian people that, in actuality, are the

cumulative results of a century of neglect, misunderstanding, prejudice and paternalism."

"I am not very profound in Indian affairs," the Commissioner of Indian Affairs told the subcommittee, "because I have been associated with them too long and that during this period of association I have developed a great respect for their profoundness."

But Bennett has not demonstrated his respect for the "profoundness" by allowing the people to run their own schools. He testified that it is the policy of the Bureau to move toward local control only if the tribe requests it.

Mondale, pointing out that last year President Johnson directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish Indian school boards for federal Indian schools, asked Bennett how many school boards have been established.

Bennett: "So far, there have been two established because of the guidelines necessary to implement the President's message. . . ."

Mondale: "One of them is at Rough Rock. Where is the other one?"

Bennett: "Blackwater on the Pima Reservation."

Mondale: "At the present rate of establishing the school boards. . . . How long will it be before the President's directive is fully carried out?"

Bennett: ". . . we leave this up to the Indian people. We don't believe that we should go out and force them into school boards."

Mondale: "Are the Indians resisting local control?"

Bennett: "There are a variety of reactions . . . our policy is not to force this upon them. They have the guidelines and the appropriate requirements for applying for the administration of their schools. . . ."

Mondale: "Is it the intention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the so-called advisory boards come within the meaning of the President's directive?"

Bennett: "No sir; it is not. These are strictly people selected at large from the Indian community that advise us in the development of our educational policies and also our school operations. . . ."

Mondale: "I was very impressed by the pride and the involvement of the board of education at Rough Rock and the parents in the community. If there is anything I heard from everyone I talked to, it was their pride and delight for the first time in their history of having something to say about the quality and direction and sensitivity in the education of their own children, something which every other American has had for generations.

"What is it about Indians that makes them any less desirous of local control and having something to say about the education of their children than anyone else in this country?"

Bennett: "I don't think there is any difference. I think they have wanted to do this for a long time. This is why we have the present policy."

Mondale: "Why has a century gone by and yet there are only two systems in the country where that is true?"

Bennett: "It might be because of the fact for many years American Indians did not accept an education program of any kind."

Mondale: "Is it your testimony that the Indians didn't want their children educated?"

Bennett: "My testimony is they evidently weren't satisfied with the education they were getting because they weren't sending them to school."

Mondale: "I think that is right. I agree with that. . . ."

Bennett testified that when the Bureau tried to bring Indian heritage and bi-lingual education into the educational system "there was an uproar in education circles about the fact that we were trying to teach Indians to be Indians . . . we get swept around by the various winds. . . ."

Mondale: "Right. As long as it is federally

controlled, it will continue to be, won't it? In other words, if the Indian children of this country are going to be educated pursuant to the notions of the current white power structure that controls Washington, you are going to have winds of change for the next century. . . .

"No other parents have that problem. If you told the school district where I was educated that we had to have a handy-dandy new national policy which was going to be controlled from Washington, complete in every detail—hiring, firing, curriculum and the rest—and that the budget bureau in Washington was going to determine through some unknown bureaucrat the nature of our education, you would have a revolution, you would have a war, and I think it would be a justified one. Yet, this has been going on for a century in Indian education."

A CANCER SURVIVOR'S WARNING

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now faced with important decisions regarding its responsibility to the American public in the area of protection from the dangers of cigarette smoking. Only the most naive still argue that cigarette smoking can be indulged in without serious danger to the human body.

If the danger is recognized, then the Congress should act to protect the public interest. First, by bringing an end to Government subsidization of tobacco crops which encourage the production of this harmful material. Second, by seeing that Federal agencies and the State governments are given the means and the freedom to take all steps necessary to adequately warn the public of the dangers. Both these proposals have my complete and unswerving support.

The best and most remarkable statement in support of this position that I have ever read was written by State Senator Edward J. Speno, of New York. He is a man who was given up for dead by his doctors because he was afflicted by what they thought was an incurable cancer. He survived, and has become a true champion in the struggle against the dread disease of cancer.

He speaks as one who has come from the valley of the shadow of death, with an earnest message for his fellow Americans. An important part of that message is to avoid the horrible danger of smoking, and a call to his fellow legislators to protect the American people.

His story should be read by all, and it follows:

A CANCER SURVIVOR'S WARNING

(By Edward J. Speno)

Ten years ago doctors at the Mayo Clinic advised me to put my personal and business affairs in order because I would be dead of cancer within a few weeks.

I make my living using words—written words when I prepare a brief at my law firm, spoken words when I address my colleagues on the New York Senate floor. But in a personal crisis words may be inadequate for communicating special thoughts and special feelings, as when I tried to impart to my wife and four children during those remaining few days all the things I should have said to them before, but didn't and all the

things I would have said to them in the future, but now couldn't.

My weight dropped 60 pounds from 198 to 138. It was decided to try daily maximum-dosage radiation treatment but it was essentially a token effort because neither the doctors nor I held out much hope. But the weeks mysteriously stretched into months and then, quite unexpectedly—some said miraculously—the radiation therapy seemed to show results. And then, complete recovery—which still baffles the specialists who had all but written me off. Although my cancer was abdominal and probably had no cause-and-effect relationship with the pack or more of cigarettes I had been smoking every day, I promptly gave them up, for I had now seen firsthand the pathetic effects of tobacco on the human body.

The first reaction most people have to being told they are going to die of cancer is usually "Why me?" And if the patient dies, the question, unanswered, is buried with him. If he recovers, the rhetorical question gradually fades away. But in my case, the question persisted. "Why me?" And to it was added another: "Why was I allowed to recover?" I am not ashamed to admit that I sincerely feel I was stricken and then spared for a reason. And so I have dedicated my life to waging a legislative battle against cancer, especially cancer caused by smoking and other critical health problems.

As one of the very few who went to cancer country and returned to tell about it, almost daily I think about needless deaths caused by smoking. Recently I thought about cancer caused by smoking as I watched my son wash his car. He began with a brand-new, beige colored sponge and as it got dirtier he would rinse it out again and again until the dirt became so deeply imbedded in the sacs of the sponge that he gave up trying to rinse it out, threw it away and got a new one. I understand the human lung is a beige, sponge-like mass about the size of that plastic sponge. It occurred to me that when it gets clogged with dirt, we can't rinse it out, we can't casually throw it away—and we cannot get a new one!

This year 300,000 Americans will die painfully and prematurely because they smoke. The Public Health Service has reported that cigarette smoking is the main cause of 50,000 lung cancer deaths annually plus 25,000 deaths from respiratory diseases. They further state that a third of all deaths of men between 35 and 60 are related to smoking. And so this "invited killer," the cigarette, continues its campaign of mass murder. Seventy million Americans now smoke. Suicide-on-the-installment-plan continues unabated and as the years go by, the number of people who sign on the dotted line increases and the age of those who sign up gets lower and lower. In one study of 11-year-olds, 50 per cent of the little boys and 25 per cent of the little girls smoked regularly. Literally nothing else kills so many Americans—and that includes war and automobiles—as do cigarettes. About 1,000,000 productive young people now in our schools will die of lung cancer alone before they reach 65—to say nothing of emphysema, heart attacks, etc.—unless we do something about the cigarette menace.

When we think about the smoking problem, we see that three groups are involved: the smokers, the manufacturers (including advertisers and sellers) and the legislators who make laws governing the sale and distribution of cigarettes.

THE SMOKERS

Regarding the smokers, there are none so deaf as those who will not hear. A mountain of statistical evidence based upon 13,000 scientific studies in 20 years of investigation in nations all around the world cites the causal relationship between smoking and cancer and other diseases. But proof, like beauty, is often in the eye of the beholder.

So, when we recognize the smoker's re-

fusal to acknowledge the facts about smoking, we must consider fresh ways to effect his rehabilitation. Coupled with this effort must be a program of prevention for those who are about to begin smoking.

Where do we begin with rehabilitation? Of the 200,000,000 Americans now alive, 70,000,000 smoke regularly; some are heavy smokers, others light smokers. But I think the numbers are so formidable that for the time being, at least, we will almost have to write off the heavy smokers. When I was in a cancer ward I saw men whose mouth, cheeks, tongue, larynx and esophagus had been cut away surgically because of cancer caused by smoking. A few were still smoking, holding the cigarette to the hole that led into their windpipe!

But with the light smoker there could still be hope. By the logical route, we must continue to barrage him with statistical evidence that smoking causes cancer and other illness until he recognizes the inevitability of the proof. By the emotional route we must find appropriate psychological means of tapping those human drives, wants and insecurities which prompt many to smoke, not to smoke or at least not to smoke too much. We must seek ways to make the ashtray as obsolete—and its use so aesthetically repulsive—as we have the spittoon!

It is in the area of prevention through education that we can most profitably expend our energies. I look to our educational leaders to develop effective school instruction in the health sciences by teachers who can communicate with our youngsters and who are professionally prepared in the health area. It is my personal belief that antismoking education should start early in the elementary grades before the child is confronted with the decision of whether to smoke.

But our educational efforts should not be confined to school programs. In two years, half of the American population will be under 25 years of age. We must seek to touch the right psychological nerve in the teenager of the "now generation." Maybe our anti-smoking TV commercials are too bland. Maybe detailed descriptions of the grim experiences of stars who finally "made it" but then died of lung cancer—stars such as Nat King Cole, Dick Powell, William Tallman, Edward R. Murrow, Franchot Tone, Judy Holliday, etc.—might impress them; or of those who are still alive but live in the shadow of recurring lung cancer, like Arthur Godfrey or John Wayne. Or maybe it takes more to frighten them. Maybe such commercials should include an "on location" TV spot showing a cancer ward like the one I was in where noses, cheeks, jaws, tongues, larynxes, throats were cut away because of cancer caused by cigarettes.

Maybe fear is no longer a motivating force for young people. Maybe the "now generation," which presumably trusts no one over 30, no one of the "establishment," can be reached by pointing out that cigarette manufacturers and advertisers are part of the "establishment," a part that is duping them into believing it is "cool," it is "in," to smoke. Maybe the social need to smoke, which so many adults feel, might be one of the "adult" values the teenagers choose to reject. Maybe they can be made to feel proud about being the "unhooked" generation.

THE SELLERS

There are none so blind as those who will not see. Thus far, the manufacturers, advertisers and sellers of cigarettes have chosen not to see that they literally are engaged in an industry that deals in death, an industry no less morbid or morally suspect than munitions making. At least the munitions makers can take some refuge in the notion that their products are also used for defense. But profit is all the cigarette manufacturers can point to. They must be made to see that they are dealing in a kind of genocide whose victims are well on their way to equal in number those of the Nazi holocaust. Maybe someday

there will be tobacco trials similar to the Nuremberg trials or the thalidomide trials to establish moral and legal guilt and to fix penalties. The tobacco industry must be made to see that were cigarettes a food or a drug they would be banned from production and sale without a moment's hesitation. And the fact is they are both; smoke is swallowed and it is absorbed into the body tissues like some drugs.

Considering the increasing frequency and severity of the charges being leveled against the tobacco industry, it has been conspicuously silent. The nearest it has come to refutation has been to make three points: first, by indirect means, that smoking is not harmful; second, in contradiction, that smoking may be harmful but that our economy could not afford to eliminate the tobacco industry; third, that the attitude of regarding smoking as a pleasurable, positive activity is so deeply ingrained in Americans that all attempts to change this attitude are futile.

But the research effort to test the harmfulness to health of cigaret smoking has been objective, exhaustive and conclusive. In virtually every test, smoking has been indicted as a cause of cancer and other debilitating diseases. The closest the industry has come to offsetting this finding has to do with the famous—or infamous—True magazine episode. The January, 1968, issue of True magazine (with a circulation of 2,000,000) contained an article entitled, "To Smoke or Not To Smoke—That Is the Question." Despite the fact that the article was shot through with fallacies, misleading innuendos and misstatements, the Tobacco Institute's public relations agency ordered 600,000 reprints and mailed them to doctors, lawyers, teachers and other professional people. The Tobacco Institute did so anonymously, and the implication was that True had made the mailing. Five cigaret manufacturers individually bought and mailed 450,000 reprints. Other tobacco companies bought newspaper ads promoting the article, again making no mention of tobacco industry involvement.

In March, another pro-smoking article entitled "Cigarette Cancer Link Is Bunk," this time in the New York Enquirer with a circulation of 1,000,000. Investigation revealed that both articles were written by the same man in the employ of the Tobacco Institute's public relations agencies. Thus, more than 4,000,000 Americans, many of them pathetically addicted to smoking and looking for any excuse not to stop smoking, were subjected to two articles which attempted to minimize and debunk the dangers of smoking. Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) exposed the Tobacco Institute complicity in the sordid affair on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Regarding the second assertion, that the tobacco industry is too important to our economy, the rationale is even more immoral than the first. I am not impressed by the fact that the tobacco industry is a \$7-billion-a-year industry employing 17,000,000 people. The war in Vietnam is much more of an "industry," employing many more millions of people. Yet we are trying to stop the war for humanitarian reasons and are not overly concerned about any adverse effect on the economy that peace might bring. And the casualty rate of the Vietnam war is much lower than in the war against cancer and other smoking illnesses.

The third assertion, that society's positive attitudes toward smoking are too firmly set to be changed, bears closer scrutiny. We live in an age of changing attitudes. Just note the drastic changes in attitudes toward sex, toward religion, toward race relations or alcoholism or mental and physical handicap—why not toward smoking? Maybe our pessimism about the possibility of changing our society's attitude toward smoking is one of those self-fulfilling prophecies.

The tobacco industry must be made to see

not only that it is engaged in mass murder but that there are a number of alternatives to oblivion. Let's suggest a few.

The industry can diversify and switch to constructive rather than lethal products. Already some manufacturers have decided they would rather switch than fight, by merging with other companies or diversifying their line of products.

Or they can take some of the \$300,000,000 they now spend every year on radio and TV advertising alone and invest it in scientific research to isolate the harmful ingredients in cigaret smoke, to discover new methods of tobacco growing that would eliminate them from the smoke that enters the body. It seems to me the burden of proof should be on them to prove to society that their product is not harmful, not the other way around. If technological ingenuity can put a man on the moon, can unlock the secrets of the atom, can break the genetic code of DNA, why can't it cope with cigaret smoke? A non-fattening beer was developed when it became economically advantageous—why not a non-lethal cigaret?

The industry should realize that some of the sting can be taken out of growing public resentment against it and its product if the tobacco interests would immediately stop their truly heinous advertising efforts to corrupt the young, or recruit fresh victims. About 4,000 American children begin smoking every day, nearly 1,500,000 a year, and many of them are simply responding to the misleading, immoral invitations to slaughter that comprise the radio and TV commercials.

THE LEGISLATORS

But this article is directed at lawmakers, not smokers or sellers of cigarets. Why? Because I think that by default, by not bringing up the big guns in our legislative battles against those whose products maim and kill, we thereby become accomplices to the crime. And until and unless smokers can be made to hear the warning that smoking murders, and until and unless the cigaret industry is made to see the severity of its crimes against humanity, legislators must speak.

With regard to legislators, there are none so mute as those who will not speak. Which brings us full circle in the hear-no-evil, see-no-evil, speak-no-evil syndrome. The cigaret industry makes monkeys of us all.

To break this cycle I urge that bold legislation be put into effect now! And if it seems to some that I am being overly sanguine, perhaps it might be because they have never heard a doctor say, "You are dying of cancer."

Most of our legislative activity against cancer has been akin to the activity of the picadors in the bullring. It has infuriated the industry but has weakened the beast only slightly. I have introduced a package of five bills—aimed at decreasing the number of cigaret users in the state—in the Legislature. The first requires the posting of U.S. government tests of tar and nicotine content of all cigarets at the retail establishments where they are sold. A second bill mandates the same information on each package of cigarets. A third in the series prevents the distribution of free samples designed to promote the sale of cigarets to young people under 18 years of age while the fourth outlaws cigaret machines in public hospitals. The final bill in the package changes the printed warning on cigaret packs from: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health" to "Warning: Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Health and May Cause Death From Cancer and Other Diseases."

But I believe that the moment of truth has now arrived. It is time for a decisive resolute *coup de grace* to be inflicted. And so I charge my fellow lawmakers—local, state, and federal—to join me, lest by default we become further implicated in the crime against humanity. Specifically, I urge that we take two bold legislative steps right now.

First, all cigaret advertising on radio and television should be banned. From a moral and philosophical point of view, to allow such advertising is not unlike allowing manufacturers of opium to contaminate the public water supply with opium and then, when there is widespread addiction, especially among the young, to sell opium on the strength of the argument that it is not harmful, or that even if it is harmful it is big business which is good for the economy, or that the public attitude is favorable to using it. The airwaves belong to the public no less than does the water supply. As legislators, we are entrusted with seeing to it that neither is contaminated with poison.

(Two days ago, broadcasters ratified a plan to eliminate cigaret advertising on radio and TV over a four-year period. The move, which would apply to the major networks and the bulk of independent stations, was designed to head off a mandatory ban embodied in a pending Federal Communications Commission rule.)

Second, we should end the schizophrenic government practice of citing the dangers to health of cigarets in government reports and then doing right ahead and giving little-publicized government subsidies to the tobacco crop.

Why now? What makes me optimistic that anything so decisive can be done legislatively now, when so relatively little has been possible to date? Because the time is right. The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. said, "When an idea has reached its moment, nothing can hold it back!" This is that moment.

OEO ATTACK ON LAW AND ORDER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the city police in my State's capital are under harassment from a lawsuit filed by attorneys salaried and subsidized by Federal tax funds funneled through the Office of Economic Opportunity and one of its fronts, the Legal Aid Society of Baton Rouge.

The criminals killed were already under felony convictions. One, Lonnie Hughes, had pleaded guilty to burglary in late 1967, and had never been sentenced because he had skipped bond and was a fugitive from justice at the time he was killed.

Another, James Oliney, was on probation, also under a felony conviction when killed, as was the third, Melvin Palmer.

These men were killed in the act of committing another felony crime by law officers defending themselves.

It is unthinkable that this House would continue to authorize the tax dollars of hard-working Americans for the OEO to finance intimidation suits which could well deprive decent law-abiding citizens of the protection of a competent law enforcement agency.

Even if any one police officer exceeded his lawful authority he would be responsible as an individual. It is absurd to demoralize and intimidate an entire municipal operation, from the mayor, the chief of police on down.

I most strenuously object to any further such outrageous use of Federal funds by OEO to erode law and order and to undermine public confidence and respect

for law-enforcement agencies in my district.

So that our colleagues might have some understanding of how the OEO is misusing the taxpayers' money to inflame racial tensions and undermine law and order, I include a newspaper clipping on an antipolice suit in my district.

DISCRIMINATION CHARGED BR POLICE IN
FED'L SUIT

Next of kin of three young Negroes killed by police during the past two years filed suit in U.S. District Court late Monday, seeking to enjoin the conduct of police officers in Baton Rouge and "to provide availability of police protection and treatment by police in a manner which does not discriminate on the basis of race and color."

U.S. Dist. Judge E. Gordon West has not set a date for hearing of the suit against the City of Baton Rouge, Mayor-President Dumas and the individual members of the City-Parish Council; Police Chief Eddie O. Bauer and Sheriff Bryan Clemmons.

The class action was filed by Mrs. Ellen Johnson and Harry Johnson, grandparents of Lonnie Hughes, 24, who was shot some three weeks ago; James Oliney, father of 17-year-old James Oliney, who was buried Thursday after his fatal wounding a week earlier, and by Mrs. Bessie Palmer, mother of Melvin Palmer, 15, who was killed about 3 a.m. on June 17, 1967.

In all three shootings, police claimed self-defense in pursuit of burglary suspects. All of the youths were convicted of felonies and were on probation at the time of their deaths.

The plaintiffs are suing for themselves and in behalf of their families, their minor children and in behalf of all others similarly situated. All allege they are indigent adult and minor black citizens and taxpayers who are aggrieved by the defendants' conduct, which is termed "a serious and flagrant abuse of the power of the police."

Specifically, the suit seeks an injunction to prohibit the following acts which are alleged in the petition:

Unlawful police raids on black communities, *gestapo* fashion, in search of youthful offenders without regard to the safety and welfare of black citizens, wherein citizens are treated discourteously and are intimidated by threats of beating, incarceration and other acts of violence.

Orders of the chief of police and other administrative officials to pursue and execute black offenders based on conclusions of guilt and trumped-up charges of aggression.

Acts of solicitation and exposure of genital parts to young black females within black communities.

Racist acts, demeanor, attitude and temperament of white law enforcement officials toward black citizens during investigation of misdemeanor violations, or any other confrontation with law enforcement officials.

Acts leading to the unlawful killing, wounding, abuse and beating of black citizens during investigation of misdemeanor violations or any other confrontation with law enforcement officials.

Acts of unlawful chase, harassment, search, and beatings of offenders, including juveniles, during investigation, interrogation and incarceration.

Acts of cruel and inhuman treatment of black offenders during investigation, interrogation and incarceration wherein 20 or more persons are placed in the same cell, starvation imposed and heat applied as a means of torture, to name a few.

Acts of general mistreatment of black citizens whenever they are found by police officers investigating violations of all kinds and during any confrontation with law enforcement officials.

Acts of condonement and support of the

above unlawful acts by the mayor, chief of city police, sheriff or east Baton Rouge Parish and the City-Parish Council.

The suit was filed for the plaintiffs by the Legal Aid Society of Baton Rouge.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN
BRADEMAM, DEMOCRAT, OF INDI-
ANA, 30TH ANNUAL CONVENTION,
NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL ASSO-
CIATION, JULY 19, 1969, CHICAGO,
ILL.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAM

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have been invited to kick off the 30th annual convention of the National Audio-Visual Association.

And, by the way, I think this is the first time that I have addressed an association of this kind when both the microphones and the lights were working.

My speech follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. BRADEMAM

I am very glad to be with you for a number of reasons but most important of all is the enterprise that brings us together—our common concern to strengthen the fabric of American education.

We meet at a time when our eyes are on Apollo and the stars and we marvel at what the mind and spirit of man can achieve. My thesis today is, therefore, clear, and I trust it will be understood by everyone of you in this room, and it is this: Now that we have harnessed our technology to reach the moon, we must harness our technology to teach our children.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY: THE PAST

You and I know how, during recent years, the Federal Government has moved on a wide variety of fronts to increase the national investment in education, and of particular concern to all of us here this morning, how the Federal Government has supported the use and application of modern technology to the teaching of America's young people. I here recite only part of the litany of historic legislation:

The National Defense Education Act Title III program of equipment and materials, at first for the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and now of many other subjects as well.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, with its title II programs for school library resources, including audio-visual aids.

The ESEA Title III program for supplementary centers and services, including a variety of programs involving technology.

The ESEA Title IV Cooperative Research Act program for the investigation and evaluation essential to the future effectiveness of your efforts and those of others.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, which not only supports facilities for educational broadcasting but authorized the Commission on Instructional Technology to inquire into the potential of technology for American education.

The Education Professions Development Act of 1967, which provides for the training of teachers in the use of educational media.

And the Higher Education Act of 1968, which provides the Networks for Knowledge Program to encourage colleges and universities to share with one another their technological and other facilities, such as computer networks and broadcasting equipment.

Moreover, the Select Education Subcom-

mittee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, has only recently unanimously reported out another measure which I am confident that Congress will pass this year that will be of interest to all of you—a bill to establish a national center on educational media and materials for the handicapped. One could go on.

As I say, I cite only a partial listing of the record of Congress over the past decade. This CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in authorizing programs for education has been impressive. As a member of the committee which wrote most of these measures and as a cosponsor of nearly all of them and of others I have not listed, I am very proud to have had a hand in compiling this record. As you know, however—and if you do not know, that indefatigable and tireless worker not only for the audio-visual industry but for all of American education, your extremely able Washington representative, Don White, by now has surely advised you—there is a world of difference between an authorization bill and an appropriation bill.

We have, therefore, a long way to go to make good on the commitment to the American people represented by the extraordinary spectrum of legislation written into being during the years of Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson. I shall then now turn to a discussion of two related subjects—money and Mr. Nixon.

THE PRESENT: RHETORIC AND REALITY

I invite you to turn your minds back to 1968 to the last Presidential campaign and to listen to these words and I here quote: "When we talk about the expense of Government—either Federal, State, or local—the one area we cannot shortchange is education at all levels, seeing to it that young Americans are the best educated in the world, that education is available to all our people that those who don't have an equal chance at the starting line will achieve equal opportunity. This must be our fundamental objective and our path to the realization of the American dream."

The scene shifts from the election year of 1968 to April of 1969. The author of those genuinely eloquent words has by then become the President of the United States, and has just submitted his budget to Congress—the budget which of course reflects the judgment of the President of the United States, on the nation's needs and priorities.

Here then based not on the rhetoric of a Presidential campaign but upon the hard decisions represented in a Presidential budget proposal to the Congress of the United States, is what Mr. Nixon thinks of the role of education in American life. I quote the respected economic writer, Sylvia Porter, in last night's newspaper: "The Nixon Administration bill," she writes, "for the nation's education budget during the 12 months ending July, 1970 would 'startlingly downgrade education to a very low place on the list of national priorities.'"

"Mr. Nixon's budget would in fact" she writes, "erase several education advances achieved under the three previous administrations of Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Specifically, the Nixon Administration would slash the total U.S. Office of Education Budget from 4.1 billion dollars in fiscal '68 to 3.2 billion dollars in fiscal '70, an incredible reduction "of 25% at a time when more and better education is a must."

"The Nixon budget would," notes Sylvia Porter, "reduce to zero funds for school library materials under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, reduce to zero matching funds for materials and equipment for elementary and secondary schools under the National Defense Education Act, reduce to zero funds for guidance and counseling services also under the NDEA, cut in half funds for college library materials under the Higher Education Act of 1965, cut

in half matching funds for public library programs and materials under the Library Services and Construction Act.

"In summary," she says, "President Nixon wants to eliminate entirely three education library programs and emasculate another two and shrink to less than 1½% of our Federal budget the total we spend for education libraries."

You can, I am sure, see that the Nixon education budget will have an especially severe impact upon programs with a high content of what we think of as educational technology. In addition to the proposed cuts I have already listed, the Administration is pressing for reductions of 56 million dollars below President Johnson's fiscal 1970 recommendations for Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III programs, another area in which the advances of technology have been most significant.

I must tell you all, therefore, that education is in deep trouble in Washington, D.C., and unlike Apollo, the Goddess of Wisdom, Athena, may never get off the launching pad in the Nation's Capitol. President Nixon's education budget for 1970 is nearly 40-million dollars less than President Johnson proposed for the same fiscal year when he left office, and President Johnson's budget proposal for education was much too low.

We have our troubles in Congress, too, for on the 24th of July, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Bill comes before the full House Committee on Appropriations and rumors are of more bad news there for American education. On Monday, July 28th, the House of Representatives is scheduled to begin floor debate on the Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill. I am very glad to tell you that the prospects are bright for a bi-partisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans to lead a fight for a package amendment to restore some of the funds for these and other education programs from what we anticipate will be a committee bill far below meeting the soaring needs of American education.

Working with the Emergency Committee on Full Funding all of you, I hope, will get busy now to let your own Representative in Congress know how you feel about this crucial matter. I hope that you will speak up not only for the programs that most directly affect you in the audio-visual industry but for funds so desperately needed across the entire spectrum of American education.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY: THE FUTURE

Now I have been speaking to you of the past, of the record of Congress in passing legislation to support an expanding role for technology in our system of education.

I have spoken of the present, of the current struggle to win the funds to make real the promise of these laws.

I turn now to the future and would offer some more, if you will, philosophical observations about the significance of the phrase, "Educational Technology," to speak of several of the problems those two words conjure up and to make comment on the potential of that phrase.

Let me therefore review with you several of the matters, which it seems to me, all of us concerned with the place of technology in American education must consider if we are effectively to meet our several responsibilities.

First, let me tell you that I am looking forward with interest, as I am sure all of you are, to seeing the report of the Commission on Instructional Technology headed by the former United States Commissioner of Education, Sterling McMurrin, now Dean of Education at the University of Utah. Sometime after we have seen the McMurrin Commission Report, I plan as Chairman of the House Select Education Subcommittee to schedule hearings on the Educational Technology Act of 1969 which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Ralph Yarborough, the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Labor

and Public Welfare Committee, and in the House of Representatives by the distinguished Chairman of my own Committee, Congressman Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky and by myself.

As you know, the Educational Technology Bill authorizes a program of Federal grants for the improvement of pre-school education, elementary and secondary school education, and higher education. The bill is focused on utilizing the resources of technology to do a far more effective job of teaching and learning at all of these levels of American education. I hope very much that spokesmen for the National Audio-Visual Association will give us the benefit of their views on this important mission.

THE "PROCESS" OF INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

But I hope, too, that hearings on the Educational Technology Bill will afford the education community, the education industry, and the American people generally an opportunity to explore in some depth several concerns which I want now briefly to discuss with you.

Here, in my judgment, are some of the problems in applying technology to education to which we must give far more attention than we have so far been doing.

First, I believe we must stop thinking of technology in this country solely as hardware or equipment. In a most persuasive paper prepared last year for the McMurrin Commission, Robert W. Locke and David Engler of the McGraw-Hill Book Company wrote of what they called the "Process of Instructional Technology" and the purpose of that process, mainly, to produce teaching strategies that are relevant to the learning abilities of individual students.

Earlier this year, Dr. Leon Lessinger, the Associate Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, made much the same point when he testified before a House Appropriations Subcommittee. He said: "What we need in education and what we are beginning to develop is a technology of instruction, a notion of technique. This is a notion of different kinds of practices, some of which use equipment that results in validated learning systems."

As an example, if you want to teach reading by using certain methods and equipment such as pacers, we can achieve or demonstrate the results in the sense of showing that youngsters, in fact, do learn. They move one grade level in a given amount of time and so on. This need for a technology, the need for strategies on how you accomplish learning is paramount. "We have had a lot of investment in equipment" said Dr. Lessinger, "and we need lots of equipment . . . with the proposals for demonstration projects and experimental schools, and so forth, we will develop an institutional technology. We will use equipment not as gadgets but as a vital part of an instructional system, something that relates process to results. This is what educators want. They want to get techniques that have a high probability of paying off in pupil achievement."

LEARNING HOW PEOPLE LEARN

If then we can come up with a clearer definition of educational technology as involving more than hardware, we can come to realize that different children learn differently with different media. We come to realize that we do not yet know enough in this country, or indeed I dare say in any country, about how people learn. For not all children live in the same circumstances; not all children have the same background; not all children seek to learn the same thing in the same way.

What I am saying here is that all of us concerned to strengthen the role of technology in education have a deep stake in seeing much more research into the learning process, into what the educators call "basic education." For with more understanding of the different ways in which children learn

will come much deeper awareness of the many different applications of educational technology.

We will, therefore, want more rather than fewer experiments and demonstrations of various ways of instruction. We will surely insist upon hardheaded evaluation of the results of the different ways of applying different technology to teach different children in different circumstances.

In particular, we should stress the importance of applying technology to lift the level of learning of the poor, the black, the minority child, the handicapped child—the child who lives in Center City. My point is that if we can learn more about the applications of the processes of technology to education, we will see better payoffs in terms of what children learn—which is, after all, what education is ultimately all about.

It seems to me clear, then, that you in the audio-visual and related industries have a very great stake in the realization that educational technology goes far beyond equipment to embrace the shaping of the most effective strategies of instruction of the nation's millions of children. If we can begin to move more aggressively in the ways I have been suggesting—more effort on developing different ways of teaching, using different media for different children, more research into the way children learn, more demonstration, experimentation, and evaluation of results—if we can move ahead effectively in all these ways, we will build greater public confidence in the effectiveness of technology in education and, coincidentally, greatly expand the market for your products and your processes. You will understand then why I was greatly encouraged by yesterday's announcement by the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and United States Commissioner of Education Dr. James Allen that he was reorganizing his office to give far more emphasis to research and to spreading new methods of teaching.

Twice in recent speeches Dr. Allen has observed that we need more Federal money for education, not less. Indeed, he has predicted that within a very few years, within a decade, we shall be seeing an expenditure of 100 billion dollars annually by all levels of Government on education, approximately twice what is now being spent. The Federal Government, said Dr. Allen, will have to bear a very large burden of this increased expenditure on education, particularly in the elementary and secondary field, by raising the present Federal share of approximately 8% to from 25% to 30%.

Yet the task of changing outmoded and unproductive patterns in American education should not, in my opinion, be the task of the Federal Government alone. Because you in private business and industry are serving the needs of a crucial public activity—education. For this reason you in the audio-visual and related industries have a unique responsibility to give leadership in all of the several areas of which I have been speaking. You in the audio-visual industry will, in my view, best serve your own as well as the public interest by working hard to assure that the processes of educational technology; indeed, help teachers teach and children learn.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA CONVENTION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Communications Workers of America held their 31st annual convention and

passed a series of resolutions which I believe are of interest to all of us.

This outstanding union's president, Joseph A. Beirne, has provided leadership in social legislation for many years and it should come as no surprise that the recent convention reflected his deep compassion for human dignity in America.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 31A-69-14—MINIMUM WAGE

Over 22 million Americans subsist on incomes below what the government terms the "poverty" level, \$3,500 per year.

Many programs have been discussed and some have been enacted to remove this blight from our land, but the obvious starting point is full employment coupled with adequate minimum wage legislation. Without this foundation, all other programs, no matter how necessary, are but castles built on sand.

The amendments to the Fair Labor Standard Act, adopted in 1961 and 1966, represent great steps forward. However, the present minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour is wholly inadequate, since \$64 a week or \$3,328 a year is still below the "poverty" level—and far below the \$9,000 a year researchers say a family of four needs for a "moderate" standard of living at today's prices.

Still, even that limited protection is denied to 11½ million people employed by private business and another 4 million employed by state and local governments, since they are excluded from coverage under the present law. Still others, including many agricultural workers covered by the Act for the first time in 1966, didn't reach \$1.30 an hour until Feb. 1 of this year and won't reach \$1.60 until 1971.

Such is the legacy of a nation which for so long has put its machines ahead of its men, granting a 7 per cent tax investment credit for new machines, yet allowing human beings to be bought for \$1.30 an hour, while ignoring the rest of a lifetime that goes with that hour's work.

Such a system could not be maintained without the help of some popular mythology. Unfortunately, the propaganda has been used so expertly that the myths persist, and are used expertly in blocking meaningful improvement in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Myth No. 1 is that those below the \$3,500 poverty level are a shiftless lot who won't work anyway. The truth is that three out of five of those 22 million are employed. They are the working poor, doomed to jobs which pay below the poverty level. When you add the 8.8 million children among those 22 million, plus the fatherless homes, the aged and the disabled, the "won't work anyway" myth evaporates.

Myth No. 2 is that expanded minimum wage legislation would put some small companies out of business. The truth is that in 1967, the year after the minimum wage increase, the U.S. Department of Labor made a concerted effort to gather reports of adverse effects. Yet in surveying 700,000 newly-covered businesses, only three closings could be found—and those three had employed 33 people.

Myth No. 3 is that an increase in the minimum wage would be inflationary, or otherwise "bad" for the economy. Yet in evaluating the 1966 amendments, the Secretary of Labor reported: "Employment in the areas affected by the extensions of coverages has increased, and there is no evidence of any restraining effect on the broader coverage of employment opportunity. The increased minimum levels set in 1966 have not contributed to the current inflationary spiral to an extent which permits reasonable questioning of their net value in strengthening both the position of

low-paid workers in particular and the economy in general."

Myth No. 4 says that farm workers are "exceptional" and should be excluded from minimum wage coverage. The truth is that farm labor on newly covered farms increased 36 percent from May 1967 to May 1968 while on farms with no wage minimums, employment declined 9 percent: Obviously, the newly-covered farms prospered, with no ill effects from the minimum wage law.

Myth No. 5—perhaps the most vicious—is an appeal to racial animosities which says minimum wage is a plot that would benefit only minority groups. The truth is that three-fourths of the 22 million Americans under the poverty level are white.

If they were associated with a less tragic subject, it would be laughable to see such myths carefully perpetrated in a nation which in the last 8 years has seen after-tax profits increase 91 per cent and dividend payments increase 84 per cent. Over the same period, wages are up 31 per cent and, in terms of buying power, only 11 per cent.

While minimum wage is the platform upon which all programs to eradicate poverty must be built, it would effectively replace some programs. Full employment coupled with adequate fair labor standards would constitute a guaranteed annual income and would remove many of the ills a negative income tax is designed to cure.

Since 90 per cent of the Americans who work are wage earners, the combination goal of full employment and adequate minimum wage is the only program that makes sense. Such a program would remove the necessity for many of the tax schemes and benefit far more people than any attempt to set up minority group members as proprietors of enterprises whose futures are limited at best. Therefore, be it

Resolved: That the 31st Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America calls on the 91st Congress to:

1—Increase the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to at least \$2 an hour immediately;

2—Broaden the coverage and eliminate the exemptions under the Act so as to extend coverage to 13 million workers now excluded; and

3—Require the payment of overtime after 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week to all workers.

RESOLUTION 31A-69-8—FARM LABOR

Almost four years ago American farm laborers began an intensive effort to achieve what most American workers won more than 30 years ago—the right to bargain collectively.

The focal points of that effort now are the grape vineyards of Central California, the produce counters in America's stores, and the Congress.

The effort began as a strike by the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee against the rich grape growers in the San Joaquin Valley, near Delano, Calif. A week after the strike started, a community-oriented group of grape workers headed by Cesar Chavez, and called the National Farm Workers Association, joined in.

The two striking units merged within a year, and were chartered as the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee AFL-CIO.

From those first days to today, the struggle of these farm workers has generated great admiration and support from organized labor, because the farm workers, are, in effect, evidence of what it would be like to have to work under pre-collective bargaining conditions, and a reminder of the great battles labor fought in the past.

A generation after Congress established

organizing and collective bargaining as national labor policy, which is indispensable for industrial peace and economic progress, farm workers are still denied that policy's coverage.

They face the unchecked hostility of the most wealthy and powerful elements of the agricultural community but without legal protections available to organized workers.

They face questionable government immigration policies, and lax enforcement of immigration regulations, which give the growers a steady stream of alien strike-breakers.

They face the combined and organized forces of reaction lined up against them—the John Birch Society, the National Right to Work Committee, the American Farm Bureau, and the rest of the far-right coalition that always chimes in with the union-hating chorus.

They face propaganda produced by one of the biggest public relations firms in America—disseminated through phony fronts, so-called loyal worker unions, paper consumer groups—all designated to deceive the public.

They are fighting this with two weapons—the truth and the boycott.

In cities and towns all over the country, representatives of the farm workers have spoken, most often to labor groups, spreading the word about their strike, urging support of the boycott, and requesting aid.

CWA has long been on record in support of the farm workers.

Locals have contributed to the UFWOC effort, have supported and publicized the boycott, and after the UFWOC ran into difficulties concerning telephone service in Delano an international officer of CWA informed the company that poor service to UFWOC would be considered a personal affront to CWA.

The UFWOC has achieved some successes.

It has won some contracts.

It has convinced many members of Congress that legislation must be written to give farm workers the rights won by labor a generation ago.

But the Administration's version of what that legislation should contain is far from what is actually needed.

The Department of Labor has devised a plan which in principle advocates union rights for farm workers, but, in fact, organizing and collective bargaining by farm workers remains difficult. It does this through a list of "special rules and procedures."

The administration of the rules and procedures would be by a Farm Labor Relations Board weighed in favor of large growers.

Growers could invoke compulsory arbitration to prevent strikes, and the roster of arbitrators would be furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This legislation must be rewritten to give farm workers the same organizing rights and collective bargaining rights that others enjoy.

But meanwhile the fight continues, in the grape fields, at the produce counters, and in Congress. Therefore, be it

Resolved: That this 31st Annual Convention of CWA requests that every CWA Local make a contribution to the UFWOC Defense Fund at Box 130, Delano, Calif. 93215, and that every Local inform union families of the fight the farm workers are in and of the need to support them both by boycotting grapes and by informing store operators of their participation in the boycott, and be it further

Resolved: That CWA inform appropriate members of Congress and the Administration of our support for legislation giving farm workers the full organizing and collective bargaining rights of American workers.