

could not be made up by additional local levies.

Thank you for your interest in the school districts of the State of Idaho and we urge you to make every effort to see that Public Law 874 continues to be funded at its current level.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. HAWORTH,
Superintendent of Schools.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians.

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Incorporated.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL SEPTEMBER 3, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 315, that the Senate stand in adjournment until Wednesday, September 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, September 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 13, 1969:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Henry L. Brooks, of Kentucky, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit to fill a new

position created by Public Law 90-347 which was approved June 18, 1968.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

William E. Schauffele, Jr., of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Douglas B. Bally, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska for the term of four years.

AMBASSADORS

Taylor G. Belcher, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

Walter L. Rice, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, AND ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Nathaniel Samuels, of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed; and U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, **XXXXXX** Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Jean Evans Engler, **XXXXXX** Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, **XXXXXX** Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., **XXXXXX** U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles William Elfler, **XXXXXX** U.S. Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification thereof as provided by law:

Robert P. Keller	Charles F. Widdecke
Alan J. Armstrong	Louis H. Wilson, Jr.
George C. Axtell	John N. McLaughlin
Foster C. La Hue	Robert R. Fairburn

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles S. Robertson	Thomas H. Miller, Jr.
Duane L. Faw	Robert H. Barrow
Mauro J. Padalino	Herbert L. Beckington
Edward S. Fris	Leonard E. Fribourg
Frank C. Lang	Robert D. Bohn
Victor A. Armstrong	William F. Doehler

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Rex M. Mattingly, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, August 13, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Now let Thy servant depart in peace.—Luke 2: 29.

O God and Father of us all, who dost reveal Thyself in all that is good and true and beautiful, make in our hearts a quiet place and come and dwell therein.

May the days ahead be a period of rest and relaxation for us and may we return ready in body and spirit for the tasks that lie ahead.

As we separate may Thy blessing be upon us to keep us healthy and strong, ever ready to serve our beloved country and always being about our Father's business.

God be in our heads and in our understanding;

God be in our eyes and in our looking;

God be in our mouths and in our speaking;

God be in our minds and in our thinking;

God be at our end—and at our departing.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 9, 1969:

H.R. 2785. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5833. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians;

H.R. 1707. An act for the relief of Miss Jallieh Farah Salameh El Ahwal;

H.R. 5107. An act for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio;

H.R. 8136. An act for the relief of Anthony Smilko;

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Incorporated; and

H. Con. Res. 315. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of Congress from Wednesday, August 13, 1969, until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, September 3, 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4658. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Coulter.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 742. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 203. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project; and

S. 1583. An act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness.

FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have read newspaper reports that President Richard Nixon has stated that he may order the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare not to spend a billion dollars of the amount recently appropriated by the House of Representatives for education of the youth of our Nation.

This is a clear statement by the President of his willingness to engage in a flagrant disregard of the will of Congress. Since the amendment which I proposed to add about \$900 million to our appropriation for education was passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 293 to 120, it represents a clear mandate to the executive branch. Refusal to abide by such a mandate would be an arbitrary and arrogant action.

Such refusal would also afford an indication of the type of set of priorities that the Nixon administration endorses. It would prefer missiles and space capsules to the adequate education of our youth. I think it most regrettable that President Nixon who opposed the concept of Federal aid to education from the beginning should now express a readiness to scuttle House appropriations for Federal aid to education.

The allegation that the spending of the money provided by my amendment would be inflationary is erroneous. If the Federal Government does not spend it, the vast portion of it will have to be spent by local governments or school boards to maintain their local public schools. This money will have to be provided by local property owners out of local taxes. Since the small homeowner is already hard pressed, the President's refusal to afford him the relief provided by my amendment would be a bitter blow indeed.

Failure to follow through on the increased appropriation would also be a heavy blow to parochial schools since a small but important portion of the money will go to these schools for libraries and equipment. It would also be very damaging to young people who want Government loans for college tuition since a small portion is devoted to that purpose also.

I noticed that the President issued his statement after consulting with his advisers, but that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was not among them. This has already been so undercut by the Nixon administration in the attainment of the goals of his Department that it is understandable why he is increasingly being referred to as "Secretary Flinch."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for his statement and also on the leadership which he showed when the appropriation bill was before the House recently.

Surely the President will not turn his back on the Congress of the United States or on the schoolchildren of America. I think it will be the most serious mistake the President will make during his administration if he does not let the will of the Congress take full effect.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what the gentleman from New Jersey had to say. It might have been much easier for the President had the gentleman voted for the surtax extension and the tax bill.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I did vote for the tax bill. I voted for the tax bill.

THE APPROPRIATION AND SPENDING BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at this session of Congress we have enacted a number of supplemental appropriation measures dealing with fiscal 1969, and the House has passed six of the regular annual appropriation bills for the current fiscal year 1970. We lack action in the House on seven of the regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1970.

None of the regular appropriation bills for 1970 have been enacted into law.

And there are a number of bills out of the legislative committees that have a direct bearing on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD a general statement and certain tables in regard to the record of the Congress thus far in regard to these matters.

DIRT IN THE MAILS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the July 24 Redding Pilot analyzes three antiobscenity bills which I introduced on July 17. The questions raised in the article concerning two of the bills highlight the difficult constitutional problems en-

countered when trying to halt the illicit traffic in obscene materials while maintaining intact the protected freedom of communication.

While the editorial cites my third bill as being the most practical to implement, I intend to urge enactment of all three of my bills.

The main objective in all my anti-obscenity bills is to protect our children and certainly their welfare is important enough to push ahead in spite of the interpretation that certain courts have placed on particular situations. This is a case by case matter. And the fact that the issues are difficult should not deter us from working for sound, constitutionally permissible laws to deal effectively with the cancerous traffic in obscene materials.

The editorial follows:

PLAIN BROWN WRAPPER

Congressman John S. Monagan has introduced three bills before the House which he hopes will stem the flood of pornography which passes through the mail.

In a speech before the House, he said "the prohibitions and penalties in my bills are sufficiently stringent to slow the pace of the current flouting of standards of minimum decency by money hungry and calculating publishers." Mr. Monagan has already filed a bill which would require that pornography placed in the mails be prominently labelled as such.

Having had our name acquired by several of these "money hungry and calculating publishers" we think we'd prefer the system they now use—a plain wrapper over an inside envelope which warns what's inside. After all, who wants the mailman to snicker about all the pornographic advertisements you get—even if it's only because a hard-up magazine you subscribe to sold its mailing list.

The first of Mr. Monagan's new bills makes it a crime to ship through the mails or in interstate commerce any materials unsuitable for minors. We don't think this is a practical solution. There are certainly some "materials" which are neither filthy nor prurient which we wouldn't recommend for minors.

The second bill would make it illegal for a person to ship through the mails or interstate commerce any advertisement "designed to appeal to a prurient interest in sex." This law probably wouldn't have much effect, because proving an appeal to a prurient interest has been notably difficult.

The third of Mr. Monagan's proposals is the one we would be most inclined to support. It would authorize the U.S. Postmaster General to maintain a list of citizens who do not want to receive any sexually oriented materials or advertisements. The criminal penalties for those who mail obscene material to those who have registered would be a \$5,000 fine and or five years in prison for the first offense.

This bill seems like a good way to protect those people who wish to be protected. The number of people who would register under this bill would at least give pornographers an idea of how popular or unpopular they are.

WHAT PRICE CLEARING THE AIR?

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial, "Clearing the Air in Peru," in the Washington Post of August 1, 1969, lavishly praised the recent takeover by Chile

of the Anaconda Mining Co. properties and stated:

This nationalization negotiated, compensated, worked out before political storms destroyed the option of compromise—has cleared the air.

It went on to state:

The United States is delighted to be able to point to it as a model for possible takeovers in other Latin countries.

In addition to deploring the fact that the writer appears to be welcoming such takeovers, I believe that someone should challenge this superficial analysis of the Chilean expropriation which glosses over the difficulties which this governmental action has caused and which similar actions there or elsewhere would cause in the future.

Certainly I do not question the doctrine that Chile had the right to expropriate Anaconda's properties but I do insist that the stockholders of that company have the right to receive adequate and prompt compensation.

The payment of the book value of the company's assets—particularly in an extractive industry—on notes spaced over a period of 12 years would hardly seem to qualify as prompt and adequate payment under the standard which we in the United States require in a case where the sovereign takes the property of the citizen. In this country we insist on immediate payment and in cash. Should our fellow Americans not be entitled to expect the same? And while it may be true that we are not going to enforce such a policy, should our Government not at least make noises of disapproval?

Such negotiation as there was in this case was carried on with a gun at the head of the negotiators and any settlement was reached under duress and it is hard to see how this procedure serves as a model for the future takeovers with the editorial envisages.

What a dispassionate observer thinks of Anaconda situation was graphically set out in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal of July 2 where a market analyst not schooled in politics set out his appraisal of the value of the corporate stock of this company as follows:

Aside from the general view that Chile is buying the mines at "well below their true value" analyst Lester Krollenstein of H. Hentz questions the "quality of the paper" involved in the purchase, the extended period during which the payments will be made and "the more critical problem of whether the present or future" government "will be willing and able to service the debt."

Now it may well be true that the tide of socialization is running so strongly in Latin America that in spite of the 20-year agreement which the company had recently concluded with Chile the alternative in this case was outright seizure. And the company directors may have concluded that by paying in 12 years bonds on the book value for 51 percent of the company, the host Government took only one arm instead of the whole body. But do we have to act as if we loved every minute of the experience?

Certainly an Anaconda stockholder whose stock had dropped from 66 to 30 would hardly share the euphoria ex-

pressed in the editorial about the fairness of the compromise. And brass mill workers whose jobs might well depend upon a supply of reasonably priced copper would scarcely applaud our maidenly acquiescence.

The result may have been inevitable, but must we give the impression that we enjoy it?

STUDENTS HANDICAPPED BY LACK OF ACTION ON STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House has failed to do necessary work before the recess starting today. The guaranteed student loan program is vital to many of our young men and women who will soon be entering in colleges and universities.

Continuation of the education of 200,000 young citizens or even one-tenth that number if the figure is in dispute—is far more important according to my sense of values, than 435 Congressmen getting a little midsummer relaxation.

College students are up against a deadline that for many may pass before we return after Labor Day. If the guaranteed student loan program is not extended before we adjourn—and that appears the way it is going to be—thousands of young people who are struggling against economic handicaps for an education which will assure their maximum contribution to our society may not be able to enroll this year.

A few of them may be able to get loans at 8½ percent interest or more—at absorbent rates—becoming the victims of the interest spiral, saddled with indefensibly high repayments, throughout their early careers.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way to postpone our recess, that there is no way to bring this issue before the House until we return after Labor Day, and after it is too late to provide the loan assistance these young people need and there is nothing the lowliest Member of this 435-Member body can do but protest. I do so now.

I do protest that there is too much at stake in the student loan matter alone, because of a deadline which will not wait until after Labor Day, for us to leave without resolving it.

I am convinced that the House will approve the loan program needed by a large majority when it comes to a vote. I believe banks can rely on that. I can only hope that they will do so and make loans at reasonable interest to keep our young people in school.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman, the committee could have gone to the Rules Committee and gotten a rule on the bill. Now the banks can make loans with the assurance that a bill will pass and they can be covered at the end of the quarter. I hope the banks will have confidence and will make the loans during

this month, and be able to participate after the bill has been passed.

Mr. MELCHER. That is my hope, also.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RIBBENTROP-MOLOTOV SECRET PACT

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, to the people of the United States, and to free people all over the world the 30th anniversary of the infamous nonaggression pact and secret protocol signed on August 23, 1939, by J. von Ribbentrop, Hitler's Minister for Foreign Affairs, and V. M. Molotov, Stalin's Commissar of Foreign Affairs.

This secret agreement between Russia and Germany paved the way for Russian domination of the Baltic States by allowing the Soviet Government to establish itself in Estonia, Latvia, and Bessarabia—part of Rumania—and in Poland as far west as the Vistula River which flows through Warsaw. Part of Warsaw was to be transferred to the Soviets and Lithuania was to fall within the German sphere of influence and activity. At subsequent military conferences, however, the Russians surrendered part of their Polish zone, including the section of Warsaw. In exchange, Germany consented to Soviet domination of Lithuania.

The Russo-German Pact of August 23, 1939, came into force immediately on its signing, and only 8 days later, Germany attacked Poland. And less than a year later, in June 1940, bolstered by this agreement reached with Hitler, the Russians overran the Baltic States, brutally conducted mass deportations to Siberia, and caused the death of thousands upon thousands of innocent Baltic people.

Mr. Speaker, today, 30 years later, I would like to remind my colleagues, and the official representatives of our country, as well as the official representatives of other countries of the free world, that the unfortunate people of the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, still find themselves under the yoke of Soviet domination.

I am pleased that President Richard Nixon has concluded a visit to Rumania, and according to the press, he is contemplating a visit to Moscow in the future. It is my hope, as serious discussions take place between representatives of our country, the leader in the free world, and representatives of the Soviet Union, that besides the currently popular issues of disarmament, and curtailment of developing and testing of sophisticated weapons, the compelling and urgent issue of the fate and future of the people of the Baltic States; namely, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, will receive prime consideration.

The world cannot live at peace unless and until the territorial integrity and freedom of the people who are held in bondage today are restored, so that once

again they may enjoy the precious rights of self-determination and self-government. This is the mission, this is the task, this is the duty, and this is the obligation of the United States of America to people everywhere who are held in bondage.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include the text of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, which follows:

[From "Nazi-Soviet Relations, 1939-41," documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Office, edited by Raymond James Sontag and James Stuart Beddie]

TREATY OF NONAGGRESSION BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, AUGUST 23, 1939

The Government of the German Reich and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, desirous of strengthening the cause of peace between Germany and the U.S.S.R., and proceeding from the fundamental provisions of the Neutrality Agreement concluded in April 1926 between Germany and the U.S.S.R., have reached the following agreement:

ARTICLE I

Both High Contracting Parties obligate themselves to desist from any act of violence, any aggressive action, and any attack on each other, either individually or jointly with other powers.

ARTICLE II

Should one of the High Contracting Parties become the object of belligerent action by a third power, the other High Contracting Party shall in no manner lend its support to this third power.

ARTICLE III

The Governments of the two High Contracting Parties shall in the future maintain continual contact with one another for the purpose of consultation in order to exchange information on problems affecting their common interests.

ARTICLE IV

Neither of the two High Contracting Parties shall participate in any grouping of powers whatsoever that is directly or indirectly aimed at the other party.

ARTICLE V

Should disputes or conflicts arise between the High Contracting Parties over problems of one kind or another, both parties shall settle these disputes or conflicts exclusively through friendly exchange of opinion or, if necessary, through the establishment of arbitration commissions.

ARTICLE VI

The present treaty is concluded for a period of ten years, with the proviso that, in so far as one of the High Contracting Parties does not denounce it one year prior to the expiration of this period, the validity of this treaty shall automatically be extended for another five years.

ARTICLE VII

The present treaty shall be ratified within the shortest possible time. The ratifications shall be exchanged in Berlin. The agreement shall enter into force as soon as it is signed. Done in duplicate, in the German and Russian languages.

Moscow, August 23, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich: J. RIBBENTROP.

With full power of the Government of the U.S.S.R.: V. MOLOTOV.

SECRET ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL

On the occasion of the signature of the Nonaggression Pact between the German Reich and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the undersigned plenipotentiaries of

each of the two parties discussed in strictly confidential conversations the question of the boundary of their respective spheres of influence in Eastern Europe. These conversations led to the following conclusions:

1. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R. In this connection the interest of Lithuania in the Vilna area is recognized by each party.

2. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement of the areas belonging to the Polish state the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R. shall be bounded approximately by the line of the rivers Narew, Vistula, and San.

The question of whether the interests of both parties make desirable the maintenance of an independent Polish state and how such a state should be bounded can only be definitely determined in the course of further political developments.

In any event both Governments will resolve this question by means of a friendly agreement.

3. With regard to Southeastern Europe attention is called by the Soviet side to its interest in Bessarabia. The German side declares its complete political disinterest in these areas.

4. This protocol shall be treated by both parties as strictly secret.

Moscow, August 23, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich: J. RIBBENTROP.

Plenipotentiary of the Government of the U.S.S.R.: V. MOLOTOV.

CONFIDENTIAL PROTOCOL

The Government of the U.S.S.R. shall place no obstacles in the way of Reich nationals and other persons of German descent residing in the territories under its jurisdiction, if they desire to migrate to Germany or to the territories under German jurisdiction. It agrees that such removals shall be carried out by agents of the Government of the Reich in cooperation with the competent local authorities and that the property rights of the emigrants shall be protected.

A corresponding obligation is assumed by the Government of the German Reich in respect to the persons of Ukrainian or White Russian descent residing in the territories under its jurisdiction.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich: J. RIBBENTROP.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.: W. MOLOTOV.

SECRET SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The undersigned Plenipotentiaries declare the agreement of the Government of the German Reich and the Government of the U.S.S.R. upon the following:

The Secret Supplementary Protocol signed on August 23, 1939, shall be amended in item 1 to the effect that the territory of the Lithuanian state falls to the sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R., while, on the other hand, the province of Lublin and parts of the province of Warsaw fall to the sphere of influence of Germany (cf. the map attached to the Boundary and Friendship Treaty signed today). As soon as the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take special measures on the Lithuanian territory to protect its interests, the present German-Lithuanian border, for the purpose of a natural and simple boundary delineation, shall be rectified in such a way that the Lithuanian territory situated to the southwest of the line marked on the attached map should fall to Germany.

Further it is declared that the economic agreements now in force between Germany and Lithuania shall not be affected by the measures of the Soviet Union referred to above.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich: J. RIBBENTROP.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.: W. MOLOTOV.

SECRET SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The undersigned Plenipotentiaries, on concluding the German-Russian Boundary and Friendship Treaty, have declared their agreement upon the following:

Both parties will tolerate in their territories no Polish agitation which affects the territories of the other party. They will suppress in their territories all beginnings of such agitation and inform each other concerning suitable measures for this purpose.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich: J. RIBBENTROP.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.: W. MOLOTOV.

THE LATE HONORABLE BARRATT O'HARA

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post in an editorial reveals a remarkable tribute to our departed colleague, Congressman Barratt O'Hara. The Illinois congressional delegation has set aside time when the House reconvenes on September 3 to pay tribute to this great statesman and patriot. His public service to this Nation extended from the Spanish-American War in 1898 up to his passing last Monday, August 11.

I hereby submit the editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington Post in tribute to Barratt:

BARRATT O'HARA

"Our youth and our manhood are due to our country," wrote Pliny, "but our declining years are due to ourselves." Few men have reversed that sentiment more dramatically than Barratt O'Hara, who died this week in Washington at age 87. At a time when the delights of grandchildren, rocking chairs and St. Petersburg take hold, Mr. O'Hara won election to the House of Representatives, from Illinois, at 66. The next term he was defeated, but he rebounded two years later, this time to stay in office until 1968.

In his earlier career—as a writer, soldier, lawyer, film executive, radio commentator—Mr. O'Hara displayed the same courage and intelligence that he later brought to Capitol Hill. A liberal, he was a student and supporter of emerging African nations. He also fought the abuses of the House Un-American Activities Committee. To the younger members of Congress, as well as the nation, Mr. O'Hara displayed one of the rare skills: growing old with grace and enthusiasm.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARE MAGEE

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House the death of a former colleague from Mis-

souri, the Honorable Clare Magee, who was elected in 1948, and who served here from 1949 to 1953. He served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Committee on Public Works. He rendered distinguished service to his district, to his State, and to the Nation.

I know we all join in mourning his passing.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Missouri and our Nation has suffered a loss in the passing of Clare Magee.

Although it was not my privilege to serve in the Congress with him in the days when he was a Member of this body, it was my pleasure to visit with him in the city of Washington on numerous occasions as a spokesman for the county court of Jackson County, Mo., to present and explain some of our local problems. Moreover, the late Mrs. Magee was a close and good friend of some of my predecessors who represented the Fourth Missouri District.

For the foregoing reasons I can attest to the fact that the former distinguished Representative from northeast Missouri was a man who always had time to see and visit with those who journeyed to Washington if they had business that concerned the Congress, whether they happened to be constituents of his particular district or not.

Clare Magee was a man who had the enviable characteristic of being gracious and friendly with everyone who knew him. Like everyone else, he had his frustrations and disappointments, but he seemed to be possessed of a capacity of imperturbability, and as I remember him, was always pleasant and even tempered.

Many things can be said about a man who serves as a Member of Congress but I suppose when all is said and done, the best that can be said is that Clare Magee was always on the job. He tried to represent the district from which he had been elected and with all the decisions he had to make he kept uppermost in his mind—first, the welfare of his country; second, the welfare of his district, and last, the welfare of the party to which he belonged—in that order. If all Members applied this kind of a test when their time comes to depart this life, words and eulogy would be much easier for their survivors.

The passing of our good friend from northeast Missouri will leave a void in the hearts and minds of all those who knew him and all Missouri will be the poorer because he has gone on to his reward. Our sympathy goes to those loved ones that he leaves behind.

FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE LATIN AMERICAN PARLIAMENT

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon to report on the Fourth General Assembly of the Latin American Parlia-

ment which was held last week in Bogotá, Colombia.

My distinguished colleague from California and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the Honorable WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, and I were designated to represent the U.S. Congress at that conference.

We went to Bogotá in response to an invitation extended by the Latin American Parliament. The Parliament, a relatively new body, asked the U.S. Congress to send observers to Bogotá.

Similar invitations were extended to the earlier meetings of the Latin American Parliament. This was the first time, however, that the U.S. Congress responded by sending observers.

I believe that my colleagues will be interested to know that 10 Latin American countries—Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela—were officially represented at the Fourth General Assembly.

In addition, a number of countries and international organizations sent observers.

The latter included parliamentarians from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Norway, and Sweden; representatives of the Council of Europe; and delegates from the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and other international organizations.

The meetings of the Latin American Parliament were held in the chamber of the House of Representatives of the Colombian Parliament.

The Speaker of the Colombian House, the Honorable Ramiro Andrade Teran, presided.

The discussions related to Latin America's internal conditions, development tasks, and external relations.

A dialog with the Western European parliamentarians, and an exchange with the U.S. congressional observers, also took place.

The resolutions adopted at the conclusion of the Fourth General Assembly covered a number of subjects. They touched on such issues as economic integration, condition of liberty on the Latin American continent, interhemispheric relations, and U.S. policies affecting economic and other developments on the South American continent.

Mr. Speaker, although it was not our role as observers either to contribute to the shaping or to comment on the substance of those resolutions, I would like to note that some of them were, in my opinion, unduly and unnecessary critical of various U.S. policies and programs.

The expression of such views was, of course, the prerogative of the Latin American parliamentarians—just as it is our prerogative, which we exercise here quite frequently, to make observations and pass judgments on their laws, customs, actions, and so forth.

In both instances, however, I feel that as the representatives of the people, both here in the United States and in Latin America, the parliamentarians have a very grave responsibility to seek the

truth and the advancement of the public good.

My colleague, Congressman MAILLIARD, and I tried to stress this point in our presentations to the Latin American parliamentarians. And we urged closer collaboration and greater unity in approaching the solution of the complex problems which confront Latin America.

A more complete account of our remarks appeared in a number of Colombian newspapers, and I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a release summarizing them. It follows:

NORTH AMERICAN CONGRESSMEN CALL FOR UNITY, CLOSE COOPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA ON 1970'S

Two North American Congressmen today called for unity and close collaboration between the governments, private organizations and individuals in the Hemisphere "to hammer out a new strategy of development for the 1970's."

The two Congressmen are Rep. Dante B. Fascell (Democrat from Florida), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the U.S. Congress, and Rep. William S. Mailliard (Republican from California), the leading Republican member of the Subcommittee.

They are attending the 4th General Session of the Latin American Parliament as official observers designated by the U.S. Congress.

In a dialogue Wednesday morning between the North Americans and their Latin American counterparts, the two Congressmen praised the initial progress of the Alliance for Progress and said that "there is no more urgent task before this Hemisphere than the realization of the goals of social and economic progress outlined in the Act of Bogotá, the Charter of Punta del Este, and the Declaration of the American Presidents."

Congressmen Fascell and Mailliard told the Latin American Parliamentarians that "all of us as legislators have a tremendous responsibility to help bring about the implementation of policies which will promote development and fulfill the legitimate aspirations for better life of 250 million people of Latin America."

In their presentations, the North American legislators stressed three major issues:

INTEGRATION

They expressed their particular satisfaction with the growing interest in and accomplishments of Latin American integration spurred on by actions taken in the III General Assembly of the Latin American Parliament in Brazil last year and its preliminary meeting in May of this year in Managua.

The North American Congressmen singled out the Central American Common Market and the recent formation of the Andean Group as "significant, constructive steps leading to the creation of a larger, more diversified market in Latin America."

Citing parallels in the development of the United States, Congressmen Fascell and Mailliard said that their own country "did not begin to approach its potential for progress until the creation, in North America, of a single market stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans."

"Latin America, with the enlightened support of its leaders and parliamentarians", they said, "is beginning to move firmly in the same direction."

The North American legislators said that they would urge the United States Government "to provide more effective assistance to Latin American integration."

Specifically, they expressed their personal interest in working for the untying of AID loans for integration to permit procurement of goods and services not only in the U.S. but also in the cooperating countries within each regional trade group.

CONSENSUS OF VINA DEL MAR

In a reference to the Consensus of Vina del Mar, Congressmen FASCELL and MAILLIARD commended the Special Latin American Coordinating Committee (CECLA) "for initiating the first step in a useful and necessary dialogue which must precede the working out of a new strategy of development for the next decade."

"The listing of the principal aspirations of the Latin American countries, added to the findings of Governor Rockefeller's Mission, and the results of the various initiatives which we have already started within the U.S. Government," they said, "will provide the Inter-American Economic and Social Council members meeting in Washington in October, with a format for discussions which should lead to positive, constructive programs and policies in support of Latin American development."

The North American Congressmen stressed that "the U.S. Government has taken very seriously the expressions originating in Vina del Mar and elsewhere in Latin America."

As a case in point they cited President Nixon's actions in:

Discontinuing the practice of applying the so-called "additionality" requirement to U.S. aid;

Preparing recommendations to the OECD for a system of generalized trade preferences;

Pledging a \$15 million loan to the Diversification Fund of the International Coffee Agreement; and

Increasing multilateralization of financial and technical assistance.

In addition, the Congressmen pointed out that a report issued a few days ago by their Subcommittee urged relaxation of conditions in aid to Latin American development, greater sharing of technology between the U.S. and Latin America, and the creation of "imaginative new ways" for engaging the broad spectrum of private and governmental institutions "in the advancement of human progress in our Hemisphere."

FUTURE ASSISTANCE

The Congressmen expressed their particular pleasure in having an opportunity to visit Colombia, which recently has made important progress in its economic and social development programs. Both indicated the very favorable impact on the entire Alliance for Progress of the recent visit of Colombian President Carlos Lleras Restrepo to the United States. They expressed the hope that their efforts in the U.S. Congress to continue economic assistance to the Alliance would prove successful.

Congratulating the delegates to the Latin American Parliament for their dedication to inter-American development, the Congressmen urged a redoubling of efforts.

Citing the Consensus of Vina del Mar, the Congressmen said they agreed that "economic growth and social progress (in Latin America) is the responsibility of the (Latin American) peoples and that the attainment of their national and regional objectives depends fundamentally on the efforts of each country."

"We intend to work with you," the Congressmen concluded.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, on August 17, the Charter of the Alliance for Progress was signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay. We will observe the eighth anniversary of the Alliance quietly and thoughtfully, for we

have far to go and many difficulties to overcome before the United States and the other members of the Alliance in North America, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America will satisfy the aspirations of their peoples for national modernization and individual advancement.

In this last year we have worked and studied intensively in various cities in this hemisphere—at Vina del Mar, Trinidad and Washington, D.C., reassessing the priorities of the Alliance, pointing out and rectifying shortcomings. This process will go on when the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meets here at the expert level in October and the ministerial level in December for a look at both priorities and operations.

We have looked back before 1961 for guidance and we are planning ahead, far beyond 1971.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 months, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs which I have the honor to chair, has been involved in a lengthy and comprehensive reexamination of the past record of the Alliance for Progress and of the tasks that still lie ahead.

We have found that the Alliance has had many shortcomings and many successes. Most important of all is that 8 years of the Alliance for Progress has led to a deep and, if I read it rightly, an enduring realization by most of the people and many of the governments of the hemisphere that the obstacles to social and economic progress can be overcome. This shared experience has contributed to the determination to complete the job. The people in the United States have learned, too, that our neighbors to the south are firm in their resolve to advance. And despite the setbacks and the difficulties, there is running in this hemisphere a tide of confidence that will assist our historic efforts to modernize before the 20th century is ended.

The 8th year of the Alliance for Progress made it increasingly clear that the original 10 years envisaged in the Charter of Punta del Este was too short a time to do the job. Some said the Alliance was trying to do too much. I do not agree. But I do think we were trying to do it with too little and in too short a time. And I think there has been a tendency, too, to ignore the notable progress made so far in economic growth. Over the last 8 years, the average growth in Latin America has been about 5 percent. At a more modest rate of population growth, this economic growth might have been a great success by any standard. Unfortunately, with a population growth of about 3 percent, even more economic growth is needed.

Our initial planning for the Alliance at Punta del Este tended to underestimate the profound economic and social problems of most of the countries, and the fragility of their institutions, political processes and economic capabilities. Since then, we have learned to be more cautious about the great size and complexity of the tasks, and we are better prepared psychologically to overcome the frustrations and reverses that lie ahead.

We are shifting now to the problems of social change as the next priority,

perhaps even the overriding priority. We have demonstrated that we know more about the problems of economic development than we do about the art of development in the social and political areas. Perhaps this is understandable. It is easier to quantify economic indicators than it is to analyze social and political indicators; it is easier to count numbers of tangible things than it is to identify and take into account attitudes, yearnings, and ability of people to participate in making the great decisions of their nations.

Looking for the good things of the Alliance for Progress on its birthday, I would put at the top of the list the fact that since 1961 the United States has become less and less a patron and more and more a partner in the Alliance for Progress. This does not mean that the United States is no longer contributing, but it does mean that the Latin American countries are contributing many, many times more.

The Latin American countries are the senior partners in this enterprise. Our role is to help, where we can, but basically, if the development process is to take place, in the right direction and fast enough to be satisfying to the peoples and governments of Latin America, it has to be on the basis of Latin American initiatives—both individual country efforts within their own borders and multilateral efforts in regional goals and initiatives. The Alliance for Progress was and is a Latin American effort, and should remain that way. As Secretary General Galo Plaza has said, the Latin Americans must take the lead in setting their own political directions for the future.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I would like to point out that the conclusions reached by our subcommittee point in the same direction. They are outlined in House Report 91-385, entitled, "New Directions for the 1970's: Toward a Strategy of Inter-American Development." And while our subcommittee has suggested some changes in existing programs, some new directions, we did agree, with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, that the primary responsibility for charting the course for the 1970's lies with the Latin American people, their leaders and their governments.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the eighth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, I want to congratulate our friends to the south upon the encouraging beginnings which have been made toward the realization of the goals of the Charter of Punta del Este—and to wish all of us, joined in this tremendous undertaking, greater, more tangible successes in the years to come.

SUGGESTED USE OF MODERN TECHNIQUES FOR OBTAINING INFORMATION INSTEAD OF EXPANSION OF BASIC CENSUS QUESTIONNAIRE

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to point out to the

Members of the House the growing concern over the number and content of questions that citizens may be required to answer in the coming census for 1970.

As the Members are aware, the taking of the census every 10 years is required by the Constitution. In fact, it was one of the first official acts of the new Federal Government shortly after the ratification of the Constitution. However, the constitutional purpose of the census is to establish an accurate count of our citizens according to place of residence for the purposes of establishing apportionment of the population for representation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Over a period of time, we have moved beyond the original purpose of the constitutional provision by expanding the area of questioning beyond the basic constitutional need to establish representation in this body.

I have joined with a number of other Members in sponsoring legislation that would limit the scope of questioning in the forthcoming census to questions essential to meet the constitutional need. It would further provide that questions which go beyond those basics to establish an accurate population count would have to be answered only on a voluntary basis.

It has been suggested that the Federal Government use the modern techniques of selected sampling, or polling, to obtain information which go beyond the constitutional requirements. Today, modern techniques have developed into a science of sampling of opinion on behalf of industry and advertisers to determine consumer tastes, marketing needs, and new product development. These techniques have become so reliable and accurate that industry, each year, invests millions of dollars in developing products to meet customer demands. The television industry is an example of the use of selected polling to ascertain audience's response.

I urge those in the Federal Government who are insisting on expansion of the basic census questionnaire, that they look at new means and techniques of eliciting this information, rather than subjecting the entire population to this broad and extensive questionnaire. By using sampling techniques, it could be done on a voluntary basis at, no doubt, considerably less expense, and without the invasion of privacy of every citizen of these United States.

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE AS NATIONAL POLICY

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), spoke on August 10 in Dallas to the American Bar Association on the subject of this country's biological warfare program. Congressman McCARTHY has done this country a great service in alerting all of us to the dangers of this program. I commend to your attention his Dallas

speech, a valuable exploration and denunciation of the military's biological warfare policies, which follows:

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE AS NATIONAL POLICY
(Address of Representative RICHARD D. McCARTHY, to American Bar Association, Dallas, Tex., August 10, 1969)

"It is the policy of the United States to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of chemical and biological weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind." This statement of national policy was given to me on April 15, 1969 by Mr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, on behalf of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. It was part of a response to a series of questions that I had addressed to the Departments of Defense and State, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, our Ambassador to the United Nations, and Mr. Henry Kissinger of the White House staff.

What does this policy mean? It means that despite the emphasis on deterrence, the United States maintains an offensive capability with biological weapons. It means that we maintain major research laboratories; Fort Detrick, Maryland and the Naval Biological Laboratory, Oakland, California, exclusively working on the development of diseases to be used as weapons. It means that we test the effectiveness of these diseases in the open air in Utah, at Eniwetok, in Alaska and possibly even Maryland. It means that we maintain a production center, Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas where bacteria and toxins—or poisons—which are the byproducts of bacteria are produced. It means that quantities of these disease-causing bacteria are stockpiled at Pine Bluff Arsenal in refrigerated igloos for use in war. It means that we have developed aircraft bombs, artillery shells, and even—I am told—a hand grenade to spread these germs and toxins over an enemy. The hand grenade sounds improbable but I am told that the bacteria are frozen so that the grenade can be left on a road or in a trench and not become active for several hours. It means that our military have contingency plans for an offensive attack with disease against another country.

Despite the emphasis on the defensive aspects of biological warfare in the policy stated by the Department of Defense and accepted by Mr. Kissinger there is very little of a defensive nature in our biological warfare program. Mr. Foster's reply said that:

"The U.S. does not maintain large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most biological warfare agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible biological warfare agents, and production and administration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures."

We do not have any defense for our civilian population against a germ attack. We do not even have an effective warning system against attack with biological agents, although the Department of Defense says that "research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing. . . ." We would not know that we had been attacked until after people began to get sick. Even our armed forces have no effective means of protection against biological warfare since it takes nine months of continuous inoculation before our researchers are allowed to work in our germ laboratories or production plant.

We can conclude from the lack of a defense that our germ warfare policy is one that would defend against biological warfare by the threat of a biological attack in retaliation. Even more disturbing, however, is the information that we have seriously considered offensive first-use of biological warfare. I have been told, although it has never been confirmed officially, that we came very close to using biological warfare in Cuba during the missile crisis. And it is a well established fact that a segment of our military planners are exerting every influence to have a policy allowing the use of what they call incapacitating biological weapons adopted at the National Security Council-White House level of government. If this policy is adopted, the United States would loose a germ war on another country without warning, even the thought of which I find indescribably repulsive.

The disease-bearing weapons that we develop and test and in some cases stockpile include the plague, anthrax, tularemia, psittacosis, O-fever, botulism, Rocky Mountain Spotted fever, brucellosis and Venezuelan equine encephalitis. As the Department of Defense pointed out, there are more than one hundred of these diseases which could be used. Biologists employed by the Army and the Navy at Fort Detrick and the Naval Biological Laboratory not only refine and concentrate the bacteria that cause known disease, they develop new vaccine-resistant strains of disease. The purpose of this work is to find germ weapons that are unknown to doctors in the country on which they would be used. Although the public relations officers of our biological warfare centers emphasize the work that they do to find cures to disease and point to their published work in recognized scientific journals, the published work is only a small fraction of their total work. Unclassified publication is more of a recruiting aid to attract biologists to these labs than a reflection of what they do.

The diseases that we research and in some cases produce for weapons range from the most deadly to those that are usually only incapacitating and I emphasize "usually". The recent report of Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, on gas and germ warfare describes the symptoms of some of these diseases. It describes the plague as follows:

"Under natural conditions, small rodents, from which the disease is transmitted by fleas, are the main source of human infection with plague. This is how 'bubonic' plague develops. If the plague microbes are inhaled, pneumonic plague develops after a three-to-five-day incubation period. The patient suffers from severe general symptoms and if untreated, normally dies within two or three days. A patient with pneumonic plague is extremely contagious to contacts."

Tularemia is described as follows:

"Under natural conditions, tularemia is a disease of wild animals, the source of human infection being rodents, especially rabbits and hares. When it occurs naturally in human beings, who are very susceptible to the disease, skin lesions with swelling the lymph nodes are its usual manifestation."

"The pulmonary form is more serious. Pulmonary tularemia is associated with general pain, irritant cough, general malaise, but in Europe and Japan mortality due to this form of the disease was never higher than 1% even before antibiotics became available. American tularemia strains, on the other hand are more dangerous; some epidemics have been associated with a mortality rate as high as 20%, despite antibiotic treatment."

These two diseases, the plague and tularemia are illustrative of the weapons that some would include in our arsenal, truly the deadly fourth horseman of Apocalypse.

There has been very little public discus-

sion of the policies that would govern the use of biological weapons in warfare. Those responsible for research, development, test and production of biological warfare weapons argue for first-use of both lethal and incapacitating diseases. This policy has apparently not been adopted by those responsible for military operations plans in the armed forces or by the Secretary of Defense. In talking to those familiar with thinking on biological warfare at the top level in the Air Force, I asked whether they seriously contemplated losing a lethal disease on another country. I was told that policy makers in the Air Force did not. I found this a reassuring evidence of common sense.

Less reassuring was a study conducted by Army chemical and biological warfare planners for a hypothetical invasion of Cuba. Using detailed plans for an invasion of Cuba, plans that showed which beaches American troops would assault and the estimated number of Cuban defenders, these planners assessed the effects of biological attack on the Cuban defenders. They believed that most of the Cuban military would be incapacitated with fevers of 102½ degrees, diarrhea, vomiting and a general sick feeling. They believed that 10,000 American lives would be saved as a result. It was estimated that the civilian population would also be affected and that somewhere between 1 and 3% of the civilians would die. Death would generally strike the very young and the old.

The results of the CBW planners' study were turned over to the military operational planners, those responsible for preparing the guidelines for our armed forces in combat operations. They were asked what they would expect the Cuban army defending the beaches to do if they had the symptoms described above. They came back with the conclusion that the Cuban soldiers, incapacitated with the biological agent would be unable to abandon their foxholes and fortifications under the shock of air and artillery attack. They would feel so rotten that they would probably man their guns to the last man and be willing to die at their post. Our operational planners concluded that our casualties would be far higher than otherwise if a so-called incapacitating biological weapon was used.

I find a United States policy based on the use of biological weapons unbelievable. It is directly contrary to principles of humanity and decency for which America stands. Anyone familiar with the history of the Korean War knows of the intensive efforts by the United Nations and the United States to refute the false Chinese-North Korean charges that germ warfare had been used in Korea. Knowing the universal revulsion to this form of warfare, every effort was made to assure the world that there was no basis for the charge. And beyond that, the principle of humanity, as a practical matter, biological weapons are so potentially dangerous to all of mankind, both in testing and development, that I believe they must be abandoned as weapons of war.

Contrary to the policy stated by Mr. Foster of Defense, I believe that if one of our NATO allies was attacked with a plague, that we would not loose a plague on the attacker. Rather I think that we would send as many medical and health teams as we could to assist our ally in stamping out the disease. We then would probably either threaten to or actually retaliate against the attacker with conventional weapons or tactical nuclear weapons, weapons which are much more predictable in effect than biological weapons.

I do not believe that lethal biological weapons are a creditable deterrent. To say that we prepare them to stop another country from using them on us means that we are willing to use a disease which we don't fully understand. We do not know whether the plague would stop at the boundary of the country on which it was used. As Dr.

Joshua Lederberg, Nobel laureate biologist at Stanford University, has pointed out, a disease is highly unpredictable. What starts out as an incapacitating disease may mutate, become highly deadly, and spread around the world as a pandemic, a world epidemic. Each year we must invent a new vaccine for the flu and even so we are not able to stop its spread. As prominent medical authorities have pointed out, all of biology involves averages, an estimate of lethality is an average—some bacteria in a weapon are milder, some are more deadly. And because of the limitations on testing, there is little likelihood that our knowledge of the effects of these weapons will improve.

Even with toxins, non-living by-products of disease microbes, the effects are highly unpredictable. Staphylococcus toxin, a fairly common bacteria, may have highly different effects from those normally experienced if it is breathed in rather than entering the body through the intestine. We may find that fatalities run to fifty or seventy-five percent from a so-called incapacitating agent. This is particularly true with the differences in physical strength from country to country. What might be incapacitating in the United States might well prove fatal among the people of a poorly fed tropical country.

"I also do not believe that in wartime an enemy would be able to distinguish between a lethal and an incapacitating disease used in war. As the effects of the disease became evident, the enemy would probably assume the worst and strike back with the most effective weapons at his disposal, very possibly nuclear weapons."

Biological weapons have a further drawback. Relatively speaking, biological weapons are cheap. A nation that may not be able to afford a creditable nuclear or conventional military force could afford a germ warfare arsenal. Although a reliable biological weapon in any quantity takes some technical skill, it is not a skill limited to a very few countries, but is rather widespread. Aside from the question of humanity, it is in the interest of the United States to support and practice a policy that completely denies the use of biological weapons.

No documented case of the use of biological warfare has been found in the Twentieth Century. It is an area of inhumanity that by tacit agreement man has been able to avoid. For this reason, I find it bizarre that our military planners can argue that we should adopt a policy to initiate its use. No form of war is humane and every step that we can take to assert human values should be taken. I do not believe that we should be the country to further break down the fragile humane practices that have been agreed upon.

Fortunately, our national policy in the fields of chemical and biological warfare are now under review. Mr. Gerard Smith of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency informed me on June 17 on behalf of President Nixon that a full-scale Executive review of our practices and policies is being made. This is the first such review in a decade and gives us an opportunity to correct what I regard as the pre-nuclear World War I vintage policies still accepted by part of our armed forces. The Departmental position papers are due at the National Security Council in September.

President Nixon has indicated that he is considering resubmitting the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning first-use of gas and germ warfare to the Senate for action. I urged him to conduct such a review on April 30, 1969 and to resubmit the Protocol on June 12, 1969. As of now 98 members of the House have joined me in sponsoring a resolution urging President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol. Twenty members of the Senate have joined Senator Hartke in sponsoring a Senate version of my resolution. Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee, in a letter to Secretary of State Rogers has indicated that he is anxious to hold complete hearings on the Protocol as soon as possible. I believe that ratification of the Geneva Protocol banning first-use of gas and germ warfare is in the interests of the United States.

Although we have said that we support the principles of the Geneva Protocol, we have not ratified it. To illustrate one of the incongruous effects of our failure to do so, let me cite the following case. Early this year, two countries in a de facto state of war with each other, Israel and Syria, ratified the Geneva Protocol of 1925. They notified the French Registrar of their action. Under the terms of the Protocol the French are only required to notify those signing the Protocol of additional nations joining the pact. The result is that when I contacted the Department of State this last week, even in the offices specifically concerned with these countries, no one was aware that the Israelis and the Syrians had acted on the Geneva Protocol. The State Department still has not been informed of this action. This makes it impossible to honor the principles of the Protocol in the case of Israel and Syria.

Going beyond the principles of the Geneva Protocol is a resolution that has been introduced at the Twenty-five Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva this summer. This resolution would ban the development, production, stockpiling, and use of biological weapons. I have urged President Nixon to fully support this resolution. I believe that the United States has nothing to lose by abandoning biological weapons as an instrument of war. I do not believe that they are effective deterrents to use by others and I do not believe that they are safe enough to use. The resolution would go into effect when the twelve or thirteen nations with a capability in biological warfare ratified it. We will always continue to find ways to eliminate disease. I do not think we should, as a matter of national policy, work to spread disease.

I urge the legal profession of this nation, as ably represented by the American Bar Association, to join in this effort to ban germ warfare and to support the growing movement for U.S. ratification of the Geneva Protocol.

NINTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE COMMUNITY CONFERENCE—"WORLD PROBLEMS AND AMERICAN POWER"

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as our world grows smaller, world problems increasingly affect the lives of every citizen.

Those who seek to solve world problems must increasingly consider individuals, who are now all neighbors. At the same time, it becomes even more important for individual citizens to understand world problems and to participate in Government.

In a democracy, and in a world grown small through modern communications and travel, both the individual citizen and the world leader have a direct responsibility to one another—for understanding and direction.

And in this world, and in our democracy, elected officials and Members of Congress have a special responsibility to bring the individual citizen and world leaders together.

Thus each year of my tenure in Con-

gress I have sponsored an annual daylong community conference in New York City. Democratic and Liberal Party Clubs of Manhattan's West Side and many individual citizens have joined me in presenting the conferences.

On March 22, 1969, we held our ninth annual West Side community conference on "World Problems and American Power." More than 2,000 individuals attended and took part in the five panels and the plenary session at Riverside Church, New York City.

Arthur J. Goldberg, former United Nations Ambassador and former U.S. Supreme Court Justice; Wayne L. Morse, former U.S. Senator, Oregon; and I addressed the plenary session.

The panelists included: David McAdams, former Peace Corps Director, Ivory Coast; former program associate in the Congo for Ford Foundation; former Deputy Associate Director, VISTA.

Waldo Waldron-Ramsey, counsellor, Tanzanian mission to the United Nations.

Immanuel Wallerstein, professor of sociology, Columbia University; author: "Africa: The Politics of Unity."

Waldemar A. Nielsen, president, African-American Institute; author: "African Battleline."

Ralph A. Dungan (chancellor, higher education, New Jersey; former Ambassadors to Chile; former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Teodoro Moscoso, former U.S. coordinator, Alliance for Progress; former Ambassador to Venezuela.

Carlos Sanz de Santa Maria, Chairman, Inter-American Committee, Alliance for Progress, Organization of American States.

Ronald M. Schneider, professor, Institute of Latin American Studies, Columbia University.

Richard W. Richardson, former associate U.S. coordinator, Alliance for Progress.

A. Doak Barnett, professor of government, Columbia University; author: "Communist China," and "China after Mao."

Edwin O. Reischauer, university professor, Harvard University; former Ambassador to Japan; author: "Beyond Vietnam: The United States and Asia."

Allen Whiting, professor of political science, Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan; former deputy consul-general, Hong Kong; author: "China Crosses the Yalu."

Roger Hilsman, professor of government, Columbia University; former Assistant Secretary of State, Far Eastern Affairs; author: "To Move a Nation."

Alexander Dalin, director, Russian Institute, Columbia University.

Ralph J. McGuire, director, Office of NATO and Atlantic Political-Military Affairs, Department of State; former deputy chief of mission in Congo; former counselor political and military affairs, and political adviser to U.S. and European military command.

Philip E. Mosely, professor of international relations; director, European Institute, Columbia University.

Ronald Steel, author: "End of the Al-

liance: America and the Future of Europe," and "Pax Americana."

Robert Kleiman, editorial board, New York Times; former European correspondent; author: "Atlantic Crisis: American Diplomacy Confronts a Resurgent Europe."

Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., country director, Israel and Arab-Israel Affairs, Department of State.

Nasrollah Fatemi, dean, Graduate School, Fairleigh-Dickinson University.

Allen Pollack, chairman, executive committee, American Professors for Peace in the Middle East.

Uri Ra'an, professor, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Mike Wallace, CBS news correspondent.

I wish it were possible to acknowledge by name everyone whose work and leadership made the conference a success. I do want to thank the following people who made particularly vital contributions.

The chairman was Susan Cohn and the cochairman was Doris Clark. With the assistance of the conference committee they organized and coordinated the entire conference.

Members of the committee, who worked tirelessly and brilliantly, were: secretary, Elaine Bernstein; treasurer, Ira Zimmerman; administrator coordinator, Elizabeth Savels; club coordinator, Judy Neale; arrangements, Doris Clark; assistant arrangements, Rita Breitbart, Betsy Eisner, Virginia Horton, Leilani Straw, Ellen Wallach; press, Bob Aronson; publications, Jack Rennert; photographer, Philip Eisner.

The panel coordinators were Suzanne Abramson, Ann Comay, Carol Leimas, Chauncey Olinger, Anna Lou Pickett, Eva Popper.

The club representatives were Suzanne Abramson, Philip Eisner, William Feyer, Charlotte Frank, Fred Haber, Eleanor L. Hensor, Pauline Marcus, Judy Maxwell, Stephan A. Nicholas, Tamara Rosen, Israel Weinstein.

Other members of the conference staff were Zvi Abramson, Mary Adamson, Sarah Arthur, Stephen Ballecer, Ada Bass, Freya Clibanski, Michael Cohn, Deborah Diller, Gemma Fastigl, Vivian Feyer, Samuel Freedman, Judith Gottehrer, Judy Harrow, Edrice Hutchinson, Mary Jimenez, David R. McGregor, Dan Nelson, Josephine Odom, Melva Peterson, Lome Piasetsky, Dean Porter, Alan Rachlin, Laura Robinson, Julio Ronda, Thomas Ryan, Dara Lee Schulman, Joan Serrano, Richard Serrano, Rosalind Silver, Treadwell Smith, Barbara Steinberg, Ricky Twersky, Jacob Waldman, Barry Willis, Selma Ziskin.

To each and every one who participated in the work of the conference we are indebted.

I also want to acknowledge the friendly cooperation of Mrs. Theodore A. Dilday, of Bob French, and the staff of Riverside Church; of Samuel Ural, assistant program director, International House; Larry Parker, manager of the cafeteria, International House; Eleanor Smith, head of the food services, Barnard College; Garland C. Hartsoe, assistant man-

ager, Men's Faculty Club, Columbia University; and the staff of the 20th Congressional District office.

The participating clubs were: Ansonia Independent Democrats; Central Harlem Liberal Club; Columbus Circle Democratic Club; Fort Washington-Manhattanville, Hamilton Heights, and Kennedy Democrats; F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats; Heights Reform Democrats; John F. Kennedy Democratic Club; Manhattan West Democratic Club; New Chelsea Reform Democratic Club; New Horizons Democratic Club; Original John F. Kennedy Democrats; Park River Independent Democrats; Riverside Democrats; Solomon Weiss Liberal Club; Tioga Democratic Club; Village Independent Democrats; Washington Heights Progressive Democrats; West Side Democratic Club; West Side Liberal Club.

I am also deeply grateful to the large numbers of community sponsors whose generous contributions enabled the conference to be held.

I opened the plenary session by calling for a strong political movement to really change our foreign policy from confrontation to negotiation.

However, I noted that a policy based on negotiation must not camouflage unacceptable or outmoded policies. We cannot hope to negotiate our way out of mistakes like Vietnam or into the domestic politics of emerging nations.

Rather, the first step toward a real policy of negotiation is unilateral initiative and example. We must take action, withdrawing troops from Vietnam, stopping support of repressive regimes, honoring commitments in the Middle East.

In his speech at the plenary session, former Senator Wayne Morse called for an immediate return to constitutionality in foreign policy and a restriction of the use of military power.

Senator Morse pointed out that the Vietnam war has been the most unpopular in American history. Not only was it undeclared by the Congress, but it has been waged against a country that has not attacked the United States and showed no signs of doing so.

The American Constitution, however, was drafted to require Congress, through a legislative act, to declare war. The purpose of this was to avoid war—like Vietnam—which the people might see as not in the national interest. For the Congress to commit the military forces would, so the Constitution assumes, require a widespread, general realization that the basic safety and interests of the Nation were at stake.

Senator Morse also pointed out that the War-State Departments and the military-industrial complex have continually extended America's theoretical defense line and vital interests further and further into Asia, making a war with China almost inevitable.

He called for a foreign policy that commits America to a military withdrawal from Asia; to negotiation and treaties, and to the substitution of the rules of law of the United Nations treaty for the jungle law of the military.

Arthur J. Goldberg in his remarks prepared for the plenary session said that we must rededicate ourselves to uphold-

ing and improving the United Nations system of peaceful change. He said the Nation should cast away such policies as have subjected us to the charge of being the defender of weary status quo situations throughout the world.

The former Ambassador to the United Nations listed a number of principles for American foreign policy, including a commitment to progressive, orderly change throughout the world.

He noted that American feelings of disillusionment about the United Nations are based on United Nations failures. However, he said the fault lies not in the institution but in the failure of support by major member nations. The United Nations works well when supported by the common will of the great powers.

Ambassador Goldberg said that whatever the United Nations' defects, America must support the world organization in its own interests and simply because there is no realistic alternative.

I include at this point in the RECORD my remarks and the remarks of Senator Wayne Morse and Ambassador Arthur Goldberg at the plenary session:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN
BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE
COMMUNITY CONFERENCE, MARCH 22, 1969

I want to welcome you to the Ninth Annual West Side Community Conference. For nine years this annual assembly has attempted to create a model for public involvement in the affairs of the American republic. Often it may have seemed a very lonely gesture. Yet 1968 proved what many of us involved in these conferences had always believed, that public dialog and grassroots political pressure can affect the course of history.

Our agenda this year is more ambitious than ever before—"World Problems and American Power"—but we chose it because we believed that the great debate over Vietnam must not be allowed to dissipate as a new administration takes power. Indeed, the scope of that debate must be expanded, its energy replenished, and its political force sharpened.

The assumptions which led us into Vietnam and the institutions which directed and defended that tragic misadventure seem to be as firmly entrenched as ever. And if, by tradition, a new President is granted a short period of grace, we should make it clear that no such allowances will be granted to the foreign policy establishment.

It will do us well, however, to take President Nixon seriously when he urges that we move "from a policy of Confrontation to one of Negotiation." I believe the American people presently support that principle. And that is important. So it should be our duty—here today and in the future—to clarify what such a change in policy must entail. And, perhaps, more important, we must build a tough, uncompromising political movement to translate such analysis into action. We aren't going to get much help from the Department of Defense or the Department of State. But we do have allies in the Congress and around the country. And it is up to us to support them and to urge them into further battle.

In doing so, let us be clear that diplomacy is not going to be altered by rhetoric alone. For "negotiation" can easily turn out to be nothing more than the continuation of "Confrontation" by other means. So, let us be very explicit about what negotiation must entail if it is to provide the keystone for a truly new American diplomacy.

For example, there is no reason whatsoever for America to 'negotiate' a continued

military presence in Vietnam or South East Asia generally. We have no business being there. We never did. And it is time to get out. That does not entail elaborate negotiation with the Saigon regime. It requires us merely to tell them that they must immediately enter into direct talks with the NLF in order to establish a new government in the South, or face the immediate withdrawal of American troops.

There is no reason for America to "negotiate" continued support for military dictatorships. We have no business showing up repressive regimes by trade agreements or by military aid. What these situations call for is decision not negotiation—decision to end America's role as political godfather to authoritarianism.

There is no reason for America to "negotiate" civil struggle and revolution in the Third World. We have no business being involved in the domestic politics of emerging nations. We have no business "negotiating" the historic struggle for liberation and self-determination among those who were long oppressed by the West.

What I am trying to suggest is simply that there are areas of diplomacy in which the concept of "Negotiation" can camouflage the continuation of policies which are either unacceptable in the first place or outmoded today. There is, after all, a familiar tactic in American diplomacy whereby we initiate error so as to be able to "negotiate" it away subsequently—from a position of strength, as they say. Thus, we bomb North Vietnam—in order to "negotiate" its cessation. Or we deploy an ABM system—in order to "negotiate" its dismantling. Only such "negotiations" never seem to get started. This approach which all too often characterizes the thinking of our diplomats—has nothing at all to do with "Negotiations." It is in fact the very essence of "Confrontation," and it cannot be allowed to continue.

The first stage in a diplomacy of genuine negotiation, therefore, must be a policy of unilateral initiative and example. We cannot wait to do with others what we ought to be doing by ourselves—not for political gain—but because America has not exactly been the symbol of international justice recently, and because of the generous and moral deed is its own reward, for nations as for individuals.

Surely we do not lack opportunities for such unilateral initiative. We can begin by withdrawing some of our troops from Vietnam—today. We can begin by recognizing China—today. We can begin by curtailing support for repressive regimes—Greece, Spain, South Africa—today. We can begin by refusing to deploy an ABM system and by cutting our military budget by 25%—today. We can begin by reappraising our relations with Cuba—today. We can begin by moving toward a program of multilateral development assistance—today. And we can begin by replacing the leaders of the American foreign policy establishment with new statesmen, new diplomats, new thinkers—today.

Such unilateral initiatives are necessary preconditions for genuine negotiations. In the Middle East, where commitments must be honored and peace secured. In arms control—where initiative can provide a basis for real disarmament. And in Asia—where lasting peace can follow an end to the terrible torment of the Vietnamese people.

The issue we address today—World Problems and American Power—is one which must concern the entire nation but this will be painful, as painful as Vietnam. For in large measure world problems are a result of American power and it will take candor and strength for the people of this country to accept that. If we are to negotiate with others, we must first confront ourselves. We cannot allow this period to be one of retrenchment, and retreat from reality.

Several years ago, discussing Vietnam, I said, "When the war is over and the burning is done, we must be different men than before." The war continues. We still burn in Asia. But the effort to be new men must start today. That is how I view this conference and the larger effort of which it is a part.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE
ON THE U.S. ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY IN
RESPECT TO OUR FOREIGN COMMITMENTS AT
NINTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE COMMUNITY
CONFERENCE, MARCH 22, 1969

In the closing months of the 90th Congress, there was building up in the United States Senate a clear-cut constitutional issue over the formulation and control of American foreign policy. Entwined with the constitutional part of this issue was the political ramifications of it, which saw a President elected only 3 and 1/2 years earlier with one of the largest margins in history, compelled to withdraw from further candidacy.

The situation in which the Johnson Administration found itself in March, 1968, was exactly the situation the framers of the Constitution had planned to avoid when they gave the war power to Congress, rather than to the President. Under Constitutional design, war is embarked upon only through joint resolution passed by both houses and signed into law by the President. It is a legislative process, not an administrative one. Its purpose and scope are plainly stated. The war policy thus becomes the law of the land, the national policy—as fully and completely as we can establish a national policy.

War waged by administrative decision leaves every aspect of that war an arguable matter. Its purpose, its scope, as well as its day to day prosecution, are left to individual discretion. All are subject to second-guessing and public dispute.

The bombing of North Vietnam has been a good example of the inadequacy of administrative war. When we began bombing North Vietnam in February of 1965, we attacked a country that had not attacked United States territory, and which had no apparent intentions of doing so. The first explanation for the bombing was that it was in retaliation for a Vietcong assault upon the barracks of U.S. troops at Pleiku in the central highlands of South Vietnam 12 hours earlier. Its purposes was explained at that time as one of "showing" the Vietcong and their friends in North Vietnam that we could levy far greater destruction upon them than they could upon us.

Within a few months, however, the Secretary of Defense began to justify the continuation of the bombing as necessary for cutting supply lines from the North into the South. Lengthy descriptions were made available to the press of infiltration routes, of bridges destroyed, of key passes closed by massive explosions delivered by our B-52's.

But the trickle of infiltration that was going on when the bombing started grew to large proportions. There were explanations that without the bombing, infiltration would have been even heavier, and not as costly to Hanoi. Yet the level of manpower and equipment that went South seems to have been determined essentially by North Vietnam and not by American airpower.

It was not until the bombing policy had been in operation for a matter of years that it was then said to have been undertaken to bolster the morale of the South Vietnamese government, which was at a low ebb in the early months of 1965.

What the real reason for the bombing may have been cannot be known yet by the American people. It is not really known by Congress. But the carrying of armed attack into the territory and population of another country, and at levels of intensity

unsurpassed even in World War II, was not undertaken as a matter of a unified national policy to conduct war against North Vietnam. It was undertaken, stopped and started up again for reasons that only a few administrators knew then and even now.

These reasons for bombing, and for the various bombing pauses, were typical of our entire adventure in southeast Asia. They are not a war policy. They are a use of military force to buttress and enforce a diplomatic policy that cannot succeed on its own. With a wealth of money, manpower, and weapons that no doubt seems limitless to policy-makers, we have seen the United States come readily and easily to practice the old dictum that war is but the pursuit of diplomacy by different means.

The system is often advertised and described now as something new—a necessity in a different kind of world than Americans knew in the good old days when military force was used only to defend American territory and then upon declaration of war.

But there really is nothing new about it at all. For nearly three centuries Great Britain practiced the same tactic, using military power from one end of the world to another to gain this political end and to enforce that aspect of diplomacy that could not succeed on its own.

Thus was an empire created. And then it was said that being the world's leading power, the burdens of leadership and responsibility called for even more massive involvements, in the Crimea, in South Africa, in France.

Britain saw great value in sending her military forces abroad, using them to enforce her foreign policies. Part of the theory held that it was better to fight abroad on someone else's territory than to let warfare come to the British Isles. But the policy brought the expenditure of such blood and wealth in World War I that the collapse of the Empire was but a matter of years. And the technology of war brought destruction to British territory in World War II even without the landing of hostile forces.

Far from being a new concept, the amalgamation of armed forces with diplomacy is as old as the nation-state. Its merger under the executive is as old as kings. Indeed, in explaining the assignment of the war power to Congress rather than to the President, the Federalist Papers mention that in this respect our Constitution is quite different from the British Constitution, denying to the American president a power held and exercised by British kings.

Most countries are saved from the easy use of military force abroad by a scarcity of means. The country that cannot afford to enforce its foreign political objectives by use of military power, does not find it necessary to do so. The country that can afford to send and maintain armies and navies around the world, seems to find reasons why it must do so.

Fear of change is usually the reason that is found. Fear of a vacuum of power, fear that where America does not dominate, someone else will, fear that if we do not enforce our stated will in one part of the world it will be ignored everywhere.

The cost of our policy is considerable. National defense costs run over \$80 billion a year. Weaponry is the largest single activity of our national government. In the case of Vietnam, since 1954 when we first began aiding South Vietnam in an effort to create a country where none existed, we have spent a grand total of \$90 billion, first on economic aid, then on military aid as well and finally to sustain the fourth biggest war in American history.

The availability of so much power has, in my opinion, sadly corrupted the administrative judgment of what is sound policy for the United States to pursue. Perhaps Vietnam is a good example of the difficulty the

military establishment has in trying to make an unsound policy work through the application of force. Half a million men and the dropping of more explosives than were used in Western Europe throughout World War II have not compelled North Vietnam, in the words of the Secretary of State Rusk to "stop doing what she is doing," which has been to aid guerrillas in the South.

But at the outset, it undoubtedly looks easier to call in the troops and send over the planes than to assess whether a pro-American government can be created to govern an area that never was a nation before.

But in addition to the warping of judgment is the loss of support at home that such use of military power entails. I think Vietnam is rightly called the most unpopular war in American history, ranking alongside Korea in that unpopularity. Both were undeclared, foreign wars. Both were fought for what their administrators called "limited purposes." Both are described as not lending themselves to declarations of war, because our purposes in fighting did not include the destruction or occupation of either North Korea or North Vietnam. Rather, they are described as designed to force another country to stop doing something we want stopped.

It is not usually mentioned, but both of these most unpopular wars not only were undeclared by the United States but they were waged against countries that had not attacked the United States and showed no sign of doing so. They were interventions on behalf of another country.

It is, I think, the fact that the war is fought to defend someone else that American public opinion has such a hard time following. When the object of our protection changes as often as the governments in Saigon have changed, when corruption and profiteering are among their foremost qualities, it is not easy for the American people to believe for long that they deserve the American blood and money that goes into their support.

It was the expectation of the framers of the Constitution that by placing the war power in Congress, these disadvantages would not occur. For the Congress to commit the military forces would, so the Constitution assumes, require a widespread, general realization that the basic safety and interests of the nation were at stake. The object and purpose of the war would be exposed to Congressional debate and therefore to public discussion. Enactment of a resolution of war would give expression to a national unity of purpose. Despite the objections raised to a declaration of war in the current Vietnam conflict, it could set forth a limited purpose and objection that still would establish a unified national policy.

Remember that even the Administration that embarks upon the use of armed forces abroad without a declaration of war is still involving the Congress. What an administration cannot do without money it cannot do without Congress. For a president to give the commands that set fighting in motion, and then come to Congress and ask it to appropriate the money needed to pay for the fighting is simply an effort to exclude Congress from the formulation of the policy.

It has often succeeded. Congress has indeed been excluded from the formulation of the policy, and has only paid the cost of putting it into effect. But the price has been high. The price has been a Congress that quickly comes to reflect public dissatisfactions and disenchantment. It is a Congress that feels no need or obligation to explain and defend a policy it had no hand in making. But if the war continues for long without an end in sight, the angry public dissatisfaction will become evident quickly.

On the face of it, at least, the Administration now coming into office has nothing to gain and much to lose by letting this undeclared war continue indefinitely. If it con-

tinues, the Nixon Administration stands to inherit the renewed dissension and the political turmoil that forced the Johnson Administration to forgo another term. Any plans it may have for domestic programs will be lost in the competition for funds and the welter of political conflict.

A return to Constitutionalism in foreign policy and a restriction of the use of military power is in the interest of both people and government. It should be sought at once.

The major role of our international relations in recent years has been in Asia. The stabilization of affairs in Europe, in spite of the invasion of Czechoslovakia, has induced the State Department-Defense Department complex that runs our international relations to turn its attention to Asia.

It has done so with no clear rationale, and with no showing of where American security interests in Asia actually lie. In fact, events, particularly military events, have dictated policy at critical turning points and have been responsible for our having backed into a full scale war in Vietnam that no policymaker would have advised or recommended in advance.

The formal rationale of our policy in Asia was formulated at the close of World War II, when we regarded as vital to our interests certain islands in the Pacific which had served as stepping stones for Japan in launching her war against us. We sought and obtained trusteeship over them. But mainland Asia was put beyond our immediate security needs. The attitude of the United States toward Indo-China, for example, was in keeping with our attitude toward the rest of colonial Asia. Burma, the Dutch Indies, Malaya, had been easy pickings for Japan largely because they were colonies of western powers. Elliott Roosevelt quotes his father as saying of the future of Indo-China, en route to the Casablanca conference:

"The native Indochinese has been so flagrantly downtrodden that they thought to themselves: Anything must be better than to live under French colonial rule!"

Cordell Hull quotes FDR as favoring a trusteeship for Indo-China.

During World War II our ally in Indo-China was none other than Ho Chi Minh, who was supported and supplied by American Intelligence units.

Roosevelt's death and the surge of the Communist Chinese across the Chinese mainland brought about a radical change in American policy, not only toward Indo-China but toward Asia generally. It is hard to say how much of the change was due to the elements of world politics and how much due to the facts of American domestic politics. Certainly the American people were shocked by the Communist takeover in China. Chiang Kai-shek had been a wartime ally. He and his family had been highly romanticized by the American press. Billions worth of American weapons and war material had been given to China to keep her in the war against Japan and thousands of Americans had served in the Chinese theater.

Having just finished a war, the United States had no taste for going back to Asia for another. There was no American military intervention on behalf of Chiang.

The shock of China's fall to Communism was taken out instead in the domestic political arena. Probably few in this audience recall the violence of the charges that flew, blaming the Communist takeover not on the Communists, nor on the failures of the Nationalists, but upon American diplomats. It was the height of the postwar era, when we believed our military and financial power was so supreme in the world that nothing could happen anywhere without having been willed to happen, and probably planned and executed, by American authorities.

By 1950 the Democratic Administration that had been in office during the fall of China, was in headlong retreat. The Secre-

tary of State was dally accused of sympathy and even compliance with Communist objectives. He finally found it desirable to become as royal as the king. In February of 1950 the United States recognized the French arrangement of the Bao Dai government in Indo-China, whereby France gave Indo-China the form of sovereignty without any of its substance. In May of 1950 the Secretary of State announced that we would furnish arms and money to the French to put down the independence movement led by Ho Chi Minh.

THE WAR IN KOREA

Even so, Secretary of State Acheson drew for the press a line enclosing the string of islands lying off the Asian mainland and described it as the new perimeter of the American security interest. It embraced Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. That chain, he said, was part of our security, the clear inference being that what lay beyond was not. It was widely assumed at the time that this press conference description served as an invitation to North Korea to invade the South, on the assumption that because Korea lay outside the Acheson line, the United States would not act.

The United States did act, of course. But we did so under our obligations as a signatory of the United Nations Charter. Like all signatories, we have obligations under it that exceed our own national security interests.

But here again, events began to dictate a change in policy. Once the United States became heavily involved in a war undertaken under the aegis of the United Nations, we began to justify it in terms of our own national interest. In a speech a few weeks ago to the National Press Club, Averil Harriman chided Americans for their bad habit of escalating their objectives in mid-war. He was talking about Vietnam. But he could well have been talking about Korea.

American apprehensions about Communist China were in control. U.S. military and financial aid to France to pursue the Indo-China war was stepped up. It would add \$2.6 billion before France finally gave up. The announcement of increased aid to France in 1950 was combined with an announcement that the Seventh Fleet would be stationed in the Formosa Strait to protect Chiang Kai-shek.

As happened with China, no amount of U.S. aid could salvage the French cause in Indo-China. Even so, there still was an American intervention. President Eisenhower vetoed all such suggestions on the ground that they would be more costly than anticipated, and secondly, because he was not willing to act without the support and participation of other allies.

What we did instead in 1954 was to set out upon a new salvage effort in South Vietnam. We installed as President a man who had sat out the war in the United States; we financed his government, equipped his army, and encouraged him to ignore the requirements of the Geneva Agreement that North and South Vietnam be united under a single government.

THE FORMOSA RESOLUTION

At almost the same time China's bombardment of islands within artillery range of the mainland induced the Administration to seek advance approval from Congress for military action against China.

The Formosa Resolution is a direct forebear of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. It authorized the President, and I quote: "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack."

"This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and

territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he (the President) judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

At issue were not Formosa and the Pescadores. They were not under assault, and China had no means of bringing them under assault. At issue were two tiny islands of Quemoy and Matsu within 3 miles of the mainland.

Senator George of Georgia presented the Resolution to the Senate. "We must commit American military power to the defense of these islands," he said, "because their abandonment would dishearten the Nationalists on Formosa." Then he said:

"If Formosa falls into unfriendly hands, it would be with the greatest difficulty that we could defend not merely Japan, nor merely the Philippines, which lie a relatively short distance from Formosa and Okinawa, but the whole of Southeast Asia clear down to the end of the great countries that lie under the Equator would be endangered. That is clear."

What is clear now from the Formosa Resolution is that American security interests were seen all across the mainland of Asia where they never had been, and an obligation to defend countries was seen where it never had been seen before. Senator Smith of New Jersey, a ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was also explicit in moving the American defense line onto the Asian mainland.

"Let us first consider a line drawn from Korea, down through China, and down through Indo-China. We see three danger spots which might well result in the entire Asiatic world being engulfed in communism, and if that should happen, the security of the United States and the western free world would be seriously threatened. . . . Unless we maintain and strengthen the defenses and solidarity of our allies, unless the program of the Administration under President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles is carried out, so that the defense of those areas is maintained, we shall face one of the most critical periods in our history."

What was not foreseen was that the price and futility of defending those areas would itself cause one of the most critical periods in our history. In Asia, we have worked a "domino theory" in reverse. To defend the United States, we needed Pacific Islands like the Marianas put under our trusteeship; then to protect those islands, we needed Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines; then to defend Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines we needed the islands immediately off the mainland, plus Korea and South Vietnam.

It seems likely that in Asia, there is still not an end to what more we must contest in order to keep what we have. Whether or not the Vietnam war ends, this trend in our Asian policy will draw us deeper into war in Asia. Unless we repudiate the Eisenhower, Nixon, Dulles military containment policy vis a vis China initiated in 1953 we may very well become the greatest threat to peace in the world. We cannot militarily contain China without eventual war with China in 10, 25, 35, 50 years. Such a war will produce an empty victory at best and a sure loss of our constitutional system of self government.

Now is the time to bring the American military under the control and checks of our constitutional system based upon government by law rather than by the exercise of arbitrary power by Presidents, Secretaries of State and Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, CIAs, Formosa and Tonkin Bay Resolutions and our blood money military industrial complex.

Now is the time for the American people to demand a foreign policy that commits us to a military withdrawal from Asia and elsewhere in the world where we are maintaining a unilateral military posture of dominance.

Now is the time for us to return to the

foreign policy role of offering to abide by the binding jurisdiction of adjudication through multilateral negotiations of threats to the peace of the world conducted under the aegis of international tribunals and treaties such as the United Nations.

Yes, now is the time for us to practice our professed ideals of believing in the substitution of the Rules of Law of the United Nations Treaty for the Jungle Law of the Military Claw as we have come to practice it in Vietnam and threaten to practice it elsewhere in Asia.

Unless the killing of American troops in Southeast Asia is stopped quickly, domestic disunity is certain to increase because a foreign policy that conscripts our youth into military fodder to be consumed in an immoral and unjustifiable war will be repudiated by our people. It is being repudiated by increasing tens of thousands of our citizens, and it should be.

President Nixon's announcement to leave our troops in Vietnam for an indefinite time resulting in thousands more being slaughtered and wounded in further escalation of the war, his attempt to justify a scientifically unsound ABM monstrosity by playing upon the fears of our people, his military approach to foreign-policy in general, bodes ill for his Administration and catastrophic for the Nation.

It would appear that on the basis of what we have seen this far from the new Administration in respect to its role in foreign policy and the military commitments we can expect from it, the only thing that will stop the military from marching our youth into a greater war is for our citizens to start marching across the country for peace.

REMARKS OF HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS AT THE NINTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE COMMUNITY CONFERENCE, MARCH 22, 1969

The United States must take the lead to strengthen the United Nations as a force for peacemaking and peacekeeping.

This is in our own interest as the greatest world power, committed to the benefits and restraints of the rule of law.

Recent bitter experience teaches us that single states, however strong, cannot succeed in keeping the peace by themselves without provoking rival forces and thus generating the very insecurity they seek to end.

Even with the best will in the world, states cannot trust one another when the international system is so unstable that they feel they must "shoot first" in self-defense.

The central challenge to our foreign policy in this nuclear age is to organize a system of multilateral security which would render any unilateral solution unnecessary.

The United Nations is the only available instrument for organizing the response to this challenge.

We should therefore rededicate ourselves to upholding and improving the UN system of peaceful change and cast away such policies as have subjected us to the charge of being the defender of weary status quo situations throughout the world.

In this way we can regain our former position of leadership in the United Nations.

Our principles should be these:

1. Fidelity to the UN Charter, demonstrated by resorting to the UN or to appropriate affiliated regional organizations to prevent or halt outbreaks threatening world peace.

We should involve the UN before rather than after any unilateral American military action, except in the most dire emergency such as the 1950 North Korean invasion.

In an extreme emergency, when diplomacy including UN organs cannot produce results sufficiently promptly, the United States can appropriately exercise its self-defense rights and responsibilities, under the UN Charter.

2. Taking the lead at the UN in opposing intervention by any country in the internal affairs of another independent nation.

A recent example was our prompt resort to the UN in the Czech crisis. To maintain fidelity to the Charter and our own credibility, we must of course apply this standard to our own actions.

3. Committing ourselves to progressive, orderly change throughout the world. We must not permit our good name to be borrowed in defense of reactionary regimes or colonialism or racism. Our abhorrence of racism must go beyond mere words to action.

4. Standing resolutely for collective UN action against violent disruption of established international arrangements.

5. Speaking and acting to promote good relations with all nations, regardless of differences of ideology, but without abandoning those safeguards which we have properly created in order to protect the free world.

6. Acting no longer as a barrier to the increasing universalism of the UN membership notably in the case of China.

7. Enlarging substantially our support for multilateral economic aid. (It is clear that Congress has lost its enthusiasm for direct U.S. foreign aid.) In contrast to direct aid, multilateral aid has the virtue of stimulating a fair sharing of the burden by other countries. It also eliminates unhealthy political entanglements from the aid process. Of course, multilateral aid does not preclude additional bilateral economic assistance.

Our moral authority to insist upon peaceful international conduct is handicapped now by world reaction to the Vietnam conflict. But our position in the UN and outside will be restored as Vietnam moves to a political settlement.

The inability of the UN to have come up with a solution to the Vietnam war has contributed to feelings by many Americans of disillusionment about the UN.

Other contributors to American feelings of disillusionment include:

Failure of the UN to enforce the obligation of the Soviet Union, France and others to contribute to UN peacekeeping operations.

Abuse of the veto power in the Security Council by the Soviet Union, as occurred recently when the Russians exercised the veto for the 105th time to block UN condemnation of Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The apparent double standard applied by some countries on issues involving racial discrimination and other abuses of human rights.

The failure of the UN to go beyond its achievement of ceasefires to permanent solutions for such crisis items as the Middle East, India-Pakistan, Cyprus.

In my experience of three years as American Permanent Representative at the UN, I have found considerable basis for this disillusionment.

But the fault is not with the institution. The UN works very well whenever it is supported by the common will of its members, particularly the great powers. Without that common will it cannot realize its full potential.

Even when the common will is weak, as is too often the case, the UN has not been given sufficient credit for substantial achievements. Here are some "plus" examples from my three years:

At the UN we stopped the 1965 war between India and Pakistan. The ceasefire worked out in the Security Council "bought time" for an agreement still sorely needed.

The long-smoldering Cyprus problem seems now to be moving toward solution, although there was real danger of war there only a few months ago.

We negotiated successfully the Outer Space Treaty and contributed substantially to the completion of the Nonproliferation Treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries.

These treaties represent important steps on the road to arms control and disarmament.

The UN is the umbrella under which the Soviet Union can cooperate with the United States on such vital matters despite our deep-rooted differences over Vietnam and Czechoslovakia.

In the Middle East, the UN couldn't prevent the June 1967 war, but it brought about the ceasefire. We were able to negotiate the unanimous November 22 Security Council resolution which hopefully will provide the basis for eventual agreement.

In the case of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the UN could not force Soviet withdrawal. But it did mobilize world public opinion against this aggression.

UN peacekeeping activities continue—notably in Cyprus and Kashmir—despite Russian and French refusal to contribute. The United States should not give up trying to strengthen this valuable UN machinery.

The little-noticed UN activities in the economic and social fields constitute an achievement I hope will continue to grow as major nations increase their stress on multilateral aid and other forms of international cooperation.

Still another important UN contribution is in providing a forum where the newly independent ex-colonial countries can make themselves heard. This is a valuable service, even though some speeches and votes are overly extreme.

For Americans, the plain fact is that while the UN has not realized our most profound hopes, it nevertheless has made great contributions.

For whatever the UN defects may be, one thing is clear: out country in its own interest cannot afford to slacken its support of this world organization which is so much our own creation. On the contrary, there is no realistic alternative to the UN.

Volunteer student reporters of the Columbia School of Journalism, including Giselle Bergeret and Mindy Reisen, and other talented citizens of the West Side generously gave of their time and skills to report proceedings at the conference. For their reporting, notes and articles, I am particularly grateful.

The morning panel on "Africa," was moderated by Waldemar A. Nielsen, president, African-American Institute; author: "African Battleline." Panel members were David McAdams, former Peace Corps Director, Ivory Coast; former program associate in the Congo for Ford Foundation; former Deputy Associate Director, VISTA; Waldo Waldron-Ramsey, counselor, Tanzanian mission to the United Nations; Immanuel Wallerstein, professor of sociology, Columbia University; author: "Africa: The Politics of Unity."

I include the report at this point in the RECORD:

AFRICA

(By Elizabeth Savels)

Waldemar A. Nielsen, as Moderator of the panel, introduced each panelist and then gave a brief survey of the continent of Africa, and of the United States in relation to the nations of Africa.

David McAdams illustrated some of the difficulties encountered by U.S. government representatives who have been assigned the task of implementing American policy in Africa. One of these is the element of time; U.S. government representatives, specifically the A.I.D. personnel, are bound by the restriction of the fiscal year and are dealing with nations most of which operate on the premise of a 4 or 5 year plan. Another difficulty is that of the language barrier, making oral communication inexact and the perusal and signing of contracts and agreements unnecessarily delayed which exacerbates the problems in any cooperative venture of the United States in an African country. A third drawback mentioned by Mr. McAdams is that each African country has a different agenda, not only different from each other, but different from that of the United States in relation to them.

In 1960 the U.S. State Department inaugurated its first Africa desk, and at that time personnel assigned to Africa was of fairly high quality. Since 1961 that quality has gradually declined. United States priorities in Africa are, unfortunately, not the same as African priorities. There is a tendency still to think of Africa in terms of regions, when regions, as such, no longer exist in Africa. Furthermore, the United States today has the same "pets" amongst African nations which it had in 1960. These "pets" amount to about 10 countries which receive the bulk of U.S. aid in Africa.

The United States' policies in regard to Africa need upgrading and updating. Waldo Waldron-Ramsey, of Tanzania, declared that United States policy makers have shown themselves to be insensitive to the needs of Africa. "Africa was a conquered continent," he said, "but its people were never vassals." The U.S. has shown itself willing to work with the colonial powers in Africa which gave its policies a vicarious character. Paralleling these vicarious policies, the United States preached independence and self-determination. This, to Africans, was hypocrisy, and it aroused resentment and some contempt for the United States.

The main objectives in Africa today are the elimination of vestiges of non-freedom, the banishment of colonialism, and the formation of an organization of African states similar to a United States of Africa. The United States has given no support to the first two objectives and only a marginal interest in the third. It is the opinion of Mr. Waldron-Ramsey that the United States has failed to recognize that Africa is going to play an important role in the panorama of nations.

Professor Immanuel Wallerstein called attention to the fragility of the state machinery in the majority of African countries. They are operating on increasing deficits, their needs being too great and their incomes too small. Some African countries have attempted to solve this problem by allocating state funds for projects which they hope will attract foreign investment or foreign gifts or loans. Others have allocated disproportionate appropriations for the relief of the most pressing needs of their people. In either case time is not on the side of the state. The usual scenario reads: "Promises of better times—inability to meet these promises—and coup d'etat." Repeat United States aid to Africa was at its height in 1960 and 1961 at the time of peak competitiveness with the U.S.S.R. Since 1961 the competitiveness has declined and so has aid to Africa. Aid from other sources is negligible.

In 1960 the United Nations seated 17 new African nations. The movement for freedom and self-determination was at its height. An area of bedrock was met, however, when no change was accomplished in southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, and South Africa. In a belt across Africa lie three states which are independent, Congo, Zambia and Tanzania. The bedrock nations make continuous efforts to break the solidarity of these belt states, for they pose a dangerous problem, being both free and allied.

Mr. Nielsen quickly introduced several points of discussion which he felt would be of interest to the audience, and asked the members of the panel to comment briefly on each one. They were the alliance of some African states against Israel, the Nigeria-Biafra troubles, possible policy changes in Africa under Nixon, and the degree to which racial problems in the United States affects its policies in regard to Africa.

Mr. Waldron-Ramsey, attacking the first area of discussion, suggested that Israel and the Arabs sit down and solve their own problems without recourse to mediation by other countries or to military force. The policy of his own country, Tanzania, was to press for such a solution.

Professor Wallerstein, commenting on the Nigeria-Biafra troubles, said it was simply a matter of internal policy and fits the scenario.

Mr. Waldron-Ramsey added that the Biafrans will continue to fight Nigeria no matter what settlement is reached. He urged, however, that human considerations be recognized by both parties to the strife.

Because of the lack of time for more, only one question was heard from the floor: "How are the internal racial problems in the United States reflected in U.S. Africa policy?"

Mr. McAdams' reply gave an example from the present: The Peace Corp volunteer force is 98 percent white and middle class. If there were more black volunteers, the Peace Corps might not have been asked to leave some of the African countries.

Professor Wallerstein predicted that conflict will develop between the bedrock nations and the states of the belt and that the United States will be called on for aid. Will we send aid to the so-called "white" countries, such as Angola and South Africa? There are many people in the United States who would vote firmly for that course. Would we send aid to the belt states of Tanzania, Zambia, and the Congo? Many people in the United States would vote firmly for that course. Would we do neither, but declare ourselves neutral? There are even many people who would vote firmly for that course. But no matter which way the U.S. attempts to solve this problem, its own internal racial problems will determine the outcome.

The morning panel on "Latin America" was moderated by Richard W. Richardson, former associate U.S. coordinator, Alliance for Progress. Panel members were Ralph A. Dungan, chancellor, higher education, New Jersey; former Ambassador to Chile; former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; Teodoro Moscoso, former U.S. coordinator, Alliance for Progress; former Ambassador to Venezuela; Carlos Sanz de Santa Maria, Chairman, Inter-American Committee, Alliance for Progress, Organization of American States; Ronald M. Schneider, professor, Institute of Latin American Studies, Columbia University.

I include the report on this discussion:

LATIN AMERICA
(By Rita Breitbart)

Ronald Schneider opened the discussion on Latin America by warning that prospects for liberal constitutional regimes are now dimmer than any time in the past 20 years.

In the past, there have been swings to the right and left on the part of Latin American governments, but now this pendulum has swung so far right that it threatens to swing off its fulcrum.

Professor Schneider said major problems in Latin America are agricultural reform, demographic problems, the economic base, high rates of internal migration, swelling marginal slum populations, housing and educational deficits. An important problem is control of a major part of Latin American economies by foreign investors, as a consequence of which there is a widespread feeling that the countries' wealth is being drained off by imperialists. Results of this feeling are alienation and apathy on the part of the older people and anger among the young.

Military establishments are even more deeply involved in politics than ever before (e.g., Nicaragua, Paraguay and Haiti). Re-

pression keeps the appearance of stability and engenders violent revolt. To a certain extent limited violence may be functional and necessary. Emergent groups cannot now gain access to power through electoral means since stable political agencies have failed to take root. There is a crisis of legitimacy and authority; the revolution of rising expectations has led to a revolution of roaring frustrations.

Professor Schneider said Latin Americans are wary of the Nixon administration. They believe President Nixon must be resentful of the treatment he received in Lima and Caracas 11 years ago. Nixon didn't mention Latin America in his inaugural address and hasn't filled major diplomatic posts there.

Teodoro Moscoso said the first half of the 19th century saw United States-like revolutions throughout Latin America, with countries adopting constitutions similar to ours. Since then the Latin American countries have been assiduously anti-American. Cynical Latins think that the Alliance for Progress died with Kennedy. Although the mystique may have been lost, however, in fact, the money support of the Alliance has continued.

Mr. Moscoso said antipathy toward the U.S. is rooted in unilateral intervention, our proclivity for dealing with military governments rather than with the people.

He said we should decide which people in Latin America share our ideals. They are the people who should get our aid. In addition, we should seek to encourage political and economic stability in Latin America, since anything we do in this regard will redound to our benefit.

Ralph Dungan said that United States foreign policy should be activist, including strong support of liberal popular democracies. The United States should be actively involved in Latin American affairs. Mr. Dungan said he has "profound respect for prudent application of American power." He said that economic assistance unaccompanied by political and social reform is wasted money. We have failed operationally.

Mr. Dungan claimed that the failure of American policy in Latin America in part results from spasmodic attention, failure to appoint adequate people to important posts in the area; the failure to recognize that what we do is much more important than what we say, and a failure to support liberal politicians.

He noted there are intrinsic difficulties in applying Anglo-Saxon standards of democratic government to Latin America. Constitutionality in the Latin American context may in fact be socially regressive, since the Latin American constitutions are dedicated to the status quo, and it is difficult to achieve change if one insists too strongly on constitutionalism. Latin American countries may need to find their own means of democratic control which still leaves large grants of power in the hands of one person. For example, he said Latin America needs wage controls which are critical to capital accumulation, but seemingly inimical to the interests of the masses. This kind of wage policy could only be achieved if the government had a powerful head. We should therefore think more creatively about some alternative solution midway between dictatorship and constitutional governments typical of developed western countries.

Carlos Sanz de Santa Maria said that to understand the plight of Latin America, it is necessary to look at the external situation as well as domestic problems. Moreover, he said, one cannot treat Latin America as a unit, ignoring the vast differences between countries and regions within countries.

Dr. Sanz said agrarian reform must involve more than the mere redistribution of large estates. Owners of large estates no longer control political mechanisms of countries. The criterion for successful reform

must be increased production, and agrarian reform may also involve integration of small and unproductive land holdings.

The following points were made in a lively question and answer exchange involving the audience:

Q. (to Moscoso). Is the "showcase for democracy" label really relevant to Puerto Rico?

A. The label has been mainly applied by the press. People there don't consider it a showcase, but one must grant the great strides toward modernization and social advancement which have been made.

Q. If there are so many Puerto Ricans in this country, there must be something wrong in Puerto Rico.

A. (By Moscoso): We don't have the resources to provide education and jobs for everyone. Puerto Rico has perhaps the highest net population rise in the world.

Q. Democracy in Latin America is impossible as long as some people are exploiting land ownership for their own gain.

A. (by Moscoso). The problem of land ownership has been exaggerated. Our concern should be land productivity accompanied by tax and labor laws. With good inheritance laws, land redistribution will take care of itself. Land reform has historically reduced productivity.

A. (by Dungan). I concur that actual title to land is not as important as productivity. But we should not lose sight of the psychological need of people who work land to participate in decisions as to how that land is used. With productivity as a criterion, it might perhaps be necessary to expropriate lands from the larger owners not using modern methods of farming.

Q. But you cannot accomplish any land reform or tax reform because the same people are in power everywhere. The problem is circular. Large land owners prevent reform.

A. (by Richardson). No one here has denied the problem of entrenched oligarchies. The purpose of American aid has been to get at this problem.

Q. (to Sanz de Santa Maria). You have spoken of the ignorance of the American people about Latin America. Does the Alliance have a program of education to inform Americans about what is going on in Latin America?

A. No. Education costs money, and we do not have enough for this kind of program, too.

Dr. Sanz de Santa Maria pointed out that Latin American countries are vastly different from one another. In terms of income one goes from a low of Haiti to countries of relatively high per capita income such as Argentina or Venezuela which compare favorably with Italy today.

He said that tax reform is necessary to pay for education which must be the basis of future development.

Dr. Sanz de Santa Maria noted that in proposing the Alliance for Progress, President Kennedy was really accepting ideas which had been developed over a period of years by Latin American leaders themselves. Since its inception, the Alliance has made progress toward each of its goals. The Alliance will continue regardless of the level of U.S. support. However, Dr. Sanz said, it is absolutely not true that the United States is producing the transformation of Latin America. The support program of the Alliance includes few outright grants. Loans to Alliance countries are all being repaid at high interest rates and half have already been paid back.

Q. From whom should the sacrifices come from economic progress? Mr. Dungan said that greater sacrifices are necessary from the masses?

A. (by Dungan). Those who possess the greatest wealth.

Q. I am disturbed because we do not know what is happening in Mexico City today.

A. (by Schneider). It is true we don't know

what is going on. From 1940 on, the Mexican system has involved a careful balance among various interests. This has become a new establishment, and Mexican students have been willing to cooperate with the establishment. What made their movement so dramatic, therefore, was the comparison with their long dormancy. It is difficult to know how much the students were revolting against the system itself, and how much they merely wanted to exert some influence within the system and affect the Presidential election.

Q. Why are the Puerto Rican people who come here so ill-prepared?

A (by Moscoso). We spend more per gross national product on education than the United States. But we are victims of the population explosion. What we need is population control, and unfortunately we have been delinquent in this regard.

Q. In the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs, do you think the prospect for American military intervention has increased or decreased?

A (by Richardson). Neither.

A (by Sanz de Santa Maria). As a Latin American, I hope it will never happen again.

I include at this point in the RECORD the text of the opening remarks to the panel on Latin America by Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santa Maria:

REMARKS OF CARLOS SANZ DE SANTA MARIA, CHAIRMAN, INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, AT THE NINTH ANNUAL WEST SIDE COMMUNITY CONFERENCE, MARCH 22, 1969

I appreciate very much the invitation of my distinguished friend, Congressman Ryan, to attend this Conference. It is a pleasure to join this panel with such distinguished friends as Professor Schneider, Ralph Dungan, Teodoro Moscoso, and our moderator, Dick Richardson, with whom I have also worked in the noble endeavor of the Alliance for Progress.

The subject of the Ninth Annual West Side Community Conference in New York is "World Problems and American Power". That is an awfully big subject for one, eight hour meeting. But let us try to shed some light on some of the problems of the Latin American region, especially with reference to that great enterprise of human development, the Alliance for Progress.

You all know that the Alliance for Progress is a cooperative movement of the member nations of the Organization of American States, that it is based on ideas that were developed over many years by Latin American leaders. You also know that President Kennedy had the greatness of vision to accept those ideas and to think that his country's vast economic and technical power could be used to help Latin America attack the whole panorama of problems of underdevelopment, which persist despite the comparative affluence and the high degree of technical and industrial development in parts of the modern world.

President Kennedy proposed that the Latin American countries unite in an extraordinary effort of self help, in an alliance to accelerate economic and social development, with the United States serving as their main partner in this Hemisphere, providing financial and technical cooperation.

The Alliance was launched in 1961 with twelve major objectives. I will not take the time to list them all or to tell how far the countries have come toward the achievement of those objectives. There has been progress towards all of them and rather impressive progress in mobilizing internal financial resources, in tax reform, in education, in expansion and diversification of industry, in health. There has been rapid development in agrarian reform and housing in only a few countries.

There is much criticism of the Alliance in

this country and in Latin America. But I must say that I have never seen a criticism that suggested a constructive alternative to this program.

The critics of the Alliance see only the shortcomings of the process. They tell the U.S. taxpayers that their money is being used abroad for no good. The Alliance, one of these critics say, serves no important interest of U.S. citizens.

In Latin America, because of the great expectations that the Alliance generated, peoples believed that financial cooperation from such a powerful and wealthy country, as the U.S. would in ten years transform their societies—educating the masses overnight, curing all sickness, adopting new science and new techniques, building hydroelectric power plants and super highways—all in a matter of a few years.

You all know that such a miracle does not happen in any society on earth. Education and economic development calls for the undertaking of a process which is difficult, sometimes painful, and definitely longer than we wish.

But I do not want to emphasize today the past. It is better to look into the future.

I believe that the Alliance must and will continue. I believe it is important, very important, for the United States—for you here on the West Side of Manhattan.

First, the Alliance for Progress in my opinion is above all the decision of a group of sovereign countries to work individually, and to work collectively towards a process of integration, to accelerate development and social progress. This effort must be carried in with or without external cooperation. It will also involve a healthy concept of nationalism by which I mean the preservation of the culture, the background, the philosophy and the state of mind of each country.

In the modern world external cooperation, financial and technical, is essential, not only for the developing countries, but for all countries on earth, because all are inter-related. None of the developed countries can guarantee that their currencies will always be strong. None of the developed countries can guarantee that its own society will always be peaceful and that there will be no strikes, social movements, or students unrest. None of the developed countries can guarantee that inflation will not harm its citizens. Those phenomena of political disturbance, so familiar to Latin America are not a monopoly of the underdeveloped countries. They are caused by a complex set of socioeconomic and geopolitical forces which, in the modern world, with the advancement of science and communications, shock all the countries, no matter how strong they may be.

For the United States the Alliance offers a way of using its economic and technical "power" to help to develop healthy economies in the rest of this Hemisphere and to create great consumers for American industries in the future. The statement of Pope Paul VI that "development is the new name for peace" applies very well in our Continent. The United States needs peace in this Hemisphere in order for its citizens to prosper. That means the Hemisphere must develop. This does not mean that the U.S. taxpayer must make gifts to Latin America. One of the worst misconceptions is that what we call "aid" is donations, handouts. In fact, Latin America is receiving—and repaying—loans, with interest.

It was originally estimated that Latin American development would require an investment over 10 years of about \$100 billion of which \$80 billion, or 80 percent, would have to come from Latin America itself; \$10 billion from the United States Government; and \$10 billion from international agencies, and public and private investors in capital-exporting nations other than the United States.

Today we find that Latin America has in-

vested more than \$100 billion in seven years and that it has supplied 90 percent of the external financing. U.S. loans and technical assistance account for about 6 percent of the region's financing. The level of private investment from the United States and the flow of private and public financing from other parts of the world has been far below expectations. That is one reason why the pace of development has been less than was hoped for. Certainly the Latin American effort to mobilize resources has been impressive. But both Latin America and the external collaborators must mobilize even greater financial resources in the future.

Now we have had some useful experience, we must look to the future with faith and honest self-criticism. You, North Americans, as well as we, Latin Americans.

We can talk here today about problems such as prices of raw materials, terms of trade, discriminatory treatment by Europe against Latin American exports and many other aspects on which this panel may be asked to comment. I am happy to contribute to this conversation. But I am trying to keep my remarks to ten minutes. The time is about up. Let me say just this: I should like to see a thorough study in the United States of the needs for development and peace in Latin America. I would like all of you in this country to study better Latin American problems and also possibilities, because I believe that Latin America has a bright future. I also believe that the international posture of your great country over the next decades will be determined mainly by its capacity to create a harmonious relationship with the emerging world of the developing countries. Latin America, which is in every respect closer to the United States and to the Western world than any other developing region, can play a key role in enhancing this posture. The United States as a great power will have to show enlightenment and restraint, especially in coping with nationalism—the same force that animated your country in the late 19th Century. The verdict in East and West relations may be decided by where the developing world will throw its weight and influence.

If you accept this idea, then we must introduce new resiliency into United States-Latin American relations and stimulate the Alliance with a new spirit and decision that may recover the pristine image of the Alliance for Progress, a phrase that awakened great expectations in all the Americas.

The afternoon panel on "Asia" was moderated by Roger Hilsman, professor of government, Columbia University, former Assistant Secretary of State, Far Eastern Affairs, and author: "To Move a Nation." Members of the panel were A. Doak Barnett, professor of government, Columbia University, author: "Communist China," and "China After Mao"; Edwin O. Reischauer, university professor, Harvard University, former Ambassador to Japan, author: "Beyond Vietnam: The United States and Asia"; Allen Whiting, professor of political science, Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, former Deputy Consul-General, Hong Kong; author: "China Crosses the Yalu."

I include the report on the discussion:

ASIA

(By Elizabeth Savels)

In his introduction of the panelists Roger Hilsman called attention to the fact that Japan is now the third most productive nation in the world, and that China is going to play an increasingly prominent part in world affairs.

Edwin O. Reischauer emphasized the importance of the partnership of Japan and

the United States. This partnership enables Japan to help keep the peace within its area of influence. Japan is a trading nation and wishes to maintain cordial relations with every nation with which she trades. It may even be possible that Japan can break through the isolation and antagonism of China and draw that country into the international community, for Japan has, besides a common cultural background, extensive trade agreements with China. At the present moment in history even the United States-Japan defense pact has a peaceful use: it enables Japan to concentrate on production of other than military needs, and it keeps the sea lanes open for her ships.

However, in the relationship of the United States with Japan there are a few areas of danger. There is strong opposition to the U.S. military commitment in Viet Nam, and a good deal of unrest with regard to the political situation on Okinawa. Traditionally, culturally and linguistically the population of Okinawa is Japanese and, while nominally self-governed, actually the political scene is dominated by the United States by virtue of the presence of our military base on Okinawa. Another disquieting factor, particularly as it affects the youth of Japan, is the role of that nation as "a friend of the United States," a restriction they find irksome. By 1970 these danger areas must be removed if the United States and Japan are to remain partners.

Allen Whiting drew a sober portrait of the Grand Old Man of China. Mao, he said, was a visionary, an idealist. His dream for China was that of an egalitarian society, non-materialistic, with selfless service of the entire population devoted to China. However, this vision met with lack of enthusiasm from his co-revolutionists, and Mao was forced to permit the establishment of more practical political policies.

In 1965, when the economy of China began to revive, Mao again argued for his visionary schemes. In an attempt to force them to fruition he purged the establishment, including his named successors, and organized the youth of China to carry forward his plans. 1967-68 was the winter of China's discontent. The youth were repudiated by the military, rejected by the peasants and workers, and the establishment remained in power. There is now no one to "carry the torch" for Mao. Indeed, the central government has become soft, and the real power is returned to the local level.

Doak Barnett reviewed the history of the United States' posture in relation to China since 1949, and asked, "How can China be included in the international family of nations?"

If, after the Communists came to power in China, there had been a period of peace the United States probably would have accepted this government and established diplomatic relations with it as was done in the case of the U.S.S.R. However, the Korean War destroyed any chance of this, and the consequences of the war produced a rigid attitude toward China on the part of the United States which is reflected in the China policy of non-recognition, opposition to any contact, and opposition to China's admission into the United Nations. Since 1959 the United States, for various reasons, has begun to reassess its position on China and to redefine its posture, as is illustrated by the "Open Door" speech of Roger Hilsman and by the statement of President Lyndon Johnson that our ultimate goal is reconciliation. To date, however, this redefinition has not been translated into concrete policy.

The present task of the United States, Professor Barnett stated, is to activate our changed attitude toward China. Positive steps must be taken toward reconciliation and they must be taken with the foreknowledge that the first efforts in that direction will meet with rejection. China, he predicted, will eventually accept our overtures, even if

it is only to the extent of becoming "limited adversaries." Recommended steps which would help remove China from its present isolated position included encouraging trade in non-strategic goods, seating China in the UN (without forfeiting the seat of Nationalist China), and taking every possible initiative for reconciliation except the discontinuance of the defense pact with Taiwan. Professor Barnett felt that the question of Taiwan should be left open except for absolute opposition to any question of a "military solution." Then, too, China should become involved in the nuclear limitation commitment for the level of fear must be reduced on both sides.

The major problem faced by the United States with regard to China is not military confrontation, Professor Barnett warned, but China's subsidizing of revolutionary movements.

Professor Hilsman quickly tallied the areas of concern in Asia which were not included in discussion of Japan and China. These included the problem of hunger in Asia, the problem of overpopulation, the economic development gap, the ancient religious and tribal rivalries, village cultures vs. membership in larger population units, anticolonialism, and the problem of multiple languages in one country. There is an identity crisis in many Asian nations. "What does it mean," he asked, "to be a Viet Name, a Cambodian?" The concept of national identity, of national pride, is in many cases too new, and often, due to the multiplicity of languages, business and affairs of state must be conducted in a foreign tongue, such as English or French, a further confusion of identity. United States policy in such nations should reflect some understanding of these problems.

Concerning the war in Viet Nam, Professor Hilsman expressed the belief that it was not only a mistake but a failure. The Paris peace talks, he said, were being conducted under the fallacious impression that a show of maximum military pressure can accelerate them.

Following are some questions and answers by panel members.

Q (to Professor Hilsman). What do you think will happen at the Paris talks?

A. I see nothing encouraging. Mr. Nixon seems to be ignoring them.

Q (to Ambassador Reischauer). Why can't the U.S. withdraw from Asia altogether?

A. It would be most unwise for the United States to withdraw from its commitments in Asia, except, of course, militarily, and even the military commitment in Korea should not be withdrawn.

Q (to Professor Barnett). Should not the U.S. remain quiet in the United Nations on the question of seating of China?

A. No. The United States should press for dual membership of mainland China and Nationalist China.

Q (to Professor Hilsman). Why don't the speakers, when they are in government, speak out on these problems as they do when they are out of government?

A. They do, but usually it is in committee and not publicized.

Q (to Professor Hilsman). Would it help if everyone concerned about a problem would write to his Congressman?

A. It certainly would. It would also help if they would work for their Congressman.

Q (to the Panel). Would the panel comment on the breakdown in India of the Congress Party.

A (by Professor Hilsman). While the anti-colonialist-nationalist leadership in India is trying to weld the country together, regional nationalism weakens its efforts. (India has 12 languages.)

Q (to Ambassador Reischauer). How can we cure the uneasiness of the Japanese regarding their status in the U.S.-Japanese partnership.

A. By 1970 Japan should have become the senior partner in this partnership, making the decisions both economically and militarily.

A correction from the floor for Ambassador Reischauer: Okinawans are not Japanese and the United States does not govern the country, as it has its own elected government.

Reply (by Ambassador Reischauer). After several hundred years of Japanese occupation, the people of Okinawa consider themselves Japanese; and as a matter of practical politics, the island is governed by the United States because of the importance of the U.S. military base in Okinawa.

The afternoon panel on "Europe" was moderated by Robert Kleiman, editorial board, New York Times, former European correspondent, author: "Atlantic Crisis: American Diplomacy Confronts a Resurgent Europe." Panel members were Alexander Dalin, director, Russian Institute, Columbia University; Ralph J. McGuire, director, Office of NATO and Atlantic Political-Military Affairs, Department of State; former deputy chief of mission in Congo; former counselor political and military affairs, and political adviser to U.S. and European Military Command; Philip E. Mosely, professor of international relations; director, European Institute, Columbia University; Ronald Steel, author: "End of the Alliance: America and the Future of Europe;" and "Pax Americana."

I include a report on the panel:

EUROPE

(By Mary Adamson)

Europe is a vital, not a secondary, interest of the United States, Robert Kleiman, moderator, said in brief introductory remarks at the "Europe" panel discussion.

He suggested the panel should touch on significant points, including historic developments and recent events. These points include the actions of General De Gaulle and the rapid economic growth of European countries as this growth affects the United States. He gave as an instance the fact that Germany now has gold reserves equal to those of the United States.

Mr. Kleiman cited the significant aspects of post-war development: the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Common Market with its intense rivalry between Britain and France, the growing power of Germany, Russia's role in Europe as shown by the recent action in Czechoslovakia. He said that President Nixon's trip to Europe so early in his term of office meant the turning back to Europe from the Johnson emphasis on the Far East.

Speaking first, Ronald Steel said that Europe is crisis-prone because the crucial issues have not been settled. He asked, Is NATO dead? The answer, he said, is no, but it no longer gets decisive support from the U.S. It is in fact "an empty room," as Walter Lippmann recently called it. Creation of a German army was the key. Should NATO survive in the '70's? Its existence prevents settling the crucial matter of the unity of East and West Germany, which is at the heart of a settlement between East and West Europe, between the Soviet Union and the United States. A nuclear-free zone in Central Europe might eliminate or help ease the problems of there being two blocks of power in Europe.

Professor Dalin said that the first problem for Europe is the settling of Soviet American relations economically and politically so that the wall dividing Europe and the U.S. may be scaled. However, there is a withering of Soviet optimism regarding Europe, and there is now no cohesive plan in the

Communist world. It is important in Europe what the U.S. does *not* do in Vietnam, because there is division in the West on policy in Vietnam, with a realistic Soviet attitude.

Mr. McGuire held that the health of NATO is a vital concern to the U.S. and to Europe because it is the link between the two. Europe alone could not withstand Soviet power. NATO is doing well, as shown in the Carmel report on the future tasks of the alliance, and has led to more meaningful consultations. It has maintained defenses and political stability in Europe. Even when France pulled out, 14 nations got together and reorganized NATO without losing pace. Czechoslovakia recent events have demonstrated the necessity for hanging together in Europe. The alliance is of course different from what it was 10 years ago, but it still has remarkable life. The Nixon Administration has a commitment to consult with NATO, and the organization will be revitalized.

Professor Mosely prefaced his talk with comments on points made by previous speakers. Does the Budapest conference indicate there are secret bilateral treaties for European security? Soviet action in Czechoslovakia was not on behalf of the Warsaw Pact. It should be noted that Finland in recent elections has chosen leadership friendly to the Soviet Union. What kind of Europe will emerge in 10 years? The answer lies in what the European countries themselves want. They, not the U.S., will decide, even if NATO continues. A detente is essential. We should try to improve trade with Central Europe, and East Europe including the Soviet Union. Strategic goods are not the issue. We need more cordial relations, with arms control in effect because Germany could in two years develop nuclear power and that would greatly disturb European relations. The main point is that the U.S. needs a strong Europe to be used in a constructive way for peace between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Panelists discussed briefly the preceding presentations, saying variously that the unification of Germany and of Europe are incompatible; NATO is not crucial in West Europe today nor in the relationship of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.; Europe is skeptical of the U.S. Could Germany be integrated into West Europe? Unfortunately, the unification of Germany remains as a major problem for the Germans themselves. Could there be a confederation in Europe including the Soviet Union? Professor Dallin questioned whether European unity could come without an outside threat. Is East Europe a Soviet empire? Mr. Kleiman thought the unity question must turn on what exists now. Economic unity may come for six countries in the Common Market in the '70's. NATO will have to be reorganized for joint decisions.

A dozen members of the audience addressed questions to the panel and received comments on different points: concerning NATO and the United Nations, German reunification, the possible reconciliation of France and Germany, a deterrent strategy in NATO, the passing of the age of superpowers, possible world organization on a geographical, regional or functional basis, the reactions of European citizens to NATO, Arab military strength, possible U.S. supplying of arms to the Greek government for internal action.

Mr. Kleiman adjourned the meeting with the comment that the lively presentations and discussion demonstrate that the U.S. interests are turning back to Europe.

The afternoon panel on the "Middle East" was moderated by Mike Wallace, CBS news correspondent. Members of the panel were Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., country director, Israel and Arab-Israel Affairs, Department of State; Nasrollah Fatemi, dean, Graduate School, Fairleigh Dickinson University; Allen Pol-

lack, chairman, executive committee, American Professors for Peace in the Middle East; Uri Ra'anana, professor, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

I include a report on the panel:

MIDDLE EAST

(By Virginia Horton)

Nasrollah Fatemi opened the formal panel discussion by pointing out that countries in the Middle East are old in culture and traditions but young in political existence.

He noted the countries have great natural resources whose revenues could benefit the people. He said that the big powers should stop exploiting the people and let them decide the solution to their problems. Most of the countries of the Middle East are united. They should work together to strengthen each other. The Arab-Israeli conflict is not in any way a religious conflict. The Golden Age of Islam was the time when the Jews, Christians, et. al. created one of the finest civilizations.

Dean Fatemi said the big powers and everyone interested in peace in the Middle East must make one point very clear: the existence of Israel is not negotiable. Israel is a state like any other state. In order to have peace in the area, the minimum requirement is that the Arabs accept recognition of Israel, end hostilities, accept the border before June, 1967, and free passage through the Gulf and the Suez Canal. Israel must accept withdrawal from occupied areas and find some solution of refugee problems. Israel must accept self-determination.

Mr. Atherton said there are three conflicts in the Middle East:

The Arab-Israel conflict is the most dramatic, but there is also one in the Arab world itself, and one between the East and West.

U.S. interests in the Middle East are primarily strategic but also economic and financial. The Soviet Union also has interests. Neither the Soviet Union nor the U.S. can control this area or any single state of the area. The Arab-Israel conflict is the greatest area of instability. Its continuation is a threat to the U.S. position there, and could embroil us with the Soviet Union.

The resolution of the United Nations represents the consensus of the Security Council and the consent of the parties that accept it. Implicit in the resolution is the feeling that settlement this time must be a package, a general settlement that deals with all elements. No aspects should be left to fester in the future. The settlement must be agreed to by all parties concerned—no imposed solution. The settlement must come to grips with and end territorial dispute, the conflicting claims to the strategic bit of geography known as Palestine. There must be permanent boundaries, not armistice lines—boundaries that are secure and recognized by both sides. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of the states must be assured. Free navigation must be provided. It must provide guarantees for territorial inviolability when borders are agreed upon. It must solve the human problem of this conflict.

To secure this the U.S. must help get things started. The status quo is dangerous, and permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility.

Professor Ra'anana said the Soviet Union depends upon a policy of bluff to deter the West. They put up a bold front, always hoping they won't be tested.

The overthrow of revolutionary regimes, their minimal help to Vietnam, confront the Kremlin with a credibility gap of vast proportions. The Soviet Union is anxious about the impact on its bloc. Her ability to apply her power is not taken seriously. The six-day war experience was bad for the Soviet Union because of the linking of this debacle with that of Prague. As long as the U.S. Sixth

Fleet is on hand, Soviet naval strength is dubious, at best. The Soviet Union doesn't want responsibility for the Arabs, and would like closer ties between Nasser and the U.S., so U.S. can pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

Mr. Ra'anana said we can discuss the Middle East seriously with the Soviet Union. There can be a tacit agreement between the two powers that if any conflict should last more than two or three days, a cease-fire would be insisted upon immediately, before either Israeli or Arab strategic centers are reached. A U.S.-Soviet Union understanding would lead local people to work out their conflict. An arms limitation agreement is Utopian.

Dr. Pollack said the mythology of the Middle East: He said the mythologies and ideas that the Soviet Union has had great victories, and that, unless a way is found immediately, war is going to break out in the Middle East which will lead to confrontation of the great powers. However, the only way war can break out is if the Arab states feel they can destroy Israel, which is not physically possible, or if Israel feels Arabs are preparing to destroy her, which she doesn't. The commando myth is that a war will be fought to save face. Actually, Dr. Pollack said, they want peace.

Dr. Pollack said there is a myth of the United Nations peace making mission. The U.N. role is nice if the parties are ready to come to an agreement, but the U.N. can't build up an alternative to coming together. There is a myth that peace is possible now. But hatred will not end soon, and it is idiocy to talk about what force will change it. Only Israel and the Arabs can achieve peace, in their good time.

MARS AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the astronauts of the Apollo 11 mission, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins, will be honored at a state dinner in Los Angeles hosted by President Nixon. The dinner will follow a day in which the astronauts will be greeted by hundreds of thousands of Americans in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

It is fitting that astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins should receive the tributes and acclamations which have already poured forth from a grateful American public; for their performance during the 6 day Apollo 11 mission was enormously impressive and a source of great pride to the entire Nation. I join with the millions of other Americans who take justifiable pride in the accomplishments of the Apollo program in congratulating these three courageous Americans, and the thousands of others who contributed to the success of the Apollo 11 mission, on their splendid achievement.

Now that the Apollo program has achieved its objective of sending a man to the moon and returning him to earth, however, I believe Congress should begin a thorough examination and review of our future objectives with respect to space exploration. For unless such an evaluation is initiated soon, I am afraid that Congress may be dragged by degrees, and without reaching a conscious decision to do so, into financing what is

very clearly the next objective of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration: a manned mission to Mars by the early 1980's.

In the past few weeks, the goal of sending a manned mission to Mars has been endorsed by several public officials. On July 17, the day on which the Apollo 11 was launched from Cape Kennedy, Vice President AGNEW revealed that he was urging that the Nation mount a program to send men to Mars by the end of this century. The Vice President's endorsement of such an effort came at a time when the results of neither the Apollo 11 project nor the two Mariner rockets then approaching Mars were available. To say his endorsement was scientifically, if not technologically, premature, then, understates the extent to which he was carried away by enthusiasm.

The Vice President's call for a manned mission to Mars by the end of the century was modest, however, compared to the call of Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of NASA, who in an August 6 speech to the National Press Club, urged that the United States set the early 1980's as the target date by which to send men to Mars. Dr. Paine, not content with simply advocating such a mission, went on to describe the kind of space craft—which he said would be nuclear powered—which would carry men to Mars and the sort of rocket propulsion system which it will be necessary to develop in order to achieve the objective of a manned trip to Mars.

It just so happens that a nuclear rocket system on which the Mars propulsion stages would be based is already under development. That system is, as I have pointed out repeatedly to the House, the NERVA nuclear rocket engine. Dr. Paine's reference to the NERVA system as the basis of a manned mission to Mars is, insofar as I am aware, the first time NASA has publicly admitted that the NERVA program forms the foundation of NASA's goal of sending men to Mars. Indeed, Dr. Paine's explanation of the relationship between the NERVA program and a manned Mars mission is the first time Congress has been apprised officially by NASA of the exact mission of the NERVA project. As recently as June 24 of this year, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in commenting upon an appropriations measure for the Atomic Energy Commission, noted on page 15 of its report on H.R. 12167 that the committee continued "to be concerned that no mission has yet been planned for the nuclear rocket." While the committee's report went on to suggest several possible missions for the NERVA program, including manned and unmanned lunar missions, unmanned deep space missions, and manned or unmanned earth orbital missions, the fact remains that Congress has to this date approved no mission for the nuclear rocket engine currently being developed.

While Congress may not have a mission for the NERVA program, NASA very clearly does—a fact which I have pointed out to the Congress for several years. The mission is, as Dr. Paine indicated in his August 6 speech, to send men to Mars

by early 1980's. Thus, even though Congress has yet to debate, let alone approve, the initiation of a program which would point toward landing a man on Mars, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission are already at work on a program which is admittedly the first stage in a manned mission to Mars.

The danger of allowing development of the NERVA project to proceed even though Congress has not yet assigned it a mission is, as I pointed out again on June 24, that further investments in the program will increase the pressure to approve whatever purpose NASA ultimately determines for the program. For as investments in the program mount, NASA will argue that, if the investments which have already been made are not to be wasted, we must proceed with whatever mission NASA proposes—even though the ultimate cost of that mission, the landing of men on Mars, may be upwards of \$200 billion.

Before the escalating investment in the NERVA program propels Congress into approving a manned mission to Mars, then, it is essential that future space objectives be evaluated and balanced with other national needs; in short, that the space program be harmonized with national priorities. Several considerations are central to the kind of evaluation I am urging on Congress.

First, Congress must be thoroughly acquainted with the benefits and costs of manned versus unmanned space exploration. To stress a manned space flight capability over unmanned missions could, in the end, undermine the space program itself. It is indisputable that manned missions are enormously more expensive than unmanned missions. These costs in themselves may cause the program to lose public support. In addition, the huge cost of developing a manned space flight capability will limit the number of possible missions; its extensive safety and life-support systems will limit the potential of each mission for innovative exploration, and the need to orient on-board experiments to the survival and performance of man will limit the acquisition of data about space itself. Perhaps most important, the cost of unmanned space exploration is, in my judgment, likely to fall within far more reasonable limits than manned space flights.

The desirability of emphasizing a manned space flight capability, then, must be weighed against the benefits of unmanned space exploration such as that being carried out under the Mariner program, and the relative cost of manned and unmanned programs.

A second consideration, and one to which Congress is not only suited but, in my view, required to make a decision, is the relative importance of whatever space program we wish to develop as opposed to the unfulfilled human needs on Earth.

The phrase "urban crisis" has been invoked so many times in the past few years that its relation to the truly pressing problems which the term encompasses is, I fear, being lost. The crisis which besets our urban areas is not an abstraction. As anyone who has walked

through the streets of New York City or any other large American city knows, the crisis is visible and manifest. It is represented by crumbling and dilapidated slum housing, decaying or non-existent urban transportation systems, polluted air and water supplies, and increasing public fear of crime and violence.

We can debate the urgency of landing men on Mars. We cannot debate the urgency of developing and adequately funding programs which will alleviate escalating urban miseries which cannot be solved without a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to help solve them and to provide the money that is needed by the cities to generate those solutions.

It is a plain fact, and many Congressmen are fond of pointing out this fact, that the financial resources of the Federal Government are not unlimited. That being the case, Congress simply must establish national priorities which reflect the urgency of the multiple areas of national need and assign money to those areas accordingly. In short, Congress must exercise its responsibility to determine which areas of national need have priority and apportion the Federal budget around those priorities.

The goal articulated by President John F. Kennedy of reaching the moon by the end of this decade has been realized. An enormous technological feat has been accomplished; and the Nation has expressed today, in honoring astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, its pride in that achievement. But the achievement of the Apollo program cannot be allowed to become the rationale for automatically approving the next goals of NASA.

As Colonel Edwin Aldrin said in the course of the astronauts press conference yesterday:

What this means is that many other problems perhaps can be solved in the same way, by taking a commitment to solve them in a long time fashion. I think we were timely in accepting this mission of going to the moon. It might be timely at this time to think in many other areas of other missions that could be accomplished.

If this Nation has the capacity to achieve the goal of landing a man on the moon in less than a decade, it has the capacity to achieve other goals in a similar period. It is not a question of capacity but a question of will and, as Colonel Aldrin said, commitment.

The goal of providing a decent home in a suitable environment for every American was first embodied in the 1949 Housing Act. The Federal Government has made other commitments to alleviating the problems which beset society on earth. It is time that those commitments receive first priority.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I wish to insert several articles relating to the space program and national priorities: an editorial from the July 18 New York Times entitled "After Apollo—Mars?"; a column from the July 28 New York Times by John A. Hamilton entitled "Meanwhile, Back on Earth"; an article from the August 7 New York Times which reveals the American pub-

lic to be opposed to a manned mission to Mars; a second article by Harold M. Schmeck, Jr. from the August 7 New York Times on Dr. Thomas O. Paine's August 6 speech to the National Press Club; and an article from the July 26 Ave Maria by Gary G. Gerlach entitled "American Priorities: Lost in Space?"

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1969]
AFTER APOLLO—MARS?

Vice President Agnew chose the day Apollo 11 blasted off for the moon to reveal that he is urging this country to mount an effort to send men to Mars before the end of the century. Politically, this was good timing since it obviously took advantage of the nation's present concentration on space exploration.

Scientifically and technically, however, it was premature. The Vice President's trial balloon was released even before the lunar landing has been achieved and before the two Mariner rockets now nearing Mars have sent back their pictures and other data. If these three projects are all fully successful, they will provide far better data for rational consideration of a manned expedition to Mars than are now available.

Compared to some of the ideas put forward by enthusiasts in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Agnew's proposal is relatively modest. He would be content to take up to thirty years for the task, while the more feverish advocates of a Martian voyage want to put men on that planet by the mid-1980's.

But it must not be taken for granted that a manned trip to Mars can be accomplished even on Mr. Agnew's more relaxed schedule. At its closest approach, Mars is still tens of millions of miles from earth, not a mere quarter million miles away like the moon. Astronauts taking off for Mars would have to carry supplies for a round trip lasting at least a year and perhaps longer—unless much greater rocket speeds than now available are attained—instead of a mere eight-day journey such as is envisaged in the timetable for Apollo 11. Far more powerful rockets and much improved guidance and life support systems would be required, and they will be both difficult and very expensive to develop.

The staggering costs of mounting an expedition to Mars would therefore dwarf even the \$24 billion spent on Apollo. Yet there is no pressing scientific reason to hurry with such a manned effort. It is already certain that a great deal of valuable information about earth's planetary neighbors can be acquired by unmanned rockets. A rich harvest of scientific knowledge is promised from the launching of the Martian equivalents of the Rangers, Lunar Orbiters, and Surveyors that performed invaluable service in scouting the moon. More important, any forced-draft Martian analogue of the Apollo Project would divert hundreds of billions of dollars that are more urgently required to meet the needs of men and women on earth, needs ranging from the fight against poverty to cleaning up this polluted earth and providing really adequate education, medical care and nutrition for all human beings.

Yet once men have attained and consolidated their first footholds on the moon, the call to move ahead to Mars will be strong, and rightly so. Of all members of the solar system besides this earth, Mars has the greatest probability of having life and of providing relatively hospitable—though far from ideal—conditions for permanent human habitation. Moreover the task of reaching Mars will be significantly eased once the moon is available as a launching pad for this next step up the cosmic ladder.

It would be a tragedy, however, if the inevitable manned trip to Mars were to be

accomplished under the same conditions of enormously wasteful national rivalry that marred the ascent to the moon. Here is a project that makes sense only if it is conducted on a truly international basis—with contributions of money, men and technology from all interested nations and with central direction provided by an agency of the United Nations.

In a highly appropriate gesture to the sacrifices and aspirations of men irrespective of nationality in their questing probes into space, Apollo 11 is at this moment taking to the moon mementos of five dead astronauts, three American and two Soviet citizens. How much more appropriate it will be if at some future date the first manned spaceship takes off for Mars carrying living Americans, Russians and citizens of other nations as representatives of all mankind in this greatest of human adventures.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1969]

MEANWHILE, BACK ON EARTH

(By John A. Hamilton)

As the moon sent signals to the earth last week, the earth sent signals to the moon.

The Eagle blasted off from the Sea of Tranquility and flames shot skyward from Columbus, Ohio, and York, Pa. Already this year fire bombings, looting and sniper activity have required the summoning of the National Guard in more than 40 urban disorders. The total thus far is smaller than last year's. No disorder has been as massive as some of those in 1967. The recent ones have broken out, however, in such disparate cities as Chicago, Ill., Omaha, Neb., and Charleston, S.C., and they signal deeply pervasive domestic problems.

After President Nixon dreamed aloud about visiting new worlds where there will be a form of life and Vice President Agnew urged sending men to Mars by the end of the century, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Romney recalled some older commitments and cited some mundane figures designed to bring a moonstruck nation back to earth.

He recalled that 20 years ago Congress set as a goal the provision of a decent home and a suitable environment for every American. Last year's omnibus housing act launched a construction program to provide 26 million new or rehabilitated homes within the decade, six million of them to replace presently occupied but substandard structures largely clustered in urban slums.

Noting that housing deterioration still outruns housing construction, Mr. Romney blamed the parsimonious funding of last year's act—at \$165 million—and recommended that this figure be increased four or five fold to \$700 million or \$800 million beginning with the next fiscal year.

NEW YORK BAROMETER

Many of the urban problems that exist nationally are proving especially acute in New York City, which may foretell worsening conditions elsewhere. The housing shortage here, growing increasingly severe, has required extension of rent controls. Structures are said to deteriorate at the rate of about 2,000 annually and more residents live in substandard units—the city has 800,000 such units—than live altogether in most cities.

Across the nation urban areas show other unmistakable signs of neglect and strain. Inner-city education offerings remain almost uniformly inferior to those of the suburbs. Health services, always pathetically inadequate, are being cut back further. Job training and skill upgrading programs lag badly, as the Nixon Administration lops the Job Corps in half and trims the Neighborhood Youth Corps by a third. The Federal Government has postponed an effective attack on hunger. Although the cost of living soars, mothers and children on welfare are forced

to accept reduced benefits while fundamental reform of the relief system does not command real attention.

Municipal budgets fall awkwardly short of their goals. Simultaneously with the nation's giant leap forward in space, the Citizens Budget Commission released a report depicting serious back-sliding in the provision of essential services in this metropolis. It found New York City's budget both frightfully bloated—triple its size a decade ago—and at the same time far too small to meet mounting responsibilities. Those in the middle class flee as the disadvantaged arrive, requiring the city to provide additional services from an eroding tax base.

PATTERN OF DISORDERS

While some of the urban disorders this year tend to follow established patterns, the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence at Brandeis University detects a "politicalization of violence." It describes the course of events as: issuance of demands, staging of demonstrations and then disorders. It points to campus troubles as generally following this new pattern. The 113-day strike by Negro hospital workers in Charleston would also seem to fit it.

These disorders, cutbacks in important domestic programs, polarization of sentiment in urban areas as reflected in recent election returns and in the decisions by some of the nation's outstanding mayors not even to seek re-election emphasize the need for Federal action on housing and on the host of other programs basic to a healthy urban society. They are, together, a reminder that old commitments need meeting and the more recent recommendations of the Kerner Commission following the devastating 1967 riots still await implementation. The commission urged a "commitment of national action—compassionate, massive and sustained"—that would include urban programs at "unprecedented levels of funding."

The space program must go forward, of course. This was the message from the moon. But domestic needs must also be met. This message from earth, sketched in flame and agony, cannot be ignored. The grave risk in the afterglow of last week's space spectacular is that the nation may succumb to a form of lunacy and neglect pressing urban problems. It may unwisely try to tuck the Kerner recommendations, as unceremoniously as green cheese myths, into its discarded past.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1969]

POLL FINDS PUBLIC COOL TO MARS TRIP—OPINIONS SPLIT BY AGE, WITH YOUNG ADULTS IN FAVOR

PRINCETON, N.J.—The public is generally lukewarm toward the idea of setting aside money for an eventual manned landing on Mars, according to the Gallup Poll. Opinions on this issue, however, were found to depend largely on a person's age, with a majority of young adults in favor of the idea and a majority of those over 30 opposed.

Taking adults of all ages together, 39 per cent favored a space push to Mars, 53 per cent expressed opposition and 8 per cent had no opinion on the question.

Persons with college training are far more likely to favor a Mars landing program than are those with only a high school or grade school background, the poll indicated.

Negroes questioned in the survey were opposed to such a project by the ratio of 3-to-1.

The core of the public's opposition to setting aside money for a Mars project appears to stem from the belief that money earmarked for a Mars landing would be better spent on domestic problems.

A 59-year old college instructor from Lansing, Mich., said: "With all the poverty, crime, urban decay that we have on this planet, I see no reason why we should use all of our resources to get to a planet where life probably does not exist."

Those in favor reasoned that the scientific exploration of space must be continued to "advance the knowledge of mankind" and to "stay ahead of Russia."

A 23-year old Bronx printer was excited about the prospect of a Mars landing: "The moon shot was tremendous, almost unbelievable. We can't stop now. There are so many areas of the universe we should explore. Man can learn a great deal from these adventures."

A total of 1,517 adults in more than 300 areas selected at random across the nation were asked this question between July 26 and July 28:

There has been much discussion about attempting to land a man on the planet Mars. How would you feel about such an attempt—would you favor or oppose the United States setting aside money for such a project?

Following are the national results and the findings by age and education:

[In percent]

National:	
Favor	39
Oppose	53
No opinion	8
21 to 29 years:	
Favor	54
Oppose	41
No opinion	5
30 to 49 years:	
Favor	40
Oppose	53
No opinion	7
50 and over:	
Favor	28
Oppose	60
No opinion	12
College:	
Favor	52
Oppose	45
No opinion	3
High school:	
Favor	39
Oppose	52
No opinion	9
Grade school:	
Favor	25
Oppose	63
No opinion	12

The public was also lukewarm about proposals in the early 1960's to begin an extensive program designed to land a man on the moon.

In May, 1961, President Kennedy called on Congress to increase expenditures for the space program with the ultimate goal of landing a man on the moon before Russia did.

On the eve of that appeal, the Gallup Poll found only one person in three willing to see the United States spend the billions necessary to get a man on the moon.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1969]
MARS FLIGHT PLAN: NUCLEAR SPACESHIP WITH A "LIFEBOAT"

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 6.—The first Americans to go to Mars will probably fly there on a nuclear-powered spaceship accompanied by an identical second ship to act as a "lifeboat."

This plan was described today by Dr. Thomas O. Paine, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In a speech at the National Press Club, he said that the recent landing on the moon was not a celestial Mount Everest expedition lacking further significance, but the opening of a great era of space exploration.

He said that a reasonable space budget would permit a manned expedition to Mars in the nineteen-eighties. In answer to a question after his speech, he gave a detailed description of the Mars flight.

Each Mars-bound vehicle would be assembled in earth orbit. Its rocket portion would probably consist of three nuclear-powered stages mounted side by side, Dr. Paine said. The outer two would be fired to send the center stage and the manned spacecraft on their way to Mars.

The two outer stages, having separated, would then fire rocket blasts in the reverse direction so that they would return to earth for re-use.

The manned vehicle with a crew of about six would take many months to get to Mars and would be accompanied all the way by the duplicate spaceship. The crew could transfer to the other ship if difficulties arose with the first.

Dr. Paine said that this plan was prompted by the difficulty of trying to mount a relief expedition across the 50-million-mile interplanetary distance.

Once in orbit around Mars, the spaceship would detach the landing craft to send three men to the surface for a possible month of exploration before returning to their orbiting main ship.

After a total of 90 days in the vicinity of Mars, the expedition would then return home on a long looping path that would take it to the vicinity of Venus. The whole expedition would take about two years.

Dr. Paine said that the nuclear rocket system on which the Mars propulsion stages would be based was already under development. This rocket engine system, called Nerva, should be ready for flight testing by 1977 if the program is continued, the space agency administrator said.

He said that nuclear rockets, far more efficient than present chemical rockets, would allow the redesigning of all American spacecraft to allow bolder missions and with smaller vehicles than would otherwise be possible.

An integral factor in this redesign will be a second nuclear power system, designed to provide electrical power for the spaceships. At present, they rely mainly on solar and fuel cells.

Dr. Paine, who had suggested that the United States should consider a manned expedition to Mars in the nineteen-eighties, said that this country and the Russians should be capable of doing it by then.

Questioned about the Soviet program, he said that he expected the Russians to establish a large manned space station, land on the moon and set up a scientific station there, all in the "not too distant future."

COOPERATION URGED

With a major, high-priority program, they might go to Mars in the nineteen seventy's, he said.

Dr. Paine said that international cooperation in space exploration was highly desirable and that the scientific value of the Apollo 11 mission to the moon could have been enhanced if the Russians had been less secretive about their Luna 15 flight.

Luna 15 went to the moon about the same time as the Apollo 11 flight. The Soviet unmanned spacecraft touched down on the moon in what appears to have been a high-speed crash landing.

If the Russians had told the United States when Luna 15 was to land and changed its orbit somewhat, Dr. Paine indicated, they might have aided an important experiment involving the seismometer the Apollo 11 crew placed on the lunar surface.

This experiment might have made possible an important analysis of the moon's interior structure, he said.

[From Ave Maria, July 26, 1969]

AMERICAN PRIORITIES: "LOST IN SPACE?"

(By Gary G. Gerlach)

Who on earth (literally) would dare criticize the cost of a program that brought us a dramatic Christmas Eve prayer for peace

direct from an astronaut orbiting the moon in a space capsule?

Such displays of the combination of what we like to think of as traditional American values and modern American know-how by the United States space program have rendered it nearly immune to criticism, or even to close scrutiny in terms of its place in the country's priorities, as far as many persons are concerned.

Suggest that the money spent on space travel might more profitably be used to start eliminating hunger or pollution or slums or any of the other urgent problems here at home and you'll get that old line about what if Spain had decided to take care of domestic problems instead of financing Columbus.

To many, the very idea and the space program should be required to more clearly define its goals, the best ways of reaching them, and the practical benefits the country can expect to receive for the money it is spending is regarded as somehow not quite American—rather as if one said that mothers do nice work, but an efficiency expert should be called in to make sure they're really worth the cost.

Yet in the past two years, particularly since the disastrous spacecraft fire that killed three astronauts in January of 1967 and the revelation of space program problems that followed, more and more Congressmen and scientists have spoken up with doubts about the program.

During the fiscal year just ended, as part of the government's overall spending reduction, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has been limited to a budget of less than \$4 billion, its lowest in six years.

The real problem, however, according to such space program critics as Rep. William F. Ryan, D-N.Y., is that the relationship between the space program and "human needs on earth" has not been explored with an eye to setting priorities.

"Perhaps the central issue is the question of what we seek in space," Rep. Ryan has said. "Is it knowledge and practical benefits, or is it glory? If it is knowledge through data which may be useful to scientists, or benefits which may accrue through application of space technology on earth, then we must ask if we have chosen the means which will lead most surely to those results. If it is glory, we must ask if that glory is worth the price in potential loss of scientific data, in low priority placed on useful earth applications, and in terms of dollars and cents."

"The primary role of Congress in connection with the space program should be to participate in the definition of national goals. It is not sufficient to make some cuts in NASA's budget one year when the budget-cutting fever is rampant and restore them in another year if funds are more readily available or if attitudes are more favorable."

"Not only is that inefficient and wasteful, but in so doing we overlook our primary responsibility, the responsibility for leadership in this program," said Ryan.

"Congress should determine which goals are worthy of the investment of public funds and which potential benefits are of the greatest value to the nation."

A major impetus to the space program, and one that until recent years has been tacitly accepted as justification for spending nearly any amount, is the desire to "beat the Russians" in space. Just as critics of military spending now are asking pointed questions about the need to invest \$8 billion or more in the so-called "Safeguard" antiballistic missile (ABM), space program critics have begun wondering whether the Russian bogeyman is truly scary enough to justify the tremendous efforts * * *

In announcing his resignation as head of NASA last fall, James E. Webb complained that cuts in his agency's budget for the current fiscal year meant that "we are going to

be in a second position for some time to come." He warned that the Soviet Union was building a booster bigger than the American Saturn 5, and said that the Russians "are still increasing" their programs, while the Americans are cutting back.

The reply by many space program observers to this charge is, essentially "If so, so what?" In an editorial after the successful Apollo 8 mission last December, the *Wall Street Journal* called for a reexamination of the United States space program, particularly with regard to its goals after the \$24 billion moon project is finished.

"The target date of 1969 for the lunar landing was wholly arbitrary, dictated by no scientific need but at most by a faintly childish wish to beat the Russians to the moon and at the same time to give the American citizenry something grandiose to think about," said the *Journal*.

A supporter of the space program, Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize-winning chemist known for his research on the atomic bomb, puts this aspect rather nicely in a newspaper article a few months ago.

"The space program is often discussed as a primary scientific program," he said. "This is not true. Its primary purpose is political, but it is also primarily an adventure. Are we not all excited when these men circle the moon? And will we not watch while men land on the moon? Why not build the modern equivalent of the Parthenon?"

Dr. Urey does take note of the problems of the cities and the poor but he says it would cost considerably more to solve them than is spent on the space program and, besides, the country should be prepared to take care of its poor and also go into space.

Perhaps it should be prepared to do both, but recent steps to close Job Corps centers and cut various other phases of the poverty program indicate that the country's resources are not limitless.

Particularly if the Vietnam war continues, the choices are likely to come down to feeding the hungry in this country or building a "Parthenon" through space flights.

The desire to give the American public "something grandiose" in the form of heroes (and therefore assure continuation of space program appropriations) is thought by some critics to be a major reason for sending men on the space missions. It would be much less costly, they say, and just as effective in terms of gathering information, to explore space with instruments instead of men.

"To stress a manned space flight capability as our primary goal, and to plan our planetary activities around manned requirements could be a grave mistake," says Rep. Ryan. "In general, its great cost may cause the space program to lose public support. More specifically, its great cost will limit the number of possible missions; its extensive safety and life-support requirements will limit the potential of each mission for innovative exploration, and the need to orient on-board experiments to the survival and performance of man will limit the acquisition of data about space itself."

But a machine, no matter how sophisticated, does not show up as well as a clean-cut young man in a ticker-tape parade (and the astronauts all are so determinedly clean-cut that one longs for a Joe Namath to sneak into the program while the public-relations men are looking the other way).

A machine cannot be photographed kissing its wife and children goodbye before a big flight, and it cannot trade good-natured insults and not-so-funny jokes with ground control. Obviously, its appeal is limited.

Nearly a year ago, a panel of the country's best-known space scientists, the National Academy of Sciences' Space Science Board, urged NASA to give up the idea of exploring the nearby planets with men.

The board proposed that NASA concentrate instead on flying unmanned spacecraft to as many of these nearby planets as pos-

sible. It said that the developing technology of fully automated systems should be able to do this job well, and it called the \$80 million devoted to such unmanned planetary exploration in NASA's budget for fiscal 1969 "totally inadequate."

"While at some time in the future it may be in the national interest to undertake manned missions to the planets, we do not believe man is essential for scientific planetary investigation at this stage," the board said.

In May of this year, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, the presidential science adviser, told the Senate Space Committee that NASA was limited in the amount of planning it could do beyond the Apollo moon-landing program. He said in response to a question: "There are no manned flights planned to other planets for the next 10 to 15 years."

And is one to infer from this that with its "limited" planning, NASA will suddenly in 10 or 15 years decide to send men to explore other planets and be all set to go? Obviously, some such planning must be going on now, but again the country is drifting into preparing for manned flights without clearly deciding whether it wants them.

Ralph E. Lapp, a well-known physicist and another architect of the atomic bomb, blames the "space-industrial-political complex" for much of the force behind the perpetuation and growth of the space program.

The aerospace industries "grab half the prime military contract awards," he says. "There are over 1.5 million aerospace workers. And they are concentrated in sensitive areas like California and Texas. Let's not forget that the Apollo program has enriched the South—there's a 'golden arc' of federal facilities stretching from Cape Kennedy to Houston."

The ordinary tendency of any bureaucracy to stay alive and indeed to grow is therefore given strong backing in the case of the space program by this complex of aerospace industries, their workers, and the politicians who represent the areas profiting from them.

Dr. Lapp points out that when the Apollo program was established by President Kennedy it was meant to hit maximum activity and then phase out. "The Apollo program was supposed to phase down, and by the year 1970 (when presumably we have reached the moon) there should be nobody working on the Apollo program, and theoretically you should be spending nothing on it; but I'm sure you'll have plenty on the government payroll doing the cost accounting for the project," he said.

"The fact is that you should not be spending money on it unless you intend to go somewhere after you've reached the moon. And that to me is the fundamental issue today. Where is NASA planning to go?"

The obvious answer is to that question, said Dr. Lapp, is "into manned space systems of long duration—of deep missions—eventually going to Mars, because there is no other reason for having such big funds, such a big budget. Man is the expensive thing in space."

"After all, I thought we've heard a great deal about the microminiaturization of instruments which bring, acquire, and send back data from space. And if these instruments which now have been made so tiny are so good, then isn't it true that we can put a great deal of instrumentation in a small payload? We don't need a Saturn 5 booster in order to do this."

Rep. Ryan charged NASA with "lack of candor . . . in terms of long-term planning" after learning that a NASA internal memorandum from as far back as 1966 revealed plans for landing a man on Mars in the 1980's.

"If it is our purpose to support that mission, we ought to do it frankly and openly, and we ought to recognize what that is going to cost," said Ryan.

"If this is not our purpose, we should not

be led into a program that will take us down this road, only to be confronted later with a statement by NASA that the investment is so great we cannot turn back." Ryan has estimated the cost of a manned Mars trip to be nearly \$200 billion. "This is occasion for a real national decision," he says.

Ryan also charges that "NASA intends the Apollo applications program as the basis for a spectacular, manned planetary mission, a goal which has not been presented to the Congress for discussion or evaluation, nor accompanied by any projection of the costs which will be eventually involved."

Practical applications of space technology so far have scarcely justified the huge sums the country has spent—one astronaut mentioned Teflon, but several billion dollars is rather a large amount to spend to keep food from sticking.

A study by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences in 1967 indicated that NASA itself has placed a very low priority on achieving the potential benefits of the space program.

"That part of the NASA budget that is directly aimed at developing practical applications of space technology is now about \$100 million per year or about two percent of the total," the study said. "If the future benefits of space technology are large, and if they can be realized soon, that amount is too small. If they are small or illusory or very far off it may be too large. The question is important and should be answered."

In some areas where benefits have been realized, such as weather prediction, there is a question as to just how much value they have in relation to the cost. As Dr. Lapp says, "If a farmer is given a three-day warning that he's going to have a hailstorm, how does he protect a wheat field? It doesn't do him any good."

With the Apollo program nearly finished, it is more than time for Congress and the country as a whole to take a hard look at where we are going in the space program, why, how much it will cost, and what we can expect to gain.

To do that will require more candor from NASA about its plans than it is in the habit of showing.

"NASA has an unfortunate habit of swamping Congress with engineering details and starving it for policy and management information," said Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., during the investigation that followed the 1967 spacecraft fire.

"And it is in this second area—policy and management—not the first, where the responsibility of Congress lies."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), in respect to their comments on the statement attributed to President Nixon in the news reports this morning in which the President is represented as having strongly objected to the recent House vote to add \$1.1 billion to his recommended budget

for educational programs and in which the President is reported as having said that Congress was following budgetary policies which promised, in the President's words, "long-term grief for the people."

Mr. Speaker, I remember in the campaign last year that Mr. Nixon made a statement in which he said that the one area in American life which we should not shortchange was education at every level. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we try to shortchange American education in 1969 and 1970, it will be this shortchanging of the young people of our country which will in fact mean "long-term grief for the people." So I call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the recent House vote for additional funds for education was an overwhelming vote strongly supported by Members on both sides and that on the teller vote on the Joelson amendment, even the distinguished chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORRIS) voted for it and thereby voted to add about \$1 billion to President Nixon's proposed budget for education.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the President would heed the call of Republicans and Democrats alike that we must invest more in the most valuable natural resource America has—educated men and women.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Of course, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think the gentleman would be on far sounder ground trying to justify the \$1.1 billion amendment to which he referred if on June 30 the gentleman from Indiana had had the wisdom to vote for the tax bill as recommended by President Johnson and as modified by President Nixon. The gentleman from Indiana did not vote for it on June 30 and, as a matter of fact, he failed to vote for the 6-month extension on August 4. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana obviously believes in greater Federal expenditures but drops out when called upon to provide the needed revenue to pay the bills.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I very much appreciate what the distinguished minority leader has said, but I wish to remind the minority leader of another campaign promise that Mr. Nixon made; namely, that he was going to be opposed to the extension of the surtax. Surely the minority leader does not object to my helping Mr. Nixon keep a campaign promise.

Also I wish to say to my good friend from Michigan that the gentleman from Indiana voted against the surtax when Mr. Johnson wanted it and he voted against the surtax when Mr. Nixon wanted it. So he is very consistent and does not base this position on partisanship. The main reason I voted last month against President Nixon's bill to continue the 10-percent income tax surcharge was that the measure contained no significant tax reform at all. In 1968 I voted against President Johnson's surcharge for exactly the same reason, I would advise the minority leader.

And, Mr. Speaker, I might here note that it is exceedingly revealing that 42 Republican Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the surtax this year when President Nixon proposed it voted against it last year when President Johnson proposed it.

Those 42 Republican House votes represent quite a turnabout.

To reiterate, I voted against it both when proposed by President Johnson and by President Nixon because neither surtax measure contained any significant reform.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If I have any more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the last statement of the gentleman from Indiana proves beyond any doubt whatsoever that he is a big spender but does not want to provide adequate revenue to pay the bills. He voted against his own President's recommendation for a tax increase in 1968—a responsible proposal—and he voted against the present President's surcharge proposal.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. He voted against both extensions in 1969.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Where does he expect to get the money to pay the bills he is voting to have the Government incur?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Of course.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The reason I said to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), that I had voted against President Johnson's recommendation for a surtax was that I wanted him to understand that neither my attitude on the surtax nor my attitude on the Joelson amendment was a partisan attitude. I was very glad to join with my friends on the Republican side of the aisle in strongly supporting the Joelson amendment. Indeed, more Republicans voted for the Joelson amendment and against President Nixon's position than voted against the amendment and with the President. Moreover, I believe I am correct in saying that only two of the Republican Members of the House, from the minority leader's home State of Michigan voted against the Joelson amendment and with President Nixon.

So I think my good friend from Michigan—one of the two, by the way—is on shaky ground in seeking to make a partisan matter of the vote on Mr. Joelson's amendment to provide additional funds for American education.

But I would say to the gentleman from

Michigan that if we had had any very strong support from the President beginning in January of this year when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), got busy on tax reform and got a good head of steam up for reform of our tax laws, and if we had had stronger support from the other side of the aisle at that time, we could have passed a tax reform bill that would have succeeded in generating the substantial increases in Federal revenues that I, like the gentleman from Michigan, want very much to see.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is amusing that the gentleman from Indiana does not realize that President Nixon is the first President in more than 20 years to send a message to Congress recommending long overdue legitimate and bona fide tax reform. No President prior to President Nixon recommended tax reform and that includes former President Johnson and former President Kennedy as well as others. President Nixon did recommend tax reform. He is the first President in 20 years to have done so and with his help we now have tax reform.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am delighted to see that the President recommended tax reform and I had hoped that we could make this subject a bipartisan matter. I have already pointed out that the Joelson amendment had strong bipartisan support and I would add that the tax reform bill that we passed last week had strong bipartisan support.

So I am delighted that the President followed the lead of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), with reference to tax reform, but I note that the President did not speak out for tax reform until several months after the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) commenced hearings on the matter in January of this year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Indiana has a consistent record of wanting to spend, spend, spend, and of not voting for the necessary legislation with which to provide the revenue to pay the bills, and he knows it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from Michigan is mistaken, but I am always glad to hear his viewpoint with reference to these matters.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO THE VOTE OF REPRESENTATIVE JOELSON ON THE SURTAX ISSUE

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time solely for the purpose to state that during the colloquy which I had with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) when I inquired of him whether he had voted for the surtax bill when it was before the House, he said he did.

I now ask unanimous consent to strike

my remarks from the RECORD because as I read the RECORD of June 30 he did vote against the original surtax extension bill, which passed the House by only five votes. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of congratulations be struck from the RECORD. It is easy to spend, but the question is how to keep the budget in balance without taxes to provide the revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE STATUS OF GREECE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of visiting Greece for the first time. Though this trip was completely unofficial and at my own expense, I thought perhaps my colleagues would be interested in my making a few observations.

The visit was necessarily brief, but included Athens and the surrounding area, Rhodes, and Symi—a delightful small island where there are no automobiles or buses to pollute the air, one of the very earliest seats of learning within our Western civilization.

As an American, I have always been fascinated by the influence of Greek history and culture on the world, and on our own country. As a politician, I revere Greece as the birthplace of democracy. As a former military man, I am deeply appreciative of the heroic achievements of Greek soldiers and sailors during World War II and Korea. As a friend of many Greek-Americans, including several in this Chamber, I am intensely aware of the great contribution of her native sons and daughters to the success of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am also a pragmatist, and as such I must speak in terms of a profound national interest in the continuation of the strongest ties with Greece.

While all of us realize it, I believe one must visit the country to fully appreciate the strategic importance of Greece to the cause of Western noncommunism, and the bulwark of Western strength that nation has been, and is today. In terms of geography, Greece has but a thread of continental connection with NATO. Geographically, it is of a piece with its Balkan Communist neighbors to the north. Even Western Germany is not so militarily vulnerable as Greece. It is an outpost in most tenuous geopolitical circumstance, but one laced in code, interests, commitment, and traditions to our mutual cause.

There is no profit in playing fast, loose, and arrogantly in our relations with Greece. I talked with dozens of citizens ranging from modest fishermen and small businessmen through industrialists, bankers, and prominent educators. Without exception, everyone I talked with had favorable comments about the existing government and the stability, confidence, the atmosphere of personal dignity, and

the climate of opportunity it has achieved.

Certain magazine writers and others would lead us to believe that Greece is an armed camp, carried on by a government built on oppression and torture, not unlike that of the days of Nazi Germany. As a brief visitor to Greece, I would be foolhardy to take the role of defense attorney against these charges. On the other hand, I would be a coward not to say that I found absolutely no evidence to support these charges. Thus, I am compelled to report to my colleagues.

American magazines sell better with stories about torture than about emancipated businessmen. A publicity seeker does better to attack than to defend.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take any more time except to suggest to my colleagues the following points of consideration:

It will be a disaster of great consequence if Greece should be left exposed, isolated, and alienated at the mercy of its Balkan neighbors.

Perhaps there are some idealists who tend too easily to equate the problems and solutions of different nations in differing circumstances. There are certainly seekers for accommodation who bristle with invective over every transgression of the right, while ignoring, forgiving, or defending monstrous crimes against freedom, human conscience, and political decency by Marxist regimes.

Before we assume the exalted role of advising Greece how to handle things, let me point out that compared to the United States, there is very little crime in Greece—virtually no civil strife, virtually no uprising on the campuses. Greek taxicab drivers do not swear at their passengers or other taxicab drivers. Greek children are well fed and not left to drift on their own. A narcotics addict or hippie is a person disrespected from another land.

The current new government has acknowledged its pledge and aim to return to a consensual democracy. I cannot assure you that they will do it, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, of this: Its record thus far seems beneficial to the people of Greece, and distrust of this Government seems more endemic among the literati in the United States than among the fishermen, farmers, and businessmen of Greece.

Stable democracy is notoriously the hardest form of social organization to learn. Certainly we, who inherited at our national birth a great body of democratic practice, and have sought to improve upon it ever since, are yet far short of perfection. The history of democratic political development is everywhere similar in its gradually decreasing cyclical swings between authoritarian and permissive emphasis. Any such society collectively learns, usually with pain, to intuit a variable scale of balance between organizational necessity and personal freedom within democratic parameters. It learns to adjust this scale in a manner acceptable to its citizens in response to external and internal crises and calms. Any nation which commits itself to the pursuit of consensual democratic governance undertakes a grueling task fraught with perils. To opt for political democracy is to seek the best and the hardest.

Greece has made this commitment. It has thrown its lot with the European democracies, with NATO, with the great western maritime trading world. It has opposed the Communist advance, defeated a guerrilla war of subversion, and fought beside the United States in the Korean war. It has rejected the Fascist and Communist totalitarian systems, and done so with blood and sacrifice. But it is having its pains in democratic political development. This is hardly shocking, nor should it be viewed as an excuse for shrill vilification and retribution.

Finally, we should recognize that despite the celebrated achievements of ancient Athens, Greece, has less experience in modern political democracy than most people realize.

Greece languished under foreign rule almost continuously from 146 B.C. till 1830, and from 1940 to 1944. Modern political parties became effective factors in Greek life in the mid-1920's, and the vote was extended to women in 1952. Greece is learning the hard balance of democracy between political freedom and workable national unity. The latest swing in emphasis is toward authoritarian organization. I suspect that the pendulum may swing two or three times in the next 30 years, each time in a less extreme arc. On each occasion there will be temptations here in the United States to agitate, dramatize, lecture, and chastise. Let us think twice, keep our historical perspective and our geopolitical cool. We can begin now.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECENT WELFARE MESSAGE

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my very deep concern about the recommendation in the President's recent welfare message which states:

For dependent families there will be an orderly substitution of food stamps by the new direct monetary payments.

Mr. Speaker, it was only last May 6 that the President took a momentous step forward in behalf of all Americans when he said:

America has come to the aid of one starving people after another. But the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself.

On that date the President recommended proposals which—if carried out—would be useful first steps toward meeting the goal.

In general, I support and applaud the suggestions of President Nixon in his recommendations to reform the present welfare system. These recommendations as they apply particularly to the aid-for-dependent-children program, represent a movement toward greater equity, adequacy of funding and broadening of participation. In addition, the President's recommendations tend to eliminate discrimination against the working poor and tend to discourage undesirable rural-to-urban migration.

However, I am deeply concerned that

the President's message indicates that the change in his position about providing an adequate and nutritious diet for all American families threatens a long-overdue expansion of the food stamp program.

In the President's May 6 message on hunger and malnutrition, he pointed out and emphasized the need for adequate nutrition for millions of American families who lack sufficient means to obtain it.

The welfare reforms recommended by the President cannot substitute for food-stamp programs. The income support is too minimal to accomplish that purpose. It is particularly disturbing that the President's recommendations in cutting back food stamps come so soon—only a little over 2 months after his hunger and malnutrition message. If the Congress were to endorse the food-stamp cutback and pass the welfare reform only, we would be committing a fraud on millions of Americans whose hopes have been raised.

The two programs are not only compatible but complementary. Indeed the original concept of food stamps can work with far greater effectiveness if the welfare reform is implemented. And the concept of breaking the poverty cycle by both sound education and wholesome care for all children and job opportunities for adults will fail without an adequate nutrition program.

THE FAMILY NUTRITION ACT OF 1969

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) and I were pleased on Monday to present to the House a proposal—H.R. 13423—we believe may be the most far-reaching, responsible approach yet to meeting the grave scandal of hunger and widespread malnutrition among American citizens and nationals. In this effort, we were joined by 23 other Members. After the August recess, we hope additional Members will join in cosponsorship.

The successful eradication of domestic hunger and malnutrition, I should like to point out, is perhaps the most concrete way we can today help to break the poverty cycle. Other programs are certainly important, but malnutrition is—if not the single most critical element—certainly one of the basic factors in the poverty cycle and clearly that element that we can most promptly, effectively, and measurably cope with.

I do not believe we can too often reiterate the basic facts of domestic hunger and malnutrition. Here are some of the key findings as they relate to poverty, to learning ability and to the immense social costs the American taxpayer incurs from permitting this situation to continue:

Although only 12 percent of the white population in the United States lives in poverty compared with 40 percent of the black population, a total of 21 million white people and 10 million black people live at or below the poverty level using the definitions provided by the Social Security Administration.

One-fourth of the Nation's children, and one out of every three children under

6 years of age, are living in homes in which incomes are insufficient to meet the costs of procuring many of the essentials of life, and particularly food.

There is strong evidence that malnutrition may be the common denominator of the evils—among the impoverished—of a high incidence of prematurity and low-birth-weight infants, increased maternal mortality and almost unbelievable prevalence of mental retardation. Children in the culture of poverty, particularly those prematurely born, contribute the major numbers of those of our population who grow up to be mentally retarded. Up to 50 percent of low-birth-weight infants may, upon survival, have intellectual quotients below 70 percent. It is estimated that approximately 70 to 80 percent of all mentally defective children are born in a poverty environment. We might note here that severe nutritional deprivation during the first 18 months of life prevents normal brain development. The number of cells present in the brains of infants dying of severe malnutrition may be from 20- to 50-percent below that present in age peers dying of causes unrelated to nutrition. In general, we can say that while there is no evidence that feeding people makes them smart, there is indisputable evidence that hunger makes them dull.

HOW DO THE POOR GET FOOD HELP TODAY?

The food stamp program reaches only about 3.2 million people. Many poor families live in jurisdictions without this program. The commodity distribution program reaches approximately 3.7 million people. The defects of the latter program are well-known. In response to my inquiry, the U.S. Department of Agriculture advises that their estimate of the percent of the poor with incomes under \$3,000 participating in the food stamp program is only 16 percent and the percent of the poor participating in the commodity distribution program is only 22 percent—on a national average.

Some 1.3 million Americans have no cash income at all: 561,000 are unrelated individuals; 770,000 live in families of varying size. More than 5 million Americans live in families whose yearly household income is less than the total amount they must have for food alone—less than the equivalent of \$1,200 a year for a family of four, the amount the Department of Agriculture claims is the minimum cost of an "emergency economy" diet. Another 9 million live in families with incomes between \$1,200 and \$2,400. They cannot spend more than half their income on food and still meet their childraising and other fixed living expenses. These 14 million hard-core poor have inadequate diets. Many, perhaps millions, suffer from chronic and severe hunger and malnutrition simply because they do not have the money to purchase a nutritious diet. Our Nation's food programs are clearly not designed to meet a hunger and malnutrition problem of these dimensions.

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAM WITH STABLE FINANCING

Our proposal, we suggest, has the particular merit of tying together—perhaps

for the first time in the history of U.S. farm programs—the legitimate interest of the agricultural producer and the compelling human and social needs of a large segment of American consumers or potential consumers in the same program on a basis that will insure fair representation of the interests of both groups. In short, we are linking, in an operational way, through the mechanism of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the producer, consumer, and welfare aspects of American agriculture.

I need only point out that the precedent for doing so is well settled as far as U.S. aid to other nations is concerned. The Commodity Credit Corporation today finances the sale and export of agricultural commodities under the Food for Peace Act—commonly known as Public Law 480. I should like to underscore the fact that title II of Public Law 480 authorizes the donation of U.S. agriculture commodities to combat malnutrition, to provide help for needy persons and for nonprofit school lunch and preschool feeding programs outside the United States. The United States has been utilizing Commodity Credit Corporation financing for such activities abroad since 1954.

The provision of adequate financial support for a major and successful effort to combat hunger and malnutrition in the United States is the basis for our proposed increase of \$5 billion in the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There is no requirement that all of this authority be used every year. There is sufficient latitude in this authority to provide for both a major effort in domestic food programs and to take care of farm emergencies resulting from bad crop years. Responsible estimates indicate that in addition to the amount the United States is presently spending for domestic food programs we must spend another \$3 billion if we are to provide adequate food for all those in America who are now suffering some degree of malnutrition.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES OF PROGRAM

Other major features of our program are:

Allowing the working poor to participate in Federal food programs;

Making distribution of stamps more convenient by allowing retail stores and other outlets to sell them.

Approaching budgeting problems more realistically by offering stamps weekly instead of monthly and bimonthly;

Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish food stamp programs in every county in the United States, and allowing him to administer programs directly or through private nonprofit agencies in counties where participation falls below 50 percent of eligibles;

Authorizing free food stamp coupons for certain very low income households; and

Allowing self-certification by affidavit for low-income households thus drastically cutting administrative costs. The bill also carries heavy penalties for fraud.

In addition, for the first time, the vast majority of the elderly poor would be

able to participate effectively in the food stamp program. It is estimated that more than 5 million Americans over 65 would be able to take advantage of the provisions of our proposal.

Our proposal, we suggest, will effectively help meet the most serious aspects of the domestic hunger and malnutrition problem. I hope, after you have had an opportunity to examine this material, members of both parties will see fit to join us as coauthors of this measure. Your support, your comment, and your testimony will be welcome for hunger and malnutrition know neither party nor ideology. Finally, I expect that the Committee on Agriculture will hold hearings

on the substance of our proposal shortly after the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, I should like, at this point in the RECORD, to include some explanatory and comparative material illustrating the details of the program we are recommending:

COMPARISON OF CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROPOSALS

The following table contains a comparison of twenty-five of the major provisions of the five food stamp proposals, including the existing Food Stamp Act of 1964, which are currently alive and either before the full Senate (S. 2547—the bill reported on July 7 by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and Senator McGovern's individual views on what provisions the Senate-enacted

bill should contain) or the House Committee on Agriculture (the original McGovern bill, introduced by Rep. Leonard Farbstein, Dem.-N.Y., on April 30 as H.R. 10728 and by Rep. Donald Edwards, Dem.-Cal., on June 26 as H.R. 12458; the Nixon Administration proposal, introduced by Rep. Catherine May, Rep.-Wash., on June 17 as H.R. 12222 and 12223, with 33 Republican co-sponsors; and the Foley-Green bill, introduced by Rep. Thomas Foley, Dem.-Wash., on August 11, 1969 as H.R. 13423, with 23 Democratic co-sponsors). It should be noticed that Senator McGovern's views and the provisions of his bill (the Farbstein bill in the House) differ at points because Senator McGovern is seeking broad support on the Senate floor for his reform efforts. In particular, the family income eligibility cut-off for free food stamps is not specified in his views.

Item	Present act	Senate committee bill (S. 2547)	McGovern views (Farbstein bill, H.R. 10728)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)
1. Policy of program	Raise levels of nutrition among low-income households.	No change	Provide adequate nutrition for low-income families and permit them to purchase an adequate diet.	Permit low-income households to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet.	Provide adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition among low-income households by permitting them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet.
2. Method and level of funding.	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$340,000,000; fiscal 1971 (1st 6 months only, through Dec. 31, 1970), \$170,000,000.	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$750,000,000; fiscal 1971 and 1972, \$1,500,000,000.	Authorization of appropriations without limitation on sum (such sums as may be necessary) or possible Commodity Credit Corporation financing or new sec. 32 covering additional 30 percent of customs receipts in addition to appropriations (Farbstein—such sums as may be necessary plus up to 10 percent override if necessary to meet unanticipated increases in participation).	Authorization of appropriations: Fiscal 1970, \$610,000,000; fiscal 1971-72, such sums as Congress may appropriate.	Food stamps to be a Commodity Credit Corporation-run program with CCC empowered to use up to \$19,500,000,000 in borrowing authority to fund this and various farm programs followed by appropriations to reimburse CCC for previous year's expenditures.
3. Carryover of unexpended funds.	None—Unspent funds automatically revert to the Treasury.	Unspent funds continue to remain available until June 30, 1972.	Unspecified.	Unspent funds continue to remain available until expended.	No problem with CCC financing.
4. Term of program	Ends Dec. 31, 1970.	Ends June 30, 1972.	do.	Ends June 30, 1973.	Ends June 30, 1974.
5. Territorial coverage	50 States only and District of Columbia.	No change	50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and Pacific Trust Territories (Farbstein—Not Virgin Islands or Guam).	No change from present program.	50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.
6. Individual coverage	Group of related or unrelated individuals living as one economic unit sharing cooking facilities and for whom food is customarily purchased in common. Not residents of institutions or boarding houses.	do.	No change	No change	Includes persons residing in private nonprofit institutions or in boarding houses (except for persons in fraternities, sororities, or social clubs) as well as persons 65 years or over.
7. Product coverage	Any food or food product except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, imported packaged foods and imported meats or meat products.	do.	Includes items necessary for personal hygiene and home sanitation.	No change from present program.	Includes imported food or food products where Secretary determines that comparable domestic items are not reasonably available; nonfood products which Secretary determines to be essential for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation; meals served to residents of private nonprofit institutions or boarding houses and to persons over 65 by private nonprofit organizations or schools.
8. Store coverage	Establishment or house-to-house trade route that sells food to households for home consumption.	do.	No change	No change	Same as in present program plus private nonprofit institutions or boarding houses and private nonprofit organizations or schools which provide meals to persons 65 years or over and DOD commissaries for households otherwise eligible to utilize them.
9. Income eligibility level, e.g., family of 4 with 2 schoolchildren.	State agency to determine consistent with income standards used in federally aided public assistance programs \$1,800 (Virginia) to \$4,140 (Alaska, New York).	State agency to take local factors affecting cost of living into account as well as income standards used in federally aided public assistance programs other than medic aid, but within national minimum and maximum standards prescribed by Secretary \$3,600.	Secretary to set uniform national standards using poverty index formula or low-cost food plan with States permitted to exceed standard if local cost of living or other conditions, warrant (Farbstein—Secretary to prescribe annually, with all households whose incomes are less than 3 times low-cost food plan automatically eligible. State option to raise eligibility ceiling) \$2,335 (rural) to \$3,335 (urban) or \$4,320.	Secretary to establish uniform national standards of eligibility in consultation with Secretary of HEW (emergency eligibility standards to help disaster victims on a temporary basis) \$3,600.	Secretary to set eligibility standards with maximum disposable income criteria to be equal to 4 times the cost of the low-cost food plan as varied for household size, composition, 4 regions, and rural-non-rural areas; New York City, \$6,530; rural Vermont, \$4,550; Cleveland, \$6,030; rural Iowa, \$4,220; Atlanta, \$5,450; rural Mississippi, \$3,810; Los Angeles, \$6,160; rural Utah, \$4,310.
10. Resource limitation on eligibility.	State agency to determine	State agency to establish within Federal minimum and maximum.	Not mentioned (Farbstein—State agency to set, but no inclusion of income realized through liquidation of resources).	Secretary to establish as part of uniform national eligibility standards.	Secretary to determine maximum value for personal or real property owned by eligible household.

Item	Present act	Senate committee bill (S. 2547)	McGovern views (Farbstein bill, H.R. 10728)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)
11. Method of certification...	Determined by State welfare agency (forms and investigation).	May be based on information in possession of State agency without further investigation if information is adequate but only if households receive some other type of public assistance.	Certification by personal declaration in the form of an affidavit with investigation thereafter—either on a pilot basis or in every food stamp area (Farbstein self-certification universal).	No change from present program.	Certification solely on execution of affidavit prescribed by Secretary.
12. Challenge to certification.	No provision.	State agency to grant fair hearing and prompt determination to any aggrieved household affected in participation.	No provision.	State agency to grant fair hearing and prompt determination to any aggrieved household affected in participation.	Operating agency to have right to challenge information included in affidavit before panel of three appointed by Secretary with challenged household to participate on basis of affidavit information during pendency of challenge.
12a. Penalties.	Criminal offense to knowingly acquire coupons in unauthorized manner.	No change.	No change in criminal offenses, but no prosecution for error in declaration of income level and no criminal charge on basis of any information or statements contained in affidavit.	No change from present program.	Additional criminal offense for knowingly making a false affidavit; enforcement by special unit within office of Inspector General known as the food stamp squad.
13. Interjurisdictional certification.	No provision.	do.	No change.	No change.	Certification valid for 60 days if household moves to another political subdivision in which program is operating.
14. Place of coupon issuance.	Purchase at banks, credit unions, welfare agency offices, poverty agencies, and local businesses.	do.	Post offices to assume responsibility (Farbstein—post offices, retail stores, or such other manner as will best insure participation).	No change from present program.	Purchase through operating agency or, if operating agency delegates responsibility, from post offices, banks, credit union, community action agencies, any other public or private nonprofit agencies.
15. Frequency of coupon issuance.	At least monthly.	At least monthly and semi-monthly.	At least weekly.	do.	At least weekly.
16. Method of coupon purchase.	Transfer for cash.	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments when household so authorizes.	Add to Senate bill permission to households to purchase less than full allotment of stamps with proportionate deduction in amount charged.	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments when household so authorizes and Secretaries of USDA and HEW approve.	Cash or deduction of charge by State from federally aided public assistance payments or from Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits by Federal Government when household so authorizes.
17. Price of coupons.	Amount equivalent to household's normal expenditures for food.	Reasonable investment on the part of the household, but no less than 50 cents per person per month for family of 5 or \$3 per household per month for family of 6 or more and no more than 30 percent of income. To assure participation by persons too poor to pay the minimum charge, State agency would be required to arrange for State or local sources (including local welfare funds and charities) to underwrite portion of all of charge.	Families of 4 or the equivalent with incomes between \$80 and \$120 a month would pay up to 15 percent of income; with incomes between \$120 and \$360 a month up to 25 percent of income (Farbstein—Same as above, but 15 percent maximum would go into effect after June 30, 1970; 25 percent maximum after June 30, 1971).	No more than 30 percent of household income to be charged any eligible household.	If income is between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ of low-cost food plan (\$40 to \$80 a month for average family of 4) no more than 5 percent of disposable income. If income is between $\frac{3}{4}$ and $1\frac{1}{4}$ of plan (\$80 to \$160 a month)—no more than 10 percent of disposable income. If income is between $1\frac{1}{4}$ and 2 times plan (\$160 to \$240 a month)—no more than 15 percent of disposable income. If income is between 2 and 3 times plan (\$240 to \$360 a month)—no more than 20 percent of disposable income. If income is between 3 and 4 times plan (\$360 to \$480 a month)—no more than 25 percent of disposable income. If household's disposable income is less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ percent of low-cost food plan applicable to household (\$40 a month for average family of 4).
18. Free coupons.	None, except in 2 counties in South Carolina for families of 3 or less with less than \$20 of income a month and families of 4 or more with less than \$30 of income a month.	No change.	No set sum, although clearly to cover families with no income and possibly families of 4 or the equivalent with less than \$100 of income a month (Farbstein—families of 4 or the equivalent with less than \$80 of income a month).	To households with little or no incomes or other financial resources under standards prescribed by Secretary (less than \$30 a month for family of 4).	Low-cost food plan defined as nutritionally adequate, taking into account regional and rural-nonrural food price differentials (between \$108.80 a month in rural Mississippi and \$135 a month in New York City for a family of 4).
19. Total value of coupons.	Such amount as will provide household with an opportunity more nearly to obtain a low-cost nutritionally adequate diet with a range of from \$58 a month (southern family of 4 with income under \$30 a month) to \$100 (northern family of 4 with income of \$325 a month).	Such amount as Secretary determines to be the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet (emergency food plan or \$100 a month for a family of 4).	Low-cost food plan or \$120 a month for a family of 4 to be equivalent to nutritionally adequate diet.	Economy food plan or \$100 a month for a family of 4 to be equivalent to nutritionally adequate diet.	Low-cost food plan defined as nutritionally adequate, taking into account regional and rural-nonrural food price differentials (between \$108.80 a month in rural Mississippi and \$135 a month in New York City for a family of 4).
20. Federal administrative responsibility.	Food Stamp Division of Consumer and Marketing Service.	No change.	No change.	Food stamp division transferred to new food and nutrition service.	Commodity Credit Corporation with 7-man Board of Directors (Secretary, Under-Secretary, and 5 assistant secretaries of agriculture) to oversee with daily operations by food stamp division in new food and nutrition service.
21. State and local administrative responsibility.	State agency must request program and set plan of priorities among counties which desire to participate. Possible program revocation by Secretary if State agency fails to comply substantially with act, regulations, or State plan of operation and State fails to correct such failure within reasonable time of notification thereof by Secretary.	As in present program, but Secretary may undertake program in any area within State as if he were State agency if 3 conditions exist: Secretary finds manifest and urgent need for food stamps rather than commodities; State agency refuses for 90 days or more to request formulation of program; Governor requests Secretary to act.	Authority for Secretary to operate programs directly or to use other local public and private agencies to administer program (regardless of State agency) if local officials refuse to act after reasonable time or if local officials fail to comply with law or if program is only token and fails adequately to serve those in need (Farbstein—Federal, State, county, local, or private nonprofit agency can administer where local agency fails to request program after Secretary offers to pay part or all of administrative costs or where Secretary determines local program necessary or where local agency fails to comply with act).	State agency must provide for operation of food stamp or commodity distribution program in each of its political subdivisions by June 30, 1970 (or 1971 if Secretary is willing because Governor notifies him of need for State legislative action) or else State cannot continue to participate in either program. State must provide for commodity distribution program until areas can be approved by Secretary for food stamps.	Secretary must directly administer program or administer it through private nonprofit agency when State agency has not submitted plan of operation for program in all of its political subdivisions, but only in nondesignated area. Secretary may so administer program if number of persons participating in an area is less than 50 percent of the OEO-classified number of poor persons in the area for 3 consecutive months after July 1, 1970. If Secretary fails to exercise discretion so to administer, he must report annually to the Congress his reasons for failing to do so and the reasons for the low level of program participation.

Item	Present act	Senate committee bill (S. 2547)	McGovern views (Farbstein bill, H.R. 10728)	Nixon-May bill (H.R. 12222)	Foley-Green bill (H.R. 13423)
22. Payment of administrative costs.	Federal Government finances cost of bonus coupons and their printing and 62.5 percent of travel and salaries of State personnel engaged in certifying nonassistance households.	Same as in present program plus 62.5 percent of cost of hearing officials.	Secretary should be able to pay full administrative costs to State agency wherever lack of adequate funds or personnel limits successful program operation (Farbstein—Secretary may pay total costs if he deems it necessary to enable local agency to conduct program).	Same as in present program plus 62.5 percent of cost of hearing officials and outreach personnel.	Secretary permitted to pay State agencies 50 percent of their administrative costs, including all certification and issuance costs, and up to 100 percent of education and outreach costs. Secretary must pay 100 percent of administrative costs to private nonprofit agencies operating the program or a simultaneous commodity program.
23. Simultaneous commodity distribution and food stamp issuance.	Not unless emergency situation caused by a national or other disaster as determined by Secretary, interpreted to exclude long term, non-natural disasters.	Permitted as well during initial period (30 days) of stamp program to provide orderly transition if State agency requests it and if commodity distribution is already in effect.	Secretary to be given authority or directed to distribute commodities in all food stamp counties until participation in stamp program reaches previous (highest?) level of participation in commodity program (Farbstein—Secretary free to distribute foods in food stamp area without governing standards).	Secretary may authorize for whatever period he determines necessary upon State agency request to effect orderly program transition (3 months?) with continued limited Federal payment of administrative costs of both programs or upon State agency request if State agrees to finance all of commodity distribution costs.	Permitted during temporary emergency; at State agency request in program transition period; at State agency request at any time if State agrees to pay distribution program costs (other than food); and at request of private nonprofit agency which wishes to run distribution program.
24. Program Outreach.....	No provision.....	State agency must undertake effective action to inform poor of program's availability and benefits and insure their participation, including use of services of other federally funded organizations.	Require State and local agencies to seek out and inform and assist in becoming certified all eligible families and to enlist services of public and private voluntary agencies in effort.	State agency must undertake effective action to inform poor of program's availability and benefits and insure their participation including use of services of other federally funded organizations.	Potentially eligible households must be informed of program's existence and given bid in making application.
25. Education.....	No provision other than administrators should take steps, including the coordination of other bodies' informational and educational efforts, to insure that participants obtain needed staple foods, particularly those in abundant or surplus supply.	No change.....	Require State and local agencies to make use of educational potential of school system and school lunch program to provide nutrition education.	No change from present program.	Participants must be afforded opportunity to receive nutrition counseling.

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Executive Director of the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, John R. Kramer, charged today that the Nixon Family Assistance System announced on nationwide television on Friday night, August 8, by the President would, by forcing recipients to choose between receiving the new family assistance and participating in the food stamp program (in its present form and in the expanded format requested of Congress by the President on May 6) be a Family Deprivation System for the vast majority of those now on welfare (and even some of the working poor).

The Nixon System undermines its own premises, Kramer contended, by the addition of one feature designed to economize—the abandonment of the right to receive food stamps as the price of receiving Nixonian welfare. Because of this budgetary gimmick, instead of providing "a leap upward for many thousands of families that cannot care for themselves", as the President had claimed, the Nixon System would, in fact, operate to reduce rather than increase the total level of support welfare clients in 44 states are currently receiving from the states and Federal Government under a combination of welfare and stamps. Because of the food stamp cut-off, instead of giving every American family with dependent children a firm foundation on which to build, it would pull the rug out from under all but 820,000 of the individuals now on the AFDC rolls or some 87% of the 6,478,000 welfare poor. Because of the desire to save \$1.5 billion, instead of eradicating "blatant inequities" among the several states, the Nixon System would be beneficial (and minimal at that) only for persons living in Alabama (103,000 on AFDC as of February, 1969), Arkansas (40,000), Florida (174,000), Mississippi (104,000), South Carolina (38,000), Texas (168,000), Puerto Rico (181,000), and the Virgin Islands (2,000).

The arithmetic and not the rhetoric of the Nixon System proves, according to Kramer, that that 90-day wonder, the Nixon May pledge to eliminate hunger and malnutrition is a casualty of the war against inflation, with deflated pocketbooks and belies the inevitable consequence.

The manner in which the Nixon System would work to the detriment of the poor is as follows: Every family of four (the illustration throughout) caught up in its net would receive a basic Federal payment of \$1,600, but would be forced to forego participation in the food stamp program as the price of this "opportunity". The only people who would remain eligible to receive stamps would be single persons and couples without children (and, presumably, those who were smart enough to reject the Nixon floor). Every state would be required to maintain its present level of amounts payable for basic needs, even if it should exceed the \$1,600 level. The relationship between the new level of support (at \$1,600 for the 20 states, primarily in the South, whose minimum benefits are less than \$1,600 and above \$1,600 in the 30 states that now pay above that amount) and what the family now obtains (or can potentially receive) from both welfare and food stamps would be negative at every level of welfare payments above \$1,200 (actually \$104 per month). This means that passage of the Nixon System, with its integral requirement that food stamps be eliminated for welfare families, would hurt, not help, in every state but the states mentioned above, which are the only one to provide \$104 or less to a family of four. Table I, attached hereto, documents that at every state level of welfare support from Mississippi (\$39 a month or \$468 a year) to New Jersey (\$263 a month or \$3,156 a year).

Should the Nixon proposal for changes in the food stamp program with a substantial revision downward in the prices charged and benefits received at every level of income become law later this year, every AFDC family would be worse off by electing Nixon security. It is quite likely that food stamp benefits will be expanded by December (or well before the Nixon System could go into effect), since the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has already reported to the Senate floor for debate and action in early September, S. 2547, which amends the Food Stamp Act of 1964 essentially to produce the purchase price-bonus stamps (or food stamp benefits) ratio suggested by Nixon. Table I illustrates that as well.

Even if every state in the Union were to decide voluntarily to supplement the Fed-

eral minimum payment by 50% (Presidential adviser Daniel P. Moynihan expects a state add-on in only 40 states), present welfare recipients would still be better off by sticking with the present unsatisfactory welfare system in California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, New York and Wisconsin (given the current level of food stamp benefits) and would find their purchasing power reduced, not increased, under the Senate bill benefits everywhere but the six states in which the Nixon System would be a boon no matter what the circumstances, plus Georgia, Louisiana, Missouri, Tennessee and West Virginia. Since it is unlikely that any state would go as high as 50% on supplementing the Federal guarantee, because welfare savings would not be that substantial and state incentives to do so would be minimal state supplementation would probably not alter to any significant degree the conclusion that at least 80% of present welfare recipients would find Nixon's hands reaching into their pocket to withdraw, not render financial aid. See Table III, attached hereto.

The working poor would, indeed, profit from the Nixon System, unless the Senate food stamp bill were passed and a family earned over \$3350 or unless, as is distinctly possible, Senator George McGovern were to wage a successful floor fight to push stamp benefits up even more (his total coupon allotment would be \$1440, not \$1200, his maximum input 25%, not 30%) in which case the \$2040 salary level (\$170 per month) would be the cut-off point at which the Nixon System would become a detriment. Once a female family head worked over 106 hours a month (the equivalent of 2½ weeks) at the minimum wage, under the McGovern food stamp schedule, she would help her family more by steering clear of the Nixon System entirely and opting for food stamps. See Table II, attached hereto.

In conclusion, Kramer indicated that the Nixon System, solely for the sake of saving the Federal fisc rather than saving human beings, would force families to choose between food stamps and Nixonian welfare and thereby guarantee their continued poverty measured in terms of the percentage of their incomes they must spend to eat a subsistence diet. It thereby totally undermines the forceful statement the President made on May 6

that he would "put an end to hunger in America itself for all time" by, among other things, requiring families to invest no more than 30% of their incomes in food. Under the Nixon System, purchase of the Economy Food Plan of \$128 (for a family of 4) itself an inadequate, emergency diet, would cost Nixonian welfare families a minimum of 33% of their incomes (at the \$3920 Nixon cut-off level for welfare benefits), a maximum of 80% (at \$1600) and an average of 55% (the \$2320 level after which benefits are reduced in light of earnings). The adequate Low-Cost Food Plan would cost 38%, 94%, and 65% of their incomes, respectively. Since poverty starts when 33% or more of a family's income must go to buy food (it has been accepted by the Social Security Administration for 4 years as the prime indicator of the demarcation line between economic well-being and poverty), the Nixon Family Assistance System would assure every family on it of being poor by its own definitions.

The only solution to family deprivation instead of family assistance is for the President to revise his System to make it unequivocally clear that assistance recipients could continue to participate in an expanded food stamp program until, perhaps a decade hence, the System floor were high enough (three or four times as great as proposed) to provide sufficient food purchasing power.

EXPLANATION OF COLUMBUS

(1) Present income level: Calculated on an annual basis with monthly equivalents in parentheses. In the welfare chart, the levels commence at \$500 or \$32 more than the Mississippi support level for a family of four on an annual basis (\$39 per month or \$9.50 per person per month), which is the lowest state level of welfare payments, and conclude at \$3100 or \$56 less than the New Jersey support level for a family of four on an annual basis (\$263 per month), which is the highest state level of welfare payments.

In the non-welfare chart, the levels com-

mence at \$100 and proceed up to \$3900 or \$20 less than the level of earned income at which the Nixon plan would cease to be operative.

(2) Present food stamp benefits: Derived from USDA's tables entitled "Food Stamp Program—Net Income Basis of Coupon Issuance," reflecting monthly net income levels and the concomitant purchase price and bonus value received. Bonus value received is the same as food stamp benefits. There are two coupon issuance tables, one for the South (S), the other for the North (N). The one for the South normally involves slightly smaller bonus values or benefits.

(3) Present total: Income and stamps: Total of columns (1) and (2) reflecting current purchasing power based on blend of welfare/income and bonus stamps under food stamp program now in effect.

(4) Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits: Benefits that may be available by late fall if S. 2547, the Senate Agriculture & Forestry Committee's food stamp bill becomes law. The benefit schedule is based on the Nixon Administration proposal contained on page 4 in the Committee hearings entitled "Food Stamp Program and Commodity Distribution," 91st Cong. 1st Sess. (1969). No reference is made there to any North-South differential, so accordingly none is used. There is one modification—the Committee followed Nixon's proposal as to the total coupon allotment (\$1200 a year for a family of four), maximum charge (30% of income), and maximum eligibility (\$333 per month for a family of four), but rejected Nixon's request for free stamps for families of four with incomes less than \$40 per month, substituting instead a requirement that the present minimum charge of 50 cents per person per month be retained. Senator McGovern's proposal would add between \$240 and \$500 to this column if it should pass.

(5) Probable pre-Nixon plan total: Income and stamps: Total of columns (1) and (4).

(6) Nixon proposals for income level: Based on provisions of Nixon Family Assistance Plan, including nationwide floor of \$1600 for a family of four, no reduction in benefits for first \$60 a month of earnings, and reduction of benefits by 50 cents for each \$1 earned up to maximum earned income of \$3920. Assumes that none of the 30 states currently above the \$1600 figure will raise the level of their current payments.

(7) Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits: Nixon intends to force families to choose between coming under the Family Assistance Plan and receiving food stamps.

(8) Potential total: Nixon welfare, but no stamps: Total of columns (6) and (7).

(9) and (10) Net loss with Nixon: The difference between columns (8) and (3) is contained in column (9). This reveals the net loss (or gain) to a family of four if the Nixon Family Assistance Plan replaced welfare or added to its earnings, while eliminating the food stamps program now in effect.

The difference between columns (8) and (5) is contained in column (10). This reveals the net loss (or gain) to a family of four if the Nixon Family Assistance Plan replaced welfare or added to its earnings, while eliminating the food stamp program likely to be in effect.

The 50-percent State supplementation table

This table is the same as Table I on the Welfare poor insofar as Columns (1), (3), and (5) are concerned. Column (8) is changed to reflect the possibility that each state will utilize the 50% of its present welfare appropriations it must continue solely in order to supplement the Federal guarantee, that is, that Column (1) will be multiplied by 1½ and added on to the standard \$1600. Columns (9) and (10) thus are changed because they are computed by determining the difference between Columns (8) and (3) and Columns (8) and (5), respectively.

TABLE 1.—THE NIXON FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN AND THE WELFARE (AFDC) POOR (FAMILY OF 4)

Present income level (1)	Present food stamp benefits (2)	Present total: income and stamps (3)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (4)	Probable pre-Nixon plan total: income and stamps (5)	Nixon proposal for income level (6)	Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits (7)	Potential total: Nixon welfare but no stamps (8)	Net loss with Nixon	
								Present food stamp benefits (9)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (10)
South, \$500	\$576	\$1,076	\$1,128	\$1,628	\$1,600	0	\$1,600	+\$524	—\$28
North (\$42)	576	1,076						+524	
South, \$600	504	1,104	1,128	1,728	1,600	0	1,600	+496	—128
North (\$50)	528	1,128						+472	
South, \$700	504	1,204	1,080	1,780	1,600	0	1,600	+396	—180
North (\$58)	528	1,228						+372	
South, \$800	465	1,256	1,056	1,856	1,600	0	1,600	+344	—256
North (\$66)	480	1,280						+320	
South, \$900	408	1,308	1,032	1,932	1,600	0	1,600	+292	—332
North (\$75)	456	1,356						+244	
South, \$1,000	384	1,384	1,008	2,008	1,600	0	1,600	+216	—408
North (\$83)	432	1,432						+168	
South, \$1,100	360	1,460	1,008	2,108	1,600	0	1,600	+140	—508
North (\$92)	432	1,532						+68	
South, \$1,200	360	1,560	924	2,124	1,600	0	1,600	+40	—524
North (\$100)	408	1,608						—8	
South, \$1,300	360	1,660	900	2,200	1,600	0	1,600	—60	—600
North (\$108)	408	1,708						—108	
South, \$1,400	312	1,712	864	2,264	1,600	0	1,600	—112	—664
North (\$117)	408	1,808						—208	
South, \$1,500	312	1,812	840	2,340				—212	
North (\$125)	384	1,884			1,600	0	1,600	—284	—740
South, \$1,600	288	1,888						—288	
North (\$133)	384	1,984	816	2,416	1,600	0	1,600	—384	—816
South, \$1,700	288	1,988						—288	
North (\$142)	360	2,060	768	2,468	1,700	0	1,700	—360	—768
South, \$1,800	264	2,064	732	2,532	1,800	0	1,800	—264	—732
North (\$150)	360	2,160						—360	
South, \$1,900	264	2,164	720	2,620	1,900	0	1,900	—264	—720
North (\$158)	360	2,260						—360	
South, \$2,000	264	2,264	696	2,696	2,000	0	2,000	—264	—696
North (\$165)	336	2,336						—336	
South, \$2,100	264	2,364	660	2,760	2,100	0	2,100	—264	—660
North (\$175)	336	2,436						—336	
South, \$2,200	264	2,464	624	2,824	2,200	0	2,200	—264	—624
North (\$183)	312	2,512						—312	
South, \$2,300	240	2,540	576	2,876	2,300	0	2,300	—240	—576
North (\$192)	312	2,612						—312	
South, \$2,400	240	2,640	528	2,928	2,400	0	2,400	—240	—528
North (\$200)	288	2,688						—288	

TABLE 1.—THE NIXON FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN AND THE WELFARE (AFDC) POOR (FAMILY OF 4)—Continued

Present income level (1)	Present food stamp benefits (2)	Present total: income and stamps (3)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (4)	Probable pre-Nixon plan total: income and stamps (5)	Nixon proposal for income level (6)	Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits (7)	Potential total: Nixon welfare but no stamps (8)	Net loss with Nixon	
								Present food stamp benefits (9)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (10)
South, \$2,500	\$240	\$2,740	\$528	\$3,028	\$2,500	0	\$2,500	—\$240	—\$528
North (\$208)	288	2,788						—288	
South, \$2,600	216	2,816	480	3,080	2,600	0	2,600	—216	—480
North (\$217)	288	2,888						—288	
South, \$2,700	0	2,700	456	3,156	2,700	0	2,700	0	—456
North (\$225)	288	2,988						—288	
South, \$2,800	0	2,800	418	3,218	2,800	0	2,800	0	—418
North (\$233)	288	3,088						—288	
South, \$2,900	0	2,900	360	3,260	2,900	0	2,900	0	—360
North (\$242)	288	3,188						—288	
South, \$3,000	0	3,000	324	3,324	3,000	0	3,000	0	—324
North (\$250)	288	3,288						—288	
South, \$3,100	0	3,100	324	3,424	3,100	0	3,100	0	—324
North (\$258)	288	3,388						—288	

TABLE 2.—THE NIXON FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN AND THE WORKING, NONWELFARE POOR (FAMILY OF 4)

Present income level (1)	Present food stamp benefits (2)	Present total: income and stamps (3)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (4)	Probable pre-Nixon plan total: income and stamps (5)	Nixon proposal for income level (6)	Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits (7)	Potential total: Nixon welfare but no stamps (8)	Net loss with Nixon	
								Present food stamp benefits (9)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (10)
South, \$100	\$672	\$772	\$1,176	\$1,276	\$1,700	0	\$1,700	+\$928	+\$424
North (\$8)	696	796						+904	
South, \$200	672	872	1,176	1,376	1,800	0	1,800	+928	+424
North (\$17)	696	896						+904	
South, \$300	672	972	1,176	1,476	1,900	0	1,900	+928	+424
North (\$25)	648	848						+904	
South, \$500	576	1,076	1,128	1,628	2,100	0	2,100	+1,024	+472
North (\$42)	576	1,076						+1,024	
South, \$750	456	1,206	1,080	1,830	2,335	0	2,335	+1,129	+505
North (\$63)	480	1,230						+1,105	
South, \$1,000	384	1,384	1,008	2,008	2,460	0	2,460	+1,076	+452
North (\$83)	432	1,432						+1,028	
South, \$1,250	360	1,610	924	2,174	2,585	0	2,585	+975	+411
North (\$104)	408	1,658						+927	
South, \$1,500	312	1,812	840	2,340	2,710	0	2,710	+898	+370
North (\$125)	384	1,884						+826	
South, \$1,750	288	2,038	768	2,518	2,835	0	2,835	+797	+317
North (\$146)	360	2,110						+725	
South, \$2,000	264	2,264	696	2,696	2,960	0	2,960	+696	+264
North (\$166)	336	2,336						+624	
South, \$2,250	264	2,514	624	2,874	3,085	0	3,085	+571	+211
North (\$188)	312	2,562						+523	
South, \$2,500	240	2,740	528	3,028	3,210	0	3,210	+470	+182
North (\$208)	288	2,788						+422	
South, \$2,750	0	2,750	456	3,206	3,335	0	3,335	+585	+129
North (\$229)	288	3,038						+297	
South, \$3,000	0	3,000	324	3,324	3,460	0	3,460	+460	
North (\$250)	288	3,288						+172	+136
South, \$3,250	0	3,250	276	3,526	3,585	0	3,585	+335	
North (\$271)	288	3,538						+47	+59
South, \$3,500	0	3,500	240	3,740	3,710	0	3,710	+210	
North (\$292)	288	3,788						—78	—30
South, \$3,750	0	3,750	192	3,942	3,835	0	3,835	+85	
North (\$313)	288	4,038						—203	—107
South, \$3,900	0	3,900	168	4,068	3,910	0	3,910	+10	—158
North (\$325)	0	3,900						+10	

TABLE 3.—THE WELFARE (AFDC) POOR (FAMILY OF 4) WITH 50 PERCENT STATE SUPPLEMENTATION

Present income level (1)	Present food stamp benefits (2)	Present total: income and stamps (3)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (4)	Probable pre-Nixon plan total: income and stamps (5)	Nixon proposal for income level (6)	Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits (7)	Potential total: Nixon welfare but no stamps (8)	Net loss with Nixon	
								Present food stamp benefits (9)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (10)
South, \$500		\$1,076		\$1,628			\$1,850	+\$774	+\$222
North (\$42)		1,076						+774	
South, \$600		1,104		1,728			1,900	+796	+228
North (\$50)		1,128						+772	
South, \$700		1,228		1,780			1,950	+746	+170
North (\$58)		1,228						+772	
South, \$800		1,256		1,856			2,000	+744	+144
North (\$66)		1,280						+720	
South, \$900		1,308		1,932			2,050	+742	+118
North (\$75)		1,356						+694	
South, \$1,000		1,384		2,008			2,100	+716	+92
North (\$83)		1,432						+668	
South, \$1,100		1,460		2,108			2,150	+690	+42
North (\$92)		1,532						+618	
South, \$1,200		1,560		2,124			2,200	+640	+76
North (\$100)		1,608						+582	
South, \$1,300		1,660		2,200			2,250	+590	+50
North (\$108)		1,708						+548	
South, \$1,400		1,712		2,264			2,300	+588	+36
North (\$117)		1,808						+492	

TABLE 3—THE WELFARE (AFDC) POOR (FAMILY OF 4) WITH 50 PERCENT STATE SUPPLEMENTATION—Continued

Present income level (1)	Present food stamp benefits (2)	Present total: income and stamps (3)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (4)	Probable pre-Nixon plan total: income and stamps (5)	Nixon proposal for income level (6)	Nixon proposal for food stamp benefits (7)	Potential total: Nixon welfare but no stamps (8)	Net loss with Nixon	
								Present food stamp benefits (9)	Senate Agriculture Committee food stamp benefits (10)
South, \$1,500		\$1,812		\$2,340			\$2,350	+\$538	+\$10
North (\$125)		1,884						+466	
South, \$1,600		1,888		2,416			2,400	+512	-16
North (\$133)		1,984						+416	
South, \$1,700		1,988		2,468			2,450	+462	-18
North (\$142)		2,060						+390	
South, \$1,800		2,064		2,532			2,500	+436	-32
North (\$150)		2,160						+340	
South, \$1,900		2,164		2,620			2,550	+386	-70
North (\$158)		2,260						+290	
South, \$2,000		2,264						+336	-96
North (\$166)		2,336		2,696			2,600	+264	
South, \$2,100		2,364						+286	-110
North (\$175)		2,436		2,760			2,650	+214	
South, \$2,200		2,464						+236	-124
North (\$183)		2,512		2,824			2,700	+188	
South, \$2,300		2,540		2,876			2,750	+210	-126
North (\$192)		2,612						+138	
South, \$2,400		2,640		2,928			2,800	+160	-128
North (\$200)		2,688						+112	
South, \$2,500		2,740		3,028			2,850	+110	-178
North (\$208)		2,788						+62	
South, \$2,600		2,816		3,080			2,900	+84	-180
North (\$217)		2,888						+12	
South, \$2,700		2,700		3,156			2,950	+250	
North (\$225)		2,988						-38	-206
South, \$2,800		2,800		3,218			3,000	+200	-218
North (\$233)		3,088						-88	
South, \$2,900		2,900		3,260			3,050	+150	
North (\$242)		3,188						-138	-210
South, \$3,000		3,000		3,324			3,100	+100	
North (\$250)		3,288						-188	-224
South, \$3,100		3,100		3,424			3,150	+50	-274
North (\$258)		3,388						-238	

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS HURT BY RACE PROBLEMS

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the sickness of a liberal society has now contaminated even our military structure. The backbone of any military organization is discipline.

The commander is given responsibility and must have authority to carry out that responsibility. Those who try to escape discipline by screaming "racism" are frauds and goldbricks, and all military personnel and veterans know it.

Camp Lejeune reports that 155 marines in training at that installation have been assaulted by other marines since the first of the year. One has been killed and a number hospitalized.

It becomes apparent that forced race mixing creates problems which cannot be handled even by the most stringent discipline and supervision. And if it will not work in the U.S. Marine Corps, how can we expect it to prove to be anything less than a disaster in our elementary and secondary schools.

Talk of "patience, understanding, and tough mindedness" may sound pleasing and look good in print, but it evades the real causation. Blind refusal to face unpleasant facts will never solve the military race riot problem.

What a tragedy that in a topnotch fighting outfit like the U.S. Marines that a noncom or an officer must be more concerned over the possibility of being smeared as a "racist" or prejudiced than he is in turning out a first-class fighting man.

The business of military men is to be prepared to fight our enemies, not to become proficient Negrophiles. Topnotch military leadership can be destroyed and its value lost to the Nation because of one accusation of racial prejudice, whether true or false.

Racial integration in military units might be justified if it strengthened our Armed Forces or aided our fighting men. If it does not do either of these things, military service is no place for social experiments. Where experience has shown the experiment to have harmed our men and weakened our defense, it should be terminated at once.

Mr. Speaker, I include a report by Orr Kelly on Camp LeJeune:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 13, 1969]

DISCIPLINE BREAKDOWN PLAGUING MARINES (By Orr Kelly)

CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.—This is paradise. Lush green grass flows off through the pine woods and around the sturdy red brick barracks and office buildings. The broad New River moves with stately grandeur past the headquarters of the 2nd Marine Division.

Bass, crappie and panfish abound in the rivers and nearby lakes. Hunters find deer, bear, wild boar, ducks, geese, marsh hens, woodcock, ruffed grouse, quail, pheasant and wild turkey almost in their own backyards.

Some of the world's finest ocean beaches are only a short drive away.

To escape this utopia, many young Marines volunteer for service in Vietnam. Others sign on for another two or three year enlistment in return for the promise that they will be sent somewhere else—almost anywhere else.

For this is a deeply troubled paradise. And the troubles bound up in the 173 square miles of this Marine base and training camp are symptomatic of profound changes within the Marine Corps—changes so deep that

some career Marines have already begun to mourn the death of the Corps they have loved.

The incident of the night of July 20, which cost the life of a 20-year-old white Marine from Picayune, Miss., and which has resulted in charges of murder, rioting and assault against five other Marines, three of them Negroes, two of them Puerto Ricans, is symbolic of the trouble and yet, in some ways, not at all typical.

On that Sunday night, about 200 Marines of the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, held a party in one of the 12 enlisted men's clubs on the base. They were celebrating their impending departure for a tour of duty in the Mediterranean Sea with the 6th Fleet. Accounts vary, but there were perhaps as many as seven women present. (The commander of the small contingent of women Marines here has since forbidden the women under her command to visit the enlisted men's clubs.)

There is evidence that a small group of men—including at least some of the five later accused of murder—deliberately tried to create a racial incident at the club. But the effort—if, indeed, that is what it was—did not succeed. Beer sales were cut off and the party ended about 10:30 p.m.

A few minutes later, a white Marine came back into the club, his face streaming blood. He had been in a scuffle in the parking lot behind the club. He was not seriously hurt.

By this time, five to ten men, followed by a group of perhaps 30 others, had gone running off across the 6th Marines area. Within 45 minutes, according to Lt. Col. Robert E. Switzer, legal officer for the 2nd Division, there were attacks on 15 white Marines at six different points spread over a distance of about 10 to 15 city blocks.

Maj. Gen. M. P. (Mike) Ryan, soft-spoken white-haired officer who has only recently returned from Vietnam to take over command of the 2nd Division, escorted a visitor through the area the other night at about the same time as the incident of July 20. The section is heavily wooded and, even though

some lights have since been added, quite dark.

"There were 3,000 men in this area and they started coming out of the barracks," Ryan said. "The military police concentrated on getting them back into the barracks. In effect, they were told, 'Get them back in the barracks even if you have to club them in.'"

Maj. Gen. R. McC. Tompkins, commanding general of the base, who returned earlier this year after commanding the 3rd Marine Division in Vietnam through the siege of Khe Sanh, can imagine a situation in which a riot or confrontation might be used as a front for an assault on the armory with its ammunition and automatic weapons. In fact, two boxes of grenades were stolen a month ago in a meticulously planned robbery.

In the darkness of the night of July 20, the MP's quick reaction prevented a massed confrontation. But they couldn't prevent the sudden, widely separated and brief assaults.

The Marine who died a week after the rampage—Cpl. Edward Bankston—was beaten with a tree limb. Pfc. James S. Young, 19, of Roanoke, Va., is still hospitalized with head injuries, apparently inflicted by a kick. Another was stabbed, but not critically hurt. In several other assaults, broomsticks were used.

Whether the whole incident was a deliberate racial attack is not clear.

That none of the assailants had armed himself in preparation for the attacks would indicate that it was not planned in advance. But all the victims were white and one of the attackers, a 17-year-old high school drop-out when he entered the Corps less than a year ago, jumped up on a platform at one point and shouted: "Kill the white beasts!"

Figures gathered by both Ryan and Tompkins from separate sources in recent days indicate the problem that has to be dealt with is the lone Marine who is beaten and robbed and then left lying in the dark, usually unable to identify his attackers or even unsure how many there were.

Ryan asked the base hospital to list the men in his division who had been treated for injuries resulting from assaults, either on the base or in the nearby town of Jacksonville, since the first of the year. The total was 155, of whom 11 were hospitalized.

Tompkins asked his provost marshal for a breakdown of assaults reported to him between Jan. 1 and the first week in August.

There were four cases of assaults by one Negro on another, two on base and two off; 14 by a Caucasian on a Negro, 10 on base and 4 off; 50 by one Caucasian on another, 32 on base and 18 off, and 122 by a Negro on a Caucasian, 104 of them on base and 18 off base—a total of 190 assaults.

Most of the attacks have occurred in an area near the bus station—an area dubbed the DMZ—and the most frequent target is a Marine returning from town late with too many beers under his belt.

In a two-hour stroll through the entire 2nd Division area on a recent night, Ryan (wearing civilian clothes) and a visitor encountered no trouble. Two-man roving patrols were much in evidence. Ryan pointed to a dark area where bushes and tall grass grow in the shadow of the trees. Several nights before, a roving patrol saw a man being attacked by a group.

The patrol caught the attackers but, in the confusion, the victim got away, apparently because he didn't want to get involved with the MP's.

Ironically, the very effort to prevent assaults has tended to intensify some of the deeper problems that afflict both this base and, in a broader sense, the entire Marine Corps.

A senior non-commissioned officer returned to his office after a morning in the field and

found a note assigning him to duty in an enlisted men's club on Sunday evening.

"Look at this," he seethed. "I've got 17 years in this Corps and what do I have to do? Strap on a .45 and spend my Sunday night watching PFC's drink beer. If one of them gets out of line, he's going to get it right across the teeth."

Another non-com with even more service was sympathetic.

"I hate to have to say this about an institution I love," he said. "But it's dying. There's no respect for authority any more."

"Men are afraid to speak up and exert their authority. It's this racial thing. I've seen men who are ready to lay it on the line. You know what I mean, ready to die for this country, with their careers ruined because they were accused of prejudice. Falsely accused . . . falsely. But their careers were ruined."

In Downtown Jacksonville, the lights along Court Street flash and glare like a miniature version of the Las Vegas Strip.

Two buddies from Columbus, O., one black and one white, stand on a corner just watching people go by and shouting "Hiya, Marine" to acquaintances.

"What do we think of the trouble out there? I'll tell you," said the white Marine. "It means we got to pull more guard duty and can't get out of this place."

Both said they "swoop" home to Columbus as often as possible. "Swooping" is the young Marine's favorite recreation. Thousands pile into cars every Friday afternoon and head for New York, Washington and hometowns up and down the Atlantic seaboard.

Many young enlisted men consider Lejeune little better than a prison. To the officers and senior enlisted men, who have their families here and enjoy reasonably adequate housing, coastal North Carolina is a perpetual delight. Therein lies part of the problem that plagues Lejeune.

"I'll tell you what the trouble is," said the black Marine. "It's those staff NCOs always picking on you. I don't know whether it's racial. Some of them are prejudiced, some aren't."

"I drive a truck, see. The other day, I'm driving and it's hot so I've got my shirt out. I stop to put my shirt back in and this NCO comes up and starts chewing me out about my hat. I've got it pushed on the back of my head."

His hair is cut in a neat, modified Afro style, trimmed close on the sides and tapering up to about a bushy one inch on top.

"A colonel and some other officers come along and I snap to and salute and then this sergeant starts chewing me for not doing what he told me fast enough."

"I told him, 'Well, goddam. You stop picking on me. You stop givin' me all this . . .'"

A few weeks ago, he said, he called his mother and told her he was coming home.

"I told her I was going to crack," he said. "I said I had to get out of here. Well, she got my daddy on the phone and she got the minister to call me and they got me a 10-day leave."

"I got home there with my Mom and Dad and my aunts and I talked to the minister some more and I felt okay. Then I got back here and the sergeant asks me if I want to volunteer to go to Nam."

"I told him, 'You're crazy, man. I ain't goin' to volunteer to go to no Nam.'"

"Next thing I know, he tells me I'm goin' anyway. That's not fair, after they give you a choice."

He thinks his chances as a truck driver are better than if he were the machine-gunner atop the truck, but he has had nightmares ever since he saw a film on a television news program the other night. It showed a truck on fire in Vietnam.

At the base, a sergeant who had recent-

ly returned from Vietnam—his third war—told in acid tones of an incident involving another frightened young Marine when he was serving near the DMZ.

"What do you think of a Marine who jabs his arm with a pointed stick and says a rat bit him to avoid combat?" he asks and his blue eyes are icy cold. "I would like to have seen him shot dead on the spot."

Both the young private and the veteran sergeant would probably agree that cowardice—as distinguished from fear—is despicable. But there is a wide gap between the attitude of the young black drafted to fight in an unpopular war and that of the sergeant who has made the Marines his life.

"You want to know what the trouble is?" asked a man about to retire from the corps. "I'll tell you in one word. It's bitterness . . . hatred. It's in our society and it's affecting the Marines. And it's going to get worse before it gets better."

Last spring, a committee of seven officers reported to Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Wheeler, Ryan's predecessor, that conditions were such that a minor incident might expand into a "major racial confrontation." A major problem, the report said, is that many white officers and non-coms "retain prejudices and deliberately practice them."

Part of this is attributed to an adverse reaction to the symbols young blacks use, which set them apart from the rest of American society—and, even more to the point, sets them apart from other Marines.

The use of these symbols appears to come as a challenge to a generation of Marines who have been taught to think of a Marine, in Ryan's words, as green rather than as black, or white or yellow.

The Afro hair style is an example.

"For the black Marine, the Afro haircut style is 'in,'" says a Platoon Leader's Pamphlet on the racial situation prepared at Ryan's direction. "Such a haircut is not necessarily contrary to Marine Corps standards of appearance. Pictures of such acceptable haircuts are on display in all Marine Corps exchange barber shops. The young black Marine deeply resents arbitrary standards established by a white officer or NCO which forces him to adopt a more 'customary' hairstyle."

But even a haircut well within regulations—closely trimmed on the sides, no more than three inches long on top—can be seen as a deliberate affront to a man who has always considered the very short haircut as one of the hallmarks of a Marine.

"I've been a skinhead all my life," said one sergeant. "We all have. I don't see why these kids have to be different. They say it's their 'African heritage.' Hah!"

The young Negro coming into the Corps, Ryan's pamphlet notes, "is extremely sensitive to real or imagined indications of racial prejudice or discrimination."

But non-commissioned officers complain that some black Marines are quick to complain about discrimination as a means of avoiding unpleasant duties.

"You can't tell a black to clean the commode," said one sergeant. "That's 'menial labor.' But it has to be done, so you end up getting a white to do it."

Thus even the attempts to avoid prejudice and discrimination add to the remnants of the real thing and, along with all the reflected tensions of the outside world, add to the tensions between black and white. Perhaps even more, they increase the tensions between rookie and veteran that plague the corps.

Fortunately, despite their rural southern atmosphere, Jacksonville and surrounding Onslow County seem to be free of overt racial prejudice. The young Marine, regardless of color, is welcome in the bars, clothing stores, jewelers and pawn shops along Court Street as long as his money holds out.

Until the early 1960s, the two predominantly black areas of Jacksonville were off-limits to white Marines. Now, gangs of Negro teen-agers seem to have taken it on themselves to keep them out—and make a profit in the process.

A man returning after 13 months in Vietnam for assignment to the 2nd Division can be assured of two months duty in this country. Then he may be shipped to the Mediterranean, the Caribbean or Guantanamo Bay.

If he wants to marry and bring his bride here, he may—if he is lucky—be assigned to what the government officially calls "inadequate quarters." If he is not lucky, he may pay half his month's salary for rent. And if he is black, he may encounter discrimination although Jacksonville seems to do better on housing than communities near many other military bases.

Because of its isolation—and probably, in many cases, because of just plain homesickness—Camp Lejeune has an unusually high rate of desertion and unauthorized absence. To try to cut the rate, an intensified effort to prosecute and convict deserters was begun last August. The result has been a sharp rise in the number of general courts martial—from 22 in 1967, to 57 in 1968 to 99 in the first seven months of 1969.

Coupled with this problem is the 2nd Division's record for the highest re-enlistment rate in the Corps—a reflection, according to some knowledgeable officers, more of a desire to get away from Lejeune than any deep love for the Corps.

There is also a feeling among some non-coms that the Corps is hurting itself by its emphasis on the rate of enlistment and re-enlistment rather than the quality of the recruits.

Ryan and Tompkins insist that the beatings and assaults are the work of a tiny minority. Ryan calls them "hoodlums," and there's little doubt that Ryan and Tompkins are capable of dealing with this hoodlum element, although at the cost of even further tensions.

One young black Marine came up to Ryan recently and asked: "General, is it true that if more than four of us get together we'll be fired on?"

This is one of many unfounded rumors sweeping across the base. Some of them, it is suspected, have been deliberately planted by a small and not clearly identified group of militants active on the base and in town.

To a visitor from the outside world, the Marine Corps still seems, from all appearances, to be a highly motivated and tightly disciplined organization. To those closer to it the corps has changed vastly in the last 30 years.

It is apparent that there are severe tensions, between black and white, between old and young, that are not susceptible to the same techniques Ryan and Tompkins are using to control the overt violence. They are tensions that can be eased only by patience and understanding combined with a good measure of toughmindedness.

This is the challenge facing this troubled paradise today.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT—FORCED RACE-MIXING CREATES ANARCHY

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's issue of a leading New Hampshire newspaper has two significant and related columns on its front page. It is fitting that we take a careful look at the rela-

tionship of these current emergencies prior to departing from Washington for the recess. Our people are seeing the truth which some of our colleagues refuse to acknowledge.

First, there is a photograph of an all too common sign on the side of a grocery delivery truck. The signs says: "Driver carries no money . . . Truck Equipped With Safe Not Under Drivers Control." Similar signs on the buses serving the city, and on the buses from the suburbs entering the city have become so common that we may fail to realize how inexcusable it is for honest tradesmen to fear to carry money in broad daylight in the Nation's Capital, or for the public transportation system to be the target of such repeated armed robbery that its vehicles must bear signs signifying that such assaults will be fruitless.

When the Warren Supreme Court perverted the Constitution by writing into it that which the people had refused to write into it, the then President Eisenhower proudly claimed that school integration in the city would make Washington a model for the Nation. It certainly has become a model—albeit a model of abject failure.

When the demagogues who had sought to serve their political purpose by mixing races in the public schools had accomplished their initial purpose, the predictable thing happened. Decent parents who were financially able to remove their children from the dangers and deprivation of an inferior school system did so without delay. Citizens moved from the city to the suburbs, where responsible elected officials were still attempting to preserve a decent system of public education.

One of the interesting features of this whole sorry episode was the haste with which those advocates of social leveling for others removed their own children from the dangers which they had deliberately foisted on others.

And so Washington, the Nation's Capital city, became what it is today. As the decent people moved out, the welfare crowd moved in, and the schools suddenly became "de facto" segregated. Crime rose, left-wing demands for "home rule" resulted in more and more abandonment of authority to the mob, and each gain by the demagogues led to louder demands for more and more surrender. FBI statistics released today show another 38 percent crime rise during the past year.

This Congress was even stampeded into proposing an amendment to the Constitution whereby the Washington rabble has a voice in the election of the President—and the people, ignorant of the truth, showed their innate goodness by "granting a vote" to the voteless residents of the Federal Capital.

The diligent efforts of the far left to further amend the Constitution, and to permit the District of Columbia to masquerade as a sovereign State, are now seen for what they really are. Today on the east steps of the Capitol a ragged crew of Hanoi supporters carried signs pointing out that the sabotage of the ABM system—sabotage called for by

Moscow and by the Communist Party USA—was prevented by a vote of 51 to 49 in the other body. The signs also pointed out that the District of Columbia should have had representation in the other body, and that two additional anti-ballistic-missile votes would have then been available, helping to destroy the defenses of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we face up to what is going on here in Washington under our very noses. The people around the country know. And they are determined that they will no longer be used as teaching aids for rehabilitating criminals.

The other item in the New England newspaper relates to the tragic betrayal of schoolchildren in the State of Arkansas. Here again, the parents are unwilling to sacrifice their children to the demagogues. At double expense to themselves, responsible parents have built independent educational facilities. This was necessitated by the deliberate destruction by the "judicrats" of the schools which the people had previously built to educate their youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent the people made the victims of the latest power grab by liberal bureaucrats, are well aware of the facts in our home areas. We know intimately the results which will follow when public schools are made unfit and unsafe for the children of our districts. We know all too well the mood of the people—a people who have suffered much, but who are still too ruggedly American to allow their children to be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency as a propitiation to the nationally repudiated left.

We who represent these Americans have expressed our sentiments directly to the President. We have talked personally with the Attorney General. We have conferred with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have plainly and repeatedly told these gentlemen what the facts are, and what the dangers are. We have not done what we can with the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary again to inform all of our colleagues in this House, and from the floor of this House, the members of the judiciary branch, that the people have had all that they will stand. The decent, responsible, hard-working, taxpaying Americans are through being pushed around. They have spoken at the ballot box in every significant election for more than a year. They are acutely aware that neighborhood peace and harmony cannot be bought with greater outlays of their tax dollars. They are dispatching petitions by the pound to the Congress, to the President, and even to the courts. They are holding meetings numbering in the tens of thousands.

They are determined that what happened to the District of Columbia will not happen to their homes. They are determined that their children will remain safe, and will be educated, not indoctrinated with propaganda foreign both to truth and to the great history of our Republic. And they are determined to do whatever it is necessary for them to do

to protect their homes and their children. This is Americanism at its finest, and we call for the understanding and the assistance of other Americans in removing from the backs of our people the unconstitutional, illegal, and useless punitive measures designed only to appease repudiated and dissident minorities in other parts of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings at this point in the RECORD: [From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Aug. 12, 1969]

LIFE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington is a city in which bus drivers require that the exact change be dropped in the fare boxes, as they no longer carry either change or tokens because of the frequency of holdups.

The holdup peril also is the reason for the sign on Elswick's truck. The safe built into the truck is designed to delay or foil thieves.

Holdup men—who Elswick says often are seeking money to buy drugs—would have several options open on encountering Elswick and his truck.

They might leave him alone and look for easier prey.

They might overpower Elswick and take him and the truck to some quiet spot where they could pry the safe open at leisure. They possibly would kill Elswick afterward so he could not identify them.

If they didn't notice the sign in time—until after they had boarded the truck—they might be defeated by the safe and flee. However, to avoid identification, they might kill Elswick. Or they might beat or kill him to express their disappointment.

The sign and safe, then, lessen the odds against Elswick as a prospective holdup victim—but not by much.

The greatest effect of the sign is to reveal the shocking extent of crime in the streets of Washington, and its effect on the daily lives of ordinary working people.

Probably the best deterrent to the holdups—on the basis of statistics from other states and cities—would be the criminal's knowledge that many responsible citizens, including truck drivers, legally were carrying firearms, while if he, the criminal, were to use a gun to commit a crime, he would be subject to heavy punishment. While desirable, it wouldn't be essential for Elswick himself to carry a gun. The fact that he might be armed would provide him much more protection than his truck's sign.

It was in crime-ridden Washington, ironically, that a commission on violence recently recommended that citizen-owned handguns be confiscated throughout the nation!

This was proposed despite the fact that not one Washington holdup was committed by a handgun. In every case the holdup was committed by a criminal, who may have used a gun, knife, club or broken bottle to terrorize or kill his victim.

Yet political commissions and political cliques continue to pass lightly over the criminal's role, and direct their wrath and restrictions at the nations' citizen-owned firearms, using arguments which with equal absurdity could be turned against automobiles, which often are used in getaways after crimes.

Meanwhile, Washington's sign painters and safe installers are being kept busy.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 13, 1969]

HOOPER BLAMES "MINORITY" OF REPEATERS FOR RISING CRIME (By John Flalka)

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover released a set of statistics today that blames much of the nation's upsurge of crime on a "relatively small minority" of repeaters.

Announcing the results of a special five-

year study of 18,333 persons arrested in 1963, he pointed out that 63 percent returned to the streets to be arrested on other charges.

More than 3,900 persons in the group were arrested four or more times between 1963 and 1968, he added.

Hoover said he was most disturbed by mounting arrest rates among the young. Of those who were under 20 when arrested in 1963, 72 percent were arrested again later.

MANY WERE ACQUITTED

By case disposition, the highest number of repeaters, or recidivists, were those who had their original cases dismissed or were acquitted. Of these, 91 percent were arrested again in five years.

Adding fuel to the growing criticism of the lack of rehabilitation in the nation's penal system the statistics showed that of those who served prison sentences for their 1963 crime, 74 percent were arrested again.

In another way of documenting the problem the FBI traced the records of 5,528 persons arrested on robbery charges in 1967 and 1968. Of these, 86 percent had been arrested previously, 73 percent had been convicted of a prior serious crime, and 50 percent had served time for prior convictions.

"We are talking about a small number of people who repeat and repeat and repeat, there's no other way of putting it," commented one FBI official.

RISK TO CITIZENS GROWS

Hoover said the risk that a citizen will become a victim of crime has doubled since 1960.

The statistics show that the risk of becoming a victim of crime in the Washington area is substantially higher than the national average, but lower than the risk in other major, nearby metropolitan areas.

Last year 2235 serious crimes were reported for each 100,000 population in the nation. In the Washington Metropolitan area, which includes all surrounding suburban jurisdictions, including Loudoun and Prince William counties, the rate per 100,000 was 3,416 crimes.

However, the Baltimore area reported a higher rate, at 4,449, and the New York metropolitan area was still higher with 4,733 serious crimes per 100,000 residents.

The nation's rate of crime increase has grown 11 times faster than the population in the 1960s, Hoover said.

The FBI statistics showed that, while police were able to solve more cases than ever before in 1968, their clearance or solution rate compared with the total amount of serious crime reported is continuing to drop.

SERIOUS CRIME UP 17 PERCENT

In 1967, clearances were reported in 22.4 percent of serious cases. Last year the figure dropped to 20.9 percent. It was more pronounced in the category of robbery, where a 7 percent decline in clearances was reported.

As Hoover reported earlier this year, serious crime in the nation increased by 17 percent over 1967.

Washington had an increase of 24 percent over 1967. In 1967, 39,585 serious crimes were reported. In 1968 the number rose to 49,360.

The FBI report complains of a "growing attitude of disrespect for police" and shows that the rate of citizen assaults on policemen climbed 17 percent last year. There were 15.8 assaults for each 100 officers.

However, the report adds, there was a decline in the number of officers murdered in the line of duty. Sixty-four officers were killed throughout the nation last year, compared with the record of 76 killed in 1967.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 13, 1969]

THE SERIOUS CATEGORY—D.C. CRIME TOPS U.S. HIKE

The number of serious crimes in the District rose 24.7 percent in 1968 over the previous year, nearly 50 percent above the

national increase of 17 percent according to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report released today.

The District ranked sixth in the nation in number of serious crimes, with all the higher-ranked cities having larger populations. New York, with 482,990 serious crimes, led the nation.

The FBI lists murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft of more than \$50, and auto theft as "serious crimes."

District police chief Jerry V. Wilson blamed part of the crime rise here on court delays in trying suspects and a lenient bail release policy. He told the House Select Committee on Crime on Monday the "immediate answer to our crime problems . . . lies in the major shoring up of our court systems and corrections facilities."

Two innovations in District police efforts to combat the upward trend of crime were put into effect this week. The city's 14 precincts were consolidated into six districts and a \$1 million worth of communications equipment was put into operation.

The report shows that in the District there was an increase in all serious crime categories except aggravated assault, where the rate dropped by 1.3 percent. The rate also went down in two lesser categories—negligent manslaughter and larceny-theft of less than \$50. The negligent manslaughter rate dropped 13.3 percent, while the larceny category rate drop was less than 1 percent.

Other category rises over 1967 figures were: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, up 9.5 percent; forcible rape, up 51.1 percent; robbery, up 49.7 percent; burglary, up 22 percent; larceny-theft of \$50 and over, up 10.5 percent; and auto theft, up 33.5 percent.

In all, the District showed 49,360 crimes "known to the police" as compared to 39,585 in 1967, and 29,479 in 1966.

Suburban statistics were not broken down in the FBI lists, and "metropolitan Washington" figures included crimes committed in Loudoun and Prince William Counties—sections not ordinarily considered part of the metropolitan area.

In the FBI's "metropolitan Washington," there were 3,416.5 crimes per 100,000 inhabitants in 1968, and 2,839.6 crimes per 100,000 inhabitants the previous year. That amounts to a 20.3 percent rise.

National statistics show a 17 percent increase in crime, with a citizen's chances of being a victim on the increase. There were more than two victims per 100 inhabitants of the country in 1968.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 13, 1969]

CRIME—A GROWING PROBLEM (By Mark Schneider)

The dominant factor affecting crime in suburban Maryland is the District of Columbia—its residents, its illicit attractions and its social crises.

In each instance, law enforcement problems and responsibilities are created for Maryland police forces. Suburban police chiefs say that the impact may be unavoidable when a center city is surrounded by increasingly affluent bedroom communities.

SPILLOVER FROM D.C.

The crime spillover was outlined during Senate District Committee hearings on crime earlier this year. Sen. Joseph D. Tydings, committee chairman, summed up the testimony: "Across the streets and rivers which mark the District of Columbia boundaries spill many of the culprits, costs and consequences of crime in its suburbs."

A review of crime statistics for the first half of 1969 and interviews with area police chiefs reinforce those conclusions, but bring into question how much police forces can do to reduce crime.

The trend of serious crimes in suburban

Maryland from January through June showed an approximate 15 per cent increase over the first six months of 1968. Crimes against property—auto theft, grand larceny and burglary—produced much of the increase. Among the violent felonies—murder, rape, assault and robbery—the latter set new highs and in most areas police had difficulty keeping up with the increase.

However, Prince Georges police, where robbery incidents jumped 48 per cent, managed to up their arrests by 60 per cent over the first half of last year. D.C. residents continued to comprise some 60 per cent of the robbery suspects.

Those robbery statistics supported the testimony before the Senate District Committee by Prince Georges Commissioner Francis J. Alulsi, who said his county, with 17.4 miles of common boundaries with the District, had the "largest and most costly crime spillover problem."

ATTRACTION FOR YOUNG

The spillover produced other law enforcement problems. John Trubow, executive director of the Maryland Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, stressed that the District's social unrest ripples of fear across political boundaries that could be measured in the sudden upturn of gun sales last year.

He said pistol sales jumped from 4,126 to 7,983 in Prince Georges and from 2,756 to 4,315 in Montgomery in 1968.

Montgomery County Police Chief James J. McAuliffe also emphasized that suburban residents, particularly young people, were drawn to Georgetown and Dupont Circle and all too often returned home with marijuana and other illicit drugs. Prince Georges police officials found drug usage reports tripling over 1968 with the District one of the major drug sources.

But the District's effect on suburban communities has been uneven and nearly every jurisdiction has a different "major" problem.

CRIME STATISTICS

A profile showing the increase in serious crimes during the first half of 1969 over the same period a year ago points up the unevenness of Montgomery County, up 23 per cent; Prince Georges, up 8 per cent; Takoma Park, up 34 per cent; Hyattsville, up 6.8 per cent; and Greenbelt, up 66 per cent.

Behind those figures are the thousands of people who have called police to report their home broken into, their car stolen or their store robbed.

Statistics cover the prosperous businessman who spent a week at his cabin and returned to a ransacked Bethesda home to find television, radio and jewelry missing. They also include the high-rise apartment complex in Silver Spring where a secretary opened the door to her airconditioned apartment and discovered the electric appliances missing. The numerical totals also cover the Takoma Park motel owner who was pistol whipped during the second armed robbery of his office this year when he "moved too slowly."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Montgomery County (577 officers, \$8 million police budget, 505,000 population) Chief McAuliffe said there were 10 murders and 20 rapes this year, a substantial increase over last year. But the Chief added, "We've also upped our arrest rate in those cases."

However, the police clearance rate for robberies was far below its mark last year with only 23 arrests compared to the 45 recorded in the first six months of 1968. "A goodly proportion of those robberies were committed by people from other areas—D.C. and Prince Georges particularly," he said.

The most frequent felonies were housebreaking and thefts of more than \$50.

"The wealth of the county, the location of

our homes surrounded by hedges and shrubs makes it easy prey for burglars," he explained. He said that the county hoped to counteract a recent rise in apartment burglaries by requiring "dead bolt" locks to make it harder for the apartment burglar who depends on fast entrance and exit.

Chief McAuliffe also said that the county's narcotics problem has continued undiminished, with juveniles and the under-25 age group the major offenders. Since January, 129 arrests for narcotics violations have been made, nearly all in the younger age group, the chief said.

"In our county, the actual use of narcotics is more or less restricted to marijuana," He agreed with the earlier statement made by Lt. John Bechtel:

"Our kids started going to Georgetown two or three years ago and it (drug use) mushroomed up just as soon as they did."

PRINCE GEORGES

Prince Georges (500 officers, \$9 million budget, 632,000 population) Police Chief Vincent S. Free said, "about 95 per cent of our crime occurs between the D.C. line and the Beltway." He said that most robberies—489 through June 1969—fall within a mile or two of the District.

Robbery Squad Lt. James Ross added that only one shop along the 10-mile length of Eastern-av had not been robbed.

Chief Free added, "the targets have been small businesses, dry cleaners, fried chicken and hamburger restaurants."

He said that most of the stores and shops had parking lots that made "drive-in" hold-ups easy to accomplish.

Despite the difficulties involved, Chief Free cited the increase in robbery arrests and attributed it to "concentrating our people in the places of highest incidence."

JUVENILES AND DRUGS

Both men named the narcotics problem as the county's most difficult to detect.

"It is increasing by leaps and bounds with more juveniles involved each day," Chief Free said. He called the drug usage "just phenomenal" and added, "It's coming from the larger cities."

Narcotics arrests nearly tripled in the county during the first six months of the year with 148 persons, including 62 juveniles, apprehended. In 1968, only 53 persons were arrested during the same period.

"We're sending them (policemen) through narcotics training as fast as we can," Prince Georges Vice Squad Capt. Wayne Milligan said. He added that more police undercover work is needed.

Here's how the crime problem shapes up in a sampling of suburban Maryland communities.

CITY OF GREENBELT

The city of Greenbelt (15 officers, \$200,000 budget, population 20,000) Police Chief William T. Lane reported that serious crimes had jumped 66 percent, with larceny over \$50 tripling and burglaries also rising by more than 60 percent.

Greenbelt's recent experience was the most dramatic evidence of a shift in the target of thieves that also was felt by other suburban Maryland communities.

The vast majority of the thefts—20 last January thru June, 1968, and 62 this year—were from autos that had been stripped inside and out. The major attractions were the tape recorders, radios and elaborate speaker systems that stud many new car interiors.

HYATTSVILLE

Hyattsville (13 officers, \$150,000, population 18,000) Police Chief Kenneth C. Moureau also said, "They go after those accessories as well as tires and batteries." Grand larceny showed the single largest in-

crease with 97 instances compared to the 80 reports last year.

He also said that housebreakings were in "apartments mostly, and in the evening, when people are out."

TAKOMA PARK

In Takoma Park (27 officers, \$250,000 budget, population 25,000) a sudden rash of 40 apartment break-ins last month helped send burglary statistics up 20 percent and larceny soaring some 60 percent above last year's totals at the same date.

Lt. Robert E. Porter said the burglaries were clustered in the apartment complexes abutting East Silver Spring. He attributed the crimes to "outside gangs who were after T.V.'s, cameras, binoculars—anything and everything small that was pawnable or sellable."

Altho the department was aware of the trend upward in narcotics usage, he said that only eight narcotics reports had been registered since the first of the year. He added that drugs were concentrated among young adults who were not habitual users but smoked marijuana or amphetamines and barbiturates at parties. He said a drug abuse educational program is beginning in junior and senior high schools in September.

PROBLEM GROWING

Despite the efforts and the cooperation of area police departments, in communication, computerized records systems and mutual aid arrangements, the simple fact is that crime continues going up.

Police expenditures for manpower and equipment are on the rise. But so is the rate of crime. That is where it stands.

QUIT? NEVER!

(By John J. Synon)

As my friend pushed himself under the steering wheel, his right heel brushed the big, black .45 strapped against the seat's upright.

My eye caught the movement as his eye caught the startled expression on my face.

"We don't go out any more without a gun," my friend said, by way of explanation. "Not in this part of Arkansas. There have been several incidents."

The journey was to be a short one, a mile, from the Marvell fair grounds where a barbecue was in progress to the new school house I had asked to see.

"Things are really getting tight," my companion told me as we arrived. "Between the federal courts and the NAACP, they mean to crush us and we don't really know what to do exactly—except resist."

The school was no great shakes, not if one were to compare it to tax-bought, public school. But the pride and love so evident in the timber of my friend's voice changed the one-story, 12-room brick building into a veritable palace. This was their very own, they had built it for their children, independent of the public schools and (they hoped) independent of the federal government. And (they hoped) nobody could tell them how to operate it.

"We built it for a hundred-thousand dollars, all of it; land, equipment, everything."

"How much do you still owe?"

My friend seemed to savor his reply: "Twenty-seven hundred more and she's clear."

Marvell, Arkansas, is located about 75 miles south and a bit west of Memphis. It is cotton country; no rain, no cotton; no cotton, no life worth the living. It is an elementary land. Its people believe in God, and they believe in good and in evil, in the United States of America, and in the boll weevil. And they believe in social segregation of the races; blacks as well as whites believe in that.

"Ninety per cent of the people of this

country, black and white, don't want the races mixed up in the schools—but that doesn't matter. They are going to do it anyway—they say."

I rather doubt they will, or if they do, not for long. And, I gather, the federal judge who rules the area is developing doubts, too. One suspects he has come to question the insistent counsel he has been getting from the NAACP.

"Over in the next town," my friend went on, "they had a man—white man, think of that—go around to all the white parents, asking them please, wouldn't they send their children to integrated school, this fall?"

"And they got some to say they would. It costs \$400, you know, to send a child here."

"They told them not to worry, that the white children would be brought in separate busses and would be taught in a separate building. They told 'em the whites and the colored would have separate recess times and that they would begin school and end school at different times of day. Not to worry."

"That's what they are going to do in September, so they say. But you watch. The NAACP ain't going to put up with that. Once they get those white kids on the lot, they will lock the door in that whites-only building and lump 'em all together"

"And then what?"

"You ever put six cats in a sack?"

I said I had not but I thought I knew what he meant.

"And that will spread."

"How far?" I wanted to know.

"Got me; it will be like six-thousand cats in a sack. That's the best I can tell you. They can crush us, and we expect they will. And then the trouble will quiet down."

"You think then, if they bring troops to Arkansas again, you will quit?"

"No, sir. They will bring the troops, all right, but we won't quit. They will just crush us."

"No, sir. Quitting and being tied up are two different things. They are just going to have to hold us. They can do that but that's all they can do. Maybe, one day, they will get tired and turn us loose. But we will never quit."

And they never will.

OBJECTIVES OF SDS

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in the event that there may be some who think that SDS will be more responsible since the Peking-oriented Progressive Labor Party group lost the SDS elections in Chicago. I think it would be well for students and college administrators, who shortly will be faced with the possibility of continued SDS-sponsored campus disruptions, to take a close, hard look at the ultimate objectives of the current SDS leaders.

A position paper entitled "You Don't Need a Weatherman to Know Which Way the Wind Blows," printed in the June 18, 1969, issue of New Left Notes, official publication of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), sets forth the views of leading officials of the SDS including Mark Rudd, national secretary; Jeff Jones, national interorganizational secretary; and Bill Ayers, national education secretary. These individuals control the SDS national office, its finances, and its propaganda facilities.

Their attitude, relative to the American educational system, is that "revolutionaries should never put forth a line

which fosters the illusion that imperialism will grant significant reforms." They express the belief that high schools and colleges should be closed rather than reformed.

They have boldly stated:

The goal is the . . . achievement of a classless world: world communism.

And that—

Political power comes out of the barrel of a gun.

That—

A revolution is war.

And—

To win a war with an enemy as highly organized and centralized as the imperialists will require a clandestine organization of revolutionaries.

They state:

Because war is political, political tasks—the international communist revolution—must guide it.

And that a revolutionary mass movement is "akin to the Red Guard in China" and one "with a full willingness to participate in the violent and illegal struggle."

The text of pertinent sections from New Left Notes follows:

GOAL IS WORLD COMMUNISM

So the very first question people in this country must ask in considering the question of revolution is where they stand in relation to the United States as an oppressor nation, and where they stand in relation to the masses of people throughout the world whom US imperialism is oppressing. . . . We are within the heartland of a world-wide monster, a country so rich from its world-wide plunder that even the crumbs doled out to the enslaved masses within its borders provide for material existence very much above the conditions of the masses of people of the world.

The goal is the destruction of US imperialism and the achievement of a classless world: world communism.

HOW TO MAKE A REVOLUTION

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletariat of different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole." (Communist Manifesto.)

At Columbia it was not the gym, in particular, which was important in the struggle, but the way in which the gym represented, to the people of Harlem and Columbia, Columbia's imperialist invasion of the black colony. Or at Berkeley, though people no doubt needed a part (as much, however, as many other things?), what made the struggle so important was that people, at all levels of militancy, consciously saw themselves attacking private property and the power of the state. And the Richmond Oil Strike was exciting because the militant fight for improvement of material conditions was part and parcel of an attack on international monopoly capital. The numbers and militancy of people mobilized for these struggles has consistently surprised the left, and pointed to the potential power of a class-conscious mass movement.

The masses will fight for socialism when they understand that reform fights, fights for improvement of material conditions, can-

not be won under imperialism. With this understanding, revolutionaries should never put forth a line which fosters the illusion that imperialism will grant significant reforms.

What does it mean to organize around racism and imperialism in specific struggles? In the high schools (and colleges) at this time, it means putting forth a mass line to close down the schools, rather than to reform them so that they can serve the people. . . . And even where high school kids are not yet engaged in such sharp struggle, it is crucial not to build consciousness only around specific issues such as tracking or ROTC or racist teachers, but to use these issues to build toward the general consciousness that the schools should be shut down. . . .

Agitational demands for impossible, but reasonable, reforms are a good way to make a revolutionary point.

NEIGHBORHOOD-BASED CITY-WIDE YOUTH MOVEMENT

One way to make clear the nature of the system and our tasks working off of separate struggles is to tie them together with each other; to show that we're one "multi-issue" movement, not an alliance of high school and college students, or students and GI's, or youth and workers, or students and the black community. The way to do this is to build organic regional or subregional and city-wide movements, by regularly bringing people in one institution or area to fights going on on other fronts. . . .

From a neighborhood base high school kids could be effectively tied in to struggles around other institutions and issues, and to the anti-imperialist movement as a whole.

The second level is combining these neighborhoods into city-wide and regional movements. This would mean doing the same thing—bringing people to other fights going on—only on a larger scale relating to various blow-ups and regional mobilization. . . . The existence of this kind of cross-motion makes ongoing organizing in other places go faster and stronger, first by creating a pervasive politicization, and second by relating everything to the most militant and advanced struggles going on so that they influence and set the pace for a lot more people. . . .

REVOLUTIONARY YOUTH MOVEMENT (RYM) AND THE PIGS (POLICE)

Pigs don't represent state power as an abstract principle; they are a power that we will have to overcome in the course of struggle or become irrelevant, revisionist, or dead. We must prepare concretely to meet their power because our job is to defeat the pigs and the army, and organize on that basis. Our beginnings should stress armed self-defense—building defense groups around karate classes, learning how to move on the street and around the neighborhood, medical training, popularizing and moving toward (according to necessity) self-defense, all the time honoring and putting forth the principle that "political power comes out of the barrel of a gun." These self-defense groups would initiate pig surveillance patrols, visits to the pig station and courts when someone is busted, etc.

THE NEED FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

The RYM must also lead to the effective organization needed to survive and to create another battlefield of the revolution. A revolution is a war; when the movement in this country can defend itself militarily against total repression it will be part of the revolutionary war.

This will require a cadre organization, effective secrecy, self-reliance among the cadres, and an integrated relationship with the active mass-based movement. To win a war with an enemy as highly organized and centralized as the imperialists will require a (clandestine) organization of revolutionaries,

having also a unified "general staff"; that is, combined at some point with discipline under one centralized leadership. Because war is political, political tasks—the international communist revolution—must guide it. Therefore the centralized organization of revolutionaries must be a political organization as well as military, what is generally called a "Marxist-Leninist party." * * * A revolutionary mass movement is different from the traditional revisionist mass base of "sympathizers." Rather it is akin to the Red Guard in China, based on the full participation and involvement of masses of people in the practice of making revolution; a movement with a full willingness to participate in the violent and illegal struggle.

INTERESTING PARADOXES

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested, as all Members were, at the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) concerning the application of pressure to the chief administrator in the executive branch on the HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are several paradoxes involved in this. First, this is not an act or a law yet. Hearings will not be started in the other body of Congress, until the end of next month.

Second, when a ceiling of \$192.2 billion has been placed on the Chief Executive, and we rather wantonly increase it by \$2.3 billion in one single appropriation out of some 15 bills—not counting the supplementals—it is needless to say that any Executive who administers under such restraints would impound and withhold until such time as priorities are established by the legislative branch, or indeed he has to assert them himself.

And finally, let me invite your attention to the paradox in the statement that if this money is not spent by the Federal Government, certainly it must be spent by the local school boards, the municipalities, political subdivisions, and governments of States other than the Federal Government. This might indeed be a very wonderful thing, and even more constitutional than our help from the Federal taxpayers' pockets.

Finally, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the gentleman from New Jersey does not want the credibility gaps in the halls of justice of the State of New Jersey to be greater than they were in the Department of Defense under Robert Strange McNamara and Arthur Sylvester, he had better correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it says he did vote against the surtax extension which he has just denied on this floor.

SCHOOL AID TO IMPACTED AREAS

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from New Jersey talk about his amendments and the suggestion that if the Federal Government does not spend the money, the local school boards and the States will spend the money instead.

If that was the case, I would not have voted for the Joelson amendment. In

fact, a number of those expenditures, especially vocational education, title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I doubt that the local schools would be able to find that money to spend. I think the local schools would find the money to spend for general education now financed by impact aid. But there are some programs that will be financed, only if the Federal Government makes those expenditures. We passed an adequate authorization last year for vocational education but, we have to spend the increased amount of money in the House-passed HEW appropriation bill in order to implement that Vocational Education Act.

It is my feeling that the President is right to the extent that the Congress has the responsibility of holding spending down to the limit we set. When we set the priorities in the House for more education money, which I favor, I also believe we have a responsibility to reduce expenditures in some other areas so that we can keep the budget in balance. I hope the administration hears our demands for more adequate education funding but I hope we also hear and heed the administration's demand for sound fiscal judgment on the total budget.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. I think you are right to a certain extent. You referred to impacted aid which I think is almost \$400 million over the budget estimate and title I which certainly is drastically needed in the industrial cities which is \$180 million. So I would say half a billion dollars would have to be provided by the cities if the Federal Government did not provide it.

GUN CONFISCATION: THE ISSUE IS JOINED AS NEVER BEFORE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the many years of public debate over gun registration, control, and licensing, the public has started to recognize that the thrust of all these proposals has been, and is, gun confiscation. The July 30 statement of Dr. Milton Eisenhower on behalf of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has brought the issue to a head as never before.

The Commission's recommendations were not watered down or obscured by technicalities, but were direct and unequivocal. The Commission has advocated gun confiscation by the U.S. Government.

What the Commission has done is to polarize the debate. As one of those Members who has consistently fought what I consider to be unconstitutional proposals for gun registration, I can only state my delight and surprise that the gun confiscators have decided to come out from under the cloak of respectability in which they wrapped themselves after the Kennedy-King-Kennedy assassinations. We, the opponents of gun confiscation, have cried "wolf," and sure

enough, but unlike the fable, the wolf appeared. In the fable, the neighbors came running to fight the wolf and that is what is happening today. The citizens are beginning to fight these unnecessary, unwarranted, and unworkable recommendations that would destroy their right to self-protection.

It is interesting that some representatives of the press are also beginning to see the light, but most important, one of the leaders of the confiscation forces has drawn back from the Commission's statement. He said:

I don't think the American people are ready to go that far.

With that statement, I find for the first time that I am in agreement with the senior Senator from Connecticut. The Commission has truly gone too far, but I fear that the gentleman from Connecticut was showing more concern for the detrimental impact of the Commission's report and recommendations on the carefully constructed image which the gun confiscators have built up over the years than on the substantive issue of gun control. The Commission's report may have given hope to some, but its blunt and uncompromising tone has finally shown the true colors of those in the forefront of the gun control debate. With the issue now out in the open, with the battle lines firmly drawn, with the American citizen aroused as never before, I believe it is appropriate to say that the turning point has been reached. The direction now is toward realism. The sob sisters and do gooders have had their day, now the voice of reason—the voice of the American people, the voice of the American sportsman—will prevail.

That voice of reason has been heard by the administration, although acknowledgment has not come from as high up as I would have expected considering the statement of candidate Nixon and the mandate of the people as expressed last November. If you will recall, candidate Nixon said on July 9, 1968:

Gun control . . . disarms law-abiding citizens . . . merchants, cab drivers and bus drivers who are unarmed because they have obeyed the gun law become the easy prey of the criminals who have evaded it.

Candidate Nixon went on to call for a mandatory sentence of up to 7 years for the use of a firearm in the commission of a major crime.

Even though I do not believe the Nixon administration's current position is strong enough in opposition to gun control legislation, I am pleased with the indication that the administration is willing to slow down the heretofore headlong rush into gun confiscation. This position was stated by the Associate Deputy Attorney General on July 24 before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The Justice Department and the Treasury Department are, in my opinion, faced with an impossible situation. They must attempt to enforce a law which is basically unworkable—the Gun Control Act of 1968. The administration spokesman has not come right out and said that the law is useless, but he did put the law in perspective concerning attempts to revise it this year. He said:

Since the (Act) did not become effective until the end of 1968, we have had only approximately seven months of experience with its enforcement.

In short, knowing that the law is basically unenforceable, the administration is hoping that the Congress will not further complicate the problem of enforcement by adding more rules and regulations. Naturally, you know my reaction to that—if it is a bad law, repeal it.

In the same statement, the Justice Department expresses what I take to be the philosophy of the administration concerning the further attempts to push gun control and registration, to wit:

We agree with the representatives from the Department of the Treasury that registration and licensing proposals represent a distinct departure from previously held concepts of Federal controls of sporting firearms and would constitute an unwarranted invasion into the province of State and local governments.

Earlier, the Justice Department spokesman gave a succinct statement on the "why" of this position:

I believe it is necessary to emphasize that each State faces different problems and conditions in the area of firearms control. The problems and conditions peculiar to the populous urban Northeastern States are not those peculiar to the sparsely populated Plains and Mountain States. Thus, the legislatures of these diverse States are likely to adopt different measures in dealing with firearms."

You will notice that the department mentions "firearms," not long guns, or handguns, but "firearms." The distinction which the Commission has endeavored to make is very weak. Unfortunately, the administration seems to play into the hands of the gun confiscation advocates when its spokesman prefaces "firearms" with "sporting." At the present time, I am willing to give the administration the benefit of the doubt on this issue and hope that the distinction between types of weapons will not become a new wedge upon which to mount a campaign to legislatively deprive the citizens of their firearms.

The gun confiscation advocates, having failed in their attempts to confiscate or control every gun in the United States last year with the emotionally spurred Gun Control Act, are now relying on the press notices generated by the Commission on Violence and the Commission's distinction between the relative "harm" caused by the ownership of one type of weapon over another. This false distinction is not likely to be palatable to the American public, and for a change, it is not left to a member of the loyal opposition to gun controllers to point out the absurdity of the distinction.

In an editorial entitled "More Gun Control Nonsense," in the July 30 edition of the Washington Evening Star, the point was made more dramatically than I could hope to do. The importance of that editorial requires its full reading and I incorporate it here for the convenience and edification of all Members:

MORE GUN CONTROL NONSENSE

As an introductory note to this editorial comment, an item in the crime news is

worthy of attention. On Monday there were 22 armed robberies in Washington. This brought the July total as of that date to 450, compared to 332 armed robberies in all of July of 1968.

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

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

This strikes us as blithering nonsense. How many members of this task force have been awakened in the middle of the night by a scream for help by some member of his family? Probably not one. But thousands of Americans are exposed to this dreadful experience every year. And in such a situation what is an unarmed householder supposed to do against an armed intruder? Hide under his bed, and never mind what happens to his family?

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

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

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

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

One point in that editorial is worth repeating over and over:

The major thrust of this soft-in-the-head report (of the Commission) is that the requirement to surrender your hand gun, of which there are an estimated 24 million in the country, would reduce crime. This is absurd, for the criminals are not going to surrender their guns.

This is what I have always stressed—we must attack the criminal problem with an attack on the criminal, not with a broadside against the law-abiding citizen who owns a gun. The President has suggested that mandatory sentences be handed down for those using firearms in the commission of a crime and the administration has already shown support for bills in Congress which would provide this.

I am introducing a bill today which would amend the penalty provisions for crimes committed while armed. The bill would provide mandatory, additional consecutive sentences for persons who carry or use firearms during the commission of felonies in violation of Federal law. Under the provisions of the bill, sentences could not be suspended, nor could offenders be given probation. The purpose of this bill is to attempt to convince the man who sets forth on a criminal venture to think twice about being armed.

We know that the Gun Control Act of 1968 provided for minimum mandatory sentencing, but that law has a loophole big enough to drive a truck through. The result is that the intent of the provision of that act may be thwarted by the very persons to whom it is directed. What good does it do to tell the criminal that if he commits a crime using a firearm he would, if convicted, receive a mandatory sentence, and then have a judge put him on probation? No use whatsoever, but that is what is happening under the 1968 act and is one more reason why the act is unworkable and should be repealed.

In addition to wrongly attacking the owners of guns as the "cause" of violence in America, the Commission on Violence in one of its recommendations calls for something that is already in existence. The Commission recommends that—

Public education program(s) to inform Americans fully about the role of firearms in accidents, crime, and other forms of violence; a publicity campaign to reduce the number of loaded guns in American homes . . . We urge in particular that the National Rifle Association and other private organizations devoted to hunting and sport shooting be enlisted with interested citizens and the media to assist in pointing out the dangers of loaded firearms in the home and the need for meaningful firearms legislation.

This suggestion is a little behind the times. Members of Congress and the sportsmen have long known of the firearm safety and marksmanship program of the NRA. For the information of the public, I am incorporating part of the NRA's 1968 Operating Report in my remarks to show that the Nation's largest firearms organization is deeply involved in safety programs:

FIREARM SAFETY AND MARKSMANSHIP

Through firearm safety education and marksmanship training, the National Rifle Association renders much of its public service. These programs are used by affiliated shooting clubs, state agencies and national youth-serving organizations. Through these activities the NRA maintains a widespread contact with the youth of America. Unquestionably, this has aided the growth of the NRA.

Police firearms training is a vital part of the NRA firearms education effort. The availability of this program has stimulated many

law enforcement agencies to place more emphasis on firearms training. Some agencies have conducted their first complete firearms training courses as a result of exposure to the NRA program. During 1968 the NRA Training Staff trained 353 police firearms instructors representing 196 enforcement agencies. The new Police Instructor Manual and combat shooting filmstrip, introduced in 1968, has aided substantially in this area. NRA also serves as a clearing house and standardizing influence for police firearms training courses, training aids, targets and courses of fire.

CERTIFIED INSTRUCTORS

NRA Certified Instructors and NRA Training Counselors are the heart of our training program; without them it could not exist. The total number of instructors continues to grow and expand. It is through the unselfish devotion of these dedicated members that many NRA objectives are achieved and the influence of the National Rifle Association is spread. These volunteer instructors give thousands of hours annually to the introduction of new people to the sport of shooting and firearms safety. Since 1933, our records show that 272,260 individuals have been appointed as NRA instructors. All instructor ratings are renewed annually in order that the files will include only active instructors. The figures below show the growth in the number of instructors for the past 3 years and the new instructors during 1968.

During 1968, 209 NRA Training Counselors (trainers of instructors) and NRA staff personnel trained 3,912 instructors. This means that more than one-third of all new marksmanship instructors were appointed after in-person training.

CERTIFIED INSTRUCTORS

	Total Dec. 31, 1968	New 1968	Total Dec. 31, 1966	Total Dec. 31, 1967
Hunter safety.....	62,480	10,902	52,871	52,545
Rifle marks- manship.....	25,470	4,459	22,520	24,915
Pistol marks- manship.....	10,261	2,514	11,220	13,194
Shotgun.....	6,481	1,680	4,117	5,461
Police.....	3,130	745	1,970	2,693
Home safety.....	5,329	946	4,612	4,176
Total.....	113,151	21,246	97,310	102,984

Note: NRA firearm safety programs.

NRA FIREARM SAFETY PROGRAMS

The NRA, long considered an authority by those who know guns, is now widely recognized and accepted as a partner by other organizations and groups concerned with safety in other fields.

Forty states and six Canadian provinces now operate hunter safety programs. Fifteen states and two provinces have laws which make hunter safety training a prerequisite for obtaining the first hunting license. The remaining twenty-five states and four provinces have official programs with voluntary participation. The number of students graduated during each of the last 3 years is: 384,514 in 1966; 385,244 in 1967; and 387,070 in 1968; with a total of 4,010,535 at the end of 1968.

Home Firearm safety training continues to fill a very definite need. Statistics show that firearms accidents in the home exceed those in the hunting field each year. NRA Clubs, Women's Organizations, Police Departments and youth groups show a continuing interest in this area of firearm safety.

NRA BASIC MARKSMANSHIP COURSES

Marksmanship training was the primary reason for the organization of the National Rifle Association in 1871. It has shown a con-

tinued increase through the years. Growth has been achieved through the creation of new manuals and teaching aids, by the regular updating of methods and materials and the development of new programs. A total of 514,514 individuals, mostly juniors, have completed the courses. Participation for the last 3 years is shown below:

REGISTERED COURSES CONDUCTED

	1968	1967	1966
Rifle.....	947	1,069	646
Pistol.....	246	184	98
Shotgun.....	61	51	27
Home safety.....	241	184	178
Total.....	1,495	1,488	949

STUDENTS GRADUATED

	1968	1967	1966
Rifle.....	34,363	32,332	20,111
Pistol.....	5,316	3,654	2,656
Police.....	56,767	36,041	31,552
Shotgun.....	3,413	1,419	980
Home safety.....	4,813	5,327	5,478
Total.....	104,672	78,773	6,777

NRA MARKSMANSHIP QUALIFICATION COURSES

Marksmanship qualification courses are designed to stimulate the shooter to practice in order to improve his skill. Such improvement is recognized by means of special awards at various stages throughout each course. Awards may be earned over various courses of fire and with many types of firearms. Some awards are within reach of the beginner while others present a challenge to even the most experienced marksman. The NRA Qualification Program has been popular since its introduction in 1926. Since that time 8,157,791 qualification awards of all types have been issued. In 1968, a total of 356,474 were earned in the following qualification courses: Air Rifle, Gallery Pistol, Gallery Rifle, Outdoor Position Smallbore, Outdoor Prone, Outdoor Pistol, Light Rifle, .22 Shotgun, Full-gauge Shotgun, Police Combat, Collegiate Pistol, Collegiate Smallbore Position, High Power Rifle, Carbine and 9 international courses of fire for 4 different arms.

NRA RANGE PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Today, finding "a place to shoot" is considerably more difficult than it was 25, or even 5 years ago. Recognizing this problem, and knowing also that the number of recreational shooters increases daily, the NRA is focusing a great deal of effort in the areas of range promotion, planning and development.

In the past year, a Nationwide Range Facilities Survey was taken, collecting data which will be used to create necessary guidelines for promotion and expansion in this field.

Programs of research and experimentation are being conducted at the NRA Experimental Range located in Cheltenham, Maryland. The facility presently includes a shooting house incorporating various types of construction design and materials, a one-hundred-yard smallbore and high power rifle range, a standard pistol and police combat pistol range which includes a manual turning target system, and an international clay pigeon field and trap house.

Beginning last summer and continuing to this time, construction has centered on the development of a safety baffle system of practical and effective design. The system includes a shooting house "overhang," a series of overhead baffles filled with crushed stone, a newly designed backstop which incorporates an "eyebrow" to contain shots deflected upward, and a "wing-baffle" structure to close in the sides of the range. This total

system will provide effective safeguards against ricochets or accidental discharges leaving the range area.

Range promotion and planning services are available to all individuals and groups interested in the development of shooting facilities. Available are information booklets which cover virtually all types of range design, range equipment, fund raising for range development and recreational shooting programs.

Mr. Speaker, the program has been in operation since 1933 and I want to point out that as of December 31, 1968, the NRA had 62,480 firearms instructors in the 50 States and Canada conducting programs for 4,010,535 students. In my humble opinion, that is a more direct and more meaningful contribution to the cause of firearms safety than all the reports, dramatic statistics, and recommendations made by any national commission, however illuminary its leaders or however many hours were spent in preparing a glossy report.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I want to reemphasize that the gun control battle has entered a new era with the report of the Violence Commission and I, for one, welcome frankness of those who would confiscate all the guns in America. We who supported the citizens' right to own firearms could only warn the American public about the true intentions of the gun control advocates. Now that we know the real purpose of these proposed laws, I am convinced that the American public will rise together to fight off this expanded attempt to more deeply involve the Federal Government in their private lives.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of relief that I note the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography has finally decided to issue an "interim" report on its activities. The report, though falling short of what I had hoped to see in terms of recommendations and guidelines, nevertheless comes at a propitious time. Hearings on smut peddling in America are underway in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and have also been scheduled by a Judiciary subcommittee. The number of my colleagues who have introduced or cosponsored bills to control the spread of pornographic trash indicates a general sense of concern on the part of Congress. The mail I receive marked "personal" or "to be opened by male staff only," is truly staggering and indicates the depth of concern of our citizens with the unimpeded solicitation of pornographic material throughout the country.

After my comments in the House of June 5, concerning the eminence of the interim report of the Commission, many Members called my office to inquire if I had any information on what the Commission was doing or its general activities. Unfortunately, and unexplainably, a critique on the Commission was most

difficult to obtain. Now that the interim report has been published and Members are aware of the direction and scope of its inquiry, I hope the Commission will be more cooperative with Members of Congress in the future because many of us want to cooperate and assist in this crusade.

I include the full text of the report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography following my remarks. A close examination should provide guidance to other Members into ways of combating all forms of smut.

The material follows:

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON
OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY
INTRODUCTION

This is a progress report to the Congress and the President. It reports no findings. It makes no recommendations. Either would be premature at this time in view of the extensive study and research assignments Congress gave to the Commission. It simply reports the manner in which the Commission is carrying out its assignments, and the directions its studies, investigation and research are taking. The Commission plans to report its findings and recommendations in the summer of 1970 as directed by Congress.

THE COMMISSION'S ASSIGNMENT

Congress, in Public Law 90-100, found the traffic in obscenity and pornography to be a matter of national concern. The Federal Government was deemed to have a "responsibility to investigate the gravity of this situation and to determine whether such materials are harmful to the public, and particularly to minors, and whether more effective methods should be devised to control the transmission of such materials." To this end the Congress established an advisory commission whose purpose is "after a thorough study which shall include a study of the causal relationship of such materials to antisocial behavior, to recommend advisable, appropriate, effective, and constitutional means to deal effectively with such traffic in obscenity and pornography."

Congress assigned four specific tasks:

(1) with the aid of leading constitutional law authorities, to analyze the laws pertaining to the control of obscenity and pornography; and to evaluate and recommend definitions of obscenity and pornography;

(2) to ascertain the methods employed in the distribution of obscene and pornographic materials and to explore the nature and volume of traffic in such materials;

(3) to study the effect of obscenity and pornography upon the public, and particularly minors, and its relationship to crime and other antisocial behavior; and

(4) to recommend such legislative, administrative, or other advisable and appropriate action as the Commission deems necessary to regulate effectively the flow of such traffic without in any way interfering with constitutional rights."

The Commission subscribes completely to the Congressional directive to make recommendations only after thorough study. Therefore, because results of its studies are not yet available, the Commission cannot yet make recommendations. Rather, this report relates the history of the Commission's activities, the status of its current work, and the directions in which it is moving.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Congress established the Commission in October 1967, and the President appointed its members in January 1968. (A listing of the Commissioners is provided as Appendix A.) However, not until July 1968 were funds appropriated for its operation; at the same

time the tenure of the Commission was extended to provide it the originally intended two years for its activities. The Commission is to report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by July 31, 1970.

The Commission held its first meeting in July 1968. It gave exploratory consideration to the various areas of its responsibilities, making use of experts who presented preliminary analyses of the available information in the legal, traffic, and effects areas. It elected a chairman and vice-chairman. The Commission then organized itself into four working panels: 1) Legal; 2) Traffic and Distribution; 3) Effects; and 4) Positive (non-regulatory) Approaches. It appointed a subcommittee to recommend a director for the Commission's staff. The Director and a General Counsel were appointed effective the last week in August 1968, and the nucleus of a staff was assembled during September 1968. (A listing of the Commission's staff is provided in Appendix B.)

The full Commission or its working panels held 16 meetings through June 5; the attendance of Commission members at these meetings has averaged 90%. The Commission has reviewed many available studies and other data in the areas of its responsibility, developed research plans, and implemented the studies required by Congress. The remainder of this report will review the status of the Commission's work in each of the panel areas.

LEGAL PANEL

The Legal Panel, noting Congress' directive that recommended action should not in any way interfere with constitutional rights, reviewed recent case law regarding obscenity and pornography for guidelines concerning permissible legislative action. Apart from general obscenity statutes, constitutional precedents suggest three primary directions for effective legislative action to control erotic materials: 1) statutes with specific concern for juveniles; 2) statutes dealing with assaults upon individual privacy and offensive public displays; and 3) statutes prohibiting pandering.

The panel, in experimenting with drafting statutes, has worked first in these above areas, while leaving open the possibility of other types of legislation, including possible use of Federal laws to aid in enforcement of local obscenity laws. In Appendix C will be found an example of a possible statute designed to meet one of the areas of expressed public concern—the problem of assaults upon privacy through unsolicited mailings.

Congress in establishing the Commission stated "The State and local governments have an equal responsibility [to the Federal Government] in the exercise of their regulatory powers and any attempts to control this transmission [of pornographic and obscene materials] should be a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels." To provide the necessary background information for recommendations in this area, the panel is studying the legal provisions and enforcement activities at all three governmental levels.

Obscenity statutes of the Federal Governmental and from the 50 states have been assembled and are under review; statutes from selected municipalities are currently being collected. Also in preparation is a descriptive review of the activities of several Federal Departments which have responsibilities under Federal law for dealing with obscenity (the Postal Inspector's Office and the General Counsel's Office within the Post Office Department; the F.B.I., the Criminal Division, and the Civil Division of the Department of Justice; and the Customs Office in the Treasury Department). A survey of State and Municipal prosecutors regarding their experience, problems, and recommendations

regarding the enforcement of obscenity statutes is nearing completion, and a survey of police officials is in the planning stage. The recommendations of States Attorneys General and of constitutional lawyers throughout the United States are being solicited. Intensive first-hand examination of obscenity law enforcement in a number of communities throughout the nation will take place within the next few months.

The survey of prosecuting attorneys merits some further elaboration. Questionnaires have been mailed to a stratified random sample of over 700 prosecuting attorneys. The questionnaires inquire into the extent of the problem of obscenity in the local community and what kinds of materials and distributions are involved; the experience of their offices in prosecuting obscenity cases; the methods most often used; the obstacles encountered in prosecution; recommendations for changes in existing obscenity law; and the role of local police officials and citizens groups in law enforcement. The sample has been selected in such a way as to allow comparisons between local and state prosecutors, between large urban and small town communities, and among regions of the nation. Although the returns are not all in and the analysis is not completed, a preliminary review indicates that there is considerable variation in the experiences of the prosecuting attorneys. The returns are providing valuable information, insights, and suggestions. Finally, the Legal Panel has authorized the staff to plan a national sample survey designed to provide information relevant to the currently applied judicial test of "contemporary community standards." Recent discussions indicate that there are considerable variations in opinions about what are contemporary community standards regarding the offensiveness of sexual stimuli, but there does not now exist any empirical data on the matter to inform these discussions. One of the most troublesome aspects is the changing climate of opinion. Change has, of course, always been a factor, but currently the rates and degree of change make the problems in assessment of community standards increasingly difficult. Differences based on locality, age, economic status, education, etc., are obviously wide. Greater knowledge seems essential in order to construct any acceptable definition of obscenity. This survey is tentatively planned for the fall of 1969.

TRAFFIC AND DISTRIBUTION

The Commission concluded early in its existence that, since there is no well-defined and generally accepted definition of obscenity or pornography, it must study a wide variety of erotic stimuli or sexually related materials. In its study of traffic and distribution, materials will be classified by descriptive categories.

Most existing estimates of volume of traffic do not designate the kinds of materials that are involved and are seldom based on empirical data. The most informative source on traffic and distribution is a report made to the California Legislature by the Office of the California Attorney General in 1967. This report described chiefly the state of affairs in California at that time, and requires updating because of rapid developments. Nevertheless, the report, based on carefully specified classes of materials, provides valuable insights into the organization of the erotic materials industry and helpful leads for further study. The overall question with which the panel is faced is, "Who gets how much of what, and how?" A two-pronged attack on the problem is being made by approaching it through studies of both distributors and consumers. Thus, two independent estimates of volume and nature of traffic will be secured.

The Commission staff is currently engaged in a study of the producers and wholesale distributors of erotic materials. Also, on our agenda is the study of local retail distribution, open and underground, including the types of materials handled and types of customers served by the various classes of retailers, and an inquiry into the extent of circulation among youth of material initially purchased at retail by adult customers. All these studies are somewhat complicated by the fact that there tend to be several different industries, each centering in a particular medium. Because of limited resources, the studies will have to be done serially, and thus, spread over time. Currently, we are looking at certain types of magazines, books, and newspapers; movies are scheduled for the fall.

The mail order business in erotic or sexual materials is also currently under study. The study is being coordinated with the Post Office Department, and will complement its activities and provide independent estimates of volume. Questions concerning the use and abuse of mailing lists for unsolicited advertising of erotic materials are of high priority in the mail studies.

Estimates of the volume of traffic in erotic materials provided by the studies of distributors will be compared with independent estimates based on studies of potential customers. A national sample survey is being planned to determine the general public's experience with erotic materials. The survey is being designed to produce information about how much exposure, under what circumstances, various kinds of people have had to different kinds of erotic stimuli. This survey, scheduled for the fall, will not only provide independent estimates of the gross volume of erotic materials, but also crucial empirical data about patterns of distribution to the eventual consumers.

Two research projects currently under way are closely related to this issue of patterns of exposure: One is a study of the experience of college students with erotic materials, and the other is a feasibility study to see if this information can be obtained from high school students. The results from these studies are expected in the summer and will provide much needed information about the extent to which and the channels by which young people are exposed to erotic materials.

Another vital question in the realm of patterns of distribution is "Who are the large scale consumers of erotic materials—the regular customers?" The staff is designing a research project, which is to be carried out next fall, that will provide information about the characteristics of the habitual consumer of erotic materials, the functions of such materials for these people, and how they came to be involved with erotic materials.

EFFECTS

The assignment to study the effects of obscene and pornographic materials on the public, and in particular on minors, is the most complicated of the Commission's technical tasks. The study of cause and effect relationships in any area is difficult enough; in the area of pornography and minors it is even more so. Some of the problems are: (1) the variety of stimulus materials that may be of concern; (2) the variety of supposed consequences of exposures; (3) isolating the effects of exposure from the effects of other influences; and (4) the sensitivity of research and inquiry in the sexual realm.

One of the first activities of the Commission was to review the existing social and behavioral science literature relevant to its tasks. A review of this literature published in 1962 reached the following conclusions: (1) there was only meager research available at that time and much of it was open to criticism on methodological grounds; (2) the

reported empirical research related to "immediate, transient responses," and there was as yet no empirical evidence to answer the questions "how long the conditions of arousal last and how this stimulation might affect overt behavior, attitudes governing behavior and mental health." Cairns, Paul & Wishner, *Sex Censorship: The Assumptions of Anti-Obscenity Laws and the Empirical Evidence*, 46 Minn. L. Rev. 1009, 1032, 1034 (1962). A Commission-conducted review of the literature published in the years 1960-1968 reveals that the situation is not changed substantially in the 7-year period since that previous review.

The Commission has only limited resources and limited time, and recognizes that it cannot completely remedy this absence of information. Nevertheless, the study of effects is one of the Commission's principal tasks, and the Commission believes that in the time available it can provide helpful scientific information to guide legislative judgments, even though the answers may be tentative. Because of our almost complete empirical ignorance in the area of effects, even tentative answers should have a value.

The panel has established a series of research goals: (1) to ascertain the relationship between use of erotic material and sexual and nonsexual behavior; (2) to ascertain the relationship between use of erotic materials and attitudes toward sex, moral outlook regarding sex, and standards of conduct in sex; (3) to ascertain the relationship between cumulative exposure over time to erotic materials and arousal and interest in such materials; (4) to ascertain the relationship between exposure to erotic materials and general social attitudes and ideas; and (5) to ascertain the relationship between exposure to or use of erotic materials and mental health or psychopathology.

The panel has defined several methods of research that should contribute to the achieving of these goals: (1) survey research with national samples of persons; (2) intensive, "clinical" research on selected populations of persons (e.g., comparison of sex offenders or juvenile delinquents with non-offenders in terms of history of experience with erotic materials); (3) studies of incidence and rates at the community level (e.g., to study the relationship between the amount of erotic material sold and the number of sex crimes in a sample of cities with differing characteristics); (4) experimental studies (e.g., rating the degree of offensiveness of erotic stimuli presented in a controlled laboratory situation); and (5) international comparative studies.

The panel has also agreed upon a strategy for implementing the research program in the Commission situation of limited funds at present, uncertainty regarding the total amount of funds to be available, and limited time. The strategy adopted is to work first on the creation of relatively standardized research instruments to be used in the survey and clinical (quasi-experimental) research, the identification of specific research situations, and exploratory feasibility studies, and to postpone large commitments to data gathering activities. Thus, we will be able to move rapidly into the data collection phase as soon as funds are available in FY '70.

A consequence of the necessity for relying on this two-phase research strategy is that much of the information regarding effects will not be available until near the end of the Commission's tenure. The results of these studies will be scheduled to be reported to the Commission in the spring of 1970 and will thus be available for the Commission to consider in making its recommendations and for inclusion in its final report.

Examples of exploratory and feasibility studies that are currently underway are: (1) the relationship between availability of

pornography and sex crimes; (2) the consequences of exposure to erotic materials among college students; (3) the judgments by adults of the degree of intensity of various erotic stimuli; (4) the cumulative effects of large scale exposure to erotic materials, i.e., satiation or increased appetite; (5) adolescents' reports of the effects of erotic stimuli they have encountered in the "ordinary course of events"; and (6) potentially erotic stimuli associated with the dating experience of junior college girls and of unwed pregnant high school girls.

The Commission has also let contracts for the development and pretesting of an adult survey research instrument, a clinical interview procedure, a test of moral reasoning regarding sex, and a high school interview instrument.

POSITIVE APPROACHES

The purpose of the Positive Approaches Panel is to explore and evaluate alternatives to legislative controls. The importance of this direction of inquiry has recently been pointed up by President Nixon, "The ultimate answer lies not with the government but with the people. Government can maintain the dikes against obscenity, but only people can turn back the tide." The panel is focusing on four types of alternatives: sex information programs, programs to encourage good reading by children, industry self-regulation, and citizen action groups.

A number of studies have shown that adolescents are generally characterized by a combination of strong curiosity about sex and a wealth of misinformation about the subject. Adolescents report that the principal source of sex information is their peers. Parents, church, and school are almost insignificant as sources of information in this area. The panel is investigating two central questions regarding sex information: (1) whether the availability to children of sex information in the home, school, or church prevents an obsessive interest in obscene and pornographic materials; and (2) whether sex education in the home, church, or other institutions prevents potentially harmful effects of later exposure to obscene and pornographic materials. These questions can be tested by empirical research. One feasibility study in this area is underway. We are conducting a number of discussions trying to identify further appropriate research settings to inquire into these questions.

The panel is exploring the possibility of testing whether programs to encourage the reading of good books may serve as an alternative to interest in obscene materials.

Most of the mass media industries have promulgated codes that supply guidelines to the members of the industry in fulfilling their responsibilities to the society and the public, and these codes often contain sections dealing with erotic stimuli. The effectiveness of these industry self-regulating attempts is a much debated issue. The panel desires not only to analyze the provisions of such codes, but also to examine their effectiveness. The recently instituted movie-rating system of the motion picture industry offers an opportunity to study the operation of such an attempt at industry self-regulation. The Commission has contracted for an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the new movie-rating system with an emphasis on the questions of the validity of the ratings and the enforcement of the admission standards regarding minors.

Citizen action groups may perform many functions relating to the control of erotic materials within a community. These ad hoc groups arise in a variety of circumstances, manifest a variety of organizational structures, achieve a variety of specific aims, and maintain viable existences for variable periods. No one, however, has attempted to

describe the social dynamics of their emergence and operations; and no general statements, based on observation and analysis, can be made regarding them. Several ad hoc citizen groups have indicated to the Commission a desire to cooperate with the Commission and to be studied as a case history. The panel has initiated one research contract to investigate the feasibility of such studies. The complete results are not yet in, but the preliminary reports indicate that a valuable contribution will result. A second research site is now being explored as a possibility for a second case history as a test of the generalizability of the tentative description of the social dynamics of such groups.

CONCLUSIONS

This brief description of the current status of the Commission's work indicates the many specific tasks being undertaken to fulfill its assignments: to analyze the legal problems and develop useful definitions; to ascertain volume of traffic and patterns of distribution; to study effects; and to recommend action. The presentation does not adequately reflect the degree of integration among the work of the various panels. The work of the various panels is intentionally coordinated, however, and one research project often serves several of the panels and several goals simultaneously.

One example of the integration of the work of the several panels may be found in the instance of the national survey. The Legal Panel requires information on community standards. The Traffic Panel requires information on how many people have been exposed to what kinds of material. The Effects Panel requires information on behavioral and attitudinal correlates of exposure to erotic materials. These three different information requirements are joined together in a single research project—a national sample survey.

Congress assigned to the Commission a tremendous task that is complicated by the primitive state of knowledge in this very complex area. The Commission feels that it is making progress in its program to remedy this lack of information. The direction of our studies will continue to be flexible as we seek the best means of securing the information needed for the recommendations requested by Congress. Although the Commission cannot exhaust the studies that need to be made in this huge and difficult area within the limited time and funds available, the Commission believes it will be able to make significant contributions by the summer of 1970 when it plans to make its report and recommendations in accordance with the assigned deadline.

All members of the Commission concur in the foregoing Progress Report as accurately reflecting the Commission's activities. A separate Statement by Commissioner Morton A. Hill will be attached, together with a brief response by the other members of the Commission.

Report Approved June 5, 1969.

WILLIAM B. LOCKHART,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A

COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY CHAIRMAN

William B. Lockhart, dean, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

MEMBERS

Edward E. Elson, President, Atlanta News Agency, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

Thomas D. Gill, Chief Judge, Juvenile Court for the State of Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut.

Edward D. Greenwood, Chief Psychiatrist, The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas.

Morton A. Hill, S.J., President, Morality in Media, New York, New York.

G. William Jones, Assistant Professor of Broadcast-Film Art, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Kenneth B. Keating,¹ Judge, New York Court of Appeals, Rochester, New York.

Joseph T. Klapper, Director, Office of Social Research, Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, New York.

Otto N. Larsen, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Irving Lehrman, Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, Miami Beach, Florida.

Freeman Lewis, Vice President, Publishing, Simon & Schuster, Inc., New York, New York.

Winfrey C. Link, Tennessee Annual Conference, Methodist Church, Hermitage, Tennessee.

Morris A. Lipton, Professor of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina Medical School, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General, California, Sacramento, California.

Barbara Scott, Attorney, Motion Picture Association of America, New York, New York.

Mrs. Cathryn A. Spelts, Instructor in English, South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, South Dakota.

Frederick H. Wagman (Vice Chairman), Director, University Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX B

COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY PROFESSIONAL STAFF

W. Cody Wilson, Ph. D., Executive Director (August 1968), Social Psychologist.

Paul Bender, LL.B., General Counsel (August 1968), Lawyer.

Jane M. Friedman, LL.B. (January 1969), Lawyer.

Karen I. Green, M.A. (October 1969), Clinical Psychologist.

Bernard Horowitz, Ph. D. (September 1968), Educational Psychologist.

Weldon T. Johnson, Ph. D. (June 1969), Sociologist.

Lenore R. Kupperstein, M.A. (May 1969), Criminologist.

John J. Sampson, LL.B. (June 1969), Lawyer.

Virginia P. Banister (August 1969), Administrative Officer.

SECRETARIAL AND CLERICAL STAFF

Alfred S. Carter, Kathy I. Diester, Dorothy A. Gooding, Muriel L. Montgomery, Anna M. Zerega.

APPENDIX C

TENTATIVE DRAFT OF STATUTE REGULATING UN- SOLICITED MAILINGS OF POTENTIALLY OFFEN- SIVE MATERIALS

The following tentative draft of possible legislation regarding the unsolicited mailings of potentially offensive sexual materials is presented only as an example of the Legal Panel's work in exploring the problems of drafting effective legislation to regulate the flow of traffic in erotic materials without in any way interfering with constitutional rights, as directed by Congress. This experiment in drafting legislation has been extremely instructive to the Commission and the result may be helpful to others who are struggling with similar issues. Whether this draft will ultimately emerge as a specific

¹ After approval of the Progress Report, Judge Keating resigned from the Commission to become U.S. Ambassador to India.

recommendation of the Commission must, of course, await the completion of the studies designed to bring the total problem into as accurate focus as possible. The definition it contains of "offensive sexual material" should not be misread as the Commission's attempt to define the "obscene" or the "pornographic."

TITLE—UNSOLICITED MAILING OF POTENTIALLY OFFENSIVE MATERIAL

(a) *Purpose*—It is the purpose of this section to afford mail recipients the option not to receive through the mail unsolicited potentially offensive sexual materials.

(b) *Requirement of Symbol*—Every person who, for himself or by his agents, mails or causes to be mailed potentially offensive sexual material, as defined in subsection (h) herein, to an addressee or addressees who have not expressly requested receipt of the mailed material from the sender, shall place a symbol upon the envelope or outer wrapping thereof. The form, placement, size and other attributes of the required symbol, and the effective date of the requirement of this subsection, shall be set forth in regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General of the United States: *Provided that* (1) the regulations shall not, insofar as possible, require significant extra expense to be incurred by persons subject thereto in order to comply with their requirements, nor shall the symbol prescribed under this subsection contain language or signs indicating a judgment regarding the quality or value of the materials to which it is required to be affixed, and, (2) the regulations shall not require compliance therewith sooner than 90 days after publication of such regulations both in the Federal Register and by the posting thereof at all United States Post Offices.

(c) *Publication of Symbol and Return of Mail*—The Postmaster General shall take suitable steps to acquaint the public with the symbol required by subsection (b) with the definition of potentially offensive material contained in subsection (h) of this section. Any person who receives mail bearing the symbol required by subsection (b) of this section, and who does not wish to open such mail, may either destroy it or mark it "refused," in which case he may redeliver it to the Post Office from which delivery was made, where it shall be destroyed. The right of destruction or refusal under this subsection may be made by a parent or guardian on behalf of his or her minor children who reside with the parent or guardian.

(d) *Exercise of Option by Mail Recipients*—Every person who wishes not to receive unsolicited mailings of any potentially offensive sexual materials, as defined in subsection (h) herein, may so notify the Postmaster General on a form provided by the Postmaster for that purpose. Such forms, which shall contain the definition of potentially offensive sexual materials set forth in subsection (h) of this section, shall be made available to the public at every United States Post Office and shall be deliverable to the Postmaster through any Post Office. A notification under this subsection may be made by a parent or guardian on behalf of his or her minor children who reside with the parent or guardian and, when expressly authorized by them to do so, a person may give such notice on behalf of other adults receiving mail at the same mail address. The Postmaster General shall take suitable steps to inform mail recipients of their option under this subsection.

(e) *Revocation of Exercise of Option*—Any person who, having notified the Postmaster General pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, wishes to revoke that notification, may do so on a form provided by the Postmaster General for that purpose. Such forms shall be made available to the public at every

United States Post Office and shall be deliverable to the Postmaster through any Post Office. The Postmaster General may, by regulation, prescribe a reasonable period of time before such revocation shall become effective and the Postmaster may further provide, by regulation, reasonable restrictions upon the frequency with which the powers conferred upon mail addressees by subsections (d) and (e) of this section may be alternatively exercised.

(f) *Non-Delivery of Mail Carrying Symbol to Persons Exercising Option*—The Postmaster General shall, after enactment of this section, devise and implement procedures to prevent the delivery of mail bearing the symbol required by subsection (b) of this section to persons who notify him pursuant to subsection (d) of this section; *Provided that*, if practical considerations so require the Postmaster may restrict the application of such procedures to mail addresses where the option under subsection (d) of this section has been exercised by or on behalf of all persons residing at that address.

(g) *Penalties*—Whoever violates the requirement of subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to pay a fine of not more than \$1,000, if the violation consists of the mailing of unsolicited material without the required symbol to no more than 25 addressees, or to pay a fine of not more than \$50,000, if the violation consists of the contemporaneous mailing of unsolicited material without the required symbol to more than 25 addressees.

(h) *Definition*—For the purposes of this section:

(1) Person means natural person, corporation or other legal entity;

(2) Potentially offensive sexual material means:

(A) Any pictorial representation, photographic or otherwise, of uncovered adult human genitalia or pubic areas, of human sexual intercourse, sodomy, masturbation, or direct physical stimulation of clothed or unclothed genitalia, or of flagellation or torture indicating an erotic relationship, or any description, advertisement or offer to sell such pictorial material where such description or advertisement presents an excerpt or excerpts from or a detailed verbal description of such material; or

(B) Any artificial human penis or vagina or device primarily designed physically to stimulate genitalia, or any description, advertisement or offer to sell or distribute such an artificial organ or device where such description or advertisement presents either a pictorial representation or a detailed verbal description of such organ or device or its manner of use; or

(C) Any pictorial or verbal material consisting primarily of instructions in or depictions of human sexual techniques or of detailed fictional or factual descriptions or depictions of human sexual practices, or any description, advertisement or offer to sell or distribute such materials, where such advertisement or description presents an excerpt or excerpts from such material incorporating detailed descriptions or depictions of sexual techniques or practices or presents a summary of the contents of the material describing in detail its treatment of sexual techniques or practices;

Provided that, material otherwise within the definition of this subsection shall not be deemed to be potentially offensive sexual material if it constitutes only a small and insignificant part of the whole of a single catalogue, book or other work the remainder of which does not primarily treat sexual matters and, *provided further*, that the Postmaster General shall, from time to time, issue regulations of general applicability exempting certain types of material, or material addressed to certain categories of addressees,

such as advertisements for works of fine art or solicitations of a medical, scientific or other similar nature addressed to a specialized audience, from the definition of potentially offensive sexual material contained in this subsection, where the purpose of this section does not call for application of the requirements of this section.

(i) *Prohibition Upon Use of Symbol in Prosecution*. The compliance by any person with the requirement of subsection (b) of this section shall not be used against him, either as evidence of his violation of laws pertaining to obscenity or related matters or as a reason for initiating or pursuing any investigation of him for violations of such laws, or in any other manner whatsoever. The prohibition of this subsection shall be applicable to all law enforcement officers and all proceedings within the United States, whether federal, state or local.

COMMENTARY

This statute would be designed to cope with the problem of the use of the Federal mails to engage in unsolicited distributions of explicit sexual material—almost always in the form of advertisements for the mail order sale of such material—which distributions may cause serious offense to recipients who do not wish to be exposed to such matter. This is one of the principal obscenity problems presently falling within Federal jurisdiction. The statute would be a supplement to the recently enacted Federal Anti-Pandering Act, 39 U.S.C. 4009, which permits persons who have once received unwanted sexual advertising material in the mail to have their names removed from the mailing lists of the mailer responsible for the offending material. The Anti-Pandering Act, as noted, comes into play only after an offending mailing has been received, and it applies only to prevent future mailings flowing from the source of the prior offending material. There were well over 100,000 complaints under the Act during its first year of operation. (The Act became operative on April 14, 1968.) The present proposal would go further than the Anti-Pandering Act in protecting postal patrons, since it would screen them from unwanted material regardless of whether they had previously received material from the source involved, thus attacking the sizable problem of initial offense mailings.

The basic aim of the statute is to use Federal power to permit persons to choose what sexual material they wish to receive through the mail. The regulatory technique used is that of a Federal labelling requirement, placed upon the mailer of material which comes within the definitional subsection of the statute. The definitions describe the sexual material capable of causing significant offense when received through the mail by persons who do not wish it. The labelling requirement thus imposed is enforced through Federal criminal penalties. A structure is then created whereby mail recipients may decline to receive and be exposed to labelled potentially offensive material if they so choose, and the Postmaster is further directed to establish procedures to prevent such material from being delivered to those who do not wish it. Labelled material may, at the same time, be freely distributed to other persons who do not exercise their option not to receive such mail. The statute would then avoid impinging upon the constitutional rights of those who consent to receive sexual material and the rights of those who wish to send material to such consenting persons, while it fully protects the interest of many persons not to be exposed to such material through the mail.

This statute would establish procedures by which local community action groups

would greatly diminish receipt of unsolicited mailings of offensive sex materials through concerted drives informing local residents of their rights under the statute and distributing the requisite forms for signatures.

Subsection (a) of the proposal states its purpose. Subsection (b) imposes the labelling requirement upon mailers of explicit sexual material which falls within the definitional provision of subsection (h) of the statute. The labelling requirement applies only to unsolicited material; it would not apply, for example, to magazines distributed to subscribers or to material distributed upon receipt of an order. The core of the material to which it would apply is that sent out as mail advertisements to persons whose names appear upon lists, which are ordinarily "rented" by the mail order house from mailing list brokers. As a consequence of this commerce in lists of names, persons who belong to certain organizations, who subscribe to certain publications, or who appear in other compilations—such as a compilation of licensed automobile drivers—may be solicited to buy explicit sexual material because pre-testing of the list on which they appear by the mail order house indicates to it that a profit is to be made through solicitation of all persons on the list. Persons may thus be exposed to sexual material coming into their homes because of some wholly sex-unrelated activity of theirs which has resulted in their names being placed upon a list: These are the recipients of mail for whose benefit the present statute is designed.

Subsection (b) does not itself prescribe the label which its terms require, but leaves this prescription to the Postmaster General, since the exact content and form of the label may need to depend upon the procedures to be devised by the Postmaster, under subsection (f) of the statute, for preventing the delivery of labelled mail to those who do not wish it. Subsection (b) does require, however, that the Postmaster's decision as to the content and placement of the label not cause undue expense nor require mailers to label their material with a symbol expressing any judgment as to the quality or suitability of the material. By this latter provision, it is hoped to prevent the required label from being used for pandering purposes.

Subsection (c) provides for self-enforcement of the purpose of the Section by giving mail recipients the option to refuse or destroy individual pieces of mail which are labelled in accordance with subsection (b). The concept of self enforcement includes the right of a parent to make the decision to return or destroy mail on behalf of minor children living with the parent.

Subsections (d), (e), and (f) provide an additional means of enforcement to that authorized by subsection (c). A mail recipient may "opt out" of receiving all mail which bears the label required by subsection (b), by requesting the Postmaster not to deliver such mail to him; a parent or guardian may, as in subsection (c), make this decision on behalf of a minor child residing in the home. These provisions for Post Office enforcement are included in the draft—in addition to the self-enforcement procedures of subsection (c)—largely in response to the problem created by children in the home. Where there are such children, it may not be a satisfactory solution to parents, who do not wish their children to see the material covered by the statute, to provide for self-enforcement within the home, since the children may have unsupervised access to mail deliveries. In addition, there may be thought to be social value in permitting persons who object to the receipt of explicit sexual material the option not to be confronted with such material directly, even in the form of an unopened envelope indicating, but not openly displaying its sexual content.

Subsection (g) provides the penalty to be imposed for violations of the labelling requirement. This penalty is the key to the effective operation of the statute. Its deterrent effect is the means of compelling persons who mail unsolicited material to affix the label which permits the enforcement procedures of subsections (c) through (f) to be operative.

The definition of potentially offensive sexual material set forth in paragraph (i) of subsection (h) was constructed after examination of a large range of material which has recently given rise to complaints to the Post Office Department both generally and under the recent Anti-Pandering Act. Each of the three parts of paragraph (i) responds to a class of material productive of a substantial number of complaints; in each case an attempt was made to require a label not only for the precise type of material now being distributed through unsolicited mail campaigns, but also to require the label for similar types of material which might be distributed in the future and which would have the same potentiality to cause offense. Subparagraph (A) deals with pictorial material; subparagraph (B) with sexual "devices;" and subparagraph (C) with marriage manuals, sex novels and stories, and anthropological sexual accounts and similar material which may be exclusively textual or combine pictures with text. Each subparagraph applies to the complete material itself as well as to certain advertisements for that material. (It is probable that most and perhaps all of the actual application of the definitions will be to advertising material, since unsolicited mailings are ordinarily advertisements which do not usually contain a full sample of what is being offered.) Not all advertisements for material which would require a label are subjected to the labelling requirement; for the advertisement must itself contain offensive matter beyond the fact that it offers offensive matter for sale. Thus, a bland "tombstone" type advertisement for a nudist publication or a marriage manual, which merely sets forth the fact that such a publication is offered, without presenting excerpts from the offered material or detailed descriptions thereof capable of causing affront, would not require a label.

The proviso paragraph to subsection (h) makes two classes of exemptions—for matter which constitutes such a small part of a whole work, not generally sexual in nature, that its inclusion in the work would not be capable of causing significant offense, and for material exempted by general regulation of the Postmaster from the requirements of the section because the language, but not the purpose of the section is applicable to such material. The Postmaster is given the power to act to grant exemptions only with regard to general classes of material; not to particular mailings by specific mailers. Thus, he does not act as an arbiter about changes to be made in particular direct mail solicitation campaigns. This rule making power would be subject to the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Subsection (i) prohibits compliance with the section from being used against a person so complying. An absolute immunity from all prosecution is not accorded to persons who comply with the labelling requirements, since such persons may, despite their compliance, violate other laws prohibiting the distribution of "obscene" material. However, fairness and, perhaps, the requirements of the self-incrimination clause of the Fifth Amendment, would seem to require that the fact of compliance with the labelling requirement of this statute should not itself subject a person to an increased likelihood of prosecution as compared with persons who refuse or omit to comply with the labelling requirement.

SEPARATE REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER MORTON A. HILL, S.J.

The foregoing report accurately and appropriately states that the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography has no recommendations to make at this time. It also states that it relates the directions in which the Commission is moving.

The report is not complete, however, because it does not record the vigorous dissent of Commissioner Hill, precisely on the subject of the direction in which the Commission is moving. It is becoming an "effects" commission, and this is not what the Congress intended.

Public Law 90-100 states, as reported here, "after a thorough study, which shall include a study of the causal relationship of such materials to anti-social behavior, to recommend advisable, appropriate, effective and constitutional means to deal effectively with such traffic in obscenity and pornography." Congress did not intend that the study of effects be the principal task of this Commission, and that all recommendations be contingent upon the results of this study. Congress did not mandate us to prove that there must be a "clear and present danger" of anti-social behavior before we make recommendations. Congress is concerned about the traffic in obscenity and pornography. Effects studies are only one of the tasks of the Commission.

Even a cursory examination of the foregoing report, and the amount of space devoted to the section on effects, as compared to other areas, indicates that the greatest proportion of the Commission's efforts is being expended on effects studies. The major portion of funds allocated to contract studies will be channeled into effects studies.

Now, behavioral scientists who have worked in this area concede that causal relationship is extremely difficult, if not impossible to prove.

If the Commission continues in the direction in which it is going, i.e., expending the major portion of effort and funds on effects studies and making recommendations contingent on these studies, it will come full circle, and the traffic in obscenity will continue to flow. It must be repeated: this is not what Congress intended.

Legal research is suffering because of the over-emphasis on effects studies. For example:

(1) The foregoing report states that obscenity statutes of the Federal Government and of the fifty (50) states have been assembled and are under review.

Congress mandated that analysis of these laws and evaluation and recommendation of definitions be carried out with the aid of "leading constitutional law authorities." To my knowledge no "leading constitutional law authority" has been hired. In fact, the phrase itself was omitted, in the listing of Commission duties, from every draft of the foregoing report, including the final draft which was approved by the Commission on June 5. It was inserted as a "stylistic change," after these separate remarks were presented, at or after a subcommittee meeting convened June 23.

(2) The nagging problem of "utterly without redeeming social value" should be analyzed and studied. I maintain that this is not a constitutional standard, since it was the opinion of merely three justices and not of the Court majority. Yet, it is being applied in lower courts as a test and being adopted into the language of state statutes.

This is open to serious study, for this "utterly without redeeming social value" so-called "test" has led to an enormous increase in the traffic in pornography in all media. This question is not being thoroughly studied, and after six weeks of debate was included incidentally in the questionnaire

to prosecutors. An oral commentary on the issue, delivered by a staff member at a legal panel meeting after my request for study, was based on the incorrect proposition that "utterly without redeeming social value" is a constitutional decision of the Court. I repeat, it is simply the opinion of three justices. Thorough analysis of this issue could lead to a re-definition of obscenity. However, the decision was made that re-definition should await "the outcome of our effects research."

(3) Reported "descriptive" reviews of activities of Post Office and Customs Departments are in actuality editorial-type articles written in law review article style, somewhat critical of both departments, and so of little objective assistance.

(4) In the area of traffic and distribution, which is a matter of intensive investigations as well as academic research: to my knowledge no investigators have been hired. One lawyer has joined the staff to work in this area.

(5) Public hearings have not been planned. Hearings would be invaluable, in the ascertainment of methods of distribution as well as in the ascertainment of community standards for legal research.

In general, I believe the foregoing report could be misleading, for it leaves the public with the impression that programs initiated are geared toward resolving the problem of the traffic in obscenity. A careful reading will show quite clearly that there is no program pointing in the direction of regulating this traffic. Of the three directions for additional effective legislative action pointed to, those dealing with obscene material and the adult community are in the areas of pandering and invasion of privacy. (Item (2) above makes one wonder if we are leaving open the possibility of other types of legislation). In other words, under the present chairmanship, the Commission appears to be moving toward permitting obscenity for adults, and therefore, will not provide constitutional "means to deal effectively with such traffic in obscenity and pornography." How can children be prevented from exposure if this situation prevails? With this in mind, I make the following recommendations:

1. That each commissioner, under the direction of the Chairman, with the aid of staff, undertake a personal content analysis of one area of obscene material, so that the entire Commission will be aware of the rapidly changing situation. The expertise of commissioners has not been adequately utilized in this area, and this could perhaps lead to re-definition.

2. That the Commission cut back on contract research into effects, and allocate—over and above staff and expenses—one-third of its appropriation to legal research, one-third to research and investigation into traffic and distribution and one-third into effects.

3. That the Commission retain leading constitutional law authorities to guide us as to how we can constitutionally present legislation to Congress which will reverse the mislabeled Supreme Court "test" of "utterly without redeeming social value." *Roth* is the only case (except for the recent *Stanley v. Georgia* decision on the invasion of privacy) in which a majority of the Supreme Court agreed. In that case, the Court said:

"The unconditional phrasing of the First Amendment was not intended to protect every utterance . . . All ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance have the full protection of the guarantee . . . but implicit in the First Amendment is the rejection of obscenity as utterly without redeeming social importance. This rejection for that reason is mirrored in the universal judgment that obscenity should be restrained, reflected in the international agreement of all 48 states, and in the 20 obscenity

laws enacted by the Congress from 1842 to 1956. This is the same judgment expressed by this Court in *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*. . . There are certain well-defined and narrowly limited classes of speech, the prevention and punishment of which have never been thought to raise any constitutional problem. These include the lewd and obscene . . . such utterances . . . are of such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality . . . We hold that obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press . . . The test (is): whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to the prurient interest."

Justice Clark, in a dissenting opinion in *Fanny Hill*, called the "utterly without redeeming social value" so-called "test" novel and noted that only three members of the Court held to it. He maintained that it rejects the basic holding of *Roth*.

4. That the Commission plan public hearings to assist in ascertaining methods employed in the distribution of obscene materials and exploring the nature and value of traffic; and, in ascertaining from the American public themselves, what community standards are.

5. That the Commission work diligently to recommend definitions of obscenity and pornography, as mandated by Congress in creating this Commission; noting particularly, that we are not restricted to the opinions of individual members of the Supreme Court, which are mistakenly called tests.

6. That the Commission work to recommend legislation when the above have been completed—not awaiting the results of effect studies which will be admittedly incomplete, undoubtedly inconclusive, and unnecessary under the *Roth* decision. In the matter of effects, the Court said in *Roth*:

"It is insisted that the constitutional guarantees are violated because convictions may be had without proof either that obscene material will perceptibly create a clear and present danger of anti-social conduct, or will probably induce its recipients to such conduct. But, in light of our holding that obscenity is not protected speech, the complete answer to this argument is in the holding of this Court in *Beauharnais v. Illinois*. . . Libelous utterances not being within the area of constitutionally protected speech, it is unnecessary, either for us or from the State Courts, to consider the issues behind the phrase 'clear and present danger.' Certainly no one would contend that obscene speech, for example, may be punished only upon a showing of such circumstances."

7. That the Commission move more practically to fulfill our mandate to "recommend such legislative, administrative, or other advisable and appropriate action . . . to regulate effectively the flow of such traffic, without in any way interfering with constitutional rights."

Failing action on these recommendations, it is difficult to see how the Commission, under its present leadership, can produce the results Congress intended. If the Commission continues in the direction in which it is now moving, it will simply propose laws on pandering, invasion of privacy and sales to minors. Congress does not need a Commission to recommend legislation of this sort. Such limited proposals will not "regulate effectively the flow of such traffic."

RESPONSE TO SEPARATE REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER MORTON A. HILL

All members of the Commission, other than Commissioner Hill, join in the following response to Commissioner Hill's Separate Remarks:

1. The study into the effects of obscene and pornographic material is only one of the four principal areas of study undertaken by the Commission. The Progress Report reflects the broad, inclusive scope of the Commission's studies into the various areas of inquiry directed by Congress. In order to carry out the research and study program outlined in the Progress Report, we estimate that the expenditures among the four principal areas for both staff work and contract research will be approximately as follows:

[In percent]	
Effects	40
Traffic and distribution	25
Positive approaches	20
Legal	15

This relative allocation of funds was given to the Congress at the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on the Commission's 1970 budget. These estimates do not reflect judgments as to relative importance, but variations in the costs of different kinds of investigation, research and study. Social science research into such matters as effects and some aspects of traffic and distribution is far more expensive than study of legal problems.

2. As with all Commission concerns with controversial topics, there have been healthy differences of opinion among the Commissioners concerning the major thrust of the Commission's activities and the priorities of our efforts. But the Commission has achieved the results reported in the foregoing Progress Report by careful consideration and nearly always without dissenting vote. The future direction of our studies will continue to be flexible as we seek the best means of securing the information needed for the final report. As changes are made in research plans, some changes in the estimated expenditures in the various areas of study and research will necessarily occur.

3. Commissioner Hill's statement that the "Commission appears to be moving toward permitting obscenity for adults" is a dissent as to our procedure and not a fair report as to our intent or future actions. The Commission will consider adult obscenity legislation, along with all other aspects of control over traffic and distribution in obscenity, when the studies directed by Congress have progressed to the point where such consideration is appropriate. To attempt to form judgments on this and other questions at this time would be premature and inconsistent with the Congressional directive to make recommendations "after a thorough study."

4. At its November 8, 1968, meeting the Commission unanimously concluded that in the first stage of its work public hearings would not be a likely source of accurate data or a wise expenditure of its limited resources. It concluded that other methods of ascertaining the facts concerning traffic and distribution and community standards would be less expensive and more productive. In addition to the research outlined in the Progress Report, national organizations are being invited to express their views on the problems of obscenity and pornography by submitting written statements. The Commission has directed the solicitation of views from those involved in law enforcement, from the legal profession generally, and from constitutional law experts. The Commission has left open the possibility of holding public hearings at a later date when it would be possible to invite witnesses to focus on particular issues and proposals as those evolve from the Commission's studies and discussions.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward E. Elson, Thomas D. Gill, Edward D. Greenwood, G. William Jones, Joseph T. Klapper, Otto N. Larsen, Irving Lehrman, Freeman Lewis, Winfrey

C. Link, Morris A. Lipton, William B. Lockhart, Thomas C. Lynch, Barbara Scott, Cathryn A. Spelts, Frederick H. Wagman, Marvin E. Wolfgang.

OPINION OF CONSTITUENTS ON NATIONAL ISSUES

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in the House, I have each year asked my constituents for their opinions on national issues. This has been done in the form of a public opinion poll. This year, over 9,000 people responded to 18 questions of vital importance to the Nation's well-being.

These surveys have been of great value in assessing the opinions of my constituents and the path they would like to see the country travel. In thousands of instances where people felt a categorical "yes" or "no" was inadequate, they troubled themselves to explain their sentiments in a paragraph or letter. This was extremely useful to me because in many cases this was the first opportunity I have had to communicate with many of the residents of my new district.

On August 13, a total of 9,747 had been returned to me. The present tabulation is based upon these expressions of opinion.

As in previous years, the war in Vietnam continues to be the most pressing problem facing our people. Of those responding to the questions, 51.08 percent agree to the continued presence of American troops in Vietnam. However, from the letters I have received on this matter, I believe this percentage also is an expression of the continued frustration of our people about this conflict and their desire to have it brought to an honorable end as soon as possible. Coupled with support for the President's anti-ballistic-missile proposal, it is clear that my constituents, while willing to support military programs which will continue to keep our Nation's defenses strong, clearly do not want another Vietnam.

Expressions were also divided about the question of ending the draft and replacing it with an all-volunteer Army. No doubt, once the Vietnam conflict is concluded, the public will be able to express its wishes more definitely.

Concerning Federal assistance to people covered by social security, feelings are strong that the benefits should be made more realistic so as to reflect the recent increases in living and medical costs. Especially concerned about this question were the older citizens with limited or fixed incomes. An overwhelming 81.18 percent favored extending medicare assistance to those people under 65 who are permanently and totally disabled.

Federal programs to alleviate hunger and malnutrition received general support, although, on a somewhat related question, a slightly higher percent of those responding felt the present anti-poverty program should be reorganized.

It would seem that my constituents support well-planned, properly executed Federal assistance programs.

On the question of the surtax, 65.96 percent opposed its continuation, while 26.42 percent favored it, with 7.61 percent undecided. Since this question was proposed, however, the House has passed a modified bill calling for the gradual phasing out of the surtax. This bill, coupled with the Tax Reform Act of 1969, hopefully will correct all financial problems that are a major concern of the people of the 10th District.

This year, as last year, strong support for direct popular election of the President and Vice President was indicated. The same is the case for the proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation. At a time when the Post Office is handling an increasing volume of mail, the public is becoming aware of the need for reorganization in order to make the Post Office self-sufficient and to improve its efficiency.

Reflecting their continued concern about campus disorders, an overwhelming 95.83 percent favor denying Federal funds to students actively engaged in campus violence. Most feel, however, that care should be exercised so that students not taking part in such activities are not penalized. This was, of course, done in the recently passed Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

Crime in the streets and the individual's awareness of its increase is no doubt reflected by the 71.51 percent support of an additional \$25 million appropriation to fight organized crime. Continued support was given for law enforcement and active cooperation between all levels of government to assure protection of life and property during disorders. As a curb against the rise in violent criminal acts, 88.49 percent support mandatory jail sentences when a firearm is used in committing a Federal crime. Only 8.70 percent oppose the proposal.

The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you believe that the United States should withdraw its troops from South Vietnam now?	35.96	51.08	12.97
2. Should the Federal Government assume a greater share of the cost of public welfare from the States and local communities?	24.73	67.18	8.09
3. Are you in favor of a proposed constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18?	41.24	55.61	3.15
4. Should the present antipoverty program be retained?	19.74	66.93	13.34
5. Would you support a law requiring an additional and mandatory jail sentence when a firearm is used in committing a Federal crime?	88.49	8.70	2.81
6. Should the Post Office Department be made a government-owned corporation and operate on a self-supporting basis?	71.82	17.04	11.14
7. Do you believe Federal funds should be denied to students actively engaging in violence and unlawful campus disorders?	95.83	3.47	7.70

	Yes	No	Undecided
8. Viewing the economy as it now stands, do you favor renewing the 10 percent surtax when it expires on June 30?	26.42	65.96	7.61
9. Should the District of Columbia be granted full home rule and representation in the House of Representatives?	41.74	39.25	19.00
10. Do you believe that the electoral college should be abolished and that we should elect our Presidents and Vice Presidents by direct popular vote?	77.54	16.54	5.92
11. Should social security benefits be increased to reflect increases in the cost of living even though it means increases in social security taxes?	59.84	33.18	6.98
12. Do you favor ending the draft and creating an all-volunteer Army?	40.05	50.39	9.56
13. Should Congress approve the antiballistic missile (ABM) defense system?	58.84	20.15	21.00
14. Do you support a Federal plan costing an additional \$25,000,000 to fight organized crime?	71.54	20.74	7.72
15. Would you support the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?	26.03	62.99	10.98
16. Should the medicare program be extended to those under 65 who are permanently and totally disabled?	81.18	13.35	5.47
17. Do you believe that the Federal Government should do more than it is doing to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in the United States?	52.43	39.71	7.85
18. Should a percentage of Federal income taxes be returned to the States to be used as they see fit?	59.96	30.65	9.39

JOINT RESOLUTION REDESIGNATING CAPE KENNEDY AS CAPE CANAVERAL

(Mr. BURKE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution which I am sure reflects the respectful, yet strong, feelings of the citizens of the entire State of Florida on a matter of national prominence. Over 400 years ago, according to the Library of Congress, Ponce de Leon is accredited with discovering what may well be the earliest point of land ever discovered in the United States. It is located in the State of Florida and it was renamed by a Presidential Executive Order 11129 on November 23, 1963, as "Cape Kennedy."

As we also well know, the cape is the launching site for our space frontiersmen of this Nation to explore and discover our universe. How fitting then, for a country which cherishes and loves its traditions that have come down to us through the explorations and discoveries of other men on our own planet—to continue this same tradition as we now reach out to explore the heavens.

It is for this reason, then, that I now call upon my colleagues in the House to join with me and support me in the bipartisan and nonpartisan effort of this House joint resolution to restore the original name of great historical signifi-

cance not only to Florida but to this entire Nation. "Cape Canaveral," the original name has been borne by this cape since 1530.

I would like to point out at this same time, however, Mr. Speaker, that it is also the feeling and desire of the people of Florida to honor and pay tribute to one of their late Presidents, John F. Kennedy. A respecter of history himself—and although he would have valued deeply this tribute to his memory—he would have and did value more greatly, the meaningful marks made long before his time by other men to the heritage of this Nation.

The people of Florida—while calling upon Congress to restore their cape to its original name of "Canaveral"—earnestly desire that the facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and of the Department of Defense, located on this cape, to remain known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center. For it is more truly significant of President Kennedy's mark on history which has now resulted in America's space frontiersmen placing our mark on the historical significance of the moon.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution by the House which I am introducing today corresponds with action taken by my colleagues in the Senate on July 10, 1969, Senate Joint Resolution 133 is now pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is my hope that this House will early consider and speedily and favorably pass upon this legislation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wish to join with my colleague from Florida in the statement he is making here. I think it would be no disrespect to the late President if we continued the name of the space center, the John F. Kennedy Space Center, and redesignated Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral. The gentleman well knows that the Spaniards, who were the great mapmakers of that time, designated only two places in Florida as points to which attention could be called on the maps of the world, one was Cape Canaveral, the other Cape Sable. The people of Florida, I believe, want the traditional name of Cape Canaveral restored, and by such move we would not show any disrespect to the late President.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. I thank my colleague from Florida.

I ask all other Members of the House to join in this joint resolution.

STATEMENT ABOUT PRESIDENT NIXON'S PLAN FOR THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—FOR INNOVATION AND PIONEERING

(Mr. ERLBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, this is a period of renewal and reform in our institutions—important changes in our welfare system, our tax system, our manpower programs. Building a new federalism—with responsiveness in all our institutions—will be one of the vital tasks of the Office of Economic Opportunity as reorganized and refocused under the President's proposals.

The goal of this agency will be to aid men in participating to the full extent of their capacity in the economic life of the Nation. We have found that this is a more difficult task than we expected some years ago—demanding new knowledge and new programs. This is why the innovative and pioneering activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity, involving new research and development, will be so critical.

The Congress and the public must assure this agency the base of support, especially in funding, that it will need for its exploratory work. The Congress should move to approve the President's proposed legislation authorizing an extension of the current Economic Opportunity Act.

We must apply to this endeavor many of the principles of action that have characterized our space program—the same flexibility of funding, extraordinary talent, teamwork and sense of adventure. The President has recognized the importance of this agency by assigning its able director, Donald Rumsfeld, a place in the Cabinet. His reorganization assures that the functions of the agency, often confused in the past, will be clearly defined and assigned.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON WELFARE AND THE TRAINING OF PEOPLE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the White House that wires and letters concerning President Nixon's speech of last Friday night are overwhelmingly favorable. At the last tally, the White House staff had counted 570 telegrams and 247 letters favoring the President's proposals. There have been only 36 wires and letters opposed to them.

Mr. Speaker, when our colleagues return to their districts this week I urge them to take their own soundings. I feel sure they will find that the great mass of their constituents favor the President's approach as outlined in his nationwide speech.

Certainly it is high time that we made it a national goal to train people and get them off welfare whenever possible. At the same time we should assure the truly needy of enough income to supply their basic needs.

Mr. Speaker, the President has urged Congress to consider and act upon his proposals as quickly as possible. I am sure this also will be the sentiment we will find back in our own congressional districts.

If this is the case, then I hope and trust we can initiate a major part if not all of the President's programs this year.

We can do this if we are all truly concerned about the welfare of people throughout this great country of ours.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week following the recess.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the week of September 1, 1969, is as follows:

On Monday and Tuesday of that week the House will be in recess.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week the following bills will be considered:

H.R. 10105, Motor Vehicle Safety Act Amendments, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate;

H.R. 7621, Child Protection Act of 1969, which will come up under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 12085, to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles, which will come up under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

EDUCATION—OUR NATION'S NO. 1 PRIORITY

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, can it really be that the continuation of the war in Vietnam is more important than the education of our children.

Yesterday, President Nixon issued a statement from his new palatial vacation estate in California noting that now was the time for economy. The President paid particular mention to the action of the House last month in increasing education appropriations by a billion dollars. The President issued an ultimatum in which he stated that he would not authorize the expenditure of the increased funds until such time as the Congress had completed all of its actions on the fiscal 1970 budget. He emphasized, too, that he ultimately would not spend more than \$192.9 billion for the year.

The clear implication of these statements is that the President does not want

to devote more money to the education of our children at this time.

There seems to be a clear instance in which the President is willing to place greater priority on expenditures for the war in Vietnam and for wasteful defense spending than he is on our very own children at home.

In making these increases in the education appropriations, the Congress was asserting its power—given by the Constitution—over the revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government. The House was asserting a long-neglected congressional prerogative of reordering our national priorities to allocate increased resources for education and health. The House was asserting its view that the future of our youth and the health of our citizens are more important than the continuation of enormous expenditures for the war in Vietnam.

There is a very expeditious means of easing Federal spending. That is to cut back on the scale of American involvement in Vietnam and to reduce needless defense spending. The Congress has expressed the view that health and education expenditures are of the highest priority. A priority apparently higher than the President is willing to accord to it.

Earlier this year in the consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969 I introduced amendments which would have exempted from the budgetary ceiling Federal expenditures for uncontrollable expenses like interest on the public debt, social security and veterans' benefits. At the time I introduced these amendments I told the Members of this body that the estimates for these so-called uncontrollable expenditures were very likely to turn out too low. Now only a month or so into the new fiscal year we find that these estimates are already \$2½ billion too low according to the President.

This is exactly what I said we could expect if we enacted this inflexible ceiling. The House on that occasion ignored my plea and proceeded to pass the ceiling.

Now the President has come back to us to say that his budget estimates were wrong and that if the inflexible ceiling is to be applied Federal expenditures for other programs will have to be cut back. This, too, is exactly what I warned the Congress would happen.

It was my feeling and it should now be your feeling as well that as Federal expenditures for interest on the debt and social security increase, Federal expenditures for the social programs like Federal aid to education and health would have to be reduced. This is exactly what we face in light of the President's recent statement.

Mr. Speaker, last month the House was warned that while we had won the moon race and while we were waging the arms race at astronomical costs, we were losing the education race. The United States was being outspent dollar for dollar in the amount of resources it was devoting to the schooling of its people. In the long run we will not be able to survive if we do not devote adequate resources to education.

Mr. Speaker, last month the House overwhelmingly expressed the strong view that increased Federal aid to education was of the very highest priority. This view was expressed even in light of arguments on the nature of the current tight fiscal situation and the need to control inflation. Mr. Speaker, I agree that education is of the very highest priority and I agree, too, that we must act to control inflation. We can devote more resources to education and at the same time control inflation if we are willing to disengage ourselves from our tragically over-long involvement in Southeast Asia and from our persistence in purchasing wasteful and unnecessary defense hardware. Mr. Speaker, I most vigorously dissent from the position taken by President Nixon yesterday.

TAX-SHARING PROPOSAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-148)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
If there is a single phenomenon that has marked the recent history of nations, large and small, democratic and dictatorial, it has been rise of the central government.

In the United States, revenues of the Federal government have increased ninety-fold in thirty-six years. The areas of our national life where the Federal government has become a dominant force have multiplied.

The flow of power from the cities and States to Washington accelerated in the Depression years, when economic life in America stagnated, and an energetic national government seemed the sole instrument of national revival. World War II brought another and necessary expansion of the Federal government to marshal the nation's energies to wage war on two sides of the world.

When the war ended, it appeared as though the tide would be reversed. But the onset of the cold war, the needs of a defeated and prostrate Europe, the growing danger and then the reality of conflict in Asia, and later, the great social demands made upon the Federal government by millions of citizens, guaranteed the continued rapid growth and expansion of Federal power.

Today, however, a majority of Americans no longer supports the continued extension of federal services. The momentum for federal expansion has passed its peak; a process of deceleration is setting in.

The cause can be found in the record of the last half decade. In the last five years the Federal government enacted scores of new Federal programs; it added tens of thousands of new employees to the Federal payrolls; it spent tens of billions of dollars in new funds

to heal the grave social ills of rural and urban America. No previous half decade had witnessed domestic Federal spending on such a scale. Yet, despite the enormous Federal commitment in new men, new ideas and new dollars from Washington, it was during this very period in our history that the problems of the cities deepened rapidly into crises.

The problems of the cities and the countryside stubbornly resisted the solutions of Washington; and the stature of the Federal government as America's great instrument of social progress has suffered accordingly—all the more so because the Federal government promised so much and delivered so little. This loss of faith in the power and efficacy of the Federal government has had at least one positive impact upon the American people. More and more, they are turning away from the central government to their local and State governments to deal with their local and State problems.

As the Federal government grew in size and power, it became increasingly remote not only from the problems it was supposed to solve, but from the people it was supposed to serve. For more than three decades, whenever a great social change was needed, a new national program was the automatic and inevitable response. Power and responsibility flowed in greater and greater measure from the state capitals to the national capital.

Furthermore, we have hampered the effectiveness of local government by constructing a Federal grant-in-aid system of staggering complexity and diversity. Many of us question the efficiency of this intergovernmental financial system which is based on the Federal categorical grant. Its growth since the end of 1962 has been near explosive. Then there were 53 formula grant and 107 project grant authorizations—a total of 160. Four years later on January 1, 1967, there were 379 such grant authorizations.

While effective in many instances, this rapid growth in Federal grants has been accompanied by:

- Overlapping programs at the State and local level.
- Distortion of State and local budgets.
- Increased administrative costs.
- Program delay and uncertainty.
- A decline in the authority and responsibility of chief executives, as grants have become tied to functional bureaucracies.
- Creation of new and frequently competitive state and local governmental institutions.

Another inevitable result of this proliferation of Federal programs has been a gathering of the reins of power in Washington. Experience has taught us that this is neither the most efficient nor effective way to govern; certainly it represents a radical departure from the vision of Federal-State relations the nation's founders had in mind.

This Administration brought into office both a commitment and a mandate

to reverse the trend of the last three decades—a determination to test new engines of social progress. We are committed to enlist the full potential of the private sector, the full potential of the voluntary sector and the full potential of the levels of government closer to the people.

This week, I am sending to Congress for its approval for fiscal year 1971, legislation asking that a set amount of Federal revenues be returned annually to the States to be used as the States and their local governments see fit—without Federal strings.

Because of budget stringencies, the initial fund set aside to start the program will not be great—\$500 million. The role of the Federal government will be redefined and re-directed. But it is my intention to augment this fund annually in the coming years so that in the Fiscal Year beginning in mid-1975, \$5 billion in Federal revenues will be returned to the States without Federal strings. Ultimately, it is our hope to use this mechanism to so strengthen State and local government that by the end of the coming decade, the political landscape of America will be visibly altered, and States and cities will have a far greater share of power and responsibility for solving their own problems. The role of the Federal Government will be redefined and re-directed toward those functions where it proves itself the only or the most suitable instrument.

The fiscal case for Federal assistance to States and localities is a strong one. Under our current budget structure, Federal revenues are likely to increase faster than the national economy. At the local level, the reverse is true. State and local revenues, based heavily on sales and property taxes, do not keep pace with economic growth, while expenditures at the local level tend to exceed such growth. The result is a "fiscal mismatch," with potential Federal surpluses and local deficits.

The details of this revenue sharing program were developed after close consultation with members of the Congress, governors, mayors, and county officials. It represents a successful effort to combine the desirable features of simplicity and equity with a need to channel funds where they are most urgently needed and efficiently employable.

The program can best be described by reviewing its four major elements.

First, the size of the total fund to be shared will be a stated percentage of personal taxable income—the base on which Federal individual income taxes are levied. For the second half of Fiscal Year 1971, this will be one-third of 1 percent of personal taxable income; for subsequent fiscal years this percentage will rise to a regular constant figure. In order to provide for the assured flow of Federal funds, a permanent appropriation will be authorized and established for the Treasury Department, from which will be automatically disbursed each year an amount corresponding to the stipulated percentage.

Second, the allocation of the total

annual fund among the 50 States and the District of Columbia will be made on the basis of each State's share of national population, adjusted for the State's revenue effort.

The revenue effort adjustment is designed to provide the States with some incentive to maintain (and even expand) their efforts to use their own tax resources to meet their needs. A simple adjustment along these lines would provide a State whose revenue effort is above the national average with a bonus above its basic per capita portion of revenue sharing.

Third, the allocation of a State's share among its general units of local government will be established by prescribed formula. The total amount a State will share with all its general political subdivisions is based on the relative roles of State and local financing in each State. The amount which an individual unit of general local government will receive is based on its share of total local government revenue raised in the State.

Several points should be noted about these provisions for distribution of a State's portion of revenue sharing.

- The distribution will be made by the State.
 - The provisions make allowance for State-by-State variations and would tend to be neutral with respect to the current relative fiscal importance of State and local governments in each State.
 - In order to provide local flexibility, each State is authorized to develop an alternative distribution plan, working with its local governments.
- Fourth, administrative requirements are kept at a minimum. Each State will meet simple reporting and accounting requirements.

While it is not possible to specify for what functions these Federally shared funds will provide—the purpose of this program being to leave such allocation decisions up to the recipient units of government—an analysis of existing State and local budgets can provide substantial clues. Thus, one can reasonably expect that education, which consistently takes over two-fifths of all state and local general revenues, will be the major beneficiary of these new funds. Another possible area for employment of shared funds, one most consistent with the spirit of this program, would be for inter-governmental cooperation efforts.

This proposal marks a turning point in Federal-State relations, the beginning of decentralization of governmental power, the restoration of a rightful balance between the State capitals and the national capital.

Our ultimate purposes are many: To restore to the States their proper rights and roles in the Federal system with a new emphasis on and help for local responsiveness; to provide both the encouragement and the necessary resources for local and State officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to narrow the distance between people and the government agencies dealing with their problems; to restore strength

and vigor to local and State governments; to shift the balance of political power away from Washington and back to the country and the people.

This tax-sharing proposal was pledged in the campaign; it has long been a part of the platform of many men in my own political party—and men in the other party as well. It is integrally related to the national welfare reform. Through these twin approaches we hope to relieve the fiscal crisis of the hard-pressed State and local governments and to assist millions of Americans out of poverty and into productivity.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 13, 1969.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, incentive and extra effort have always been essential elements of success.

It is just those elements that would be generated by Federal revenue sharing, as proposed today by President Nixon.

Throughout the President's proposal for diversion of an assured portion of Federal income tax revenue to the States and local units of government is woven the idea of greater responsibility for those units of government, for governing bodies closer to the people than is the Federal Legislature.

As a supplement to other Federal aid, revenue sharing can be the catalyst for problem-solving on a scale we have never yet witnessed in America, problem-solving at the local level on the basis of priorities viewed as local people see them in their own communities.

The House Republican leadership has long urged the adoption of Federal revenue sharing. Together with the President's new family assistance program and his Comprehensive Manpower Training Act, revenue sharing would supply the cement for the building of a better America.

This is the new federalism the President spoke of last Friday night—a channeling of new funds and new responsibilities to States and local communities, a movement which will return Government to the people.

Mr. Speaker, any proposal as bold as Federal revenue sharing will require deep study and concentration within the Congress. I am hopeful that hearings on the President's revenue sharing plan will begin very soon in the House and move steadily to a favorable conclusion.

President Nixon's revenue-sharing plan is a proposal which speaks to the future of America, a program which is needed to revitalize the American political system and the people it serves.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult tasks any President can undertake is the task of reversing governmental trends. It cannot be done overnight, and it cannot be done all at once.

As power and authority and responsibility have accrued to the Federal Government, step by step over a period of 35 years at the expense of State and local governments, so must the trend be reversed.

Until now no President has made a start toward reversing that trend. On the contrary, in recent years the trend toward centralization has accelerated as one new Federal program after another has tied State and local governments ever more closely to Washington and ever more subject to Washington dictation.

But today President Nixon, in announcing his revenue-sharing proposal, has signified his willingness to take the first significant step in the opposite direction. He seeks to bring Government closer to the people and make it more responsive to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it well to repeat what the President has said, in announcing his plan. I quote:

Ultimately, it is our hope to use this mechanism to so strengthen state and local governments that by the end of the coming decade . . . states and cities will have a far greater share of power and responsibility for solving their own problems. The role of the Federal Government will be re-defined and re-directed toward those functions where it proves itself the only or the most suitable instrument.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the Founding Fathers had in mind and this is what Lincoln referred to when he spoke of Government of, by, and for the people. If President Nixon can succeed in this effort, he will have taken a major step toward the preservation of the Republic.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years we have watched power accumulate in the Federal bureaucracy. For 30 years we have watched Americans turn to the White House and to Capitol Hill for the solution of their own social and economic problems. The result of that has been the most enormous growth of any Government in history. Within those 30 years, the Federal Government has become a behemoth and an increasingly ineffective one in resolving the crises that grip our society and may ultimately decide its destiny.

In President Nixon's revenue-sharing message, we have the beginnings of a great change—a reversal of power to the States and cities, the restoration of funds to their sources where the problems of America can be better dealt with.

The President's message represents the beginning of a new era in American political history—the restoration of a proper balance between the States and the Federal Government—a new partnership—a "New Federalism" in the President's own eloquent words.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, for every national Republican convention that I remember, the Republican Party has gone on record for the strengthening of local and State governments—for providing Government closest to the people with the power and responsibility for dealing with the great problems closest to the people.

Last November, we elected a Republi-

can President; and today I am proud to say that this Republican President has made good upon the promise of our party.

Under the new revenue sharing act, power, and responsibility begin to flow away from Washington and back to their source, the country and the people whence they came.

A tide of 30 years of having power come to Washington is being reversed and this measure is what is changing the course of political history.

Under this proposal, each year a percentage of the gross personal incomes in the United States will be automatically turned back by the Government to the States, for their use and for use by the local communities. The percentage rises each year in the next 5 years—so that by 1975 and 1976 more than \$5 billion a year will be returned without strings from Washington to the State capitals. Here is presidential performance on a campaign promise; here is a party delivering on its platform; here is a major governmental reform that should alter the political landscape of the Nation by the end of the decade.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, it was the stated intention of the Nixon administration when it took office in January to use new engines of social progress in addition to the old workhouse—the Federal Government. The administration declared its intent to place some of the expanded responsibilities of the Federal establishment back on the shoulders of local and State governments where they belong. I think the President's revenue sharing proposal confirms that intention and spells out the means of attainment.

The President's proposal not only provides the States and local governments with the responsibility for solving their own problems, but, more importantly, provides the financial basis for carrying out the new charge from the administration.

It is estimated that the amount of revenues returned to the States will rise each year by approximately \$1 billion. Therefore, by the year 1976, when we celebrate our 200th anniversary as a nation, some \$5 billion annually will be returned to the States by the Federal Government, and without the usual bureaucratic strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noteworthy occasion—a time when the Federal Government is finally giving recognition to the fact that it is not the only instrument or necessarily the best instrument for solving all of America's problems. It is a time for building "a new partnership" with the States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message on Federal revenue sharing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPORT CONCERNING ADMINISTRATION OF ANTIDUMPING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Title II, section 201(b) of Public Law 90-634, I am pleased to submit the enclosed report for the period beginning on July 1, 1968, and ending on June 30, 1969, setting forth: (1) the texts of all determinations made by the Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Tariff Commission under the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, in that period; (2) an analysis with respect to each determination in that period of the manner in which the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, was administered to take into account the provisions of the International Antidumping Code; and (3) a summary of antidumping actions taken by other countries in that period against United States exports, relating such actions to the provisions of the International Antidumping Code.

I have no recommendations to make at this time concerning the administration of the Antidumping Act, 1921.

There are differences in language between the Antidumping Act, 1921, and the International Antidumping Code. The differences in language, when applied to the cases contained in this Report, have not affected the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission in making their determinations under the Act. Obviously, the domestic law would take precedence over the International Antidumping Code in the event of an actual conflict. If this question should present any problem in the future, I shall submit a supplemental report to the Congress covering this matter.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 13 1969.

THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE FIREARMS CONTROL

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distressing domestic problems facing our Nation today is the continuing increase in the level of violence in our national life. Regardless of whether it is individual or collective, whether it is spawned by malice or frustration, violence can only impede our efforts to understand and respond to the severe deficiencies of our national life.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence was established to consider this problem and to make recommendations for its solution. The commission has concluded, quite accurately in my opinion, that the frequency and severity of violence has

been exacerbated by our ineffective and almost irresponsible policy toward the possession and use of firearms. The Commission's Task Force on Firearms has found that:

Firearms, particularly handguns, play a major role in the commission of homicide, aggravated assault, and armed robbery, and that they are being used in greater percentages of these violent crimes.

On July 28, the Commission released a statement on firearms and violence indicating that an effective national firearms policy would help to reduce gun violence in the United States. Such a policy would impose reasonable controls without seriously inconveniencing responsible citizens who have a legitimate need for a handgun.

I ask that the Commission's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD to bring it to the attention of both the Members and citizens alike.

COMMISSION STATEMENT ON FIREARMS AND VIOLENCE

(Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman)

FIREARMS AND VIOLENCE

Whether guns cause violence, contribute to it, or are merely coincidental to it has long been debated. After extensive study we find that the availability of guns contributes substantially to violence in American society. Firearms, particularly handguns, facilitate the commission and increase the danger of the most violent crimes—assassination, murder, robbery and assault. The widespread availability of guns can also increase the level of violence associated with civil disorder. Firearms accidents, while they account for only a small percentage of all accidents, cause thousands of deaths and injuries each year.

This relationship between firearms and violence tends to obscure two other important facts bearing on the firearms question. First, the vast majority of gun owners do not misuse firearms. Millions of Americans are hunters, target shooters, and collectors, who use their guns safely and responsibly and who, perhaps more than many of their fellow citizens, deplore the criminal use of firearms. Second, in attending to the firearms problem, we must not forget that the root causes of American violence go much deeper than widespread gun ownership. Firearms generally facilitate, rather than cause, violence.

The challenge for this Commission—and for the nation as a whole—is to find ways to cope with illegitimate uses of guns without at the same time placing undue restrictions on legitimate uses. We believe this is possible if both the advocates and the opponents of gun control legislation will put aside their suspicions and preconceptions, accept the fact of a common danger without exaggerating its dimensions, and act for the common good.

1. The domestic arms buildup—We find that the United States is in the midst of a period of increasing firearms ownership

Our Task Force on Firearms estimates that there are now about ninety million firearms in the United States. Half of the nation's sixty million households possess at least one gun, and the number of guns owned by private citizens is rising rapidly.

During the first half of this century, about ten million firearms on the average were added to the civilian firearms supply in each decade. In the decade since 1958, however, nearly thirty million guns have been added to the civilian stockpile. Moreover, the sharp-

est increases have occurred in the last five years—a period of urban riots and sharply rising crime rates. Annual rifle and shotgun sales have doubled since 1963. Annual handgun sales have quadrupled.

Some of the increased gun sales in recent years have resulted from an increase in hunting and sport shooting, a fact consistent with the rising amount of money being spent on leisure time activities. But these predictable increases in sales of sporting arms cannot explain the much larger increases in the sales of handguns. With a few scattered exceptions, handguns are not sporting guns.

A substantial part of the rapidly increasing gun sales, particularly handgun sales, must be attributed to the rising fear of violence that the United States has recently experienced. Studies by our Task Force on Firearms, as well as by the Stanford Research Institute and the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, show that gun sales in a particular area tend to increase sharply during and after a period of disorder. After the 1967 Detroit riot, for example, gun sales skyrocketed: Detroit issued four times as many handgun permits in 1968 as it did in 1965, and a nearby, predominantly white suburb issued five times as many permits.

Lending impetus to the arms buildup are the exhortations of extremist groups, both black and white. In their speeches and publications, leaders of these groups urge their members to buy firearms and be prepared to use them against "the enemy." Neighborhood protective associations have proliferated and have sometimes come to share the fears of the right-wing paramilitary groups, with the result that firearms are now being stockpiled in homes as well as "in the hills." A new wave of American vigilantism could result from these activities. Further, black extremist organizations urge their members to obtain firearms for neighborhood and home defense, and sometimes for guerilla warfare and terrorist activities as well. Ironically, extremist groups, regardless of race, are remarkably alike in their attitudes toward firearms and their opposition to firearms control.¹

Quite apart from civil disorders, the urban arms buildup has increased the role of firearms in accidents and violent crime. Our Task Force has found that in Detroit accidental firearms deaths were three times greater in 1968, the year after the riot, than in 1966, the year before the riot. Between 1965 and 1968, homicides in Detroit committed with firearms increased 400 percent while homicides committed with other weapons increased only 30 percent; firearms robberies increased twice as fast as robberies committed without firearms. (These rates of increase are much higher than for the nation as a whole.)

Other studies confirm our finding that the proportion of gun use in violence rises and falls with gun ownership. The urban arms buildup threatens not only to escalate future civil disorders, but also to bring with it greater misuse of firearms in crimes and accidents.

2. *Firearms and violent crime—we find that firearms, particularly handguns, play a major role in the commission of homicide, aggravated assault, and armed robbery, and that they are being used in greater percentages of these violent crimes*

Many Americans are alarmed by the rise of violent crime in the United States, and not without reason. Personal injury and death from crime occur more often in the United States than in any other industrial nation of the world.

¹ This is not to imply that all persons who oppose additional controls are extremists.

Firearms are a primary instrument of in every three homicides are committed with jury and death in American crime. Two out guns. Since 1963 the number of homicides involving firearms has increased 48 percent in the United States while the number of homicides committed with other weapons has risen only 10 percent.

The circumstances of most homicides suggest that a person without ready access to a gun would not inevitably kill with another weapon. Studies show that most persons who commit homicide are not relentless, determined killers, but rather are persons likely to act on impulse in a moment of rage or passion and without a plan or determined intent to kill. There is no hard evidence to prove or disprove the thesis that lacking a gun, an enraged person will resort to a knife or other weapon. But there is evidence demonstrating that the fatality rate of firearms attacks is more than four times greater than the fatality rate of knife attacks (knives being the next most frequent and lethal weapon used in homicides). Thus, even if the number of violent attacks did not go down, the number of fatalities resulting from violent attacks would be substantially reduced if the attackers did not have guns.

The deadliness of firearms is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that they are virtually the only weapons used in killing police officers. Policemen are armed. They are trained in the skills of self-defense. They expect trouble and are prepared for it. Yet, from 1960 through 1967, 411 police officers were killed in the course of their official duties—76 of them in 1967 alone. Guns were used in 96 percent of these fatal attacks on police.

In assassinations, guns play a crucial role because they extend the deadliness and the effectiveness of the assassin. Of the nine assassination attempts on American presidents or presidential candidates, all involved firearms. All, except the assassination of President Kennedy, involved handguns.

Guns also play an increasingly deadly role in aggravated assault and robbery. In 1968, 23 percent of all aggravated assaults were committed with guns, as opposed to only 13 percent in 1963. One out of every three robberies (two out of every three armed robberies) is committed with a gun, and the fatality rate for victims of firearms robberies is almost four times as great as for victims of other armed robberies.

In all these violent crimes, handguns are the weapon predominantly used. Although only slightly more than one-fourth (or 24 million) of the firearms in the nation are handguns, they account for about half of all homicides and three-fourths of all firearms homicides. When firearms are involved in aggravated assaults and robberies in large cities, the handgun is almost invariably the weapon used.

3. *Firearms and self-defense—we find that firearms in the home are probably of less value than commonly thought in defending the householder's life against intruders, but that firearms in business establishments may sometimes be effective in defending against robberies*

It may seem incongruous that in our advanced and civilized society individual citizens should feel the need to keep a gun for self-protection. Yet a 1966 public opinion survey, conducted for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, disclosed that more than 22 million households (37 percent of the total and 68 percent of the households with guns) included self-defense as one reason, among others, for owning a firearm. Since many owners keep their guns in the home for protection against intruders, it is important to assess, to the extent possible,

the nature of the threat from intruders and the chances of gun owners to defend themselves successfully with their weapons.

What is the nature of the threat in the home? The number of killings in the home by burglars and robbers² is not large relative to the total number of homicides. Burglars usually try to avoid contact with the homeowner: they rely on stealth and are more likely to flee than fight when discovered. The robber poses a much greater threat to the personal safety of the occupant of the house, but robberies occur in the home far less often than in other places.³ Because of these factors, studies in several cities indicate that killings in the home by robbers and burglars account for no more than 2 percent or 3 percent of all criminal homicides.⁴

What are the householder's chances of successfully defending himself with a gun? In only a relatively small number of instances do home robberies or burglaries result in the death of the victim. Examination shows that in the great majority of the cases, the householder had no warning and thus no chance to arm himself with a gun. Studies in Los Angeles and Detroit indicate that only about two percent of home robberies, and two-tenths of one percent of home burglaries, result in the firearms death or injury of the intruder at the hands of the householder.⁵ Moreover, in considering the value of handguns, or firearms generally, for self-defense in the home, one must also take into account the risks associated with home possession of a gun. A substantial number of the 23,000 annual firearms accidents occur in the home. Of the 8,000 annual firearms homicides, a large percentage occur among family members or acquaintances, and many of these also occur in the home.

From the standpoint of the individual householder, then, the self-defense firearm appears to be a dangerous investment. The existence of guns in one-half of America's homes may deter intruders. One may assume a robber is reluctant to ply his trade in homes rather than on the street because of the possibility that he may encounter an alert, armed householder. Our Task Force made an effort to study the extent of this deterrence, but was unable to arrive at any firm conclusion. The evidence is convincing, however, that the home robber most often has the advantage of surprise, and the armed segment of our population is paying a heavy price in accidents and in the shooting of family members, friends and acquaintances for whatever deterrent effect their possession of self-defense firearms may be providing. In a more rational world, home intrusion

² Robbery involves taking property by force; burglary involves illegal entry without force against the person.

³ The 17-city victim-offender survey conducted by our Task Force on Individual Acts of Violence shows an average of 6 percent of armed robberies occurring in the home.

⁴ Home intrusions resulting in sexual attacks are also a threat, but they occur much less frequently than commonly believed. Our victim-offender survey suggests that substantially less than one fourth of the 27,000 rapes or rape attempts reported in the United States each year are committed by intruding strangers in the home. Since about 20,000 robberies (armed and unarmed) and 800,000 burglaries occur annually in the home, not more than three-quarters of one percent of home intrusions result in an attempted rape.

⁵ No data are available on how frequently robberies and burglaries are foiled by the householder's display of a gun that is not fired. Nor are data available on use of guns by women to prevent attempted rapes; presumably this occurs extremely infrequently.

would be deterred by other means—such as non-lethal weapons, alarm systems, and other security arrangements—that are less dangerous to the occupants of the home.

Burglars and robbers also threaten businesses, and firearms are frequently kept in places of business for protection. Such firearms are useful primarily against robbers, since burglars usually break and enter after the business has closed. Research to date does not permit us to draw firm conclusions as to the net usefulness of self-defense firearms possessed by storeowners and other businessmen. We do know, however, that business self-defense firearms do not cause the great number of accidents caused by home firearms or involve the same risk of homicide to family members and friends. Thus, the home and the business establishment must be clearly distinguished from each other when considering the usefulness of firearms for self-defense.

4. Firearms control in the United States—A national firearms policy which significantly reduces the availability of handguns will reduce the amount of firearms violence

The United States still does not have an effective national firearms policy. Federal gun laws have been passed largely in response to sensational episodes of gun violence. In general the approach of these laws has been to use federal power merely to curtail interstate movements of firearms, leaving each of the states free to adopt the degree and kind of internal control it wished. Moreover, even this limited policy objective was not effectively implemented. It was perfectly legal, until the passage of the Gun Control Act of 1968, to sell or ship weapons from a state which had little or no firearms control to persons in a state with a stricter system. Since attempts to establish uniform state and local firearms laws never succeeded, the few serious efforts at state and local regulations (as in Massachusetts and New York) have been consistently frustrated by the flow of firearms from jurisdictions with looser or no controls.

Under this patchwork statutory regime, our firearms population has grown to the point where guns are readily available to everyone—legally in most cases, illegally in the rest. The Gun Control Act of 1968 does curtail imports of cheap foreign firearms; it significantly restricts mail order and interstate gun shipments to individuals; and it forbids the possession of handguns by convicted felons and other dangerous classes. But the 1968 Act is not designed to affect either the overall size of the tremendous United States gun population which is the legacy of past firearms policies, or the hand-to-hand or "street" sales of second-hand guns. Yet such sales appear to be the major source of the firearms used in crime. We have learned that almost half of all rifles and shotguns and more than half of all handguns are acquired second-hand—usually from a friend or other private party.

Our lack of an effective national firearms policy is primarily the result of our culture's casual attitude toward firearms and its heritage of the armed, self-reliant citizen. These are the factors that have prevented passage of effective gun regulation legislation in the United States. Guns are routinely carried in pockets and left in closets, and bureau drawers. In many parts of the country, they are standard equipment in pickup trucks and small businesses. Nearly 15 million licensed hunters make extensive use of firearms for sporting purposes. The hero of American movies and television is the man with a gun—the soldier, cowboy, spy, sheriff, or criminal—and our children accumulate an arsenal of toy guns. Accustomed to firearms, convinced that they are household necessities, entertained by fiction and drama that portray the gun as a glam-

orous instrument of personal justice, many Americans underestimate the consequences of widespread firearms availability.

Despite the acceptance of guns as a common part of everyday American life, there is also a growing realization in the United States of the social costs of ineffective gun control. On the one hand, firearms manufacturers are on record favoring the requirement of an identification card for firearms owners and denying gun ownership to felons and mental and physical incompetents. On the other hand, advocates of strict gun control are increasingly inclined to acknowledge the legitimate use of guns by sportsmen. Both the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967 and the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in 1968 recommended that the federal government and the states should act to strengthen the presently inadequate firearms control laws.

In determining what our national firearms policy should be, it is necessary to keep clearly in mind that just as the term "firearms" includes different kinds of weapons which contribute unequally to violence, so also does the phrase "gun control" comprise a number of quite separate ideas. Four different strategies of gun control can be identified, though in legislative measures the strategies are often found in various combinations.

1. Registration of firearms.—Registration is designed to provide a record of all persons who own firearms as well as the firearms they own. Proponents point out that registration would help police trace weapons and thus deter a registered owner from criminal use or illegal transfer of his firearm. Opponents of registration reply that criminals will not register firearms and that the registration process is costly.

2. Prohibition of gun ownership by certain classes of persons (felons, addicts, etc.).—This type of control is put forward as making it more difficult for poor gun risks to obtain firearms from legitimate sources. Licensing and investigation of applicants are often utilized as part of this strategy. Opponents argue that the prohibited class can still obtain guns by theft or in the hand-to-hand market, while legitimate users are caused added inconvenience.

3. Increased criminal penalties for the use of guns in crime.—Increased penalties are urged as a means to deter criminals from using firearms. Opponents point out that existing penalties for violent crime are already severe and that an extra measure of punishment will have little additional deterrent effect.

4. Restrictive licensing.—This method requires all persons seeking to buy a particular type of firearm, typically a handgun, to demonstrate to the authorities an affirmative need to own the firearm. Its proponents urge that alone among the four control strategies, restrictive licensing is designed to reduce substantially the number of handguns in circulation. Its opponents note that restrictive licensing systems require the surrender of many previously lawful firearms, and amount to "confiscation."

Can any of these systems of firearms control be expected to reduce firearms violence? Some argue that with 90 million firearms in our country, no system of control will prevent persons from obtaining guns and using them illegally. The criminal, they declare, can always get a gun. The argument is not without merit, for it points the way to the steps which must be taken.

Our studies have convinced us that the heart of any effective national firearms policy for the United States must be to reduce the availability of the firearm that contributes the most to violence. This means restrictive licensing of the handgun. We believe, on the basis of all the evidence before us, that

reducing the availability of the handgun will reduce firearms violence.

Although no other nation in history has ever attempted to institute firearms control with so many guns already dispersed throughout all segments of the population, foreign crime statistics provide some encouraging insights into the possible results of stricter control of the handgun in the United States. Thus in England and Wales, with restrictive licensing systems and with much lower rates of violent crime than the United States, only 18 percent of homicides in 1967 were committed with firearms weapons compared to 64 percent in the United States. Only six percent of all robberies in England and Wales in 1967 involved guns, as compared to 36 percent in the United States. These lower rates of homicides and armed robberies and more importantly of firearms usage in such crimes suggest that a system which makes it substantially more difficult to obtain firearms can reduce the use of firearms in violent behavior and consequently can reduce both the frequency and the dangerousness of such behavior. In England and Wales the criminal cannot—or at least does not—always get a gun, and the public safety is much improved as a result.⁶

5. Recommendations for a national firearms policy

The Commission offers the following recommendations to reduce the role which firearms play in violence in the United States.

Public Education

We urge a public education campaign aided by the National Rifle Association and other private organizations devoted to hunting and sport shooting, to stress the duties and responsibilities of firearms ownership so that a new awareness of the proper role of firearms in American life can prevail in the more than 30 million homes which possess firearms. In particular, we urge the nation's gun manufacturers to issue safety booklets with each gun that they sell and to administer safety tests by mail to purchasers based upon these booklets.

We urge individual citizens—particularly on the basis of the statistics on firearms accidents—to reflect carefully before deciding that loaded firearms are necessary or desirable for self-defense in their homes.

Research

We urge that further research be undertaken on the relationships between firearms and violence and on the measures that can reduce firearms violence. Further work should especially be done on how firearms accidents occur and can be prevented and on the psychological impact of guns on criminals.

Further research is also needed as part of the effort to design firearm control systems that are no more restrictive than necessary and which minimize costs to firearms users and to the community as a whole.

Scientific research should be intensified on devices to assist law enforcement personnel in detecting the presence of concealed firearms on the person.

The Federal Governor should join with private industry to speed the development of an effective non-lethal weapon. We consider this recommendation to be of the utmost importance. So long as crime rates mount in this nation and civil disorders threaten, law-abiding Americans understandably fear for their safety. An effective non-lethal weapon could serve defensive needs without risk to human life.

⁶ Comparison of firearms crimes in cities within the United States, although complicated by the problem of "leakage" across state lines, also shows that rates of firearm use in violence are lowest in the Northeast where firearms possession rates are the lowest.

LEGISLATION

We conclude that the rising tide of firearms violence in this country merits further legislative action at the present time.

It is the ready availability of the handgun, so often a weapon of crime and so infrequently a sporting arm, that is the most serious part of the current firearms problem in this country. The time has come to bring the handgun under reasonable control.

A restrictive licensing system for handguns is needed. State governments should be given the first opportunity to establish such systems in conformity with minimum federal standards that afford considerable discretion to each state to adopt a system suitable to its own needs. Accordingly—

We recommend federal legislation to encourage the establishment of state licensing systems for handguns. The federal legislation would introduce a federal system of handgun licensing, applicable only to those states which within a four-year period fail to enact a state law that (1) establishes a standard for determining an individual's need for a handgun and for the licensing of an individual who shows such a need and (2) prohibits all others from possessing handguns or buying handgun ammunition.

We propose that the states be permitted to determine for themselves what constitutes "need" to own a handgun. For the federal system applicable to states which fail to enact their own licensing systems, we recommend that determinations of need be limited to police officers and security guards, small businesses in high crime areas, and others with a special need for self-protection. 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.

We also recommend that a system of federal administrative or judicial review be established to assure that each state system is administered fairly and does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, national origin, or other unconstitutional grounds.

We note that it will be necessary to compensate those handgun owners who are required to give up previously lawful firearms; this cost, which should be borne by the federal government, could amount to \$500 million.

Finally, we emphasize that laws controlling handguns should provide serious penalties for the possession of such guns by unlicensed persons. The apprehension of such persons should in time greatly reduce the rate of violent crime in the United States.

Shotguns and rifles are far less of a threat than handguns, particularly in the area of violent crime. At the same time, legitimate use of the long gun is widespread. The significant differences between handguns and long guns call for substantially different control strategies. We can make substantial inroads on firearms violence without imposing major inconveniences on hunters and skeet and trap shooters, and without impeding other legitimate activities of millions of long gun owners. Accordingly—

We recommend federal legislation to establish minimum standards for state regulation of long guns under which (1) an identification card would be required for long gun owners and purchasers of long gun ammunition (a system similar to that recommended by gun manufacturers) and (2) any person 18 and over would be entitled to such a card, except certain classes of criminals and adjudicated incompetents. For states which do not adopt such regulations within four years, a federal regulatory system would be established.

We do not recommend federal legislation to require nationwide registration of existing long guns. Substantially the same benefits could be obtained from less costly and burdensome control strategies.

We do recommend that persons who trans-

fer long guns be required to fill out a single card giving the serial number, type, make, and model of the weapon, the transferee's social security and firearms identification card numbers, the transferor's name and social security number, and the date of the transaction.

Supplementary Measures

Restrictive licensing of handguns and the simple identification card system for long guns represent the key legislative recommendations of this Commission in the area of gun control. There are, however, a number of other important goals which uniform and effective gun control legislation should accomplish. We urge the nation's lawmakers to consider them.

First, the Gun Control Act of 1968, which is intended to curtail the import of firearms unsuitable for sporting use, should be extended to prohibit domestic production and sale of "junk guns." Second, a federal firearms information center should be established to accumulate and store information on firearms and owners received from state agencies; this information would be available to state and federal law enforcement agencies. Third, licensed gun dealers should be required by federal statute to adopt and maintain security procedures to minimize theft of firearms.

6. Conclusion

An effective national firearms policy would help to reduce gun violence in the United States. It would also have a significance beyond the question of firearms. In comparison with most of the causes of violence in America, the firearms problem is concrete and manageable. But it is also complex and emotion-laden. For the United States to move effectively toward its solution would signify a new ability to transcend our violent past.

Separate statement

Four members of the Commission (Senator Roman L. Hruska, Judge Ernest W. McFarland, Congressman Hale Boggs, and Leon Jaworski) state that there is a great deal with which they agree in the report on "Firearms and Violence." They feel, however, that the needs are not the same in the various States, or, for that matter, in all parts of a State. It is their opinion that each State should be permitted to determine for itself without additional restrictions from the Federal Government the system which best meets its needs to control the use of both the handguns and the long guns. They are unable, therefore, to concur fully in the report of the Commission.

RETREAT, RETRENCHMENT, OR REALITY: SOME OBSERVATIONS ON INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS—1969

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Columnist James Reston noted several years ago that North Americans are willing to do anything for Latin America except read about it. Once again, Latin America has drifted off our front pages. There is no raging civil war; there are no threatening Communist missiles. The recent dispute between Honduras and El Salvador was settled through the quiet procedures of the Organization of American States.

Since the completion of the Rockefeller mission, it is difficult to find Latin American news in North American newspapers.

Yet, today, perhaps more than any

other time in history, we are at a crucial stage in inter-American relations.

The Nixon administration will soon announce its own Latin American policy. It is awaiting the recommendations Governor Rockefeller developed on his four fact-finding missions. It has already received the recommendations of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, developed through a series of hearings on the status of the Alliance for Progress chaired by the able gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Whatever policy is proposed by the Nixon administration, it will be the duty of the Congress to give serious consideration to its implementation. It is for this reason that I have taken the floor today. The Congress has its own solemn obligation to assess what is happening in Latin America today and how best the United States should relate to those developments.

It has long been a truism that the United States and Latin America have a special relationship based upon common colonial and revolutionary traditions. In point of fact, however, Latin American history differs markedly from our own. We have been too eager to accept the truism and too reluctant to try to understand the very different political, legal, social, and religious traditions of our hemispheric neighbors.

United States-Latin American relations have historically been characterized by misunderstanding and excessive United States actual or apparent intervention and dominance of Latin affairs. Just as we have learned in Southeast Asia that we must not only talk more softly but also carry a smaller stick, so we must learn this lesson in Latin America.

There is a tremendous difference, however, between nonintervention and nonparticipation.

Despite our different traditions and experience, the future of the 200 million people of the United States is linked with that of the 250 million people of Latin America by geography, history, and the realities of global politics.

No one who has traveled in Latin America can fail to be struck by the massive problems that each of the Republics face. Nor can one help but notice that each of those Republics is an entity unto itself. We err when we assume that Latin America is monolithic in its problems, politics and policies.

While we can and in my judgment should encourage greater cooperation between the Latin nations, we cannot ignore the individuality of each of them.

As we move toward a new era of U.S.-Latin American relations, we must also recognize the crucial relationship between procedure and substance. In some respects, we have tended to overestimate the one and underestimate the other in alternate cycles. Out of concern for drama and style, we promised through the Alliance for Progress more than could be achieved in a single decade. Expectations were raised but hopes were not fulfilled.

At the same time, we have been insensitive in some of our diplomatic appointments, disrespectful upon occasion, of the procedures of the inter-American

system, and inattentive to the psychic needs of peoples for whom personal dignity is extremely important.

We now have an opportunity to correct these errors and misunderstandings. We have an opportunity to move into an era when the concept of partnership can move from rhetoric to reality.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor to discuss recent changes in Latin America and what I believe to be the correct U.S. response to those changes.

We must first face the fundamental question—what is the U.S. interest in the future of Latin America?

First, Latin America is part of what former Assistant Secretary Covey Oliver often referred to as our "Home Hemisphere." In geopolitical terms, the security of Latin America is indispensable to our own. The events of October 1962, demonstrated the validity of this precept.

Second, by our very existence and economic involvement in Latin America we have a stake in the manner by which our neighbors evolve.

Third, we have much to learn from Latin America. In our excessive concern with growth rates and GNP, we tend to forget the age and richness of Latin American culture.

Fourth, because of the affinity born of our common bonds, there is a genuine desire on the part of the people of the United States to assist our Latin American neighbors in their own drive for self-sufficiency and equal standing in the world community. We not only have expressed this commitment publicly, as in the Charter of Punta del Este and the 1966 Hemispheric Presidents meeting, but also through the private commitment of the thousands of individuals involved in groups like the Partners of the Alliance. We must not shrink from responsibilities we have already openly, willingly, and enthusiastically accepted.

We often neglect the fact that the U.S. public investment in Latin America since the beginning of the Alliance has accounted for only 6.7 percent of the total investment in Latin America. The Latin American nations have contributed almost 90 percent from their own resources. How best the United States could participate in the development thrust is a question to which I will return later in my remarks.

In the discussion that follows, I will call attention to some recent developments in Latin America and to recent developments in the United States which have particular relevance to inter-American relations. I will conclude by offering a few recommendations for future U.S. policy toward Latin America.

I. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Let me note a few comparatively recent Latin American developments and trends involving the military, the church, economic development and U.S. trade relations, and U.S. property and investment.

1. THE MILITARY

There has long prevailed in many circles in this country an image of Latin American military regimes dedicated to preservation of the status quo, espousing

a Neanderthal and cynical anticommunism which treats as subversive all elements of the country advocating reform and change, and conducting a foreign policy in line with that of the United States on most major issues. That image is misleading, of course, because the military in Latin America is by no means monolithic, and there are wide variations in their countries of origin, their traditions, and their levels of training and political sophistication. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that in the past, Latin American military forces have generally exerted a conservative influence and in recent decades have often represented one of the major obstacles to leftist and radical attempts to gain power, either peacefully or through violence.

That is why I regard the Peruvian military golpe of last October as particularly significant. During intervening months, it has become quite clear that the government of Gen. Velasco Alvarado is not one which is susceptible to facile classification and convenient labeling. On the contrary, available evidence indicates that the objectives and policies of this regime present a sharp contrast to the traditional patterns set by many previous Latin American military governments. Among other things, the new Peruvian Government has expropriated the oil fields and refinery of the International Petroleum Co.—IPC—a Standard Oil subsidiary, and has announced a sweeping agrarian reform program calling for the expropriation and redistribution of all large landholdings. If implemented, this agrarian program will involve a basic shift in Peru's traditional political and economic power structure. Indeed, agrarian reform apparently is to be only one of a number of measures contemplated by the Velasco Government for the total transformation of Peru. Far from seeking to preserve the status quo, this military regime seems bent on shattering it. Far from embracing conservative economic and social theories, this regime seems to be guided by a combination of forces representing nationalist and leftist philosophies.

In the field of foreign affairs, it is also noteworthy that the Peruvian Government established relations with the Soviet Union early this year. A trade agreement between the two countries was signed shortly thereafter. And I feel it is both revealing and significant that whereas Soviet commentators at first attacked the October takeover as just another Latin American military coup inspired by the Pentagon, Moscow's propaganda has switched to praising the expropriation of the IPC and describing the new Peruvian Government as something quite out of the ordinary, if not unique, for Latin America. The new Peruvian leaders were even compared with the Nasserites of the fifties.

I trust it is unnecessary for me to add immediately that I am not implying that the current Peruvian Government is Communist. Obviously it is not. Nor would it be my purpose here to pass judgment on the Velasco regime, even if I knew enough to do so responsibly and accurately—and I certainly do not. Furthermore, I am well aware that other military coups have taken place in Latin

America in recent years in the name of progress, reform, and more efficient administration. But I do submit that the present pattern of cooperation between certain nationalist and leftist groups in Peru is something essentially different. And I would estimate that regardless of what happens in Peru or any other specific country, we are going to witness a growing tendency among some elements of the Latin American military to abandon the role of guardian of the status quo, to participate actively on behalf of rapid and radical change, whether well- or ill-conceived, and to assume different attitudes toward the United States.

I believe this is a new and important factor which must be taken into consideration in the formulation and conduct of our policies in Latin America.

2. THE CHURCH

A second traditional supporter of the status quo in Latin America, the Catholic Church, is also undergoing change—change which became evident soon after World War II and which has gained momentum during the past decade. This is, of course, in part a reflection of the review of the liturgy and social doctrine and the reassessment of the proper role of the Church in modern society that is occurring throughout the world.

The impact on Latin America became all the greater when, in 1960, in response to a Papal plea for help to the Latin American church, American and European priests and nuns began to arrive in relatively large numbers. Today the various schools of thought prevailing among the clergy in Latin America range across the ideological spectrum, from determined conservatives and traditionalists through moderates and liberals of one variety or another, on to those whose views are decidedly of the radical left. Those on the right wish the church to limit itself to a narrow interpretation of its religious function, doing little to disturb the social order. More liberal elements see a need for considerable change and reform, and believe the church should either acquiesce to such change or actively promote it. Those on the far left are convinced that Latin American societies today are too rigid to be improved by peaceful reform, and that the only path of change lies through violent revolution.

Thus the Latin American church is a vastly different force than it has been. Some of the clergy have become focal centers of dissent in their countries. It is not unusual to read of Latin American priests going to jail. A good many not only look upon their own governments with hostility but also regard the United States as a major obstacle to Latin American progress. Some priests advocate dialogue and cooperation with Marxists. The growing diversity and intensity of church debate was reflected at the general conference of the Latin American Episcopate held in Medellin, Colombia, immediately following the Pope's visit last August.

3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND U.S. TRADE

Some recent trends in the field of Latin American economic development and U.S. trade are also relevant. I have in mind first of all the proposals pre-

sented last month to President Nixon by Chilean Foreign Minister Valdes on behalf of the Special Latin American Coordinating Committee—CECLA. These proposals—46 items running some 16 pages—spell out Latin American concerns and expectations regarding future economic relations with our country. Among other things, the Latin Americans hope for an increase in the flow of U.S. resources available for development assistance, along with a reduction in the conditions we attach for the use of such resources. The Latins also hope to gain greater access to world markets, particularly U.S. markets, through the elimination or reduction of tariff and nontariff barriers. Not least in significance, the proposals are based on the hope of obtaining from us firm commitments which can be relied upon as a permanent basis for inter-American relations.

I realize that many—probably most—of these Latin American proposals are not new. We have been hearing them for many years. But I would point out that the CECLA document was prepared and presented in circumstances quite different from those of two, three, or four decades ago.

We have come a long way in our relations with Latin America since World War II. For one thing, along with the many changes taking place south of the border there has been a rapid rise in Latin American expectations. For another, Latin Americans have become painfully aware that the economic and technological gap between them and the United States, as well as Europe, is widening. Moreover, the promises of the Alliance for Progress fired still further Latin American hopes.

We must admit that the Alliance has fallen short of many of its original goals. We must face the fact that the utility and feasibility of its very existence is being questioned in some quarters. But whether or not the Alliance is modified, improved or continued under a different name, there can be no question but that Latin America feels more intensely than ever before that its views must be heard, that justice and reason are on its side, and that our commitment to assist Latin American economic, social, and political development was formalized under the Alliance for Progress.

Once again, I am not attempting here to evaluate the validity of specific Latin American proposals and complaints but only to call attention to this aspect of the new stage we have now reached in our relationship with Latin America. I should not leave this subject without also referring at least briefly to the visit paid to this country in June by a man considered by many, including myself, to be one of the most intelligent and far-sighted democratic leaders of Latin America: President Carlos Lleras Restrepo of Colombia. In his speech before the National Press Club, President Lleras eloquently described the disadvantages experienced by less developed countries in trading with industrialized nations, and in his meeting with Senate and House leaders, he was most articulate and convincing about the difficulties

arising from certain required AID procedures, such as the "additionality" provision.

The Colombian President's articulate presentation was instrumental in Assistant Secretary Meyer's announcement to the IA-ICOSOC meeting in Port of Spain, Trinidad, that the additionality provision would be abandoned.

4. U.S. PROPERTY AND INVESTMENT

The nationalization or buying out of some of the larger and more prominent U.S. business interests in Latin America has had a more immediate and direct impact on the United States. I have already referred to the Peruvian expropriation of the IPC oilfields and refinery, last year. In addition, the Peruvian Government as since taken over lands belonging to W. R. Grace & Co. as part of its agrarian reform program. In Chile, after protracted negotiation, the Kennecott Copper Corp. signed an agreement in 1967 to "Chileanize" the largest underground copper mine in the world. A mixed corporation was formed in which Kennecott retained 49 percent ownership. Last month the Chilean Government reached an agreement with the Anaconda Company to buy out that firm's vast copper mining operations there. U.S. oil companies in other places are facing restrictions on the size of their concessions.

It is also significant that some Latin American countries are limiting foreign participation in such varied fields as landownership, banking, and information media. Brazil, for example, issued decrees this year regulating the sale of land to foreigners, and altering in a number of respects the principle of equal treatment for foreign and domestic firms.

I do not conclude from these developments that U.S. petroleum and mining companies will necessarily be subjected to a wave of further expropriations throughout Latin America, although that is what Soviet propaganda in Latin America is urging. And I certainly do not mean to suggest that U.S. business and private investment has no future in Latin America. It is noteworthy, for example, that although Mexico has extremely strict regulations with regard to foreign ownership of enterprises, over \$1 billion of U.S. capital has been invested there during the past 20 years and the country is regarded as an excellent investment area.

Nevertheless, I do believe that as in other aspects of our relations with Latin America, so in the field of business and investments we are entering a new stage. It promises to be one in which U.S. private companies will be operating more and more on Latin American terms, and it will demand increased sensitivity on the part of U.S. private investors, entrepreneurs, and managers not only with regard to the environment of the particular host country, but also to the goals of U.S. policy. This is one more trend which calls for reassessment of our past policies and practices.

I could point to developments in still other fields which have helped to bring us to the turning point I feel we have reached in our relations with Latin Amer-

ica, but I believe those cited are sufficient to make the point.

II. SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Now, let us turn for a moment to the United States. What trends, what developments do we see here that are relevant to our attitudes and policies toward Latin America? There are innumerable viewpoints in this country, of course. But if I am not mistaken, the prevailing mood of Congress and the public is one of disappointment, discouragement, and frustration that things somehow have not gone well in our relations with Latin America. There is considerable confusion as to just what we do now and where we go from here. There is a tendency to look for convenient targets for blame, be it the State Department, AID, the U.S. military, or Latin Americans who sometimes seem to North Americans to be much more energetic at criticizing the United States than they are helping themselves.

It is disappointing to note that while illiteracy was one of the main targets of the Alliance, there are more illiterates in Latin America today than there were when the Alliance was conceived. It is frustrating to realize that while the Alliance was supposed to help promote political democracy as well as economic development and growth, there are more military governments in Latin America now than there were 8 years ago.

In Congress this reaction has resulted in deep cuts in Alliance appropriations. Some able and intelligent individuals in and out of Government now share the view that the Alliance was naively conceived, hopelessly optimistic in its objectives, and grossly oversold to Latin America and to the North American public. They argue that experience has proved that there is, after all, relatively little that the United States can do to help the economic or political development of Latin America, that neither the withholding of economic assistance nor the refusal of diplomatic recognition have been effective instruments for discouraging military golpes and fostering the growth of democratic institutions, that our role at best can be but peripheral, and that wisdom therefore recommends reducing our commitments and presence.

They reason that the reduction of U.S. presence will remove many of the irritants in our relations with Latin America, that U.S. disengagement will be psychologically healthier for Latin Americans in encouraging them to take the initiative and to shoulder greater responsibility. They believe that the United States will, with disengagement, get less of the blame for future failures in Latin America.

Thus we have reached a turning point in our own attitudes toward Latin America—a point which also presents new opportunities and dangers.

Speaking personally, I would like to express my own hopes and my own apprehensions on this subject. Let me begin by spelling out my reaction to North American frustrations which lead some to a desire to disengage. Then, I would like to suggest an alternative course.

First of all, I understand and sym-

pathize with this frustration and the irritation which it has caused. I also agree that the Alliance was oversold and that it was overly optimistic in its expectations. I further agree that there are very real limitations on the extent of the influence we can and should exert in Latin America, and that Latin Americans must shape their own future.

Nevertheless, I have long been convinced that what the United States does and does not do, has and will continue to have, profound repercussions in Latin America. I disagree strongly with the argument that we should diminish our efforts and our commitments to Latin America and attempt to reduce our involvement.

That objective is totally unrealistic.

The thrust of recent history indicates that, regardless of whether we wish it or not, our impact on Latin America will be even greater than it is now, that we are going to draw closer together rather than farther apart, and that our daily lives and destinies will be more closely linked than ever before. Nor will attempts to extricate ourselves reduce in any way the volume of Latin American criticism or diminish Latin American claims on our cooperation. I would expect quite the contrary. As I pointed out at the outset, our very size and existence make our impact on Latin America substantial and inevitable.

I, therefore, maintain that the best course lies not in reducing our efforts to assist Latin America, but rather in increasing them while employing techniques more effective and sophisticated, more sensitive and acceptable to Latin America. There is no question in my mind but that we have it within our capacity to do much better in Latin America than we have to date.

I hope that rather than conclude that our record shows we cannot improve our performance, we will now seek to learn from our experience and return to the task with renewed determination. I also hope that we will discard once and for all the illusion that there are going to be any quick, easy, and simple solutions to the problems of Latin America. Finally, we should not let discouragement with the Alliance blind us to its many solid achievements. The U.S. contribution to those achievements reflects credit on our people and Government, and particularly on the competent, dedicated, and hard-working officials of the Department of State and the Agency for International Development.

III. SOME RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FUTURE U.S. POLICY

I now turn to some specific suggestions as to a few of the ways in which I believe U.S. performance in inter-American affairs could be improved. They are certainly not intended as a panacea for the many ills which beset Latin America and inter-American relations. Nor do they touch on such important issues as health and education, population, agrarian reform, labor, military assistance programs, and Cuba. But I believe on the basis of my own personal experience and observations, both in this country and in Latin America, that the following recom-

mendations, if implemented, would yield beneficial results and that they are well within our capacity to implement if we but have the will. Last, and of particular concern to this body, these recommendations could for the most part be accommodated within levels of appropriations presently being sought for our Latin American programs.

1. A CLEAR POLICY

The United States must develop and announce an unequivocal policy statement making clear that we regard the development of a democratic, independent, well-educated, and prosperous Latin America to be important to our own interests as well as to those of our neighbors. The fact that such goals may be beyond immediate reach of some of the Latin American nations does not obviate the need for clarifying and reaffirming our long-range objectives. This is all the more important since confusion and misunderstanding regarding U.S. policies now abound in Latin America, where it is too widely assumed that we seek to preserve the status quo, force our neighbors into the role of impoverished, semi-colonial satellites, and pin a Communist label on those calling for basic, structural social change.

As to the perennial controversy over whether the goals of Latin American economic development or democracy and social justice should take precedence in our policy plans, advocates of both sides usually assume that one objective can or must wait upon attainment of the other. In actual practice, that assumption has proved to be false. Both goals can be achieved more rapidly if we pursue them simultaneously, and it is in our interest to cooperate with Latin America in doing so.

Likewise, the controversy over whether we should be "for democracy" or "work with" military governments is equally unrealistic. We can and should emphasize to all concerned our preference for democratic government while recognizing that the facts of Latin American political life indicate clearly that democratic development will not come quickly or easily.

The maintenance of normal diplomatic relation with nondemocratic governments—and these include a wide variety of regimes functioning in a wide variety of circumstances—is not, in itself, a betrayal of our democratic objectives and should not be regarded as such.

2. SUSTAINED COMMITMENT

Concrete proof of a genuine and mature U.S. commitment to sustained, long-range cooperation would have a positive and steadying effect on Latin America. Inter-American affairs have long suffered from too much rhetoric unsupported by substantive commitment and action. Therefore, an increase in the AID appropriations and other concrete forms of economic assistance must be an essential part of our policy. However, we should avoid the mistake, which has often proved very costly in the past, of assuming that money is the only, or even the decisive, factor in promoting Latin American development. The trick is people, not dollars or pesos.

3. DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

One of the fundamental weaknesses of the Alliance has been its excessive reliance on central governments, with little or no involvement of the mass of the population in either selecting or carrying out Alliance programs. A number of us in Congress have long been concerned over this basic shortcoming.

In 1966, I cosponsored with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act which calls for "assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of people of developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions." Despite much rhetoric, this mandate has largely been neglected. It has been neglected principally because AID officials generally have far more experience in economic development, and they naturally prefer to stick to what they know best. In part this neglect, frankly, reflects skepticism regarding the feasibility or even desirability of title IX objectives.

And yet the results achieved at local levels in some places have revealed the dramatic potential of this approach.

It is essential to place more emphasis on civic development and the promotion of local community institutions. This can be done by applying methods which have already proved successful and by giving leadership responsibilities to those most affected by the proposed projects. It is impossible to promote democracy without involving the people of the society.

4. EFFECTIVE TRADE PROMOTION

Clearly the less developed countries must expand their export earnings to finance increased imports or capital goods and essential raw materials, and to service their international debts. To some extent the problems they face may be eased through concessions on imports by the United States and other developed countries. However, concessions are not necessarily an answer. They can do as much harm as good by permitting inefficiency and high costs in local production to continue indefinitely. We could use sugar quotas as an example. Judging from all indications, no significant percentage of the profits accruing from sugar quotas has been used for national economic development plans, for improved efficiency in production, or for improved labor conditions in the producing countries.

Some international action may be necessary to establish price floors to prevent the complete collapse of prices while normal market forces work to adjust the flow of trade between countries. This kind of stabilization, in my view, would be desirable and has been achieved through devices such as the International Coffee Agreement. But most of the effort to increase profits through trade must be made by the less developed countries themselves. There are countless examples of countries which have lost important export markets because they failed to pay attention to production requirements and export promotion. Available evidence suggests the likelihood that in practically every coun-

try there are major opportunities for profitable expansion of exports and/or economically sound substitutes for imports. But this requires a concentrated and professional effort in locating trade opportunities, in organizing the needed private and public production and marketing efforts to supply proper qualities and quantities at the right time, in obtaining the needed financing, and in carrying out the essential export promotion. The United States could effectively provide the necessary managerial advice to achieve this goal.

The prevalent foreign trade image of the United States in Latin America is that of an industrial nation which sells manufactured goods to the developing countries at steadily increasing prices while importing raw materials and agricultural commodities at advantageous prices from them. But the fact is that we also export large quantities of raw materials. U.S. exports of agricultural products alone exceeded \$6 billion last year. This year they will again approximate that figure, with about \$5 billion in cash sales. The tremendous growth achieved by the United States in soybean output and exports serves as one example of the opportunities available in the field of agricultural production and trade. In the early post World War II period we produced and exported less than \$10 million worth of soybeans a year. Now soybean production is a multi-billion dollar crop, and our last year's exports of beans, oil, and meal were valued at well over \$1 billion.

South America provides a similar success story in this field. In 1964, Brazil was faced with a serious problem because exports had failed to keep up with foreign exchange needs. Helped by temporary balance-of-payments support from us and others Brazil set about diversifying production and exports. Through its own effort and determination, that country has expended exports of nontraditional agricultural commodities by 50 to 75 percent—\$200 to \$300 million per year—since 1964, accounting for about 15 to 20 percent of total national exports. Brazil's export earnings are now almost sufficient to meet her total foreign exchange needs for imports of capital and consumer goods and for supplies and debt servicing. Our contribution to this success consisted largely of technical assistance, plus modest amounts of financial aid.

Ecuador is faced with a similar foreign exchange problem, though of different proportions. Banana exports, which in 1968 accounted for half of Ecuador's total exports of \$210 million, are expected to be off sharply in 1969 and to decline still further in 1970. Action is urgently needed to locate and develop new opportunities for export and for import substitution. Through agreements for private development of petroleum and timber, Ecuador expects to improve its foreign exchange position by \$30 to \$35 million per year after 1973-74. However, these earnings will not meet interim needs and if the present rapid growth rate of imports continues, they will not meet post-1974 needs either. A study now being completed suggests several other potentially favorable commodity opportunities which, through a

combination of economically sound import substitution and export expansion, would provide over \$50 million per year to relieve balance-of-payments pressures.

This is an area of United States-Latin American cooperation of great potential benefit to our neighbors and involving relatively little cost to us. We should encourage Latin Americans to seek and expand production and trade opportunities, and we should help them in doing so.

5. PROGRAMS THAT REACH THE PEOPLE

Most U.S. assistance programs in Latin America have concentrated mainly on the development of large industry and urban services, housing and living conditions, leaving very little for the 50 to 85 percent of the Latin Americans who live in the campo and in the smaller towns and cities. Nevertheless, we have learned through experience that the intelligent and well-coordinated application of modest resources can achieve a great and rapid impact in rural areas in terms of agricultural production. A 5- to 6-percent annual increase over a period of 5 years would be quite possible in most South American countries. Rural living standards can be raised appreciably at costs of from a few dollars to a few hundred per family, compared with several times the amount needed for creating urban jobs and barely adequate urban living conditions. This in turn would reduce the massive migration to the cities which is already overwhelming urban facilities and creating political pressures of dangerous proportions.

Future U.S. lending should concentrate more on rural and interior areas with emphasis on such targets as production and marketing, processing of agricultural products, building farm-to-market roads, and the development of local community services. Large industry and most urban programs would be better left to other international lenders and multilateral agencies. Except for emergencies, U.S. bilateral loans should not be made for the principal purpose of financing general commodity imports. Instead, the United States should reserve its loans for institutions that will provide new public and commercial services which help the small man get on his feet, or that stimulate private initiative generally.

6. PRIVATE INITIATIVE

Latin American private enterprise could play a much more productive and beneficial role than it does at present. Properly encouraged and controlled, it is capable of infusing faltering economies with new sources of energy and income. In many areas of Latin America private initiative is thought of in terms of the dog-eat-dog practices prevalent in the 19th century. And in all too many instances local practices justify that image. There may be some ways in which the United States could effectively encourage Latin America to derive much greater benefit from the private enterprise sector; for example, to—

Assist willing countries in systematically identifying and studying opportunities for increasing production and improving distribution through expanding the private sector.

Encourage the use of economic incentives which some countries have used

successfully to attract funds and managerial know-how from indigenous sources into productive private enterprise in depressed areas.

Employ seed money obtained from U.S. Government, business, and elsewhere to establish special funds for the financing of investments which develop indigenous talents.

Ask the U.S. business community to lend, at its own cost, junior executive or professional talent on a rotating 1-year basis for specialized management skills needed in Latin American business. This would be a kind of business-world Peace Corps. I have been encouraged to note that the new Peace Corps director, Joseph Blatchford, is moving in the direction of attracting highly skilled individuals into the Corps. The International Executive Service Corps can also play an expanded role.

Assist Latin American governments in identifying government services which indigenous private enterprise could manage more economically, thereby permitting them to shift public resources to areas presently neglected.

7. DIALOGUE WITH LATIN AMERICA

It is essential to establish a more meaningful dialogue and increase rapport with those Latin American groups, particularly intellectuals and students, who are highly critical of our policies but who are still open to reason and persuasion. Fortunately our visa policy has become more intelligent in recent years, and Latin American leftists wishing to visit the United States usually have no difficulty in obtaining the necessary authorization. But visits and tours to the United States, useful as they are, are not enough to provide a clear perspective of our country with all its virtues and defects. And at all events the numbers of Latin Americans involved in such visits are relatively small. We must improve the quality and scope of our dialogue, especially with Latin Americans outside government circles. More frank and vigorous give-and-take is needed, not only for purposes of mutual understanding and correction of misconceptions, but also to overcome unfortunate prejudices which have developed on both sides in our relations over past decades.

Neglect of this aspect of our relationship with Latin America, either through failure to understand its importance or because of fear and resentment of Latin American criticism in frank discussions, has cost us heavily in the past. Our officials should be encouraged to develop an activist approach to the dialogue with Latin America, and should be trained to become much more effective at it. This includes a willingness to listen as well as to talk, and an ability to explain the United States and its policies with honesty and objectivity.

8. IMPROVED PERSONNEL SELECTION

Our performance in Latin America could be improved through better selection and assignment of experienced and professionally qualified State, AID and other officials, including our military representatives, especially for key posts both here and in the field. Selection should be based on proven ability and

achievement in the actual implementation of U.S. policies and in improving our relations with Latin America, particularly along the lines set forth in these recommendations. Among others, the trade promotion and title IX programs will require dedicated, experienced professionals with private as well as public experience working directly and full-time on these activities.

9. OAS LEADERSHIP

We should help to increase the prestige and effectiveness of the OAS by working to improve the level of its day-to-day operations, its decisionmaking ability, and the quality of its personnel. Special emphasis should be placed on recruiting officials who are skilled in the fields of economic and civic development. To the extent the OAS gains recognition and acceptance as a competent, serious and useful organization there will be a lessened tendency to interpret inter-American affairs as an inevitable confrontation between the United States and Latin America.

10. COORDINATION OF U.S. ACTIVITY

Much more could be done inside the United States to raise the level of our knowledge and understanding of Latin America. Progress in this field could be achieved by increasing and improving relations among the various sectors of our society which are involved, in one way or another, with Latin America. Hopefully this would yield better results in the performance of all concerned. During my years in Congress I have often despaired, not only over the lack of coordination among those sectors but also with the amount of mutual suspicion and even hostility which prevails. Congress is frequently superficial and unfair in its criticism of the State Department, and the latter is usually extremely defensive and cagey in its dealings with the Hill. Some of the Latin Americanists in our academic community regard any contact with the Government as pointless. And there is much wasted motion and misunderstanding on all sides. I am not suggesting for a moment that we should all get together to agree on a common "party line." But I am convinced that we all have a great deal to learn, much of it from one another.

As a specific example, it would be very useful if more of the results of United States and Latin American research and scholarship could be injected into the "think tanks" of the State Department, and if our academicians could be brought a little closer to the realities of Latin American problems which confront us daily in Government. The State Department's creation of a special office to follow and report on U.S. research on Latin America was an excellent step in this direction. But I would hope that much more frequent contact and exchange can be developed among all of us who are seriously committed to improving United States-Latin American relations.

Mr. Speaker, the 10 suggestions I have outlined today only scratch the surface of possibilities for improvement in United States-Latin American relations. As I mentioned, I have not addressed myself in detail to the massive substantive

problems of literacy, public health, housing, and population growth, among others.

Together with the Latins, and with their leadership, we can solve those problems. But we cannot be unrealistic about what that solution will require. It will require: A realistic time frame; the will of the Latin Americans and their leaders; sensitive, patient and understanding U.S. participation; and a commitment, stated at the highest levels of our Government, to active U.S. participation in the challenge of Latin American political, social and economic development.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I believe we are at a critical turning point in our relations with Latin America. This point is fraught with dangers as well as opportunities. We can, like spoiled children, pick up our marbles and go away in frustration and defeat. Or we can use the wealth of tools at our disposal to develop a mature relationship with an important, vibrant and exciting area of the world.

It is my judgment that we must take the second path and take it with dispatch and sensitivity.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House passed the tax reform bill of 1969. It was a commendable effort. Although it does not meet all of our expectations, it is a beginning down the long road toward tax equality.

Now our attention must turn to our Nation's senior citizens. It is imperative that this session of the 91st Congress adopt legislation to increase social security benefits. Those hardest hit by the current inflation have been the elderly. It is unconscionable that our senior citizens should suffer because the Government has been unable to control the rising cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session I introduced social security legislation which would raise benefits by 15 percent and set a minimum payment at \$80 per month. Built into the system would be a cost-of-living increase provision. Over 80 Members of the House of Representatives cosponsored this legislation.

In addition, my staff has just completed a study of all other social security legislation which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by all Members. The compilation of different types of bills, by number and sponsoring Member's name will be included at the conclusion of my remarks. In summary, this study shows that nearly 700 separate social security bills have already been introduced this year: 124 Members introduced legislation to increase social security benefits; 149 Members introduced cost-of-living increase measures; 172 Members introduced disability coverage.

This study clearly shows the extensive support which exists among members of both parties for immediate action on social security improvements. It is my sincere hope that the Ways and Means Committee will take immediate action on this vital legislation. Our senior citizens deserve nothing less.

Number of Members introducing or co-sponsoring bills (by party)¹

Percentage and dollar minimum benefit increase:	
Democrat	108
Republican	16
Cost of living increase:	
Democrat	105
Republican	44
Special increases in benefits:	
Democrat	5
Republican	2
Computation of benefits:	
Democrat	8
Republican	2
Death benefits:	
Democrat	9
Republican	4
Maximum limitation on earned income:	
Democrat	161
Republican	82
Coverage (Federal, State, and local Employees):	
Democrat	21
Republican	10
Disability benefits (eligibility):	
Democrat	118
Republican	54
Eligibility:	
Democrat	12
Republican	4
Benefits at 72 for certain uninsured individuals:	
Democrat	24
Republican	6
Benefit categories (adoptions, parent, wives, etc.):	
Democrat	20
Republican	5
Taxes and contributions:	
Democrat	13
Republican	4
Total Democrats	604
Total Republicans	233

HEALTH BENEFITS

General aid and miscellaneous amendments:	
Democrat	105
Republican	26
Child health and welfare; aid to dependent children:	
Democrat	86
Republican	6
Hospital insurance for the aged:	
Democrat	104
Republican	18
Supplemental medical insurance:	
Democrat	70
Republican	16
Grants to States for medical assistance programs:	
Democrat	4
Republican	4
Total Democrats	369
Total Republicans	70
Grand total:	
Democrats	973
Republicans	303

¹ Correct as to the Ways and Means calendar and subsequent additions through Aug. 8, 1969.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROFILE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a new way has recently been discovered by those who would seek "instant publicity" to

acquire same, by the simple device of catagating the Department of Defense.

There are those who have served in the Congress for 20 years and more, who have had opportunities time and time again, year after year, to express their opinions of this Federal agency; yet no voices of criticism had been heard until recently, when it apparently became fashionable and the "in" thing to do, to take "picks" on the military in general and the Department of Defense in particular. I have taken my swings at individuals therein, especially civilians at the top level, but today I speak of and for the organization, and especially one of its components.

I am not here today to defend the Department of Defense, their record of achievement for defense of air, land, and sea, needs no words of backing from me; however, I do wish to take this time to commend one section of that Department, for an outstanding contribution to the city of Neosho, Mo., located in the Seventh Congressional District, a district that I have proudly been privileged to represent in the Congress since 1960.

I refer to the Office of Economic Adjustment, its Director, Donald F. Bradford, and his fine staff, who at my request studied the problem, surveyed it with me, and have made at least two subsequent helpful and cooperative trips to the area, and then prepared an industrial profile and district plan for the city of Neosho.

All of this, following the loss of its major industry, the Rocketdyne plant of North American Rockwell, when its liquid propelled rocket engines were phased out, and the remaining capability was merged with other plants belonging to the company.

To those of you unfamiliar with the industrial profile idea and the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, let me provide you with a brief background on the subject—

The Office of Economic Adjustment was established in March 1961 by the Secretary of Defense for the specific purpose of assisting individuals and communities to adjust to the economic impacts of changes in programs of the Department of Defense. It operates under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for installations and logistics, Mr. Barry Shillito.

The Office of Economic Adjustment is assisted by representatives of other Federal agencies who join in ad hoc conferences or community visits under the management of the DOD.

Assistance to private individuals and business firms provided indirectly by helping communities raise their levels of economic activity.

Assistance to communities consists of counseling and technical support: That is, helping community leaders—who invite its assistance—to organize for economic growth, to develop a strategy for economic expansion and diversification, to identify the resources and liabilities of the area, and to find and apply appropriate Federal programs.

Since its establishment, the OEA has engaged in a total of 98 projects in 39

States. Among these, 61 were major base closures, and nine others contract-change situations. At the present time, 21 base closure projects and two contract-change projects are active in the OEA offices in varying degrees.

The Office of Economic Adjustment is manned by five professionals and two secretaries. It has no field offices. It contracts for industrial development assistance at a cost of \$22,500 annually.

On June 26 of this year, Mr. Donald Bradford, accompanied by four members of his staff, journeyed to Neosho, Mo. for the third time and for the purpose of presenting the industrial development profile to the leaders of that city, and to discuss with them the intention of the Air Force to declare certain—old deactivated Fort Crowder—industrial properties of interest to the community—surplus to its needs.

The industrial profile, a 92-page document prepared by the OEA, was developed after numerous trips to Neosho and much research and preparation. It contains a detailed charting of the course, for Neosho's best industrial development strategy based on the economic activities and locational factors of Neosho in today's national economy.

The profile deals in great detail with seven areas of importance:

First. The economy of the Neosho area;
Second. An evaluation of the industrial development program;

Third. Recommendations for an industrial development strategy;

Fourth. Target industries recommended for promotion;

Fifth. The industrial development program;

Sixth. Development and control of industrial land;

Seventh. Training for the industrial skills of the future.

The visit to Neosho, Mo. by the Director and staff of the Office of Economic Adjustment, has brightened considerably the prospects of that community to attract and acquire new industry, and has assured the people that the pullout of an important defense-related, high-employment industry, will not leave them stranded and helpless in their quest of improving the economic base of their community.

I am sure that the advice, and analysis offered the city of Neosho, Mo. will benefit it as much as it has other cities.

To cite a few examples:

First. The Brookley Air Force Base in Mobile, Ala., was announced for closure in November of 1964. Following the development of a program by the Office of Economic Adjustment, the city of Mobile has established a general aviation airport, an industrial development park, which has accounted for 1,635 jobs, including an engine remanufacturing plant of Continental Motors Corp., which employs 1,200 persons.

The University of South Alabama built on 250 acres of the property, and by the end of 1970, the campus is projected to have a student enrollment of 3,260 and a faculty and staff of 250.

In addition to these major uses, the city of Mobile will use 24 acres of the

property for a new city park and a U.S. Coast Guard station will occupy a portion of the former base.

Overall, 11,000 new jobs have been created in the Mobile area since the initiation of the industrial profile by the economic adjustment program.

Second. Olmsted Air Force Base, in Middletown, Pa., was scheduled to be closed in June 1969. It was found possible, however, to close the installation one year earlier because of the rapid development of civilian uses for the property following closure announcement.

Civil aviation, industry, and higher education represented the major civilian uses found for the property.

Olmstead State Airport, a regional jet airport, was established.

Warehouses have been converted to factory space by a number of companies, such as Fruehauf Corporation. The total of more than 20 industrial and service enterprises occupying space at the former base provides employment for 1,500 persons.

The State Capitol campus of Pennsylvania State University opened at Olmsted with an enrollment of 500; by 1975 the enrollment figure is expected to rise to 7,500.

A residual military use is represented by the presence of the Pennsylvania National Guard on a portion of the property.

Third. To cite another example, Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans., was closed in June 1965. With the industrial profile made available to the city by the Office of Economic Adjustment, Salina was encouraged to turn part of the base into a new municipal airport. A number of industrial enterprises, such as Beech Aircraft Corp., have set up operations on the property and current employment is running over 2,000 persons.

An area vocational-technical school with an enrollment and faculty of 500 is established on the property and a "waiting wives" program for 3,092 dependents of military personnel serving overseas are occupying Capehart housing at the installation.

Many other cities, have received the most helpful attention of this fine division of the Department of Defense.

To name a few:

Waco, Tex., James Connally Air Force Base; Erie Army Depot, Port Clinton, Ohio; Hastings Naval Ammunition Depot, Hastings, Nebr.; Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine. The shock of losing a defense related industry would be great for any community, be it large or small. The Department of Defense, being under no obligation to involve itself in local problems, could well have plead "too busy," or have adopted a "so what," "hands off" policy, and gone on about its business. Instead, realizing, the loss of jobs, income, and opportunity that would befall a community undergoing such a loss, the Office of Economic Adjustment was created, and has paid for itself many times over and good will and competent service to many cities of the Nation.

It is a pleasure for me to speak in their

behalf today, and say to them, for the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri and the city of Neosho, thank you for a job well done.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for mentioning in some detail the work that has been done in Mobile, Ala., since the closing of the Brookley Air Force Base there.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, as the gentleman in the well knows, and as many of us in the House know from experience, that when the word comes down from the Defense Department that a base is going to be closed in a Member's district, sudden panic sets in. Certainly that was the case in my district. Two weeks after I was first elected and before I ever set foot into Washington, Secretary McNamara ordered Brookley Air Force Base closed.

There were 13,000 civilians working on that base, and about 1,000 military people. This represented 17 percent of the work force in the area of Mobile, Ala., the biggest industry in southwest Alabama, if you will, and all of a sudden the ax descended.

So when you shake yourselves, and shake that sort of a thing off and try to get your wits about you again, and your people start to rally and to try to save the base, as is proper, and find that that is out of the question, then there appears on the scene Don Bradford, and the Office of Economic Adjustment, with the sole purpose of trying to assist the community in overcoming this impact.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Missouri is very sound when he says that one of the smart things the Defense Department has done is to take into consideration the fact that there will be an impact when one of these bases is closed, and to set up a department such as the Office of Economic Adjustment to go in and work with the community leaders, with the city officials, the county officials, with the chamber of commerce, and all other officials and citizens in trying to help them, through experience with past base closings, to find ways and means to convert the facility to a thoroughly useful purpose insofar as the community is concerned.

What the gentleman from Missouri has said about the progress made in Mobile, Ala., is true. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have now located Lear-Siegler in Mobile with the help of Don Bradford and his agency.

This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that they go personally and solicit industry; that is not their business, but they find ways to help the community do the job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with my colleague in the well, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) in his comments about the agency and in his comments about Mr. Bradford himself, and to say that the agency and Mr. Bradford and his fine staff have been of immeasurable value to the peo-

ple of southwest Alabama in trying to work out the problems created by the unfortunate—and I still believe wrongful—closing of Brookley Air Force Base.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us who have dealt with industrial procurement, industry related, and defense related, and other agencies in our own communities, know full well that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) was right in there scrambling, so that, even with the help of the base technicians, as far as industrial profiles and business and management procedures are concerned, the local community can do much to lift itself up by its own bootstraps.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the comments made by the gentleman from Alabama, and I am also delighted with the additions that have recently come to his community, and I certainly appreciate the gentleman's comments about this defense agency.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important as a member of the Committee on Armed Services that we lend a hand and recognize the degree of service given to our Nation over and above the call of duty at times by our various agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) whose predecessor, the present Senator from Kansas, has just been on the floor—to insert his remarks concerning the situation at Salina, Kans., and that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) be permitted to extend his remarks on this subject of the Economic Adjustment Agency of the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to point out and illustrate how cooperation between a Federal agency and a local community can achieve meaningful results through an example in my home State of Kansas. We hear much about the ineffectiveness of our vast Government bureaucracy; I think the public should also be aware when a Government program achieves proven success.

I would like to thank my good friend and colleague from Missouri, Mr. HALL, for giving me this opportunity to talk about the cooperation and progress between the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense and the City of Salina, Kans.

As the gentleman from Missouri pointed out, Schilling Air Force Base in Salina, Kans., was closed in June 1965—a decision that might have meant an economic crisis for the city of Salina, located in the First Congressional District in Kansas.

However, the Office of Economic Adjustment developed an industrial profile similar to past projects for Neosho, Mo., and Mobile, Ala. The offer of qualified

assistance by the Federal Government sparked local initiative by community, city and county leaders, and many civic organizations.

The combination of advice and direction from the Federal Government plus local involvement and enthusiasm attracted industry to Salina, stimulating the economy and avoiding the slack in business activity that was anticipated.

My colleagues from Missouri and Alabama have already mentioned the basic reason for this success. The Office of Economic Adjustment based on their past experience, has with a minimal staff, been most successful in offering sound advice to communities in similar situations. The key to their success is that they allow the local community to make the key decisions and plot the course to achieve the goal of economic growth.

To paraphrase the gentleman from Missouri, "There is nothing that will sustain the momentum in a local community more than the pride resulting from a community lifting itself up by its own bootstraps."

The success of this approach in Salina, Kans., has been noteworthy; Beech Aircraft Corp. set up operations on the base employing over 2,000 persons; an area vocational-technical school, with an enrollment and faculty of over 500, uses the facility; and a waiting wives program and organization for 3,092 dependents of military personnel serving overseas is located on this property.

Mr. Speaker, I think this cooperative progress emphasizes a basic principle in keeping with President Nixon's "New Federalism"—that the Federal Government should provide for local initiative to implement the programs, direction, and other assistance provided by our governmental agencies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks concerning the Economic Assistance Division of the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIVING INCOME PROGRAM OF 1969

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was joined by three of my colleagues in introducing legislation that would provide a realistic living income for all citizens. Mr. WHALEN, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. RYAN and I feel that the National Living Income Program Act will provide subsistence, not affluence for all Americans; but it will treat the poor as they have not been treated by any past or pending legislation, with dignity and as equal and individual citizens.

In concept, our plan seems similar to the family assistance plan outlined by

President Nixon in that the Government undertakes a form of income maintenance as a substitute for welfare. In reality, the President's family assistance program departs little from the theories behind current welfare programs. Conceptually and specifically it contrasts greatly with the national living income program. The administration has not accepted that a minimum standard of living is a right, not a privilege in the wealthiest nation in history. A person is forced to work under the family assistance program to receive family assistance; it is available only to couples with children, implying that the older generation does not deserve help. The level of assistance under the Nixon plan is only half the requirement for a minimum existence. It provides a financial foundation but not a living.

Three important issues are involved in any income maintenance plan our proposal attempts to resolve in a new way. To the question below what level should no family's income be allowed to fall, we assert that the poverty line set by the Social Security Administration is the absolute minimum. With the affluence and expertise possessed by the United States, the Federal Government has the responsibility and the resources to insure that all its citizens—families, couples, and single persons—enjoy at least this minimum standard of living. A floor of \$3,200 for a family of four faces the realities of the cost of living. Even a \$3,200 benefit level for a family of four provides nothing more than subsistence in a time of great inflation of all prices; \$3,200 will not allow a family to live in affluence, but is just adequate for its basic needs.

A welfare plan fails if it does nothing to help its recipients to take over from the Government the task of supporting them, and to choose for themselves the type of life they want. Thus we have included a system of work incentives to provide the poor with the tools by which they may become more productive members of society. Payments are not contingent on employment, but the more outside income a person earns, the more he is able to keep. He will eventually, under the national living income program, be able to work his way up from the subsistence level of government benefits, to a decent living which he has earned. The right to live and survive should not be a reward that can be taken away as punishment. The living income program encourages, but does not coerce, the poor to work.

This is one of the most serious problem with the Nixon proposal, that it seeks to impose the desire to work. It substitutes incentives to work for coercion to work. If the threat is not accepted, loss of payments results as punishments.

Through this legislation we seek not only to encourage employment, but also human dignity. The theory that, if welfare is distasteful and shameful enough, people will be dissuaded from accepting it and get a job instead, has not proved valid. Only a small percentage of those receiving welfare have been found to abuse it, and only a small number of the poor are actually able to work, but do

not. If the Government asserts that a living income is available to all citizens as a human right, the poor can accept the money without a stigma and will be free to use it as they wish, to make the choices that any other consumer makes, to feel that they are directing their own lives.

The goals of the national living income program are ambitious; the scope is wide. Yet I believe we cannot afford to strive for less. This Nation can—must—provide the \$20 million our program will cost. If we reordered our priorities so that human needs come before missiles and dams and buildings, the money would be easy to come by. The sooner the Vietnam war ends, the sooner the Government can devote proper attention to its underprivileged citizens.

Mr. WHALEN and I first presented a draft of our current proposal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 10, 1969 as a bipartisan attack on the problem of poverty which pays no heed to party affiliations. Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. RYAN joined us yesterday in cosponsoring the national living income program. We introduce it as a realistic approach to the problem, more in the hope that the principle will provide a basis for study than in the expectation that it will immediately become the law of the land.

I believe, however, that this is a worthwhile objective that will gain acceptance as its purpose becomes clear to the Congress. In this spirit I insert a summary of our bill, confident that this beginning will attract, stimulate, and move my colleagues to join us in this newest and most vital antipoverty effort:

SUMMARY: NATIONAL LIVING INCOME PROGRAM ACT OF 1969

The National Living Income Program Act of 1969 is designed not only to eliminate poverty and provide incentives for work, but also to encourage stable family structures, to protect the rights and dignity of the recipients, and to do all this without impossible burdens on administration. These goals are difficult to achieve, but this proposal, outlined originally by Professor James Tobin of Yale and worked out in detail by the *Yale Law Journal*, comes closer than any other to satisfying the numerous requirements of a comprehensive and decent family assistance program.

HOW THE PROPOSED NATIONAL LIVING INCOME PROGRAM WOULD OPERATE

A family (a single man or single woman is considered a "family") may receive an "income supplement". The family may choose either to have its supplement paid in semimonthly installments or in a lump sum at the end of the year. If the family decides to have the Treasury pay benefits twice a month, it must file an affidavit estimating its income for the calendar year, based on its income from the previous year. Benefits are then paid on the basis of these affidavits. Except in special cases, only a specified random percentage of these affidavits may be investigated by the government. Benefits may not be discontinued without granting a hearing to the recipient prior to the date of cutoff.

The amount which the government will pay to a family is equal to the family's basic income supplement, reduced by one-half of any income which the family has received. The definition of income is very comprehensive, including, for example, a fixed percentage of the value of a recipient's capital assets and imputed rent on his house as well

as almost all income taxed under the positive tax system. If a family has no income, it will be entitled to the entire basic income supplement, which approximates the Social Security Administration poverty line for the particular family size and varies only according to the cost-of-living in the area in which the family resides.

The following schedule shows the sliding scale of benefits provided by the Act on the basis of the Social Security Administration's figures:

Number in family:	Income supplement
1. (adult) -----	\$1,200
2. (1 adult, one child) -----	1,800
3. (2 adults) -----	2,000
4. (2 adults, 1 child) -----	2,600
5. (2 adults, 2 children) -----	3,200
Each additional child -----	600

These figures are for the nation as a whole. Income supplements in New York City would be higher, while those for rural Mississippi or South Carolina would be lower.

The Act contains many provisions to protect the rights and dignity of recipients. All payments are to be made in cash and there are no restrictions on how the family may spend money and no circumstances under which it can lose its entitlement. Finally, the Act provides generous administrative and judicial remedies for aggrieved members of recipient families.

The National Living Income Program is to be federally funded and federally administered. The administration of the Program would be vested in a newly-created agency within the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Income Maintenance, and it would be funded directly from the federal treasury. The Program would thus free substantial state funds for other state and local projects. The personnel involved in welfare administration would be allowed to concentrate on providing counseling and advisory services, together with administering whatever emergency financial assistance was still needed.

An example of a hypothetical family of four will show how these elements fit together. The income supplement for this family is \$3,200 a year. If the family has no earnings or other available income for the year, it will receive the full income supplement, which is set at the poverty level. Thus, even the poorest families get enough money so that they need not live in poverty. If, however, a member of the family takes a job and earns \$3,000 a year, so that the family's available income climbs from zero to \$3,000, its supplement will drop from \$3,200 to \$1,700 (the supplement is reduced by half of available income). The family's final income for the year—including the supplement paid by the government—is thus equal to \$3,000 (earned) plus \$1,700 (supplement) or a total of \$4,700. There are two points to note here. First, the National Living Income Program preserves a substantial financial incentive for continued employment and advancement. As family available income climbs from zero to \$3,000, the supplement is not reduced dollar-for-dollar, but only fifty cents on each dollar earned. In effect, the family is allowed to keep half of what it makes. Second, most families will have an income far in excess of its income supplement. These well-to-do families would, therefore, lose money under the program and so would not elect to participate.

ENDING THE RURAL HOUSING VACUUM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, rural America—30 percent of the Nation's

population and 99 percent of its land-mass—is in a vacuum so far as the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families are concerned. This condition exists and is worsening despite the fact that rural America has nearly half of all the Nation's poverty stricken people and two-thirds of its substandard housing. It exists despite a mountain of testimony and reports on housing—despite an extensive and continuously growing library of housing legislation—despite frequently repeated 20-year-old promises that everyone in the land is entitled to adequate housing and a suitable living environment.

That promise was made in 1949 and, if there is hope of its fulfillment, that hope exists largely, if not solely, in our cities where almost all of the resources marshalled to provide adequate housing are being invested. The token efforts made in rural areas during the past 20 years have done little to slow the pace of continuing housing deterioration which now is measured by the more than 4 million substandard dwellings that now exist there. The facts of the matter are the rural housing programs are not even sufficient to maintain a status quo situation, as sad as that is.

As an example, 16 percent of all occupied units in the Nation are substandard, but 25 percent of all occupied units in rural America fall into this category. And this is but one set of figures that are part of a picture that shows the struggle to achieve a decent life in rural America is far greater than in the cities. Non-metropolitan areas of the country with 37 percent of the population have received less than 20 percent of the home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Only 15 percent of Housing and Urban Development Department units for the elderly have gone to rural America where 43 percent of all the Nation's elderly live. Less than 10 percent of HUD's low income public housing rental units have been built or are under construction in rural areas. Thirty percent of all rural families are without bathrooms and less than half of all rural homes have central heating. To this sad list of statistics showing that rural America is desperately disadvantaged should be added the fact that the median income for nonmetropolitan areas of the Nation is 22 percent less than in urban America.

RURAL AREAS—THE FORGOTTEN AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, these conditions have existed for decades in rural America because of the indifference, or lack of knowledge, or both, on the part of the Government and most of our urbanized population. How else can you explain antipoverty and housing programs which virtually ignore nearly half of the Nation's poor and most of its substandard housing? How else can you explain the creation of the Urban Affairs Council, a title that clearly implies that its concerns are concentrated almost completely on the city?

The pronouncements of the Council, so far at least, have utterly failed to recognize there is a rural America, to say nothing of the inescapable conclusion that its problems are even worse than

those of the city. My description of housing and income in rural areas are but two aspects of this situation. Proportionately, rural America has far fewer doctors, nurses, dentists, educational facilities, and needed social services of all kinds. More than 30,000 rural communities lack water systems and more than 40,000 lack sewage systems.

Efforts to meet the desperate housing needs of rural America are being made by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Farmers Home Administration staff members have said theirs is the only agency providing housing of any consequence for low- and moderate-income families in rural areas. At the same time, they will readily admit that their accomplishments not only fall far short of meeting the need but, if continued at the present level, may not even check the problem, let alone eliminate it. In the 4 years ending in fiscal 1969, the agency received only \$104 million for its water and sewer facilities grant program, less than half the amount it estimates is needed. Throughout its entire history, Farmers Home has been able to provide only 22,000 units of low-income housing. Even if Farmers Home is successful in tripling the volume of its insured home loan program, as is proposed in its 1970 budget, it will still only scratch the surface of the rural housing problem. If its budget is tripled it would theoretically be able to make 150,000 insured home loans next year and that is all to the good. But it cannot be considered a serious response to the prevailing circumstances when there are more than 4 million substandard homes in rural America and the need for federally assisted housing there amounts to 300,000 new or rehabilitated units a year, according to testimony given by Farmers Home Administrator James Smith himself when he appeared at the housing goals hearings of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

FARMERS HOME CANNOT DO THE JOB ALONE

The possibilities of realizing even this inadequate expansion of activities have diminished considerably. The House, in a burst of misguided generosity, has voted to increase the Farmers Home insured home-loan fund about 2¼ times, but it has drastically cut funds proposed to increase the agency's staff so that it can administer the loan applications that will be applied against this increased capacity. If the situation is not corrected, Farmers Home will end up with just about the same number of employees that it had when the Federal Expenditures Control Act went into effect last year and, in the name of false economy, forced Farmers Home to leave 596 authorized permanent positions vacant at a time when the agency was headed toward a record backlog of more than 70,000 insured home-loan applications.

None of these things are said in criticism of Farmers Home, which I think has done a remarkable job despite extreme limitations. This has been particularly true so far as Farmers Home's operations in east Texas are concerned. The staff of the program in this area, in my view, is the most dedicated of any in Government. Nevertheless, these limitations do

exist in the program and make it impossible to meet the urgent housing needs of low- and moderate-income families in rural America. Chief among the restrictions imposed on Farmers Home is that it has been characteristically viewed by Agriculture Department policymakers as a minor section of an otherwise farm industry dominated program. From the day it was established, the Department has focused its attention almost solely on the problems of our farm economy and the development of methods designed to assist in food production and pricing. There was a time in the Nation's history when the Department's programs and expenditures affected the lives of far more people living in rural America than is now the case. Today, only 30 percent of all rural families have direct farm connected incomes. An indication of the Department's treatment of Farmers Home is exemplified by orders issued by its leaders over the years to the agency to cut back its budget proposals despite studies conducted by the Department itself that showed rural housing conditions were rapidly deteriorating. There still is no indication that Farmers Home will ever be elevated to the position it should occupy in the Department.

Other restrictions on Farmers Home include the law limiting the services it can provide to rural communities of 5,500 or less which, in my view, ignores a large part of rural America.

TWO HOUSING PROGRAMS FOR THE NATION

Mr. Speaker, in essence, I have described two housing programs for the Nation. One is operated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and is directed almost entirely to the needs of our cities. The other, in some respects resembling an unwanted offspring of the Department of Agriculture, is prevented from even dealing adequately with the housing needs of only a part of rural America.

Under present circumstances, it is my opinion that the housing needs of our cities stand a far better chance of being met than those of the rural areas. The deplorable slums of our cities, with their congestion, squalor, the lack of opportunity for the people and their despair and anger cannot be hidden from the Nation—indeed from the world. The demand for change and for a chance to contribute to and share the wealth of the Nation is concentrated here and it cannot and will not be denied.

The new Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. George Romney, is obviously acutely aware of these conditions and of his responsibility to help lead the way toward their elimination. He has clearly demonstrated, in his decisions to launch a crash program to rebuild riot damaged ghettos and to develop mass production techniques to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, that he wants to move the programs of his Department forward as rapidly as possible in the areas of greatest need as he sees them.

It is understandable, since there is little in his political or business background that has related directly to the economic problems of rural America,

that he has failed to recognize that the problems of cities are magnified in rural areas. The great migration of rural people to the cities—a migration which continues at a rate of over one-half million people a year—is one of the most dramatic examples of this. By the same token, it is a national tragedy that awareness of rural problems is occurring only after the victims of these conditions are forced to leave their homes in what more often than not is a futile attempt to escape from poverty. The poverty of rural America, the substandard housing, the wretchedness of life where families must live in rotting houses, jammed into one or two rooms and made to pay appallingly high rent, is frequently hidden from public view along the backroads of the countryside. But the poverty stricken are there, comprising a scattered, anonymous army of despair.

HUD MUST BE BROADENED

Mr. Speaker, the Government of our Nation must not be permitted to meet the housing needs of only the urban half of the country. It is clear to me, as I hope it will be to all who profess concern for low- and moderate-income families, that the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development must be broadened so that they extend equally to urban and rural America. HUD is, after all, the national Government's housing department, primarily responsible for providing housing assistance for low- and moderate-income families in both urban and rural areas. Although it is the youngest of all Federal departments, it is well on its way to becoming one of the largest and hopefully one of the most effective in Government.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, am proposing that the Housing Act of 1968 be amended to provide for establishment of the office of Assistant Secretary for Rural Housing within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In my view, this is one of the first steps that should be taken in the effort to meet the housing needs of our rural areas as quickly as possible.

HUD has the staff, the expertise and the funds and the avenues of credit that can form a solid base for an expanded effort to deal with rural housing problems. An Assistant Secretary for Rural Housing, as the title implies, should be responsible for administering HUD housing and community facility programs in rural America.

In this connection, the boundary lines for rural America itself should be re-drafted. I am convinced the present descriptions—the 2,500 population criteria used by the Census Bureau and the 5,500 standard employed by Farmers Home—fail to describe the real boundaries of rural areas. Communities of 25,000 or less outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas would be much closer to an accurate description of rural America.

I want to make it clear that this amendment will place a part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, both in Washington and in the field, under the administrative direction of the Assistant Secretary for Rural

Housing. Of necessity, HUD, either through training, or recruitment, or both, must in the future include on its staff people who are experts on the economy of rural areas, rural housing and rural mortgage credit requirements. Moreover, because of the very nature of our rural population, scattered and frequently isolated, HUD staff members working in rural areas must have direct contact with loan applicants to provide necessary counseling in terms of credit, site and building arrangements. In addition, a mandate directing the HUD staff to seek out the people who need help must be placed over the entire operation. Only in this way can the program reach the maximum number of participants and provide maximum benefits.

HUD AND FARMERS HOME BOTH NEEDED

Nothing said here, Mr. Speaker, is meant to imply in any way that expanded efforts in HUD will result in diminishing the Farmers Home program. As I have stated, Farmers Home has done an excellent job despite the restrictions under which it labors. Nevertheless, these restrictions make it impossible for that agency to extend its housing services throughout rural America to say nothing of meeting the housing needs of rural communities of 5,500 population or less. As a matter of fact, James V. Smith, Farmers Home Administrator, testified before the House Banking and Currency Housing Subcommittee that he was not certain that his agency's budget, even though its proposed insured loan fund for home ownership is tripled, would be able to surpass the rate by which rural housing is falling into a substandard state. He told the subcommittee that he hoped his budget would manage to reverse the decline, but that he was not certain because the level of funding for personnel was inadequate.

It is obvious that the only feasible solution to this problem is to have the Nation's housing department reach out to the rural areas with the same effort that it has, until now, focused on the cities and suburbs. Adequate funding for HUD for this purpose and strong support for Farmers Home are both required if we are to realistically expect the critical housing problems of rural areas will be finally overcome.

BARRATT O'HARA, A MAN WHO LIVED AND GAVE FULLY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it was just last October 8, 1968, that I gave a "Merienda" in honor of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Barratt O'Hara, whom I affectionately called the Mexican Shamrock.

Barratt O'Hara departed this earth on Monday, and I feel very keenly the need to pause long enough to pay tribute to the full and distinguished life of this wonderful man.

In 1948 at the age of 66, Barratt O'Hara rather amazingly began his 20-year career in Congress. Long before that time he had already crowded into the

first 30 years of his life more accomplishments and good deeds than the overwhelming preponderate number of other human beings do in a long lifetime.

In January 1962 I first came to the Congress of the United States and enjoyed a warm, close working relationship with this distinguished gentleman through October of last year.

The dean of the House was always a source of great inspiration to me. He was deliberative, he was just, he was knowledgeable, and always alert, despite his many years.

His great wisdom was the result of decades of great personal involvement with people and with life.

His great physical and moral courage was legendary and the envy of such luminaries as the trial lawyer, Clarence Darrow.

He was the champion of the little man and the champion of the emerging African nations. He was once chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa.

During the depression in Chicago, he had a daily radio commentary in an attempt to help people.

From the time of his early boyhood, Barratt O'Hara led a life which would destine him to be uniquely a man who fully lived and fully gave.

In 1895, at the age of 13, he went to Nicaragua with his father and accompanied an expedition marking the route of a proposed canal. A Panama route was chosen later.

At 15 he ran away from home to enlist in the 33d Michigan Brigade, which followed Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders as the second American force in Cuba. He became chief scout for the brigade and was awarded the Order of Military Merit by Cuba.

He was the last congressional veteran of the Spanish-American War and he always spoke of it on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* that set off the war.

He attended the University of Missouri, became sports editor of the St. Louis Chronicle at 20, then moved to Chicago where he was sports editor of the American and later Sunday editor of the Examiner.

He went to law school, edited and published "Chicago Magazine," wrote a history of boxing "From Figg to Johnson" and at 30 became the youngest lieutenant governor in Illinois history. In this job he attracted attention with his investigation of substandard wages being paid women. A brief stint as president of a Hollywood movie company followed, then Army service in World War I, and finally law practice.

As defense attorney, he tried nearly 300 homicide cases and won acquittals for more than 90 percent of his clients. None was executed.

Mr. Speaker, although it is not possible to mourn Barratt O'Hara's passing because he did not live a long life, it is always sorrowful to know that such a singularly unique leader and distinguished colleague and friend will no longer walk these hallowed halls that house this august body.

Nevertheless, I know that he has left for us a cherished legacy by the example of the full and dedicated life which he led.

I know that at least some of his spry spirit, his sharp wit, and great wisdom will be with us always.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALL, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITTEN, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON and to include certain tables.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROTH in five instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. MCDADE in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. KEITH in three instances.

Mr. POLLOCK in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. MARSH in four instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in four instances.

Mr. MIKVA in three instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. MINISH in four instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 203. An act to amend the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1583. An act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians;

H.R. 1707. An act for the relief of Miss Jallieh Farah Salameh El Ahwal;

H.R. 5107. An act for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio;

H.R. 8136. An act for the relief of Anthony Smilko;

H.R. 10107. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle and the existing interest equalization tax; and

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 742. An act to amend the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 12, 1969, this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vita Cusumano;

H.R. 1808. An act for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III;

H.R. 2037. An act for the relief of Robert W. Barrie and Marguerite J. Barrie;

H.R. 6581. An act for the relief of Bernard A. Hegemann; and

H.R. 9088. An act for the relief of Clifford L. Petty.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 315, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on September 3, 1969.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 315, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1057. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a detailed statement of disbursements, January 1 to June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 105 of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on House Administration.

1058. A letter from the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the first annual report of the Administration, for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1059. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the number of employees of the agency in each general schedule (GS) grade on June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1952 (65 Stat. 736, 758); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8449. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 13517. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American

workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 13518. A bill to establish a comprehensive manpower development program to assist persons in overcoming obstacles to suitable employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 13519. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Yankton Sioux Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMANS (for himself, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 13520. A bill to provide comprehensive preschool education programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13521. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13522. A bill to provide that the numerical limitations on the number of immigrant visas that may be issued under the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not apply with respect to certain nonimmigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 13523. A bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 13524. A bill to permit expenditures in connection with a library in Ogden, Utah, to be counted as local grants-in-aid to federally assisted urban renewal projects and neighborhood development programs in Ogden; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13525. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 13526. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to extend, in certain pending cases, the period prior to approval of a neighborhood development program within which a public improvement or facility must have been commenced in order to qualify as a local noncash grant-in-aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 13527. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13528. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the import duty on certain raw silk and certain yarns of silk wholly of non-continuous silk fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 13529. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to provide for a long-range program of comprehensive regional planning for, and coordination of, transportation, including therein the undertaking of research and development and the conducting of demonstrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 13530. A bill to provide for quarterly reporting to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense with respect to major defense contracts, to provide for auditing by the Comptroller General of such reports and contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13531. A bill to share the costs of education borne by State and local governments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13532. A bill to share the costs of public safety borne by State and local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13533. A bill to share the costs of public works and sanitation borne by State and local governments; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13534. A bill to share the costs of general government borne by State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13535. A bill to share the costs of health, welfare, and recreation borne by State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13536. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 13537. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13538. A bill to establish a clean water trust fund in which Federal water-use fees shall be deposited and from which shall be expended all amounts for Federal water pollution control programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 13539. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13540. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to remove Shooters' Island from lower Newark Bay to improve navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13541. A bill to authorize the States to be reimbursed for certain toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13542. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 13543. A bill to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 13544. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13545. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13546. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to recognize

the independence of the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13547. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails to send material harmful to minors and to regulate the use of the mails to send material which is sexually provocative; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13548. A bill to provide veterans an option to receive hospital care in facilities other than Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13549. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to participate in programs under title IX of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13550. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 13551. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of premium pay under section 5545(c)(2) of that title in the determination of Federal employee benefits under the civil service retirement, group life insurance, work injury compensation, and severance pay provisions of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida (for himself and Mr. HALEY):

H.J. Res. 880. Joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as "Cape Canaveral"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.J. Res. 881. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 882. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. Arthur E. Hertzler; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13552. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13553. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gines Potencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13554. A bill for the relief of Dr. M. Farooz Anwar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 13555. A bill for the relief of Lumena La Guerre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 13556. A bill for the relief of Luis Krasny-Factor (also known as Louis Krasny-Factor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

215. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., San Carlos City chapter, Negros Occidental, Philippines, relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.