

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: A NEW
APPROACH TO SELF-DETERMINA-
TION FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, most of us give lip service to the concept of self-determination for American Indians. But if this concept is to have any real meaning, it must be coupled with economic self-sufficiency. Too often in the past, self-determination has meant only that the Indian people could choose between staying on the reservation and starving, or moving off the reservation and taking their chances in an alien environment.

In recent years, economic development of the reservations has provided a hopeful new option for the Indian people. Since 1962, 140 new industrial and commercial enterprises have been established on or near reservations as a result of Indian industrial development programs. These new efforts are only just beginning to make a dent in Indian unemployment—but they are an important beginning.

In a recent speech to the National Congress of American Indians, Marvin Franklin, director of special cooperative projects for the Phillips Petroleum Co., reports on new trends in the area of Indian economic development. I am taking this opportunity to insert Mr. Franklin's speech in the RECORD:

INDIANS AND INDUSTRY

It is a thrill to share in this enthusiastic response to the invitation of the National Congress of American Indians. My special salute to you—the industrialists of the greatest economy in the world. To many this may be your first introduction to one of the most exciting accomplishments of this decade—the story of the American Indian and Industry!

I want to pay tribute to the many tribal representatives here today. Your fellow tribesmen will be proud to know how well you have represented them at this New York Industrial Conference. Without hesitation, I can assure you the business leaders visiting with you on this occasion are grateful for your very efficient presentations.

To our host—National Congress of American Indians—we acknowledge your thoughtfulness in preparing such an efficient forum at which we might speak directly to industry representatives, civic leaders, government officials and the news media. You have an extremely important and interesting story to tell and it deserves the great setting you have prepared in this New York landmark.

It has been less than ten years ago that a presidential task force studied the Indian Reservations of our country and found one of the great needs to be an opportunity for economic betterment at the reservation level. Many things had been tried—all designed to afford an assimilation into the dominate culture of our society. Relocation of families into urban areas for example, education at many levels—and vocational training. None of which could overcome the intense love for the land—and home. So one of the strong recommendations in the final report was that

"job opportunities be brought to the reservation." Several forms of employment situations have been created—but the most successful means of reaching the goal has been through the development of industry on or near reservations. And that is why we are here today!

As evidenced by the exhibits you have seen—and the articulate representatives with whom you have talked—you have already sensed they have a success story. A story that is one of the most dramatic examples of cooperation of this decade—and one that has an immediate application elsewhere in our society—in this country and perhaps abroad—and now!

I know it is inconceivable for those of you in this area to contemplate the problems that exist where a concentration of capable people suffer unemployment as high as 93%—and underemployment is a persistent situation! Many of you may ask—"What is being done about it?" And that is also why we are here—let us share with you what we think is the beginning of a timely story.

There is a parallel between the reservations of the Indian Tribes and the urban centers. In one instance people are locked in by too much land surrounding them—in the other, too little land for the number of people—and isn't it ironical that both suffer from the same problem—transportation. Did you ever stop to think—90% of the population in the continental United States live on only 2% of the land area—but even if you have, I will bet you did not know that the American Indian Tribes own areas totalling 2% of the total land area. Look at the products on the displays and you will see how this transportation problem is being solved on reservations. Transportation of products, rather than people. Think, if you will, of the many items which require a dedicated craftsman, or a special skill that only a concerned person can perform—and you will quickly realize why industry can use these talents at seemingly distant locations—transporting light weight, high value products.

Two predominant factors have lead to the success of bringing industry and employment to the people. The cooperative efforts of Government, Industry and the Tribal leadership—each contributing his share to channel resources, technology and talent into the formation of viable enterprises. The other factor is the intense loyalty and dedication of the individual American Indian. At one time we proudly pointed to the keen manual dexterity as an outstanding feature—but now we can proudly tell you that judgment and intellect are the leading characteristics of our Indian employees.

Government has been quick to respond when those areas involving changes in programs dictated the need for administrative flexibility to increase resource opportunities. Most people think only in terms of one agency when considering Indian Affairs—when in fact—many agencies, departments and administrative bodies are engaged jointly in providing services and resources. The Department of Commerce, through the Economic Development Administration has approved or funded over \$18-million for industrial parks, or loans for buildings, equipment and machinery. It has approved over \$27-million for recreation and commercial development. Other agencies have provided leadership training—many of those with whom you will talk today could not have served so adequately without this preparation.

You will be interested to know that through 1968 more than \$99-million had

been invested by the private and public sectors along with tribal resources in creating business enterprises.

Like yourself, I too am from Industry—and like yourself, I deal with the tangibles.

In the very early stages, developing employment opportunities for Indian people was essentially finding an industry that was not only willing to locate on a reservation, but willing to teach and train a labor pool that had little orientation to the sophisticated manufacturing complexes of our time. In just a short period—less than ten years in some instances, it is a tribute to both industry and government that these people have not only become efficient craftsmen—they have made substantial investments in manufacturing plants, created facilities to develop their natural resources—and in many cases, own and operate facilities that rival the best examples of commerce.

The Navajo Tribe, for example, has a bountiful forest on its mountain ranges—and with the aid of volunteers from industry, has developed through its own investments, a \$12-million sawmill, complete with cut-stock plant, planing mill and specialty products, a plant which processes between 45 and 50-million board feet of pine and fir timber annually. It employs about 450 of its tribal members and the total benefits in 1968 exceeded \$3-million. This enterprise known as Navajo Forest Products Industries would not have come about had it not been the results of dedicated industrialists who brought technology, government participation through loans for buildings and equipment, and the desire to learn and to be productive on the part of the Navajo people. From this tribal enterprise come a steady stream of workmen qualified for employment in many forms of endeavor throughout the land, and many candidates for managerial positions.

Several similar situations involving the total concept of developing natural resources owned by a Tribal group are to be found on other reservations.

The most common method of bringing industry to the American Indian—and one I hope will appeal to you—is through investments by the private sector which creates a new or branch plant to manufacture products for today's markets. Industrial tracts have been developed at most reservations. Facilities are available or can be erected to fulfill a particular need. Training programs are available, both at the institutional or in-plant level. Speaking now as an Indian, we are very much interested in talking with you.

Beyond the common approach—and perhaps reflecting the sophistication that the American Indian has reached in these few short years—there is a growing desire on his part to be the owner—and operator—of manufacturing enterprises in which he invests his own resources. This is quite possible today where industry is looking for additional suppliers—and particularly if he is willing to share his technology.

An example of this concept is a newly formed tribal enterprise in Stilwell, Oklahoma called Cherokee Nation Industries, Incorporated. A joint effort on the part of Phillips Petroleum Company and Western Electric Company to create a wholly minority owned private business corporation has been accomplished. Incidentally, you will be interested to know this project grew out of a meeting similar to this one—held in the Waldorf-Astoria on March 8 of last year. To support this enterprise, Phillips is training the people to manage their business affairs, and Western Electric is furnishing the

technology and skill training. Contracts for manufactured items for a three-year period assures this new company a stable footing. Again, we are equally interested in discussing this concept in detail with you if you have a product supplier problem.

In retrospect, we have taken a quick look at a segment of the American scene, formerly dependent upon the direction and guidance of government. An outgrowth of an over emphasis brought about by the trust responsibilities of government to the Indian resources and lands. With a new emphasis on a "freedom to manage their own affairs", you are witnessing a kindling of initiative that will enhance the economy of our country.

None in recorded history have experienced restraint and defeat known to the American Indian—and yet—they have retained a strong belief filled with compassion—they have been the great architects of conservation—they have a fervent reverence for the land and for native—but most of all—they are willing to share. It is not unreasonable to believe that our Indian population—with his resources—with his ambitions—and his capabilities, can build a better America. The Great Spirit is not dead—loyalty is not dead—patriotism is not dead.

Let us profit from these experiences! The American Indian has been the target of more experimentation than any ethnic group in history and it has taught us some important lessons on how to solve the problems of others in our nation. Together—industry, government and the identifiable cultures—must stabilize and balance the industrial growth of America to create living and working conditions that emphasize the individual and his family—for it is this freedom of choice, to work, to play and be humble that we build a great country. Our biggest obstacle is a lack of belief that we can change the future—that we are destined to follow the disastrous path of the probable—and not the possible. Let us not be the prisoners of events—but the masters of them—I urge you to consider a growing partnership—a partnership with the American Indian!

KEE FIELD, IN WYOMING COUNTY, W. VA., IS DEDICATED—AIRPORT IS IMPORTANT TO AREA AND STATE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 27, it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of a new airport in Wyoming County, W. Va.

Carved out of the mountains and valleys of southern West Virginia, this new facility—approximately an hour and 40 minutes flying time from Washington—represents a vital link in the rapidly emerging transportation program of our State.

My participation in the ceremonies was a special pleasure because the local citizenry chose to formally dedicate the new airport to the Kee family—a family that has exercised an important role in the lives of West Virginians for more than a third of a century. It has been my privilege to serve in the Congress with three members of that family, the late

Representative John Kee, the former Representative Elizabeth Kee, and their son, JIM KEE, now serving in the House of Representatives. The Kee family, over the years, has exhibited a high level of responsible service with continued attention to the public welfare. They have contributed much to the development of our State. Thus, the dedication of this airport is a timely tribute to their endeavors. Representative JIM KEE was present to accept the formal presentation and to respond to deserved tributes. It was helpful to have him recall the legislative endeavors of his father, and the manner in which that work was carried on by his mother. JIM serves in the fine tradition of public service established by his parents.

The establishment of a new airport is not an easy job for any community, either large or small, and the work that went into the construction of Kee Field, near Pineville, is an admirable example of cooperative action.

Governmental agencies and private interests were involved. A vital contribution was the donation of 232 acres of land by the Georgia-Pacific Co., an indication of the importance that industry places on air facilities.

The Federal Aviation Administration provided \$305,000 in construction money from the Federal-aid airport program. Another \$105,000 came from the Appalachian Regional Commission which also recognizes the urgent need to improve all types of transportation in the Appalachian region. The State of West Virginia added \$95,000 of State funds. This participation by different levels of government enabled the airport to be built with only \$106,000 in local money, including the value of the land.

It is my belief that the participation of FAA indicates that this airport can be of considerable economic and social value to the region.

While airline service is not available to Kee Field, the new port will provide direct links by smaller planes to larger cities and connections there with major airlines. It opens the possibility of having regular commuter air service established in future years. Immediately, however, Kee Field will be utilized by privately owned and company planes, thus giving Wyoming County and the area an additional inducement in efforts to strengthen its economy. The capacity of providing an air facility is becoming increasingly important in attracting new industries and businesses.

The potential of Kee Field is evidenced by the impressive citizen participation on Sunday. Some 3,000 persons attended the dedication. Though every individual present will not derive direct advantage from the facility, I feel they realized the overall benefit which will accrue to their community, their county, and their State.

Mr. President, accompanying me to the dedication were Stanley Henceroth and William Whittle of the Federal Aviation Administration. The former Governor of West Virginia, Hulett C. Smith, a pilot in his own right, participated in the ceremonies. It was during his administration

that the Kee Field project was finalized. Also present were Representatives JOHN SLACK and KEN HECHLER of the Third and Fourth West Virginia Congressional Districts. Gov. Arch Moore, who had planned to attend, sent his regrets and greetings.

To outline the contributions of the persons who diligently worked to bring this new airport into being is not possible. Their endeavors were significant and their number was large. Yet, I must call particular attention to Joe H. Hansbarger, chairman of the airport authority, who was presented with a special award by his authority members in recognition of his contributions. Former West Virginia Secretary of State Robert D. Bailey was a moving force in the airport development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the dedication program be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

KEE FIELD, PINEVILLE, W. VA., JULY 27, 1969
PROGRAM

Mullens High School Band: Louis J. Kamen, Director.

Sky Diving Exhibition: Para-Pros, Morgantown, W. Va.

Welcome: Judge R. M. Worrell, 27th W. Va. Judicial Circuit.

Invocation: Rev. R. J. Chenoweth, Jr., Pineville United Methodist Church.

Posting The Colors and Flag Salute, Color Guard, Pineville Boy Scouts, Troop 154.

Star Spangled Banner.

Presentation of Guests: Honorable Hulett C. Smith, Former Governor of West Virginia.

Dedication of Kee Field: Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senator of West Virginia.

Acceptance: Honorable James Kee, M.C., 5th West Virginia Congressional District.

Announcements: Judge R. M. Worrell, 27th W. Va. Judicial Circuit.

Benediction: Rev. Robert Wheeler, Pineville Baptist Church.

Sky Diving Exhibition: Para-Pros, Morgantown, W. Va.

AIRPORT NOTES

In 1961 the legislature of West Virginia enacted a local bill providing for the creation of a Wyoming County Airport Authority, members to be appointed by the Wyoming County Court.

Due to the prior interest and initial work that had been done by certain individuals, the court was able to appoint men already dedicated to a vision of an airport in Wyoming County. The court appointed Joe H. Hansbarger, chairman of the authority and more recently C. E. Richner as his co-chairman. Other members include Robert D. Bailey, Jack Feller, Arnold A. Rose, Dr. Emerson Shannon and B. W. Bailey.

The acquisition of the land came as a donation from the Georgia-Pacific Corporation which today totals approximately 260 acres. The airport is located one and nine-tenths miles from Pineville on the headwaters of Skin Fork Branch with access by way of the newly constructed Williamson Branch Road as well as from Wyoming or Rockview on the Skin Fork Road.

To date approximately \$610,000 has been required to provide the facilities you see before you today. The Honorable Hulett Smith, while Governor of West Virginia, allocated \$92,000 of the Governor's Contingency Fund;

the Federal Aeronautics Administration allocated \$305,000; the Appalachian Regional Commission allocated \$162,000; the County Court of Wyoming County allocated \$15,000; and individuals and business concerns in the county have donated approximately \$36,000, all of these funds being used in clearing, excavating, draining, grading, paving and lighting this airport that we dedicate today.

The actual construction began with a cooperative effort between the Wyoming County Board of Education and the Manpower Development Training Administration conducting an eight-week heavy equipment school on the airport site.

The pupils enrolled in this school did some of the clearing and excavation work prior to the time that the contract was let to the W & H Contracting Company of Bluefield in the amount of \$415,812 for excavation, drainage, grading, paving, and lighting of the runway and apron.

At present the airport is under the very capable management of Jack Taylor, a highly qualified and licensed pilot and instructor, a former commercial pilot with more than 25 years flying experience. Mr. Taylor owns two airplanes and is presently operating a flying school at this site.

The facilities are open for twenty-four hour operation offering a 3100 x 60 foot paved runway with adjacent taxi-way and apron, in addition to which office, lounge and hangar facilities will soon be available.

The engineering and architectural designs were done by Rader and Associates of Miami, Florida.

We can all be proud of these modern facilities we are dedicating on this day, and we may be equally proud of West Virginia's Kee family to whom this field is this day dedicated.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY

Joe H. Hansbarger, Chairman; C. E. Richner, Co-chairman; Robert D. Bailey, Jack Feller, A. A. Rose, Dr. Emerson Shannon, W. W. Bailey.

COUNTY COURT MEMBERS

Tom Smith, Woodrow W. Cook, W. W. Bailey.

OTHER ELECTED OFFICIALS

Circuit Judge, R. M. Worrell; Sheriff, Bill Bolt; Assessor, Mack Arnold; Circuit Clerk, John S. Lambert; County Clerk, Bill Houck; Prosecuting Attorney, D. Grove Moler; House of Delegates, Warren McGraw; House of Delegates, J. T. Davidson; State Senate, Tracy Hylton.

DEDICATION AND ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEES SPONSORED BY PINEVILLE ROTARY CLUB

General Chairman, Jesse W. Morgan.
Dedication Arrangements Committee: Mrs. Robert Bailey, Jr., Chairman; Mrs. W. C. Bailey, Jr., Co-chairman; Mrs. C. E. Richner, Mrs. Jack D. Martin.
Publicity, Ranny Cline.
Special Music, Larry Cooper.
Sky Divers, Dick Rundle.
Decorations, Byron Rose, Ned Crews.
Programs, James Stone.

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We especially wish to thank these individuals and businesses for their contributions to this airport.

C. E. Richner, Dr. Ned Rogers, Castle Rock Bank, Pine Chevrolet, Wyoming County Insurance, Southern Exterminating, Wyoming Lumber and Supply, Owens Manufacturing Company, B. B. Shilling, City Auto, Wyoming Refrigeration, Miniaci Engineering, Pineville Fashion Shop, The Cow Shed, Guyan Mobile Homes, The Joy Manufacturing Company, Thomas Grocery, Robinson-Phillips Coal Company, Buddy's Discount, Crews Store, Dr. E. M. Wilkinson, Pineville Gas

Company, Pocahontas Fuel Corporation, Jackson's Ashland Service Station, Island Creek Coal Company.

SUPPORT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received two editorials from newspapers in my district indicating support for actions and positions taken by the Department of Transportation. The first is from the Muscatine Journal and deals with comments of Secretary Volpe relative to renewed efforts in two areas of highway safety.

The second is from the Keokuk Daily Gate City, and deals with the Mass Transit Trust Fund. I concur in the positions taken in both of these editorials.

[From the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal, July 30, 1969]

COMBINED EFFORT

The federal Highway Safety Act of 1966 has been a major incentive for states to develop their own programs to curb death on the roads.

It was the 1966 law which appropriated funds to be matched by states in creating programs. The act also threatens states with a 10 per cent loss of highway aids if they do not have a program Jan. 1, 1970.

Iowa does have an implied consent law (mandatory tests for persons arrested on suspicion of drunken driving) but Iowa does not have a law establishing statewide motor vehicle inspections.

One criticism of the safety act is one that applies to numbers federal programs; promises of a certain amount of federal aid with actual aid made available at a substantial lower level.

Nevertheless, the federal government's program has pushed in the right direction. This year \$70 million to be shared by all states has been requested for the fiscal year (three years ago it was presumed that as much as \$250 million or so would be available for all.)

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe is moving on two major fronts for higher safety.

A few weeks ago he singled out the fatal mix of alcohol and driving before the Senate Public Works Committee. He said that he was at work on a "tough and workable program" to identify drinkers and keep them from driving.

On a second major front, Secretary Volpe recently told the Automotive Safety Foundation of Washington that the Nixon administration was prepared to "get tough" with auto makers.

In citing the need for safer auto construction, he said, "Industry leaders should insist that their cars be designed from road to rooftop as mobile safety systems." If the automakers do not voluntarily follow the standards for safety as defined by the Transportation Department, federal action should be taken in Volpe's opinion.

The overall federal approach to highway safety continues to be one of working through state governments where possible and providing complimentary programs where a national effort is necessary, such as in auto standards.

Reducing the highway death toll should be high among the national priorities. It

demands complete federal and state cooperation.

[From the Keokuk (Iowa) Daily Gate City, July 29, 1969]

MASS TRANSPORTATION

The Highway Act of 1956 created the Highway Trust Fund, which as a matter of national defense enabled the Federal Government to pay 90 per cent of all interstate freeways. It is creating a highway system unsurpassed in the world.

The Highway Trust Fund is also levelling poor people's homes, neighborhoods and public parks, as it pushes approaches and elevated highways in and out of the nation's cities, and drains the lifeblood from the cities. For it has become clearly apparent that freeways run in two directions, away as well as into the city, and it is taking people and trade outside the cities.

Mayor James D. Braman of Seattle was the first to appoint a team of highway engineers, transportation experts, architects, sociologists and other specialists in the various aspects of urban ecology. The result was a transportation plan with a truly integrated social and physical development.

Now as Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Urban Systems and Environment, Braman has, through Secretary John A. Volpe, withdrawn federal funds from the riverfront expressway in New Orleans, thus saving the historic French Quarter. His theory, which Volpe backs, is that "If we lose the core of our cities, we create the seedbeds for the destruction of our Nation."

Both are looking forward to the expiration of the Highway Act in 1972 and the introduction of the proposed Mass Transit Trust Fund. It would make it easy for cities to get help for public transportation and thus get commuter traffic off the roads and back into the heart of the city to shop and do their business. It could well be the savings of the big cities of the nation.

SELF-REGULATION OR CENSORSHIP

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the problem of smut being sent through the mails is one to which our Subcommittee on Postal Operations is devoting considerable attention. Hearings were held last week and further hearings are planned after the August recess.

Smut in the mails is not the only problem in this area. There also are the complaints being received about the liberties which are being taken in programs being broadcast over radio and television stations, particularly the latter.

As for the matter of dealing with television programs, I was very much impressed by the excellent discussion contained in a speech which Commissioner Robert E. Lee of the Federal Communications Commission provided in a talk to the Association of Broadcasting Executives of Texas, meeting in Dallas, Tex., on July 31, 1969.

Following is the text of his remarks:

SELF-REGULATION OR CENSORSHIP

George Bernard Shaw, asked what he thought of television, retorted with typical

Shawian wit and precision—"I don't know; I'm afraid to look."

About five years ago, I gave a speech expressing considerable apprehension on the future use of movies, then being produced, and speculated what would happen when this old product was fully exposed and the then current motion pictures were released for television.

The public and Congressional reaction today to an overkill of sex and violence can be traced to many of the productions of several years ago and now, for the first time, available to television.

What will happen 4 or 5 years hence when the television rights to current controversial movies becomes available? My first reaction is that of Mr. Shaw—I am afraid to look.

Actually, I do watch and enjoy television and expect to watch it for years to come. We have the very best television and communications network in the world, which was not brought about by government regulation but by the broadcaster's responsible use of freedom of speech and expression, and I might add, a large measure of his perspiration and common sense.

A MAJOR INTERSECTION

We are now at another major intersection—industry self-regulation or censorship. I doubt if this matter will ever be solved.

Back in the 1700's, Dr. Samuel Johnson, a leading writer of his time, said that the unbounded liberty of printing "has produced a problem in the science of government which human understanding seems hitherto unable to solve." The problem still remains.

Before I proceed further in this delicate area, I think you should know my position on Commission control of programing. I must emphasize that anything I say from here on is not to be interpreted as Commission policy.

Actually, there is a divergence of opinion within the Commission as to just what our role can and should be in this area. When I say "can" I have reference to the view of those who believe the Commission is, pursuant to Section 326 of our Act,⁴ completely without legal authority in the field of programing.

This is based on the theory that there can be no prior restraint on material that is broadcast. From this, it follows that we cannot examine material already broadcast, and, if we find said programing not in the public interest, cannot refuse to renew the license.

FEAR OF REPRISAL

The fear of reprisal by the Commission is no less censorship than if the licensee were required to submit his day-by-day programing in advance.

I have read with great interest the 5 part series of articles published in the Congressional Record⁵ by Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York called "The Smut Peddlers."

He is primarily concerned with the use of mails for distributing such matters but an equal temptation exists in the radio and TV medium to pander to the baser emotions within all of us. Congressman Dulski points out that in his state alone there is a 19-million-dollar-a-year business in pornography.

Nation-wide, pornography is estimated perhaps to be a 500-million-dollar business. Is it any wonder that the radio or TV producer or owner might be tempted to the off-color or risqué in programming?

The station's financial support comes through public donations in the case of non-commercial stations or through advertisers on commercial stations. Without question,

smut of any type through any medium has dollar appeal.

MOST STATIONS HAVE BALANCE

However, I believe that the majority of our stations have reached a balance on programing which is acceptable in their communities insofar as the morals and local tastes are concerned.

Even though I commend the industry for its effort along this line, I cannot overlook the fact that the Commission received 1265 complaints during the fiscal year 1969 which were related solely to the off-color type of programing.

I think it may be safely assumed that for every complaint received there were others who shared those views but did not write.

I believe that the station owners must exercise ever increasing diligence in the review of programing offered over the station so that the off-color smut will not be aired.

When borderline programing is used because of some overriding social or moral redeeming value, the broadcaster should insist on truth, not titillation.

CENTRALIZING STANDARDS

I do not view moral standards as being equal for the entire nation nor do I believe that such standards should be necessarily dictated by production centers located in New York State, California or other states.

I question whether we have either now accepted or should ever accept universal or unrestricted use of the 4-letter words and all manner of normal and abnormal sexual activity.

Courts have found that theatre admission can be restricted to "adults only" but how is a station to judge the age of its viewers with precision?

I believe that a station must assume that its audience at all hours of operation includes the young who can be mentally injured by smut programs as seriously as they can be by a dose of strychnine or LSD.

In the final analysis, station control is surely preferable to censor control.

FCC DOES NOT SIT AS JUDGE AND JURY

I am in complete agreement with the view that the Congress very wisely did not set up a seven-man body to sit as a judge and jury of what the American people shall hear and see on their air waves.

This could be carried one step further when you consider that only four of the seven Commissioners are required to take action. Had Congress attempted to set up such a body, I have no doubt that the Supreme Court would have held such an Act unconstitutional.

On the other hand, the Court said in the *NBC* case⁶ that:

"The right of free speech does not include . . . the right to use facilities without a license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act of 1934 was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard of licensing of stations was the 'public interest convenience or necessity. Denial of a license on that ground is not a denial of free speech.'"

The Court went on to say:

" . . . The Act does not restrict the Commission merely to the supervision of the traffic. It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic."

COMMISSION DOES HAVE CONTROL

This, or similar statements contained in various decisions of the Courts, indicates that the Commission does have a certain amount of control over programing through the exercise of its public interest determination.

This, to me, is a passive duty in that I expect the licensee to determine what the

listening or viewing desires of his service area may be.

Having once made such a determination, I regard that licensee as the expert to carry out his commitment—which I also recognize can be changed from time to time.

BROADCASTER HAS RESPONSIBILITY

It is the obligation of the broadcaster to bring his positive responsibility affirmatively to bear upon all who have a hand in providing broadcast matter for transmission through his facilities so as to assure the discharge of his duty to provide acceptable program schedules consistent with the public interest in his service area.

If the licensee significantly fails to live up to this commitment, then we do have authority to examine past programing. In the *KFKB*⁷ case, the court turned to scriptures and stated:

"In considering an application for renewal of license, an important consideration is the past conduct of the applicant for 'by their fruits, ye shall know them.' Math. VII:20."

Actually, I believe the broadcasting industry is close today to inviting censorship, even though the courts may later strike it down, if the broadcaster does not daily practice responsible self-regulation in direct relationship to the public he serves.

SHOULD UNDERSTAND YOUR FREEDOM

I believe your best defense against censorship is an understanding of the freedom which you now enjoy. At the outset, the critical question you will have to answer is: Do you view censorship as representing hatred of restraint more than a love of freedom?

Someone once said to John Adams that man is born with a desire for freedom. "Yes" replied Adams "but so is a wolf." If freedom meant no more than a natural hatred of restraint, it would not be a useful ideal.

Your freedom as a broadcaster, under Section 326 of the Act, is more than a matter of making choices. It also includes the freedom to share in setting up possible choices of programing.

This implies some restrictions because no society allows unlimited choice. Laws, as well as the unwritten codes embodied in community standards may restrict freedom. Free speech, like other rights has definite limits.

ON MAKING A SPEECH

For example, if a man walks uninvited into a home and makes a speech, he has no right to complain when the owner puts him out or has him put out and arrested. He has abused the privileges of free speech by invading the privacy, and perhaps also the property, of those who do not want to hear him.

Speech can invade the rights of listeners. In the case of the broadcaster invading the rights of the listener, the listener can turn off the offending program; refuse to purchase the products of the sponsor; write the station, the Federal Communications Commission, or his Congressional delegation.

Over a period of time, if enough people object by the various means open to them, the broadcaster must eventually get the message that he has missed the mark. He simply is not responsive to the public he serves.

A CALL FOR ADJUSTMENT

The duty connected with his freedom as a broadcaster is calling for adjustment. Let me make it clear at this point that I am not talking about the fringe or way-out complaint. And, I do not expect a puritanical sentiment to seize the broadcast industry.

Former President Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce during the Radio Conference

⁴ Id. at 215.

⁵ Congressional Record Vol. 115, Nos. 112, 113, 114, 115, and 116, July 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14, 1969.

⁶ *NBC v. U.S.*, 319 U.S. 190, 227.

⁷ 47 F. 2d, 670.

⁸ *McIntire v. Wm. Penn Broadcasting Co.*, 151 F. 2d, 597, 600.

of 1922-1925, set forth the responsibility of the local licensee to the public:

"The dominant element for consideration in the radio field is, and always will be, the great body of the listening public, millions in number, country wide in distribution. There is no proper line of conflict between the broadcaster and the listener, nor would I attempt to array one against the other. Their interests are mutual, for without one the other could not exist.

"There have been few developments in industrial history to equal the speed and efficiency with which genius and capital have joined to meet radio needs. The great majority of station owners today recognize the burden of service and gladly assume it. Whatever other motive may exist for broadcasting, the pleasing of the listener is always the primary purpose. . . .

"The greatest public interest must be the deciding factor. I presume that few will dissent as to the correctness of this principle, for all will agree that the public good must ever balance private desire, but its acceptance leads to important and far-reaching practical effects, as to which there may not be the same unanimity, but from which, nevertheless, there is no logical escape."

RELY ON BROADCASTERS' CODE

I can say that personally I rely heavily on the standards set by the industry itself in the Code of the National Association of Broadcasters and the commitment of each individual broadcaster, as far as the judgments I am called upon to make in the field of programming.

It is my belief that if all broadcasters lived up to the Code and observed their programming commitment as updated to a true cross section of the public interest, it seems, my job as a Commissioner would be much easier and the growing number of skeptics would be obliged to concede that ours is the best broadcast system in the world.

But as you know, all broadcasters do not live up to the Code and I am afraid some few treat the public with an "I know what is best for you attitude," or simply do not care.

Carved on the Archives Building, in Washington, D.C., which houses many of this nation's important historic documents, is a statement admonishing all who enter that "The past is prologue to the future."

These dusty files, and men, who long since have passed from the scene, still attest to the most advanced thinking and up-to-date precepts. The Founding Fathers knew what they intended when they used the word "freedom."

THEIR FEELING OF FREEDOM

They felt that true freedom was obedience to moral laws. Lawful freedom, they said was the right of decent men, governed by conscience, to make their own principal choices in life. The founders were not anarchists, who wished to abolish government.

Most of them, lead by men such as John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Gouverneur Morris, George Wythe, John Marshall, and Alexander Hamilton, desired only a disciplined, moderate, law-respecting freedom.

Perhaps the greatest cause of decay of freedom is that people do not understand the sources from which come true freedom.

In this sense, I believe the "Self Regulation" (part of the title of this speech) is perhaps a misnomer for what I am really talking about is the broadcaster's true freedom.

Such freedom does not grow out of any fear of what government or the FCC may do but rather grows out of love, respect and regard for the freedom we have here.

In closing, I would briefly bring before you a few observations on current issues involving programming and the individual licensee.

A FEW OBSERVATIONS

I question whether a broadcaster is actually exercising his right of freedom when an off-color program is permitted on the air only to be cancelled after one night due to the vociferous outcry of an overweary public. This is your responsibility.

I question the individual network affiliate's right to accept the judgment of a review board in New York. This is your duty as a broadcaster and you cannot delegate such obligation.

Here the local licensee cannot look to the network to perform this duty for him. It is not the answer to say that the local broadcaster has no control over network programming or is obliged to take whatever comes over the "line."

Unlike the network, the local broadcaster is a censor of programming with the exception of political broadcasting.

I question whether the broadcaster's freedom duties can be discharged with occasional spot checking of programs because these duties entail a 365 day-per-year task.

I will vigorously dissent to any FCC decision which threatens to control the content of your programming.

The broadcaster's license is not intended to convert his business into "an instrumentality of the Federal Government" but neither may he ignore the public interest.

PATRIOTISM OF AN ADOPTED CITIZEN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a pastor in my district, Rev. Theophilus Palis of the Lady Queen of the World Church in Pittsburg, Calif., which I think is a wonderful expression of patriotism in its finest sense.

I include this letter in the RECORD in order to share it with all the Members of the Congress.

The letter follows:

OUR LADY QUEEN OF THE
WORLD CHURCH,
Pittsburg, Calif., July 28, 1969.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
U.S. Congressman,
Cannon House Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: I thank you for your kind letter welcoming me to the area of the 14th District of California! I am happy to be here in Pittsburg and to work for the spiritual welfare of the people. I am adoptive citizen of this great Country, and have great respect to it. I shall never forget

¹ Sec. 326 Censorship; Indecent Language—Nothing in this Act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication. (The last sentence of Sec. 326 was repealed and re-codified as Sec. 1464 of the Criminal Code, 18 U.S.C., 1464. Sec. 1464 now reads as follows: Broadcasting Obscene Language. Whoever utters any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.)

what America did after the Second World War—thousands and thousands of refugees were taken care, protected from starvation, then settled in the free countries, but most of them in the U.S. of America. I am sure all of them are loyal citizens, because they have learned better to appreciate the true freedom that they found in this Country. Some of us, like myself, still cannot speak too freely, because our parents, brothers are still behind the Iron Curtain—so we can endanger their lives.

I appreciate your interest in all citizens, and I will support you in your great work.

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. THEOPHILUS PALIS,
Pastor.

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District to send reports of my activities to constituents and, once each year, to ask for their views on important current national issues, by means of a questionnaire. The questionnaire is now in its sixth consecutive year.

I send the questionnaire to every resident who lives in the Fabulous Fourth Congressional District, regardless of party. In this way, I can truly test the prevailing opinion on great national issues.

Once again, many thousands of people of the Fourth Congressional District have answered the questionnaire. The results have been carefully tabulated and I am still busy answering the many comments that have been made to me on the questionnaire returns. The enthusiastic response proves, once again, that people do care about their government.

I am now sending a copy of the questionnaire results to each home in the Fourth Congressional District. These results show the prevailing opinions in the district.

As for the results, almost three-quarters of my constituents oppose a Federal guaranteed annual wage and more than 90 percent favor an expansion of private industry's involvement in programs to train the unemployed for jobs.

More interestingly, more than 90 percent believe the Federal Government should use wiretapping to fight organized crime when authorized by court order.

Strong opposition to the surtax—78 percent—is coupled with strong support to tie social security benefits to the cost of living—88 percent.

The people of the Fourth District surprised me by favoring most a selective service system that would establish compulsory public service for men at age 19—40 percent.

Not surprising was the overwhelming support for my proposal for direct election by popular vote of the President—75 percent.

The questionnaire results follow:

YOUR 6TH ANNUAL FABULOUS 4TH QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Are you in favor of a Federal guaranteed annual living wage?	24	73	3	10. Which Selective Service System would you prefer?			
2. Do you favor an expansion of private industry's involvement in programs to train the unemployed for jobs?	92	7	1	(a) abolish the draft, increase pay, and rely on volunteers.....	28		
3. Should the Federal Government use wiretapping and electronic surveillance under court order to fight organized crime?	92	7	1	(b) a lottery system.....	16		
4. Do you favor returning a portion of Federal income tax revenues to State and local governments?	79	17	4	(c) establish compulsory public service for men at age 19.....	40		3
5. Should the Federal Government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees?	76	21	3	(d) the present system.....	13		
6. Should the \$600 Federal income tax exemption be increased?	92	7	1	11. Which presidential election procedure do you support?			
7. Should social security benefits be tied to the cost of living?	88	10	2	(a) the present electoral college system.	7		
8. Do you favor renewing the 10-percent income tax surcharge when it expires on June 3?	18	78	4	(b) electoral college system with electoral votes of each State being divided by the percentage of the State's popular vote.....	14		2
9. The admission of Communist China to the United Nations should be:				(c) direct election by popular vote.....	75		
(a) prevented absolutely.....		29		(d) some other system.....	2		
(b) postponed for now.....		26		12. Do you believe that the war on poverty should be:			
(c) favorably considered.....		26		(a) continued as is or expanded.....	23		
(d) arranged as soon as possible.....		10		(b) discontinued or sharply cut back.....	28		
(e) undecided or no opinion.....		9		(c) replaced by a system which provides funds for the same purposes to existing local agencies and business.	42		7

BIG TRUCK BILL IS BACK

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the big truck bill is once again before the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee in the form of two bills, H.R. 11870, and H.R. 11619. I recently testified before the Committee in opposition to this legislation. I insert my statement in the RECORD at this point as background material for other Members on this important legislation:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGEL BEFORE THE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, JULY 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman, we have before us again this year a misguided piece of legislation that was productive of much controversy in the last session, primarily due to a woeful lack of research and study. Once more, I feel it is necessary to present my views and convictions. It may be well to put the bill in proper perspective.

But before turning to the substance of this matter, I would like to express my appreciation to the Chairman for ensuring that more adequate time is being made available for both sides to be heard on this critical subject. One thing which was made clear last year. This matter is far too important to pass over lightly with only cursory consideration.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956

In 1956, the Congress first considered the subject of vehicle weights and dimensions. The subject was broached in the consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act which established a vast new highway system spanning the country known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Federal-State ratio of contribution was to be 90-10.

The magnitude of the Federal contribution gives support to the imposition of standards for vehicle users designed to protect the useful life of this enormous investment and to enhance the safety of the motorists who travel on our highways. Before this time, the matter of regulation had been primarily re-

garded as a State concern. Naturally, the standards varied quite widely from State to State, ranging, for example, from 18,000 to 24,000 pounds for single axles—from 28,650 to 44,000 pounds for tandem axle maximums.

Ten years earlier, the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO), concerned with the same problem of promoting the maximum useful life of the nation's highways, established certain standards to that end. This group of professional highway officials from the various States set forth the following standards:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle, 18,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 32,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, 73,280 lbs. (as determined by AASHO formula based on maximum allowed length within the states).

2. maximum height: 12½ feet.

3. maximum width: 96 inches.

4. maximum length: (a) single unit trucks, 35 ft.; (b) buses with 2 axles, 35 ft.; (c) buses with 3 axles, 35 ft.; (d) truck-trailer semi-trailers, 50 ft.; (e) other combinations, 60 ft.

Although in 1956 some thought that these standards were out of date and somewhat restrictive, still it was felt that they were reliable enough to be incorporated into the Federal Aid Highway Act. As passed, the Bill adopted the following legal limits and made them binding upon all Interstate mileage, with certain exceptions for States with liberal legal standards:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle, 18,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 32,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, 73,280 lbs.

2. maximum height: 12½ feet.

3. maximum length: No limit.

4. maximum width: 96 inches.

The exceptions protected by the "grandfather clause" contained in Section 108(J) of the 1956 Act are in the appendix to my statement.

At the time of the bill's passage, a commitment was also made to undertake extensive research to determine the standards necessary to ensure maximum useful life of the new Interstate System. The commitment was embodied in Section 108(K) of the Act which reads:

"TEST TO DETERMINE MAXIMUM DESIRABLE DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS"

"The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned, or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several states, and other persons

and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal Aid Highway Systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

In 1956, AASHO already had in the planning stage, a series of tests which were designed to elicit much the same information as that mandated by the Act. With some modifications to meet the requirements of Section 108(K), 836 sections of test pavements were built late in 1956 near Ottawa, Illinois. Beginning in 1958 and spanning a two-year period, a nearly continuous series of tests of fully-loaded trucks was conducted over these sections of pavement. The purpose was to gather information bearing on the relationship between pavement types and bridge construction and vehicle weight limits and axle loadings. The resulting data was to be a critical factor in setting the maximum desirable weights and dimensions of motor vehicles allowed on the Interstate System.

After several delays, the data from the tests was made available by the Secretary of Commerce and printed as House Document No. 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session.

The maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles justified on the basis of the Ottawa tests are the following:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck—(to be determined by the formula

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

Where W is the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L is the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N is the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. maximum height: 13½ feet.

3. maximum width: 102 inches.

4. maximum length: (a) Single unit truck, 40 ft.; (b) single unit bus, 40 ft.; (c) semi-trailer, 40 ft.; (d) truck-trailer semi-trailer, 55 ft.; (e) all other combinations, 65 feet

It must be noted that the AASHO tests were designed to compare the durability of various pavements and bridge structures under the stress of different vehicles, load suspension systems, etc. Before we change these standards, we must be provided with ample and

proven justification. The toll in needless safety hazards and mounting costs which is likely to follow any increase in the present limits should place a heavy burden on those who would propose a change. Unless the economic benefit to the nation derived from increasing vehicle weights and dimensions is sufficient to offset the higher safety and construction costs necessarily incurred due to the greater burden created by these larger vehicles on present roads and bridges, this bill should be summarily rejected. It should be noted that AASHO's official position is in opposition to any increase in size or weight of motor vehicles on the Interstate System.

We must also put this bill in other than economic terms. We must place it in the realm of human consideration—the well-being of all the motorists who use our nation's highways. We should not promote the economic well-being of particular interest groups at the expense of the safety of the great majority of the motoring public.

II. ACTION IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

A. Senate action

In November of 1967, Senator Magnuson, and others, introduced a bill, S. 2658, to increase the maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles operating on the Interstate System. This bill provided for the following limitations:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 36,000 lbs.; (c) gross weight, computed by the formula:

$$W=500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 40 \right)$$

Where W equals the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L equals the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N equals the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. Maximum length: No limitation.
3. Maximum width, 102 inches, exclusive of tire bulge and safety devices such as mirrors.

Four days of hearings were held before the Senate Public Works Committee in February and March of 1968. The bill was reported out of committee after it was amended to include the following limitations:

1. Weight, single axle, 20,000 lbs.; tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; gross weight (computed by formula):

$$W=500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

The bill was then considered by the Senate under suspension of the rules, and passed by a voice vote with only 7 Senators on the Floor.

B. House action

Similar legislation, H.R. 14474, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Kluczyński of Illinois and 8 others. During the general hearings on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, this bill was considered together with S. 2658. The hearings were held in February, May and June of 1968. On July 3, 1968, the House Public Works Committee favorably reported the bill, as amended, to the House.

Subsequently, a rule was obtained from the Rules Committee and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar, Number 669. The bill, however, was never called up for action and died at the end of the session.

C. Campaign

During the Presidential Campaign of 1968, the question of increasing the vehicle weight and dimension limitations became a national issue. Eventually, both major candidates issued statements on the subject. President Richard M. Nixon observed during the 1968 campaign, that:

"This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.

"I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.

"As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered. I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interests of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce."

Former Vice President Humphrey also indicated his opposition to the legislation during the campaign.

III. ACTION IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

A. House of Representatives

In June of this year, Representatives Kluczyński and Denny introduced legislation essentially the same as that which was reported out of the House Public Works Committee in amended form in 1968. This bill is H.R. 11870. The only change is the addition of a length limitation not contained in S. 2658. The following limits are provided in the bill presently under consideration by this committee:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, as computed by the formula:

$$W=500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

2. Maximum height: No change from present limits.
3. Maximum width: 102 inches.
4. Maximum length: 70 feet.

We must bear in mind that this bill, while specifically referring to the Interstate System, must in fact apply to all Federal Aid Systems—Primary, Secondary and Urban extensions—as well as Interstate, as there is no Federal law governing maximum size and weight standards for any system except that System.

This bill would increase the present allowable width of a vehicle from 96" to 102", "plus additional width necessary for safety devices and tire bulge due to loads." Competent authorities have estimated that safety devices can add as much as 24" to the width, thus making legal a total width of about 126", or 10½ feet. This creates a definite safety hazard on roads with 10 and 11 foot traffic lanes. Under the present limit, two trucks passing on an average two-lane road, with 12 foot lanes (of the size found in the Interstate System), would have 4 feet of clearance if they are in the middle of their lanes. Under the new limits, this safety gap would be reduced to less than 2 feet. Now, consider for a moment two supertrucks passing at 60 or 70 miles an hour with less than 2 feet of clearance between the trucks. Most truck drivers would attempt to put far more distance between vehicles, thus putting the trucks virtually on the shoulder of the road, a very dangerous practice in itself. Further, more than 60 per cent of all State primary road mileage in 1966 had lane widths under 12 feet; another 16 per cent of the roads were under 10 feet.

For the first time, the Federal law would impose a length limit. In H.R. 11870 the limiting length is placed at 70 feet. At the beginning of 1969, only two states permitted lengths of 70 feet or greater for regular operation, while 18 permitted 65 foot units, and 32 states restricted overall length to 60 feet or less.

The single axle weight would be increased, in the proposal, from 18,000 lbs. to 20,000 pounds, and that on a tandem axle from 32,000 pounds to 34,000 pounds.

The gross weight of a vehicle is presently restricted to 73,280 pounds. Under the bill this weight would be determined by formula. The practical new gross weight of the proposed 70 foot vehicle with 5 axles would be 88,625 pounds or an increase of 15,345 pounds above the present legal limit. A six axle, 70 foot vehicle would have a practical gross weight of 92,000 pounds.

A new section provides that two consecutive sets of tandem axles separated by 36 feet or more may carry 68,000 pounds, regardless of the law's formula. The practical effect of this section is to permit the common 55 foot truck-tractor semi-trailer unit to haul about 78,000 lbs. rather than the 73,500 lbs. which would result from using the formula.

It is noteworthy that the policy of AASHO recommends performance standards for vehicles of the anticipated sizes. The Department of Transportation concurred with the AASHO recommendations in 1968, and submitted a bill covering this aspect which is so fundamental to safety. The proposals before us do not include any such item on safety.

B. Hearings on highway safety

Early in June, hearings were held on the subject of the Highway Safety Act of 1966. In the course of these hearings, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, testified that little, if any research was being conducted with respect to the effect of increasing vehicle weights and dimensions on highway or vehicle safety. Mr. Ben Kelly, Vice-President of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, testified that he knew of no credible research done on this problem. Dr. Brenner further testified that he believed the work done by Professor Wolff at Cornell University, with respect to the high rate of accident involvement of trucks, was reasonable, accurate.

It seems clear, then that there are several important aspects of this legislation which must be considered and dealt with, and important questions which must be answered, before this committee or the Congress can act on the question of increasing vehicle weights and sizes. Generally, these considerations fall into four broad categories: safety, highway costs, economic benefits, and Federal initiative versus State's rights. I shall discuss each briefly:

Safety

When I speak of the problems of safety with respect to increasing the weights and sizes of vehicles, there are a number of areas to be explored. One of the most important, in my judgment, is the effect of increased vehicle dimensions on automobiles. This legislation must, of necessity, reduce clearance between passing vehicles, decrease visibility, increase difficulty in passing, increase the hazards of negotiating narrow corners, generate additional suction or blast caused by ever larger trucks and buses, etc. These are not trifling problems to be lightly passed over. They are concerns which may be reflected in lost lives and disabling injuries. These are problems upon which we now lack sufficient information to make reasoned judgments. In the highway safety hearings last month, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the Highway Safety Bureau, testified before this very committee that his agency has almost no research underway with respect to these problems. Witnesses who have testified to date in favor of the bill have failed to come forward with any credible research to support their position that the weights and sizes of vehicles can be increased with-

out significantly affecting safety. I believe, in fact, that when these hearings are completed, there will be a considerable amount of raw data and personal observations indicating that serious highway safety problems would result if we allow bigger and heavier trucks on our highway system. I might note here also, Mr. Chairman, that it is my position that the proponents of this legislation have the burden of coming forward with sound evidence that the increases in legal limits which they seek can be made without endangering the safety of the motoring public at large. Economic benefit is of little value if it must be measured in terms of needless accidents and human suffering.

A distinct aspect of the safety problem is that where two trucks or buses are involved. The real problems in passing, turning, suction, and decreased clearance between vehicles are present here as well.

Consider also the safety of the single large vehicle. Adequate braking capacity, weight to horsepower ratios, coupling devices, tires, and stability must be assured. Of prime importance is adequate braking capacity for each weight of vehicle considered, and adequate horsepower to diminish the problem of speed differentials which are the cause of so many fatal accidents.

Still another concern is related to highway surfaces and structures. Nearly every source admits that increases in vehicle weights and sizes will bring about an accelerated deterioration of highway surfaces. The earlier and more pronounced any deterioration is, the greater the safety hazards in the form of cracking and rutting and—in the case of our narrower highways—serious rutting in the shoulder area alongside the pavement. Aside from these dangers, any increase in required maintenance means more detour lanes as well as machines in the roadway, which pose additional safety hazards in and of themselves. Similarly, the effect of the proposed increases in sizes and weights on structures such as bridges will create additional hazards. While the legislation before us purports to deal only with vehicles on the Interstate System, it is clear that these same vehicles cannot load and unload on the Interstate System itself. They must of necessity travel on primary and secondary road systems for at least a sizeable portion of most journeys. These highways, which are the backbone of our road network, account for 244,753 miles of our most vital roadways on which we would rely in a period of national emergency. This important system includes 95,750 bridges, 68,700 of them, or over 71%, are designed for less than the present Interstate Standard (HS-20) and 30,073, or more than 31% are designed for a 15-ton truck with a 24,000 lb. load on its rear tandem axle and 6,000 lbs. on its steering axle with a 14 foot wheelbase. These are much smaller and lighter vehicles than those being considered in this bill. Thus the dangers of allowing still larger and heavier trucks on our highways is apparent.

Effect on highway costs

Now we shall consider the effects on our nation's highway system with respect to costs of building and maintenance. In a Government document entitled "Total Disbursements for Highways, All Units of Government," I find that from 1921 to 1965 we have invested over \$232,190,000,000 in this system of highways. A great portion of these billions of dollars represents the so-called Federal "contribution." This alone justifies more extensive Federal involvement in the active protection of our nation's highway network. It is an undisputed fact that an increase in weights and sizes will cause more rapid deterioration of highways. AASHO testimony last year stated that a 20,000 lb. axle weight

would reduce the remaining service life of payments by 35 to 40 percent.

We would have, then, a direct increase in total costs over those which would accrue under present standards. The basic design criteria for the Interstate System is based on the standard of an 18,000 lb. single axle weight. Doesn't this mean that the bill, if enacted, would require reconstruction of the 70% of the system presently built, at a period 35 to 40% sooner than we have anticipated? Such reconstruction is already taking place due to overweight trucks. The potential costs of this early reconstruction are staggering. Conceivably we would actually be rebuilding some of the older Interstate sections before the System is ever completed. I think it is important that this committee and the Congress have a reasonably accurate estimate of this enormous additional cost.

A corollary question is that of *who should pay for the additional costs incurred by any increase in the weights and sizes of vehicles.* It would appear that we presently have sufficient data at hand to make an informed judgment on this question. Both the Highway Cost Allocation Study, 88th Congress, First Session, House Document No. 354, and the Supplementary Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study, 89th Congress, First Session, House Document No. 124, are available. Relying on these documents we should have sufficient information to determine which highway users should bear the increase in cost of highway construction and maintenance accrued by reason of any increase made in vehicle weights or dimensions. At present, studies of wear characteristics of pavement indicate that the passage of a heavy truck over a high grade pavement produced deterioration equivalent to the passage of 6,000 automobiles. In order to pay their fair share of road costs, heavy trucks would have to pay 6,000 times the tax levied on the passenger car per mile traveled. These figures do not, obviously, reflect the substantially greater costs which would result from increasing vehicle weights. And, just as obviously, large trucks are not paying their fair share of road maintenance costs even now. Therefore, in considering any increase in truck sizes and weights we must also include reasonable increases in user taxes. No such proposal is included in this bill.

One remaining problem in this area is the method by which the increased costs of highway building and maintenance would be recouped by the government. This could take the form of an increase in the fuel tax, in the various user taxes presently being used by the states, or some new form of taxation. Suffice it to say that I am not troubled about the ability of this committee to arrive at a fair and rational decision with respect to each of the items I have here mentioned.

C. Economic benefits

While I feel other factors, such as motorist safety, are our primary concerns, the economic impact of increasing vehicle weights and sizes cannot rightly be ignored.

The first important element of this discussion is the adequacy of available transportation for goods and materials in various geographic sections of the nation. It is clear that certain areas of our country rely almost entirely on motor vehicles for transportation of vital goods, and, obviously, the economic impact of this legislation will be very grave in these regions. I am more concerned with this phase of the economic problem than any other. At the same time we must realize that the adverse effects of increasing motor carrier sizes can more than cancel out the economic benefits of such an action. The undesirable side-effects of adding larger vehicles to our roadways must be measured realistically against the benefits to the public

which might result from increasing hauler capacity.

Further, the extent to which this legislation will reduce transportation costs, namely freight rates, is questionable. Again, we must know exactly by how much costs will be reduced and, more importantly, who will be the ultimate benefactor of the purported savings. I seriously doubt if the consumer, or even the various manufacturers and intermediary shippers will experience substantial or any benefits. The trucking industry has recently signed a new labor contract providing for rather significant increases in labor costs. The temptation to offset these increased costs with any savings resulting from an increase in vehicle weights and sizes will undoubtedly prove too difficult to resist.

D. Coercion of the States

A fourth and final consideration with which this committee must deal is that of the relative roles of the Federal and State governments in regulation of vehicle weights and dimensions. This Congressman realizes that the action we take with respect to this legislation will have effects more far-reaching than those which simply concern the Interstate System of this nation. In this respect we should look once again to the mandate of the 1956 legislation. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed a study of the appropriate vehicle weight and size limitations with respect to all Federal aid highways. The AASHO studies and the recommendations resulting therefrom, have been directed solely to the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, the Interstate System has been built to the highest standards of any highway system in our Nation. The greater problem arises from the fact that our Interstate System does not lead from one vacuum to another, but, in fact, leads from one city to another via the ABC, or primary and secondary road systems. The Federal Government has an investment of 50% in the cost of constructing these systems. Granted, this amount may be considerably less than the 90% of construction costs which we have invested in the Interstate System, but there is no logical argument why the Federal Government should not protect its investment merely because it is "only 50%" of the total cost.

The larger and heavier vehicles which would be permitted on the Interstate System under the legislation now before us are not going to load and unload in the middle of that system. They must, of necessity, use the primary and secondary systems in their movement from one point to another. Section 109 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which includes standards for all Federal Aid Systems, says that the Secretary of Transportation may not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects unless they provide a facility "(1) that will meet the existing and probable future traffic needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance." AASHO stated in testimony last year that they believe the standards adopted as maximums should apply to all systems. It is clear that passage of this legislation by the Congress would serve as leverage to force the various states to increase their size and weight limitations on the primary and secondary systems so as to equal that of the Interstate System. This is despite the clear fact that our primary and secondary systems are not up to the same standards as our Interstate System, particularly with respect to the bridge structures on these systems, many of which were built prior to 1935, and are over-stressed even under present weight limitations. It is one thing to say that this legislation is merely "permissive" and doesn't force the states to do anything. To adopt this philosophy is to be something more than naive.

EXHIBIT I

STATE LEGAL MAXIMUM DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS PROTECTED BY "GRANDFATHER CLAUSE"

State	Width, inches	Axle load pounds		Specified maximum gross weight—lbs.		
		Single	Tandem	Truck-tractor semitrailer		
		Statutory limit	Including statutory enforcement tolerance	Statutory limit	Including statutory enforcement tolerance	4-axle 5-axle Other combination
Alabama			19,800	36,000	39,600	
Alaska		20,000		34,000		74,000 88,000 100,000
Colorado				36,000		
Connecticut	102	22,400	22,848	36,000	36,720	
Delaware		20,000		36,000		
Florida		20,000	22,000	40,000	44,000	
Georgia			20,340	36,000	40,680	
Hawaii	108	24,000				
Indiana			19,000		33,000	
Iowa			18,540		32,960	
Kentucky			18,900		33,600	
Maine	102	22,000		36,000		
Maryland	96	22,400		40,000		
Massachusetts		22,400		36,000		
Nebraska			18,900		33,600	
Nevada			18,900		33,600	
New Hampshire		22,400		36,000		
New Jersey		22,400	23,520		33,600	
New Mexico		21,600		34,200		
New York		22,400		36,000		
North Carolina			19,000		38,000	
Ohio			19,570		32,960	
Oregon		20,000		34,000		76,000 76,000
Pennsylvania		22,400	23,072	36,000	37,080	
Rhode Island	102	22,400				88,000
South Carolina		20,000				
Utah				33,000		79,900 79,900
Vermont		22,400	23,520	36,000		
West Virginia			18,900		33,600	
Wisconsin			19,500		32,000	
Wyoming					36,000	
District of Columbia		22,000				

EXHIBIT II

1. The additional cubage granted to longer vehicles would be about as follows:

States with 55-foot law: additional 15 feet or 27% more cubage.

States with 60-foot law: additional 10 feet or 17% more cubage.

States with 65-foot law: additional 5 feet or 8% more cubage.

The history of additional length is that for each foot of additional length, the permissible weight has gone up about 2700 pounds.

2. (a) The findings of the AASHO road test (from testimony of AASHO on S. 2658, page 203) that a single axle had a tandem axle equivalent in accordance with the following:

Single axle:	Tandem axle
18,000 lbs.	29,000 lbs.
20,000 lbs.	33,000 lbs.

(b) The increase from 18,000 lbs. to 20,000 lbs. single axle, would reduce the remaining life of pavements from 35 to 40 percent. (AASHO testimony S. 2658, page 203)

(c) Cost of resurfacings due to heavier loads would be about \$3 billion over a ten year period (Congressional Document 354 expanded to 50 states)

3. A 65 to 70 foot double bottom unit with 4-18,000 pounds axle would have about 125% of the damaging effect of a truck-tractor semi-trailer with two 32,000 pound tandem axles. (AASHO road test date—Summary Report #7, Chap. 7)

4. In September of 1968, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads reported that there was a total of 473,869 miles of surfaced roads on the State Primary Systems. 429,913 miles of these roads were undivided. 198,735 miles had lane widths of less than 12 feet. When two vehicles 10.5 feet wide (including the width of their safety equipment) meet on a highway with 10 or 11 foot traffic lanes, the result is obvious. This condition pertains to 198,735 miles of State Primary highways or nearly 42% of the total.

5. About 70% of the original 41,000 mile Interstate system is now built and it was designed basically for 18,000 pound single axles and 32,000 pound tandems.

6. The defense requirement routes of the country total 244,753 miles or one-seventh of the total highway network. This System includes 95,750 bridges, 68,700 of which are designed for less than HS-20 (the present Interstate Standard), and 30,073 for H-15 or less (the standard which applied prior to World War II.)

EXHIBIT III

(From the June 4, 1969, hearings on "Federal Aid Highway and Highway Safety," before the Subcommittee on Roads, of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives)

Mr. SCHWENGLER. And I would like to ask, have you done any research or are you planning any research on the effects of increasing the width of the trucks on the highway?

Dr. BRENNER. We have work in progress at the present time in the general problem area of stability of trucks, truck-trailer combinations, double bottoms, semis, the whole problem of truck-trailer stability. And insofar as the width of the vehicle, wheel base in relation to the height as well as the mass distribution, are certainly central to stability studies and we will be working in the general area.

As to the specific of what the extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am not aware of any work specifically in that regard.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. Do you not think since this was a question before the committee, question before the Congress, question both of the candidates for President commented on in the last election—one candidate said we ought to do a lot more studies here in this area—where we should be immediately pursuing this?

Dr. BRENNER. Of course, the Department is studying its position on this question of truck size and weight right now.

I think that we have to learn a great deal more about the problem of truck stability. I think this would be helpful. I do not know whether or not at this time this would preclude action, one way or another, upon the legislation that is pending. I think we have to continue to work in the area.

I would not comment as to whether or not

we now know enough one way or another with regard to safety.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. You are not sure we ought to study this, research this before we act on increasing the width? One candidate for President said we should.

Dr. BRENNER. I certainly would like to see as much information as possible, or at least all of the information that is available, considering any legislation on any matter. And I am not familiar with the totality of the research that has been done with regard to the truck-trailer stability. I do know that there is an awful lot we do not know about why some of these vehicles flip over and why some of them don't.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. Are you aware of the Professor Wolfe report?

Dr. BRENNER. Generally dealing with it, yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. If you are, then you know that they say that there will be two and one-half million accidents per year in which trucks are involved, with 4,000 to 5,000 deaths. And this study also shows that for every truck driver killed in a truck-auto crash, 35 are killed in automobiles.

Now, this is one of the reasons the public is concerned, the very reason we had better know what we are doing, the safety measure before we consider legislation.

This also applies to buses. I do not know what effect it is going to be, increasing width, how much more suction or how much more it has to bear, or what will be the result if we have better design for trucks, so that there will be a better flow of air as it goes through down the road.

Dr. BRENNER. I am familiar with Professor Wolfe's study. As a matter of fact, his group is one of the groups that is under contract to us in the accident investigation area. I have known Professor Wolfe for many years and the work there certainly is reasonably accurate.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. I understand you do try to do research, more research in this area?

Dr. BRENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. I am very glad to hear this.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT—DEMOGOGS IN THE URBAN JUNGLE—II

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the disgraceful riot in the chambers of the Washington City Council, resulting in the arrest of District of Columbia School Board Member Julius Hobson, and District Democratic Chairman Bruce J. Terris, among others, even drew an unfavorable editorial comment from the usually liberal Washington Post.

The riot came about quite simply—when the City Council finally, and quite reluctantly, agreed to obey the law.

The dissidents objected to the building of highways for working people to use to come into Washington, alleging that such progress would displace welfare recipients upon whom they depend for their power. A demagog with no rabble to rouse is out of business—hence the riot.

Meanwhile, following the example of their local civic and political leaders, some 200 Washington youths rioted over a several block area, threw rocks and bottles, fired shots, and required the

activation of the police special operations division to restore peace.

Mr. Speaker, I include three news clippings following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 12, 1969]

VIOLENCE IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER

The cause of orderly government in the Nation's Capital took a fearful beating in city hall on Saturday. When the City Council attempted to take the only course that Congress had left open to it to provide this city with a modern transportation system, it was jeered, insulted and disrupted. Violence then broke out when the Council was compelled to clear the chamber in order to proceed with its business.

It is obvious from what happened that emotions were deeply stirred, but the essence of a democratic system is that issues will be settled by debate and majority action of the body entitled to make the decision, regardless of how critical or momentous the outcome may be. In this case the issue of whether the Three Sisters Bridge should be built and the proposed North Central Freeway restudied had been debated and redebated until there was nothing more to say. Congress, which is the constitutional law-making body for the District, had made the final decision and indicated to the City Council that further delay in carrying out its mandate would not be tolerated.

The Council had only one decision to make: would it comply with the law or inflict disaster upon the city? It was not only a question of losing the proposed city subway system until the demands of Congress were met. The city was also threatened with loss of the Federal payment if it did not comply and loss of the meager control it had exercised in the past over the raising of local revenue. In effect, therefore, the Council had no control over the situation whatever. It had to bow to the inevitable.

For this belated but nevertheless courageous acknowledgement that a more authoritative voice had spoken, the Council members were denounced as "liars," "cheats" and "tricksters." An ash tray was thrown at Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr., and the Council meeting was plunged into turmoil by swinging fists and flying chairs. Whether one favors freeways or opposes them, the incident must be regarded as a disgrace to the city.

It is difficult to imagine, moreover, a more damaging setback to the cause of home rule in the District. The Council jeopardized its own standing by its long defiance of the congressional mandate on the freeways. When the ingredient of violence was added in a desperate effort to force the Council to persist in its defiance, the warmest friends of home rule on Capitol Hill were left in a hopeless predicament.

It would be ironical indeed if the repeated disruption of its meetings should force the Council into closed-door sessions. That would involve another critical loss for democratic procedure. Ways must be found to permit the Council to operate in the open without intimidation, disruption or violence, and this is probably the most important business now before it.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 12, 1969]

ONE HUNDRED YOUTHS CLASH, SIX HELD

Six juveniles were arrested when police broke up a wide-spread fight between two factions of youths last night in Northeast Washington. 150 to 200 persons were involved.

Numerous shots were fired by the youths during the confrontation between groups who had attended two separate dances, but there was no reported serious injuries.

The police special operations division was activated to help quell the disturbance after youths from a dance at 9th street and West Virginia Avenue clashed with some attend-

ing another dance at 13th Street and Florida Avenue.

The fighting spread out over a several-block area. Rocks and bottles were thrown.

One of the six youths arrested was charged with carrying a prohibited weapon, which police said was a knife. All six were charged with anti-loitering violations.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 11, 1969]

POLICE CHIEF RAPS COURT FOR CRIME WOES

District Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson said today court delays and liberal bail release policies permit the average youthful criminal to feel "there is virtually nothing to constrain him from committing crime."

Testifying before the House Select Committee on Crime, the city's new police chief blamed court backlogs for making "the criminal much less fearful of the consequences of his act."

Chief Wilson, who also called for a "complete realignment of social attitudes," nevertheless insisted that "the immediate answer to our crime problems in this city . . . lies in the major shoring up of our court systems and corrections facilities."

He took issue with those who claim the District is the crime capital of the nation, noting that while the city logged a 24.7 percent increase in crime in 1968 over 1967 most suburban jurisdictions surrounding the District showed a 20 percent or more increase in the same period.

[From the Evening Star, June 21, 1969]

TWELVE PERCENT BOOST IN DISTRICT CRIME IS SMALLEST RISE IN YEAR

Crime in the District increased 12.2 percent in May over May 1968 for the smallest monthly percentage increase in the last year, Police Chief John B. Layton said yesterday.

Decreases were recorded in two crime classifications—auto theft, down from 1,028 to 925 offenses, or 10 percent, and burglary, down from 1,710 to 1,707 offenses, or .2 percent.

However, increases were noted in rape, up 66.7 percent; homicide, 37.5 percent; robbery, 23.7 percent; aggravated assault, 36.1 percent, and larceny (\$50 and over), up 64.3 percent.

Crimes against persons—homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault—represented 25.6 percent of the May total, while the remainder, 74.4 percent, were crimes against property—burglary, larceny and auto theft.

NIXON'S NEW WELFARE PLAN A VICTORY FOR GEORGE SHULTZ

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times quite properly called to the attention of its readers today the fact that the principal architect of President Nixon's welfare reform proposal is the Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD today an article by Mr. Tom Littlewood which describes Secretary Shultz's role in the development of the President's proposal.

We in Chicago are particularly gratified that one of our constituents should have played so important a role in hammering this new concept.

Secretary Shultz is a former University of Chicago professor.

The article by Mr. Littlewood follows:

NIXON'S NEW WELFARE PLAN A VICTORY FOR GEORGE SHULTZ

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—The Cabinet officer who was instrumental in making the family income maintenance plan politically palatable to President Nixon was his secretary of labor, former University of Chicago professor George P. Shultz.

The President's Cabinet was overwhelmingly against the welfare reform program that was introduced to the nation Friday night and described more fully Monday in a message to Congress.

Shultz placed a crucial role within the administration's Urban Affairs Council by perfecting the job training and employment requirements that Mr. Nixon thought were needed to make the proposed changeover salable, both in Congress and among the Republican Party's conservative middle-class constituency.

Besides contributing the job training features, Shultz worked stubbornly for the basic but highly controversial support program for the working poor.

Only Robert H. Finch, secretary of health, education and welfare, Economic Opportunity director Donald Rumsfeld and Shultz actively supported the plan that was originated almost six months ago by Daniel P. Moynihan, Mr. Nixon's principal urban affairs adviser.

While guaranteeing a foundation level of income for families, able parents of school-age dependent children would be required to register with the employment service and accept jobs that are available.

THREE OPPOSED PLAN

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and Housing and Urban Development Sec. George W. Romney all tried to shoot down the Moynihan-Finch plan on its troubled journey to the President's desk.

Although labeled a GOP liberal, Romney has chosen to push hard for low-income housing, of primary concern to his department, to the exclusion of most other rival plans for the scarce federal budget dollar.

The outcome against uncertain odds is expected to boost the Nixon administration stock of the mild-mannered Shultz and his "Midway Mafia"—the former Chicago colleagues led by the assistant secretary for manpower, Arnold R. Weber, who joined Shultz at the Labor Department.

One White House informant said that Defense Sec. Melvin R. Laird, whose political judgments on domestic affairs are respected by Mr. Nixon, also encouraged the drastic new program.

TWENTY TO ONE IN FAVOR

Moynihan said Monday the mail and telegram response to the President's Friday night speech had been "absolutely astonishing"—about 20 to 1 in favor of the program.

Moynihan tended to underemphasize the work requirements in the proposed system, which he said were not much different from existing law. He pointed out that requirements would not apply to mothers with preschool-age children, as many as 8 out of 10 present ADC recipients in many of the large cities.

Interestingly, the administration is proceeding on the dubious assumption that the biggest problems in getting the change through Congress will be raised by liberal Democrats.

A White House spokesman suggested Monday that a Democratic administration never could have proposed such a revolutionary program because of the vested interest that big-city Democratic organizations have in the existing welfare system.

DEBATE ON BENEFITS

On another level, the ensuing debate is certain to involve the proper share of benefits for the industrial cities of the North, as compared with the rural South, where the

underfinancing of welfare payments has been most severe.

Many black politicians and other leaders also have mixed emotions about the welfare system, another reason why the administration is convinced that "the Democrats never would have dared fool around with welfare."

Following his Friday night television address, Mr. Nixon was reported to have told one of his assistants that he had been reading the life of Disraeli and was convinced that:

"It has been the Tory men with liberal principles who have enlarged democracy."

Of immense prospective importance is how and by whom the work requirements are policed.

MESSAGE DUE TUESDAY

The administration plan would vest that power in the U.S. Employment Service and give the governors more control over the operation of the employment offices in the big cities.

The manpower training message that Mr. Nixon will submit to Congress on Tuesday will spell out the details of his proposal to consolidate and decentralize the scattered employment assistance programs.

Now the governor of Illinois has little or no control over the federally financed manpower grants that are provided directly to Chicago. Under the new plan, Chicago would be assured a fair share of the money. But Gov. Ogilvie would establish a state planning council with some authority over Chicago's manpower projects.

Shultz's agency would settle any jurisdictional squabbles between Democratic Mayor Daley and Republican Gov. Ogilvie.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AD- MISSIONS TAX PROPOSAL—A POOR APPROACH

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, I am certainly well aware of the financial difficulties faced by the governing body of this city. It is obvious that many of the necessary programs so vital to the well-being of the citizens of Washington, D.C., are woefully inadequate; others are nonexistent. I cannot blame the District government, therefore, for seeking new sources of revenue to meet the needs of its people.

I must take issue, however, with the recent proposal by the District of Columbia government to place a 4-percent admissions tax on the performing arts in this city. In my opinion, this proposal would result in a loss of revenue in the long run, rather than the desired increase. Further, I strongly believe that this tax would contradict the sense of the Congress in regard to the performing arts. Finally, I fear that this proposal would lead to a further erosion of culture in this city and throughout the Nation by depriving those who need and want it most of the opportunity to see cultural events in person.

Much of my concern over the admissions tax idea is embodied in a letter which I sent to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), the chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee and the other mem-

bers of the committee. I wish to insert a copy of that letter at this point in the RECORD:

JUNE 12, 1969.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Rayburn House Office Building, U.S. House
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply distressed by a suggestion in the District Government's revenue proposals that admissions to legitimate theaters, concerts, and other cultural events be taxed four percent. For many years now, my Committee and the Congress have heard persuasive arguments that the arts are in dire economic trouble in our nation and, because of this, government financial assistance is needed. In response, we have appropriated funds to bolster our cultural institutions in Washington and in the Nation. In 1965, we removed a federal tax on admissions, and I am informed that several major cities have in similar fashion eliminated such local taxes. Several times my committee has been requested by the District Government to provide funds for theater, music and similar activities.

The suggestion of the District Government that these worthwhile and necessary programs which offer so much in the way of constructive recreation be subjected to a new tax runs directly counter to the steps taken by Congress and the nation to encourage these activities. Furthermore, it directly contradicts programs the District Government itself has undertaken to assist and finance.

I am informed that the tax on legitimate theater, concerts and dance presentations would produce approximately \$200,000. I believe that because these activities already take place on a precarious financial base, a consequence of this tax would be to force their curtailment. If this were to happen, I have no doubt that the District would suffer more than \$200,000 per year in revenue loss. This will occur because the employment of District residents will be reduced in these cultural areas. In addition, businesses that benefit from the fact that these attractions draw people into the city will also suffer, and the District's revenue raising program will accordingly be impaired.

The proposed tax poses many very serious questions in my mind. This Congress has invested in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts which falls under the Smithsonian's operations; the Ford Theater which is operated by the Interior Department; and the Carter Barron Theater which is also operated by the Interior Department. Is it the intention of the District Government to tax admissions to these places? If not, wouldn't the proposed tax place cultural activities conducted under private auspices at a competitive disadvantage? The answer must certainly be "yes". The consequence, therefore, of the District's proposal is to discourage privately sponsored and operated cultural institutions from operating in the city with the end result that eventually all such activities will have to be government operated and financed.

Last year, the District Government created an advisory committee on the arts. It is my understanding that this commission was never consulted on this tax proposal and that no study regarding the impact which this proposal would have on the cultural life of our nation's capital has been conducted by the commission or the District Government. I respectfully suggest that this proposal of the District Government not be incorporated in legislation at this time, but be placed in abeyance pending such consultation and study.

Meanwhile, I will strongly oppose any attempt to levy a new tax on the legitimate theater, concerts, the dance and similar cultural activities because it would contradict efforts of my own committee to support such programs on the grounds that they are de-

sirable to the economic, cultural and recreational life of the Nation's Capital city.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported the performing arts, for I believe that they provide the quality and cultural stimulation so necessary to a healthy society. I must oppose, therefore, any attempt to reestablish this unnecessary and unproductive levy in the District of Columbia, for if the Congress reverses its position and approves this proposal, it will most certainly result in cries of "tax the arts" from other cities throughout America. Such a trend, in my opinion, would lead to cultural disaster.

At a time when the performing arts have been described in committee testimony as "an economically depressed area of activity typified by high unemployment, low wages, diminishing returns on investment, increasing deficit, and a decreasing product," must we hasten the erosion by adding to the financial burden?

At a time when more and more Americans are unable to afford the cost of admission to a live play, concert, or other cultural event, must we increase the price even further, thus making culture the sole property of the affluent?

At a time when young people of all races and creeds are seeking their cultural heritage, must we deprive them of this opportunity, thus consigning them to the wasteland of television, or, what is worse, to the streets?

We cannot allow this to happen, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, refuse to sacrifice a portion of the economical, cultural, and recreational life of the Nation's Capital for a financial scheme which will, in all probability, wind up losing money. I refuse to give the green light to those in other parts of our land who would endanger the quality of American life for a few pennies. I refuse to support any measure which would reverse the recent trend of Congress toward a meaningful partnership with the arts, a partnership which is beneficial to all Americans.

I realize the value of the performing arts to the American way of life. My committee realizes it and so does the Congress. Now, especially, we cannot afford to renege on our cultural commitment. The District's admissions tax proposal would do just that. I urge its defeat.

PUT UP OR SHUT UP: A CITIZENS CRUSADE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major findings made after man landed on the moon was an expected one—water does not exist on that distant planet. A few days later, however, scientists were excited when pictures and data indicated that perhaps water—and, therefore, the possibility of life—existed on the planet Mars.

We know that without water there is no life. But what kind of life can man expect if our water becomes polluted and lifeless, for although the pollution of water may not be a problem on the moon, for the majority of us on earth who will never get to the moon, it is a major problem, indeed.

Man has existed on earth a relatively short 2 million years. In that time, whether consciously or not, he has mismanaged his environment to such an alarming degree that it will take billions of dollars to clean up our abundant, but still limited, water resources.

With passage of legislation such as the Water Quality Act in 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act in 1966 Congress has recognized the fact that this damage has been done; that it will take money to clean it up, and that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help in the effort. We stated the problem and promised the help, but to put it in current terms, we "copped out" when it came to performance. And there is no doubt that the longer we wait to curb pollution, the more expensive this job is going to be, both in terms of money and in terms of the incalculable and irretrievable damage which we will have done to our lakes, rivers, and streams.

There is an old saying which all of us have heard at one time or another: Put up or shut up. I think it applies here.

Certainly the people of this Nation will not shut up about the pollution of their water. They are concerned about water that is discolored, water that has offensive odors, water that is so polluted that people can neither swim in it safely nor eat fish from it except at their own risk.

Moreover, people are willing to do something about it. In a recent Gallup poll, 73 percent of the American people said they are willing to pay additional taxes to finance pollution abatement programs. Eleven million have voted in recent referenda to tax themselves in an effort to get clean water, including over 800,000 people in my own State of Wisconsin.

So, now the responsibility has been passed to Congress, and the question the American people want answered is whether or not we are going to allocate funds to end the pollution of our rivers and lakes at the level Congress promised when it passed the Clean Water Restoration Act in 1966.

Under that act, funds were authorized to finance Federal grants for sewage treatment facility construction. The problem developed when Congress failed to match its performance with its promises.

In 1968, for example, \$450 million was authorized for waste treatment grants under that act, but only \$203 million was actually appropriated. In 1969, \$700 million was authorized but only \$214 million was granted, and in 1970, with \$1 billion authorized, only \$214 million has been asked by the administration to help clean up our waterways.

Fortunately, a committee of concerned citizens has been formed to persuade the Congress and the President that full funding is necessary to help finance local sewage-treatment plants.

Last Friday I attended a meeting of

this committee—the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water—and joined with more than 135 Members of the House of Representatives in an effort to obtain full funding of \$1 billion for the Clean Water Restoration Act for the 1970 fiscal year.

That crusade includes labor organizations, government officials, civic groups, and conservationists from all over our Nation. The coordinator of this massive effort is Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America.

Mr. Penfold and his organization have played a leading role in attempts to get meaningful funding for water pollution programs, and have generated support from others partially through Outdoor America, the magazine of the Izaak Walton League. In the July 1969 issue of that magazine, there appeared an editorial titled "Clean Water—Call to Action." That editorial states that "the organizations and the individuals of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water are to be commended."

Mr. Speaker, to that I say "amen." As one who supports the goal of full funding for construction grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act, I wish the Citizens Crusade every success, and congratulate them on their fine efforts thus far.

The full text of the editorial follows:

CLEAN WATER—CALL TO ACTION

The Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, reported elsewhere on these pages, points up once again two important truths which all people concerned with environmental quality should remember.

First of all, the public wants pollution eliminated from the lakes, streams, estuaries and coastal waters of the Nation and are willing to pay the costs involved. The Gallup poll taken earlier in the year showed this. Yet more conclusively, the public, when given the opportunity to vote for bond issues indebted themselves for waste treatment facilities, have voted "yes." The Administration and the Congress should note this well.

The Crusade also demonstrates that strong and independent organizations of widely varied purposes can put aside their differences and join in an effort to achieve a common objective.

Forces in the modern world which degrade the environment—population growth itself being a major root cause—are powerful and unrelenting. They can be resisted and turned back only as people are willing to put aside their differences, great and petty, and join their strengths toward the common objective. And what more universally desired objective than a decent, wholesome, and rewarding environment for all people!

The organizations and the individuals of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water are to be commended. And, we urge that this coalition not be permitted to expire. The Crusade for Clean Water has not yet been won, and there are a myriad of other environmental problems in which we shall find common objectives, if we will but seek them out.

INSURRECTIONISTS GET A BREAK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in recent years a rash of extreme decisions

by the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts, both State and Federal, have raised the ire of citizens everywhere, whether they be legally oriented or not. A recent decision of New Jersey Superior Court Judge Robert A. Matthews is a good example of why the public has for some time now been fed up with judicial judgments which strain to protect by every device the civil rights of criminals, revolutionaries, and other extremists who war on society while at the same time placing undue burdens on the protectors of that same society. If the press accounts of Judge Matthews' action are factual, the law-enforcement officials in the State must destroy secret files kept on persons suspected of involvement in riots and other public demonstrations, except in cases where there are "specific charges against persons for specifically defined conduct." Judge Matthews is quoted as saying that the "secret files maintained by the intelligence gathering system are inherently dangerous, and by their very existence tend to restrict those who would advocate social and political change."

The Chicago Tribune of August 8 commented editorially on the effect such a decision, if allowed to stand and adopted nationally, would have on law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation:

A ruling which could drastically affect record-keeping by every police department in the country and conceivably lead to court action to force the Federal Bureau of Investigation to dismantle its files has been handed down by a state court judge in New Jersey.

The Trib editorial further pointed out that:

This is a strange interpretation of the motives of those who, in New Jersey's sad experience, engaged in rioting, looting, and sniping. In Plainfield, for instance, a policeman was shot and kicked to death and 90 stores were looted in what a police lieutenant described as racial "war." In Newark, five days of fire-bombing, looting, and sniping left 27 dead, 1,100 injured, 1,300 under arrest, and property damage in excess of 15 million dollars. Are such outbreaks within constitutional "protected areas," and have they anything to do with free speech and right of assembly? Only the most tenuous and far-fetched rationalization would hold they were.

As I have previously stated, if the sum and substance of Judge Matthews' decision have been factually reported, then I trust State authorities in New Jersey will take their case to the highest courts for correction. I include at this point the editorial "Insurrectionists Get a Break" in the Chicago Tribune of August 8:

INSURRECTIONISTS GET A BREAK

A ruling which could drastically affect record-keeping by every police department in the country and conceivably lead to court action to force the Federal Bureau of Investigation to dismantle its files has been handed down by a state court judge in New Jersey.

Acting on a complaint of the American Civil Liberties union, Judge Robert A. Matthews of the Superior court of Hudson county ordered the state attorney general and every other law enforcement official in New Jersey to destroy secret intelligence files on persons suspected of being involved in riots and other public demonstrations.

The intelligence-gathering was instituted

last year as a precautionary measure against the repetition of bloody rioting in Newark and Plainfield in 1967. Atty. Gen. Arthur J. Sills directed law enforcement officials to compile data on suspected groups and activists and to turn them over to state police.

The attorney general defended the system in reply to the ACLU court attack by saying that "on balance, the public need for information predominates over the individual's interest in not having the police compile information about him."

The ACLU, in turn, called the files the product of a "gestapo-like network of police spies," and Judge Matthews bought this highly charged thesis. He said that they violated the guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly of the 1st amendment to the federal Constitution, adding that the Supreme court had repeatedly held that individual rights are paramount and that any restriction on freedom could not be tolerated.

"The secret files that would be maintained as a result of this intelligence-gathering system," the judge held, "are inherently dangerous, and by their very existence tend to restrict those who would advocate, within the protected areas, social and political change."

This is a strange interpretation of the motives of those who, in New Jersey's sad experience, engaged in rioting, looting, and sniping. In Plainfield, for instance, a policeman was shot and killed to death and 90 stores were looted in what a police lieutenant described as racial "war." In Newark, five days of fire-bombing, looting, and sniping left 27 dead, 1,100 injured, 1,300 under arrest, and property damage in excess of 15 million dollars. Are such outbreaks within constitutional "protected areas," and have they anything to do with free speech and right of assembly? Only the most tenuous and far-fetched rationalization would hold they were.

If files of the sort described can be ordered destroyed, what about fingerprints and criminal records kept by every police department and by the FBI? What about "mug shots" of criminal and suspected criminals? What about records of traffic violators kept by every state? Where is the line to be drawn?

The first requirement of the Constitution, and the first duty of government, is to insure domestic tranquility and to secure the rights of the citizens in their person and property. Surely society has a right to protect itself from the lawless, the anti-social, and the revolutionary. The state of New Jersey was seeking to take out insurance against a revival of civic disorder, yet, even while Passaic, because of violence and racial tension, was under curfew, a Jersey judge has ruled that the law is to be disarmed.

MARINER 6 AND 7

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during all the excitement of the world's welcome home to the Apollo 11 astronauts, another equally significant space achievement was being unfolded. I refer to the flights of Mariner 6 and Mariner 7 to the planet Mars. Spectacular pictures, giving us many times more information about the red planet than man has ever had, have been returned to NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif. For many months scientists will be poring over these pictures and other scientific data to try to un-

ravel the mysteries of our neighbor, Mars. These flights are among the greatest achievements of NASA's unmanned space science program. Congratulations are in order for Dr. Thomas O. Paine, NASA Administrator; Dr. John Naugle, Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications; Mr. Donald Heath, Planetary Program Manager, NASA Headquarters; Mr. N. W. Cunningham, Mariner '69 Manager, NASA Headquarters; and Mr. Bud Schurmeier, Mariner '69 Project Manager at JPL.

I place in the RECORD several newspaper editorials commenting on the Mariner 6 and 7 flights:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1969]
HOMAGE TO THE ASTRONAUTS—AND PORTRAIT OF MARS

By this morning, if all goes as planned, the three Apollo astronauts will have been released from quarantine and reunited with their families. Then they will begin receiving the world's homage for their historic accomplishment in a celebration that will start with Wednesday's grueling cross country parade.

Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins richly deserve the heroes' acclaim they will receive in the days immediately ahead. As no earlier feat has ever done, their successful trip to and return from the moon captured the imagination of men and women almost everywhere. In the universal glow produced at least briefly by their success, many of the normal divisive barriers among men broke down. They were hailed in Moscow as well as in Washington, in Cairo as well as in Jerusalem, in New Delhi and Karachi, in East Berlin and West Berlin.

This background makes it particularly unfortunate that the formal celebration planned this week has such a narrow, nationalistic cast. In the words of the plaque they left on the moon, the astronauts "came in peace for all mankind." Yet their visit to the United Nations next Wednesday will be very brief, while the rest of that day will be devoted to an American celebration of an American achievement.

Perhaps it is not too late for more imaginative planning to emphasize the role of the astronauts as envoys of all humanity, emissaries whose trip was made possible by contributions of knowledge from many nations over many centuries. Better than any men before them, after all, Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins know that this one planet is one world and that what unites men is far stronger and more important than the forces dividing them.

On that eventual day when the first men walk on the surface of Mars, they will find much "magnificent desolation" akin to that seen by Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin when they strolled on the moon last month.

That virtual certainty emerges from the brilliantly successful exploration of the red planet just completed by Mariners 6 and 7. Their expedition lacked the human drama of Apollo 11, but the scientific information they returned may well qualify the two Mariners as the most scientifically productive enterprise men have yet carried out in space.

Generations of science fiction writers—from H. G. Wells and Edgar Rice Burroughs to Ray Bradbury—were mistaken, it turns out, in their visions of human or nonhuman civilizations on Mars. Or the contrary, Mars is a bleak, arid wasteland, a geologist's nightmare of twisted plains and innumerable craters whose typical landscape is almost indistinguishable from that of the moon.

True, Mars has a thin atmosphere—whose ground-level pressure is about that found twenty or thirty miles above the earth—but it is composed mainly of carbon dioxide, and could never support any complex life familiar

here on earth. Worse yet, the Martian surface—or most of it anyway—is bathed daily in a deadly shower of ultraviolet radiation, and there is no equivalent of the lifesaving protection provided by the atmosphere here. While Martian temperatures may get up to a comfortable 70 degrees or so at best, they descend at worst to hundreds of degrees below zero. For lovers of comfort, Mars is as uninviting as the moon, and well over a hundred times as far away.

The irrepressible optimists who refuse to believe that earth alone has life in this solar system did get something to cheer about from Mariner 7. Professors Pimentel and Herr believe they detected methane and ammonia in Mars's south polar region, and they suggest this may have a biological origin, i.e., there may be some primitive form of life in that part of Mars.

It is an exciting hypothesis worth further investigation, but for the moment the idea must be viewed as an extremely long shot. Methane and ammonia can arise from non-biological processes. Moreover, there are serious contradictions between some of the Pimentel-Herr conclusions and those of other investigators using different data sent back by Mariner 7.

Whether the Pimentel-Herr hypothesis is right or wrong, the case is strong for further intensive study of Mars by unmanned satellites—as against a precipitate switch to the much more costly alternative of manned exploration. A race to put men on Mars would be a moonoggle for which there is neither need nor justification.

The fascinating close-approach photographs sent back by the two Mariners covered only 20 per cent of the planet, and they offered no explanation for the changing patterns of dark and light that telescopes have shown on Mars for centuries. Additionally, Mariner 7 has uncovered an intriguing mystery by demonstrating that the bright area called Hellas is decidedly atypical in not having craters. That revelation immediately raises the question of what processes have obliterated the craters that meteors must have created in Hellas too.

For the scientifically minded or even the merely curious, the rich harvest of the Mariners can only whet the appetite for more knowledge.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1969]

RECONNAISSANCE OF MARS

For the scientifically minded, the reconnaissance of Mars now under way by Mariner 6 and Mariner 7 is almost as exciting as the triumph of Apollo 11.

Mariner 6 has been traveling through space for nearly six months. It is now close to 60-million miles from earth, or 240 times as far away as the moon. Yet on a signal from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology, the instruments aboard Mariner 6 took pictures of Mars and later transmitted them to earth. Even the first pictures of Mars, taken from more than half a million miles away from that planet, had recognizable features and apparently provided new information to delighted scientists watching the transmissions unfold.

Within recent years, unmanned rockets carrying cameras and other instruments have been sent toward Venus as well as toward Mars and the moon. Man's knowledge of all three of these celestial bodies has been enormously enhanced by these missions, none of which risked human lives and all of which were relatively cheap compared to the enormous cost of manned flight to the same destinations.

Nevertheless, American political leadership has been so obsessed with sending a man to the moon that unmanned probes of the planets became the stepchildren of the national space program. There were times when even the continued existence of the Jet Pro-

pulsion Laboratory—the center for these unmanned flights—seemed in doubt.

Now, in the new phase of American space exploration begun in the wake of Apollo 11's historic achievement, the major cost-benefit advantages of Mariner-type unmanned flights needs be more fully appreciated by Washington policy makers, and more intensively exploited than in the past, even as the manned exploration of the moon continues.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1969]
THE MOON AND MARS

It is not often that the public has a chance to share in the day to day unraveling of scientific mysteries. The men and women who engage in basic research prefer to work quietly in laboratories and eventually announce their findings in the atmosphere of scholarly meetings or academic publications. But at Houston and Pasadena these days, the public has become a silent observer of the plodding work that goes into basic research. Regardless of the drama that is involved, the study of the rocks brought back by Apollo 11 from the moon and of the pictures being transmitted back by Mariners 6 and 7 as they fly past Mars is simply basic research. Although results are trickling out each day, the dimensions of each discovery are hard to measure and an understanding of their cumulative impact is likely to be long in coming.

The rock samples scooped up before our eyes less than two weeks ago probably have taught us already more about the moon than all of man's study in previous history. This knowledge, combined with the preliminary reports from the experimental packages left there, indicates that the moon may be a smaller version of the earth. In itself, this fact (if it is so) means little or nothing to men immersed in trying to solve earthly problems. But neither did the initial discoveries about radioactive elements or of the properties of electricity, although these now have major roles in daily life. What our first knowledge of the moon does hold out is the promise of more knowledge, first of how both the earth and the moon were created and eventually, perhaps, of how we can better control the physical forces in both bodies. It is possible, for example, that our scanty knowledge of the hows and whys of earthquakes can be immeasurably increased by knowledge gained through moonquakes, if further seismic reports bear out the first readings that there are such things.

Similarly, the new pictures of Mars will broaden substantially our limited knowledge of that planet although they are likely to do no more than bring our understanding of it up to where our understanding of the moon was before the space program began. It is quite possible, however, that they will enable the scholars of the heavens to make a much better estimate about the possibility that some form of life exists there.

Each of these stabs into space ought to be regarded for what it is—basic research that will broaden our knowledge of the universe. Since these efforts are being conducted in the full glare of constant publicity, we might as well get accustomed to the scientific method once taught us in school—the building of hypotheses and then the confirming or destroying of them, a process in which negative results are often as helpful as positive ones. That is what basic research is all about—wandering down roads without knowing what, if anything, is at the end of them and discovering, once in a while, fantastic new vistas. And that is what is going on today at Houston and Pasadena.

[From the Washington Star, July 31, 1969]
A LOOK AT MARS

The current twin probe of Mars, coming on the heels of the triumph of Apollo 11, must inevitably suffer by comparison. The photo-

graphic and scientific mission of Mariner 6 and 7 cannot compete for drama and glamour with man's first landing on the moon. Two weeks ago, the world would have stood in awe of the feat. Today, the enthusiasm is notably restrained.

There should, however, be no mistaking the major contribution that the Mariners are making. Mariner 6 has already done its work. If the technicians at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory succeed in correcting the difficulties aboard Mariner 7, man will receive 183 photographs from his distant messengers, sent back across 60 million miles of interplanetary space. These pictures will provide views of Earth's intriguing neighbor never before seen by man.

The closeup look at Mars, together with the scientific probes carried on board the Mariners, over the next few days can answer many of the questions that have been the subjects of wonder and debate for centuries. The environment and the topography of the planet should be thoroughly clarified. The mystery of the Martian canals may be solved. The suitability of Mars for human visitation will be known. And the most intriguing question of all—can Mars support any form of life—may well be answered by the time the Mariners have completed their sweeps 2,000 miles above the alien surface.

It is possible that nothing man accomplishes from now on can match the excitement of the fantastic sight and sound of his first step onto another celestial body. But the Mariners have something, too, that should commend them to the public attention.

For a fraction of the cost of manned exploration, and at no risk to human life, they have expanded man's probing intelligence to the other planets. There, they and other unmanned probes to come should be able to tell us if there is any need for man to follow.

[From The Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer,
July 21, 1969]

MARS MIGHT BE BROUGHT NEARER

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew stirred up a hornet's nest when he proposed Mars as a possible future stop on the United States' space probe itinerary.

The debate over national priorities has been a heated one and undoubtedly will continue to be such. And some critics felt that the vice president was jumping the gun by talking about Mars at the moment Apollo 11 had just left the pad on its moonquest.

But the fact is that America's space program of the future is, and has been, directed beyond the moon and Mars has become more than a mere item of curiosity.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has two Mariner vehicles headed toward Mars. They will pass within 2,000 miles of that planet and take more than 200 pictures to send back to the earth.

Mariner 6, launched last Feb. 24, will reach its closest point to Mars on July 31. Mariner 7, launched March 27, will pass by Mars on Aug. 5. The closest approach to Mars so far was made by Mariner 4 in 1965 when it came within 6,100 miles of the Red Planet.

NASA said this series of television pictures, taken while the planet revolves through several Martian days, will reveal general surface features not visible from earth and may provide information on the formation and motion of clouds.

Peeking in at Mars may not sound like much but it has to be remembered that the entire moon shot program to a large degree has been developed on what cameras were able to relay to scientists and researchers. First the picture, then the trip. The vice president may be premature in his enthusiasm for a Mars voyage but the fact is that the first probing steps, to determine feasibility at least, are under way.

A ROAD IN PERU

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, although Latin America is, geographically, our closest neighbor, few Americans are adequately acquainted with the problems and issues confronting this vast continent. In order to further understanding of one such Latin American country, Peru, I am today inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Clayton Willis, entitled "A Road in Peru," which appeared in the Manhattan Tribune of July 5.

Mr. Willis' analysis of the problems facing one small community in Peru illustrates some of the problems faced in Latin America today; problems with which Congress must become more familiar if it is to be in a position to make a knowledgeable evaluation of the U.S. Latin American aid program.

The article follows:

[From the Manhattan (N.Y.) Tribune, July 5, 1969]

A ROAD IN PERU

(By Clayton Willis)

PUCALLPA, PERU.—This boom town of about 65,000 residents which hugs an Amazon River tributary called the Ucayali River, is at least one example of what can happen when a road connects it to the "outside world." It also spotlights a clearcut discrimination problem through which this nation's Indians have suffered for decades.

Once a sleepy jungle outpost of a bare 2,368 inhabitants in 1955, people from all over this country of 13.5 million inhabitants and some from abroad began to flock here in the last five years as the first overland road was completed, the 525 road miles from the capital of Lima on the Pacific coast. Pucallpa is about 350 airline miles northeast of Lima which is now giving the United States a tough time over its expropriation of the International Petroleum Company and the country's demands for control over waters for fishing out to 200 miles from the coast.

Former President Fernando Belaunde Terry succeeded in getting a fairly good road built across the Andes Mountains from Lima to here. The all-weather highway sparked the construction and opening of a jet airport and modern airport terminal building, the construction of several plywood mills, the opening of a big paper factory partly owned by the brother-in-law of former Panamanian Foreign Minister Fernando Elea (Elea left office when now deposed President Arnulfo Arias took over Panama for 13 days last September.)

Also Sinclair International has modernized its oil refinery here to handle a capacity of 2,500 barrels per day. A 46-mile long, 4-inch pipeline brings crude oil to it from the Agua Caliente Field. The Pucallpa refinery in 1967 processed 1,512 barrels a day, according to a Sinclair spokesman.

Truck farming by Japanese immigrants has sprung up east of here and is helping the economy. Various small industries are popping up.

Examples of Europeans coming here to cash in on the business boom include the German couple who opened the Berlin Hotel and Berlin Restaurant.

"We used the name Berlin because we thought international travelers would know from it that we had a clean restaurant and clean hotel," it was explained.

Pucallpa itself has few hard surface, black tar roads. Quite a few people live in real squalor. Yet a modern housing development on the southeastern side of town attracts some of Pucallpa's wealthier residents.

Luis Escalante on May 1, 1968, started up the city's only daily newspaper, "La Razon." Editor and Publisher Escalante said the tabloid's first month profit was a whopping \$25. (That's twenty-five U.S. dollars!)

Escalante is concerned about the failure of the Peruvian Government to complete the final 100 miles of a transcontinental highway which starts in Lima, passes through here and is to go on to the Brazilian border. Completion of the road would permit overland highway travel from Rio de Janeiro through Brasilia and on to Lima.

Brazil has built most of its part of the road from Brasilia to Cruzeiro do Sul which is about 75 miles east, northeast of the Peruvian border. The final 400 miles from Rio Branco, Brazil, to Cruzeiro do Sul, Brazil, is not all weather. It is little more than a trail in some spots. Although finishing the road is the only way to open up mineral, forest and agricultural development of the 175-mile area from this city to Cruzeiro do Sul, United States A.I.D. and U.S. Public Roads officials told me they are not giving priority to this link to the Brazilian border. U.S. A.I.D. funds have been cut. What money remains goes into several projects of Belaunde's Marginal Road system which he pushed to open up the Andes Mountains areas (one snow-clad peak of Mt. Huascaran is 22,205 feet high.)

At Pucallpa a bridge must be built across the massive Ucayali River which at this point is from one quarter to one half mile wide, depending if it is at flood stage during the rainy season or not.

But, of all things, the new military regime in power in Peru apparently is cranking up the rusted survey for the 100-mile link, and may order the road built.

Then it must allocate the money and have it built, which is something else! Such road projects in this part of the world are not usually done very quickly.

But as American missionary Jim Davidson of the South American Indian Mission Group here said, "With the military behind it, the road just might get some action."

In Rio Branco, Brazil, recently, General Maldonado Yanez, Peruvian minister of development, discussed the project with officials of the Bolivian and Brazilian Governments. There is talk about starting work on the road this year.

Who knows, perhaps the Indians of this land will get a break yet from the new government just as they benefitted somewhat from Belaunde's 1964 land reform law which called for distribution of large land tracts to peasants.

Meanwhile, the Indians remain primarily a mass of people whom the Spanish-Peruvians choose to "forget" just as the Spanish-Colombians "forget" the Indians who are mostly isolated in the Amazon River region of Colombia between Leticia and Miraflores. Miraflores is 250 miles southeast of Bogota, and 400 miles northwest of Leticia. A road from Miraflores to Leticia on the Amazon River could give Colombia another trade outlet to the Atlantic Ocean, open up vast areas of potentially mineral-rich jungle, and help include the Indians of Colombia in that neighboring country's economy.

Since the Peruvian Highway Department did a survey of the remaining 100-mile stretch of the road several years ago, Escalante complained the government had done "nothing" to get under construction the final link of the potentially rich trade route.

"Our government just doesn't have the money," he lamented.

Located in the jungle northeast of Lima, Pucallpa is a sort of "capital" for much of this country's huge indigenous population which lives in the jungle in the eastern part of this nation. Many other million Indians

scrape an existence off the land in the Andes Mountains areas.

Three times as large as California, Peru's population breakdown is: 46 per cent Indians; 11 per cent white and 43 per cent mestizo (a mixture of both).

For the most part, the people of Spanish descent living in Peru have deliberately and ruthlessly squeezed the Indians out of the Peruvian economy except as sellers of beads, rugs, spears, jewelry and other such items. By excluding them from the Peruvian economy, the Spanish-Peruvians have essentially economically controlled the Indians. They have simply been left out of a sizable piece of the economic action of the country.

Although former President Belaunde put up a magnificently equipped jungle hospital here in this river city with dust filled streets, many of the Indians who go there are turned away for one predominant reason: they are Indians. As many as possible are treated at the Albert Schweitzer Amazon Hospital. It is a small privately run hospital located about 6 miles from here near the Summer Institute of Linguistics regional headquarters at Yarinacocha. The Summer Institute of Linguistics has done much to bring the Indians at least a little closer to the mainstream of the economy by teaching them to read and write in incredibly remote areas of the jungle. Although the Spanish population in Peru boasts of what most specialists consider to be the greatest archaeological ruins in South America (the stone city of Machu Pucchu 70 miles from Cusco), these same Spanish-speaking Peruvians have always rated themselves better than the Indian.

THIS WEEK'S HORROR STORY: NORTHERN PACIFIC WOULD KILL NORTH COAST LIMITED

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the August 8, edition of the Seattle Argus, contains an interesting story by Mel Voorhees quoting Louis Menk, president of Northern Pacific Railway as saying he would welcome the death of their fine train, the North Coast Limited.

This is distressing, Mr. Speaker, but it is indicative of the attitude of the railroads toward passenger trains they say are losing money; in the case of the North Coast Limited, it is \$3 million annually.

However, I hope the Interstate Commerce Commission will find that this train is necessary in the public interest to be maintained. Meanwhile, I will support legislation that would permit the payment to the railroads of the amount above their operating expenses that is considered to be a loss so these passenger trains can be saved.

But, there is an obligation on the part of the railroads too, for they must remember that their endowment in public lands and profits from the public domain, oil and timber, and other resources as a land grant have been more than profitable for many years.

Passenger trains are not to just be discarded as a thing of the past. They are necessary in the transportation of people and becoming increasingly so in today's world of hurry up and wait airports.

For the information of my colleagues,

I include the Argus story at this point in the RECORD:

THIS WEEK'S HORROR STORY: NORTHERN PACIFIC WOULD KILL NORTH COAST LIMITED

(By Melvin B. Voorhees)

One might have expected such a statement from the president of the Airlines' Association, but coming from Louis Menk it was shocking—and, to some of us, a virtual obscenity.

Menk said he would welcome death for the North Coast Limited.

Menk is not head of a bus line or even of the competitive Great Northern or Union Pacific. He is president of the Northern Pacific which, for about 80 years, has operated the illustrious North Coast Limited with pride and profit.

Menk said at Missoula the other day that he'd like to junk the famous old train because it is losing \$3 million a year—according to his bookkeeping, of course.

It's like Frederick & Nelson boarding up display windows because they don't directly make money.

There was a time when a railway president was a regional demi-god. With good reason, his service area hung on his wisdom, hearkened to his advice and forecasts.

That was when rail bosses were rail operators. Now is the day of the comparatively timid attorney or accountant in the drivers' seats. They measure by the buck.

This writer is ignorant of Menk's background. But when he derided the North Coast Limited, he sounded like the authentic voice of the counting-house, not the roundhouse.

The North Coast Limited remains one of the world's dozen finest trains. It was a leader during all the past years when there were hundreds of fine passenger trains, most now faded into hazy history.

It is unseemly for the N.P. to seek the North Coast's demise, and such loss to travelers, in light of the railway's unmatched endowment in public lands and its profits from the public domain (oil). Northern Pacific should be required to fulfill its long-ago eagerly and profitably assumed compact with the public.

Mr. Menk ought to eat his shameful words in a North Coast Limited dining-car papered with thousands of N.P. deeds to millions of acres of public lands and parked among the railroad's Dakota derricks.

TAX REFORM PASSES THE HOUSE AT LAST—A BEGINNING HAS BEEN MADE

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, after years of frustration and weeks of intensive debate, the House of Representatives has approved a major series of tax reforms. My vote was cast in favor of this measure despite attachment of an unfair surcharge extension. I also disapprove of the fact that it is not adequate in depth of reform as it is in breadth. We have covered all the ground, but have not dug deeply enough into vested accumulated tax privilege. Still, every vested interest will lose a small portion of its privileges. Lower- and middle-income taxpayers will gain across the board.

A typical family of four with a \$7,500 income will gain an annual tax reduction of \$111 by 1972. As written by the House, the bill removes \$7 billion worth of special tax benefits, while giving \$9 billion

worth of benefits, largely in the form of lower tax rates. Who gains and loses then, specifically?

All taxpayers will basically gain from lower rates. Extra benefits will be available for low-income taxpayers, single people, widows, and people on straight salary now paying more than 50 percent in taxes.

Those who will be hit include stock market speculators, wealthy persons now paying no taxes, foundations, oil companies, bond-floating municipalities, and real estate speculators.

For nearly all taxpayers, reduction in rates will mean tax savings of 5 percent, half of it in 1971 and the rest in 1972. Lower income people would benefit far more. Those under \$3,000 would save 66 percent. Those from \$3,000 to \$5,000 31 percent. Some at the top would save too.

Widows, widowers, and single persons over 35 would get half the income benefits now available to married people who now file joint returns. A person whose spouse dies would continue to receive full income-splitting benefits as long as there are dependent children.

A raise in the standard deduction from 10 to 15 percent—up to \$2,000—would mean a tax break for 34 million taxpayers. People who rent, and have no major interest deductions, would benefit. Eleven million taxpayers would be able to come out ahead by taking the standard deduction instead of itemizing, which would mean they could use the simplified tax form. Those who would be hit hardest are upper-income people who escape much taxation by investing in tax-free municipal bonds or taking fast writeoffs on real estate. The House bill says everyone will have to pay taxes on at least half their income. Million-dollar incomes with no taxes will be a thing of the past.

Stock investors who play the market for short-term gains will be hurt. A stock will have to be held for a year instead of 6 months before profit can be treated as capital gains. Only 50 percent of losses can be deducted. Foundations would have to pay 7.5-percent tax on investment income that is now tax free. This is what corporations pay on received dividend income. Foundations would have less money to dispense.

Extra-fast writeoffs on new buildings would be limited to housing. Construction of new office buildings would be less attractive from a tax viewpoint. Some real estate money would move into remodeling of old residential buildings as well as into new homes and apartments. Corporations would no longer be able to avoid tax by setting up a number of related corporations to secure a \$25,000 exemption for each division. Corporate mergers would be less attractive because some tax advantages—interest deductions for debt—would be removed.

Banks lose tax advantage coming from special reserves for bad debt losses and capital gains treatment on bonds held in their business. The oil industry is at last slated to lose some tax privileges. The House-approved bill reduces the outrageous 27½-percent depletion allowance to 20 percent, eliminating the foreign depletion allowance entirely. This is not enough, but it is a start.

It is my fervent hope that next time around we shall be able to cut much deeper into such privileges. Broad popular support from many of my constituents was of inestimable help.

BEFORE WE START TO MARS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is justly proud of the Apollo 11 astronauts and the extraordinary teamwork and effort of so many who made possible the first walk on the moon.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to determine policies for future space exploration and the appropriation of public moneys for the space program. It is our duty to consider internationalizing space exploration and to set priorities between the ills at home and further conquests in space.

On Friday, August 8, 1969, the lead editorial in the Washington Post provided a thoughtful analysis of the object of space exploration. It reminds us that the pursuit of scientific knowledge and not simply perfecting the technology of space travel is the object of the program.

I include it in the RECORD at this point for the consideration of my colleagues:

BEFORE WE START TO MARS

It is quite understandable that NASA Administrator Paine and Associate Administrator Mueller should propose an expanded manned space program designed to send men to Mars perhaps as early as 1981. Flushed with the success of Apollo 11, the advocates of manned flight are eager to latch onto a new goal and the money needed to reach it. It may be that they have judged the mood of the country accurately and that a Mars landing will become the focus of future space activities. But before they or the President make a final judgment, some other considerations ought to be weighed.

The news from Houston, still exciting in some respects, has taken a disturbing turn in others. There seems to be a notion in Houston that the highest priority in the space program should be assigned projects designed to perfect the technology of space travel. The resignations of Dr. Wilmot Hess as director of science at the Manned Space Center and of the scientist-astronaut F. Curtis Michel, coupled with the low priority given research scientists who wanted to talk to the two men who walked on the moon, demonstrate the results of such thinking. The challenge of the space program for the group in Houston which has had the dominant voice in planning the Apollo missions has been simply to put men into space. So far the pursuit of basic scientific knowledge, which is the fundamental justification for the program, has been a handmaiden (often an unwanted one) on space flights.

Against this background, Dr. Hess was brought into NASA a few years ago in an effort to improve the quality of the basic research done on Apollo flights. His successes have been small but important for they seemed to pave the way for other scientists—those more interested in the knowledge that lunar and planetary exploration can bring than in the techniques of getting there—to take a larger hand in the future Apollo plans. His departure is likely to reverberate through the scientific community as a sign that the goal of Apollo is simply to repeat the tremendous feat of July 20-21 and improve on the techniques of space flight in-

stead of setting the mission of each flight primarily to maximize the yield of basic scientific data.

The manned space program cannot be allowed to take such a course either in future Apollo flights or in the grandiose plans for a trip to Mars. If the landing of Apollo 11 is to be any more than a stunt, albeit the grandest stunt in history, it must be the beginning of a careful and systematic basic research program aimed at unlocking the secrets of the universe. It makes only a little sense to go back to the moon again and again simply to improve our method of getting there and of getting to Mars; it makes a great deal of sense to go back in order to learn all we can about the moon's origin and composition. It makes little sense to send only test pilots while bypassing the trained scientists among the corps of astronauts, although it is undoubtedly wise to use only test pilots until landing techniques are improved.

There was a certain logic in playing down the purely scientific aspects of the Apollo program in the past since the effort was to land men on the moon before the Russians did. But that day is past. The scientists of space, as contrasted with its engineers and technicians, have been forced into the back seat of the manned space program. It is time now to make them the navigators. The choice of missions—for future flights to the moon and for future operations that will lead some day to a trip to Mars and eventually other planets—should be largely in their hands. They, far better than the men who created the hardware and the knowledge necessary to make space travel possible, know the areas most appropriate for exploration in terms of gaining knowledge.

It is possible that the great sense of exhilaration that Apollo 11 provided can be sustained most easily by embarking at once on an all-out effort to reach Mars. But the costs of the space program (and Messrs. Paine and Mueller are now talking about \$6 billion a year) can be rationalized only in terms of basic research. Before either NASA or the administration commits itself to long-range plans for man in space, it ought to be sure that the program it suggests is based on doing it right, not merely on doing it first. It is knowledge we seek, not spectacles, and the task of gaining knowledge often is tedious. Our ability to move through the universe may grow more rapidly than our ability to absorb the information that awaits us there. In such a situation, the pace of the space program must be geared to our capacity for absorption, not our capacity for travel.

INHUMAN TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from a distinguished gentleman and leading citizen of Santa Fe, N. Mex., expressing his concern, his alarm, and his disgust over the deplorable inhuman treatment being given some of our men being held captive by the North Vietnamese. I, along with a great many others, share his feelings as so forthrightly described in his letter, as follows:

SANTE FE, N. MEX.

HON. ED FOREMAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Having such a widespread interest in all areas and problems effecting the state of New Mexico, I think you would want

to assist in a cause which Santa Fe County wholly supports and one which I feel we as concerned citizens are obligated to support in Washington since it involves men who are patriotic soldiers.

It has come to my attention during the past year that the North Vietnamese are holding some 1300 Americans, 300 and some captives and the others known only as missing-in-action. These men are undergoing stresses which should not by all humanitarian standards be tolerated by the United States and by peoples of the world. Evidence in support of this statement was very apparent on national television recently when the three pilots were released by North Vietnam: one with a dangling and useless arm, one too ill to even face the cameras and all three seemingly on the verge of malnutrition. I for one feel this is a deplorable state of affairs when we cannot obtain better treatment for these prisoners, allow them to write to their families and make the enemy abide by the rules as outlined in the Geneva Convention.

I would like to request that you bring this before the House of Representatives in an open appeal to all nations of the world, the United Nations, Red Cross contacts in other countries, in an effort to bring the plight of these prisoners to the judgment of the world community with the request that we begin primarily by asking for the release of all sick and wounded prisoners.

Lt. Colonel James Lindberg Hughes of Santa Fe has been a prisoner for two years and three months when his F-105 was shot down over Hanoi; a young Navy Lieutenant, Everett Alvarez, was shot down and captured over five years ago. Can you imagine the effect of being placed in a solitary cell with no contact with the outside world—the effect on the minds of educated, active, dedicated men.

Mrs. James Lindberg Hughes has been a long time resident of Santa Fe County and it was through her that the city of Santa Fe and as a matter of fact, the State of New Mexico became aware of the sad situation involving these prisoners.

I would be very proud to have our state representation in Washington expound on this subject at an early—and every—opportunity in an effort to help these men and solve the prisoner dilemma.

Most gratefully,

VICTOR M. MARTINEZ.

STATEMENT ABOUT PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW DOMESTIC POLICY PROPOSALS—A NEW REALISM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President has referred to a concept which he calls the New Federalism. I would like to add that he has also brought about a "new realism" to the complex and important field of welfare.

This new realism is implicit in every part of the President's proposals. For the first time in our Nation's history, a President has addressed himself to the problems of welfare and the problems of urban living in their entirety, boldly striking out on new paths, paths which take us away from the confused and confusing tangle of outmoded welfare programs that have burdened as much as they have helped the poor.

The poor people of America do not need fantasy; they need realistic aid so that they can begin to share the Amer-

ican dream. The President's policy recognizes this.

Hitherto, in many cases, the hand that had reached out to help the poor to rise only helped to keep them down through bureaucratic misunderstanding of the essential problem of the poor.

The essential problem of the poor is not lack of money; it is lack of opportunity. The President has in effect said to the poor: "Let us work together. Let the Federal Government not only help you to keep alive but also help you to find employment opportunities that make life worth living." I applaud this new realism, and I know that it will meet with the approval of the American people.

EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, delivered an outstanding address at a rehabilitation workshop dinner for business and industrial leaders in Aiken, S.C., located in my congressional district.

Following Mr. Russell's visit, an excellent editorial appeared in the Augusta Herald which I call to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

HAROLD RUSSELL POINTS THE WAY

When Harold Russell visited Aiken County recently in behalf of the National Employment of the Handicapped movement, no man could have come on the mission with better credentials or with fuller understanding.

More than 20 years ago, Russell suffered the loss of both hands in a training mishap while in the service of his country. The blow might have felled a lesser man, but not Russell. It has been said of him that "God took his hands, then performed a miracle" that guided him "to point in many directions." In the two decades since his own rehabilitation, Harold Russell has steadily pointed the way for this nation's handicapped.

As chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, this warm, magnetic, inspiring, altogether very human personality made his South Carolina visit on invitation from the Aiken Rehabilitation Workshop's board of directors and staff. While being feted by handicap victims, business and industrial leaders and local and state officials, Russell had an opportunity to appraise the Workshop's progress over the three years of its existence. It has been substantial, alike in its physical expansion, its increase in work contracts and its records which boast more than 100 clients now gainfully employed at full time vocations.

All of this has been made possible in large part by Aiken's cooperative efforts through volunteer citizens and business and industrial leaders working together.

But much of this kind of local level success can also be credited to the inspiring example set by just such men as Harold Russell who, though cruelly handicapped, never let go of the idea that there still existed for him a useful place in the world, in a community made up of people who care, and that with determination and self-preparation, he and others like him could be no different from others.

The degree of effectiveness to which Mr. Russell has carried this inspiration into many communities across the length and breadth of the country was attested once again on his Aiken trip, where the general response seemed to be one of genuine thankfulness that providence has given the handicapped a champion like Harold Russell.

Combined with community cooperation such as has been shown in Aiken, and the determination of the afflicted to help themselves, this inspiring leadership continues to prove every day that no man, however great his handicap, need ever surrender himself to the hopelessness of the physical reject.

EFFORT TO ELIMINATE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to alleviate one of the most urgent, the most potentially dangerous problems facing our society today: the pollution of our air and water. No national asset could be more important to us than our air and our water, the very substances of life; and yet, almost every American daily sees his air defiled by more and more exhaust fumes and industrial waste, and his waters becoming increasingly filthy until many of our rivers are little more than open sewers. Everyone is aware of the problem—how could you not be—and almost everyone expresses concern, but clearly not enough is being done.

My legislation proposes to attack the issue head on, with no hedging, by establishing a Federal Pollution Control Commission, with extremely broad powers, with the responsibility to formulate national standards for air and water quality, and then to enforce them rigorously. I should say here that I have not chosen to propound this course without much careful thought. I believe in letting the States, the municipalities, the counties, do everything that they can, but the more one considers this problem of pollution, the more clearly apparent are two facts. Local and State governments, try as they have, are not in all too many cases coping with the problems. If ever there were two interstate media—two elements that cross State boundaries and are of concern to everyone in the Nation—those are air and water. I think this is one area where the Federal Government has the right to act and I think we shall be remiss in our responsibilities if we do not. My proposal would allow States and local governments to establish and enforce standards higher than the Federal minimums.

The Federal Pollution Control Commission would bring together under one roof and under a single and unified directorship, the several Federal agencies that are now attempting to deal with the problems. The commission would continue all the good works that these agencies have begun, but it would have substantially greater enforcement authorities. Standards are of no value unless enforced, and research and knowledge are of little use unless implemented. I would suggest that the authorities pro-

vided to the current pollution agencies are far too cumbersome, and leave far too many loopholes. I would ask my colleagues: When was the last time you remember anyone being fined or brought to court for polluting the air or discharging waste into the water?

I fully realize that my proposal is a rather abrupt departure from the current directions we have taken to deal with pollution, but I believe that we can no longer content ourselves with half measures in this area. In some places in the United States time has run out already, in others it grows short. I urge my colleagues to give this proposal the most careful deliberation.

EDUCATING FOR 21ST CENTURY MANPOWER NEEDS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the impact of our rapidly changing times being felt more keenly than in our schools. America's educational system at all levels is now faced with the need to make a number of wholly different types of changes at the same time. One of the educators who has demonstrated that he has the perspective to contemplate what these changes should be and what they may mean is Dr. Howard Matthews, Director of the Division of Manpower Development and Training in Health, Education, and Welfare. In Outlook, published by the New York State Department of Social Services, Dr. Matthews has written an article entitled "Tomorrow Is Now." Because this article successfully pinpoints a number of directions in which it is now necessary for us to move, I would like to introduce it at this point into the RECORD:

TOMORROW IS NOW—IN EDUCATING FOR 21ST CENTURY MANPOWER NEEDS

(By Howard A. Matthews)

The people who are in school now will be the backbone of industrial and technological society when the year 2000 dawns. Will they be prepared for the radically different world of the 21st century? Not unless educators raise their sights. The bulk of the training being given in our schools is geared to yesterday and not to tomorrow.

So little is known today about people's future needs that educators face extremely vexing problems in designing an educational system to serve these needs.

Often, too, the real issues in education are hopelessly entangled with questions of status: vocational schools seeking academic recognition or some comparable insignia of respectability, teachers of standard academic subjects fighting for preeminence, some advocates of an educable elite resenting the infringement of mass education, those committed to the research ideal opposing expenditure of time on other disciplines and all types of institutions competing for students and for popular support.

General education, when viewed functionally, is not the opposite of vocational education. The two are complementary. Often they are alike in kind, differing only in purpose.

Education functions vocationally when its purpose is the cultivation of skill in the actual performance of a previously determined

task. Argument to the effect that general and vocational offerings must be totally different and separately administered will delay the development of the 21st century education needed now for adjustment in a rapidly changing economy. Conflict between the two functions is joined when concern for the one leads teachers and students to forget the importance of the other.

Today, the terms "education" and "manpower" are virtually synonymous. When they are not, they should be. Two assumptions must pervade all manpower policy. First, within every job (from the research physicist to the custodian) skills are changing, and there will be increasingly less emphasis on years of experience and more emphasis on education. Second, a radically increasing number of jobs puts a premium on general intellectual alertness, on ability to read well and compute accurately, analyze and solve problems, and work cooperatively with others. These are educational needs of people and of society, not of schools, universities, and institutions. These are our manpower needs. Education should be concerned with more than just what people do in the teaching-learning transaction.

What really should concern us, then, is education as a whole, recognizing that it has several functions and purposes. Education, like electricity, is easier to define in terms of its effects while in motion than in terms of its actual composition.

The educational needs of society can be met only through the development of more and better education at all levels from the nursery to the university. Several specific suggestions come to mind:

ADJUST TO THE TIMES

(1) In order to play something more than a passive role in social change, all schools at all grade levels need to be able to respond quickly and effectively to sudden technological changes. They must provide educational experiences which will assist people in making short and long term adjustment to changing social and economic conditions.

Unfortunately, there have been instances in a few cities where the sudden termination of jobs caused the unemployment of hundreds of adults almost overnight and where the local school boards refused to provide the necessary retraining—apparently because the money was to come from Federal sources. More often, of course, the reverse has been true. Cooperation between levels of government is generally acceptable today.

Some prime examples are found in the skill centers which have recently been developed in several key metropolitan areas under the Manpower Development and Training Program. In these, the local director works with all levels of government, but also seeks out the advice and support of the local power structure outside the formal halls of officialdom.

(2) More active and comprehensive educational planning by school officials in all types of school administrative units and by the leadership of the community must be nurtured. Some school board members and school administrators are making forces for change, such as automation, positive influences. To do so, they continually seek the advice of business, labor, universities, agriculture, and other interested groups. They are designing responsive educational systems that will provide programs suited to the emerging needs of the community. However, one of the most justified criticisms of public schools at all levels is still that they fail to anticipate change and take deliberate steps to prepare for it.

AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL

(3) Evaluation is just as much a part of planning a new course or program as is the housing of it. Programs must be redirected whenever evaluation suggests such a change. Many teachers, particularly those at the post-high school level, simply do not know

to what extent they are effective. Tests of their own making, reflecting not what the student knows but what the teacher thinks is important, prevent careful analysis.

Schools are not the only training agencies in society. Labor unions and industry which are involved in apprentice programs and on-the-job training should, like the schools, be asking themselves questions: Is it possible, for instance, to accelerate some of these programs and do, say, in three years what we are now convinced takes five?

(4) Education must be available to people throughout their lives or fails to meet the needs of today as well as tomorrow. Ability to manage change—whether keeping up with developments in professions or retooling for new jobs—requires education to be available when needed. Access to education governs the pace at which new knowledge is absorbed, adjustments are made to new technologies, and solutions are reached to related social, political, and economic problems.

The lifelong learning process goes on not only in the classroom, the extension course, and the lecture series, but through individual reading, television, instruction on the assembly line, and even at the coffee break.

A well-balanced system of continuing public education must provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunity for persons with varying educational attainments in all areas of the state. The high school drop out should be able to find a program which encourages reentry to school, and the Ph.D. an opportunity to probe more deeply into a special field or to broaden his general background. Such possibilities require an open-ended system with students free to enter, to leave when other experiences seem more fruitful, then to reenter.

MAKING TOMORROW NOW

With the intent to make tomorrow now, programs must be designed without regard for the conventional administrative (but not educational) conveniences of quarters, semesters, six-week or nine-week terms, Carnegie units, and quarter-hour and semester-hour formulas. Flexible programs can be developed so the student may leave to take a job at any time or stay for advanced school work without regard for the school calendar or the college catalog. Such a system can become a reality only through the coordinated efforts of public schools, community colleges, vocational schools, universities, and employers.

The educational process, beginning at the most basic levels, must impress upon the individual his responsibility for continuing self-education and self-renewal to achieve a meaningful adaptation to his changing environment.

(5) There is a special need for broader and deeper opportunities for those adults whose basic education is deficient. About 30 million members of the present labor force lack high school diplomas. Some eight million have not completed the eighth grade. One-sixth of American youth cannot qualify for military service because they are unable to pass a seventh grade equivalency test. Yet opportunities for adult basic education are few, and knowledge of how to overcome the problems of teaching adults is meager.

(6) Retraining programs need to be expanded rapidly so that a significant percentage of the local labor force is retrained annually. The training provided thus far by the Manpower Development and Training Act has demonstrated that a significant capacity for training and retraining exists outside the public school framework. It has also uprooted some entrenched ideas about how long it takes for the American worker to develop the skills necessary for an entry-level job, for entering apprenticeship or on-the-job training.

There is increasing evidence that one of the most effective ways to retrain people—whether displaced as a result of automation

or unemployed because of social and economic disadvantages—is through cooperative education programs. In such "person-centered programs," the school develops instruction best suited to the classroom and helps a potential employer develop specific work skills at the job site. The total training responsibility, however, rests with the school.

In summary, it has been far too common in our tradition of mass free education to blame failure on the shortcomings of the student and to neglect innovative techniques which could meet the student's needs. Reducing economic barriers helps those who can respond to well-established techniques of formal education. But it does little for those, either in or out of school, who cannot make effective use of established training patterns. The task must focus, then, on adjusting the system to meet the needs of people who cannot be reached through existing educational methods.

OVERTURN OLD METHODS

Considerable experimentation and research in the application of computer technologies to educational problems is under way. Much of what is being done bears on compensatory education techniques for disadvantaged people in the labor force and on the development of a system of continuous, lifelong education. Applying new techniques to systems of education is difficult because it requires overturning antiquated methods.

Through newer techniques, a wider variety of individual learning patterns can be recognized and accommodated. The new technologies can also relieve teachers of administrative chores so they can spend more time helping individual students.

In short, more educational programs of high quality must be made available. But the word "quality" should not be confused with sophistication of course content. "High quality programs" are those with adequate resources, well-trained teachers, suitable buildings, and appropriate curricula and educational methods. These are possible only through partnerships between agencies of the federal, state, and local governments, private employers and trade associations, labor unions, and the rest of the community.

The beneficiary of this careful planning and cooperation is the student in the first instance. In the long run, society as a whole can be expected to benefit.

INDEPENDENCE DAY SPEECH FOR CONGO-BRAZZAVILLE: AUGUST 15, 1969

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, independence has been a guidepost for the Congo-Brazzaville since its political independence nearly a decade ago. Since its independence from France, the Congolese Government has been keenly bent on pragmatic, adaptive approaches to its international relations in trade and in politics. One of its earliest governments, for example, under the Abbe Fulbert Youlou chose to maintain close links with France and to pursue pro-Western policies defiant of its less enthusiastic neighbors. Congo-Brazzaville also supported Mr. Tshombe's bid for Katanga secession from neighboring Congo-Leopoldville.

President M. Alphonse Massamba-Débat followed an even more independent course in foreign affairs than his pred-

ecessor. He permitted the left-wing opposition to the Congo-Leopoldville Government to operate from Brazzaville, and concluded aid agreements with both the Peoples' Republic of China and the United States of America.

The Congo's economic relations have also been highly colored by independent activity—as much a function of necessity as of conviction. The Congo's natural resources are small, and its known mineral deposits are not considered commercial. Thus the government is thrown back upon its own independent initiative to develop close trade and economic ties with a diversity of nations. Her trade lines include the countries of Equatorial Africa; the European Economic Community, of which she is an associate member; as well as with countries of Eastern Europe.

These pragmatic and independent policies have brought success and prosperity to the 760,000 inhabitants of Congo-Brazzaville. Allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate them on their independence—in its many senses—and to wish them success among the African family of nations.

RURAL MIGRATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, enclosed is an article on a matter of national importance affecting both rural and urban America:

RURAL MIGRATION

That old problem of "keepin' 'em down on the farm" is fading away. There just aren't many people left to migrate to the cities.

Says Calvin L. Beale, the Department of Agriculture's chief population specialist, "We try not to mislead people into thinking that you can solve the problem of the cities by stopping rural migration. It is too late, by about 20 years."

One of the major arguments used by the farm bloc in justifying to city congressmen the huge agricultural subsidies is that they keep some poor farmers from heading to town to see if they can better their lot.

CITY UNREST ROSE

In the past, many of those leaving the farm ended up in the slums.

America's Negro population, for instance, was once primarily rural. Now about 1 million are living on farms. That's approximately 5 percent of the total of more than 22 million blacks.

This huge shift in population was accompanied by growth in unrest in the cities. It eventually roused the interest of politicians, sociologists, and others. Curiously, the number of requests for demographic information on this topic rose 250 percent between 1964 and '68, reports Mr. Beale, a man skilled in the use of a calculating machine. Other population queries rose only 12 percent.

However, the number of migrants had well passed its peak.

During the 1950-60 decade, a net annual average of 1 million persons left farms or ceased farming operations on their land. For the period 1960-68, the comparable figure has been 750,000.

Mr. Beale guesses that about 500,000 farm

people are dropping farming this year, most going to the cities and towns.

Of course, half a million is a sizable number. But not all of these end up in city slums by any means.

Comments Mr. Beale: "The main problem of the cities is coping with the natural population increases there—the excess of births over deaths."

He adds: "Most of the population effects of the technological changes in agriculture have already taken place."

ABOUT 10.5 MILLION LEFT

There are at present about 10.5 million residents on the nation's nearly 3 million farms.

The farm population is still declining rapidly through outmigration and reclassification—about 6 percent a year. However, 6 percent of 10 million is a lot less than 6 percent of the 30.5 million who lived on farms in 1940.

Farm people make up no more than 20 percent of the total rural population today. Thus, from the city standpoint, it is more important to look at migration trends for the rural population as a whole. And here, too, the picture is happier than a few years back.

The rural population has been more greatly affected by trends of employment in the off-farm phases of agriculture (such as farm supply, farm services, transporting and processing of food products), mining, lumbering, rurally located manufacturing industries, employment in urban centers within commuting distance of rural people, defense spending, and development of rural recreation and retirement areas.

In the 1950's the rural counties grew by 3.3 million people, even though they lost some 4.6 million migrants. From 1960 to '66, they gained a net of 2.8 million population, while their outmigration was reduced to about 550,000. That is only a fifth of the annual average outmigration of the 1950's.

In other words, both birthrates and migration have dropped.

Probably the most dramatic change in population trend has come in the South Central states—Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama. These states embrace the Appalachian heartland, Mississippi Delta, and the black-belt areas. They exported a net of 1.5 million migrants from their rural areas in the 1950's. But from 1960 to '66, only 164,000 left.

ALTERNATIVE JOBS APPEAR

The area that did least well since 1960 in retaining population in rural areas is the western North Central states—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas. They lost 300,000 people to other parts of the country in the 1960-66 period. Again, though, that's less than the outflow in the 1950's.

Contrary to the impression of many, rural and semirural counties in the United States have grown faster economically than metropolitan ones during the 1960's.

This has some importance to farm policy. It means farmers have a somewhat greater opportunity to get work elsewhere.

From 1962 to 1967, about half the nation's 2,000 rural counties added at least enough private nonfarm jobs covered by social security to offset losses of farm jobs. However, the situation varies greatly from one region to another.

Mr. Beale notes that these regional differences point to the need for special regional adaptations of public and private programs to deal with rural and farm problems.

For instance, nonfarm job opportunities for residents of rural and semirural counties have been relatively plentiful in the industrial North and in the industrializing upper South. On the West Coast, agriculture itself is growing rapidly.

About half the north-central counties reported moderate to major gain in nonfarm jobs.

AGE LEVELS RISING

But in much of the rest of the country, nonfarm job opportunities were growing more slowly; people are departing. These areas extend from the central Appalachian counties westward through the Ozarks. They include large portions of the plains and mountain states, part of the lower South, and the region west of the Great Lakes.

Another demographic factor affecting the farm problem is the growing age of farmers on the average, particularly of smaller-scale farmers.

The average age of all farmers was 51.3 years in 1964, up from 49.6 in 1954. Mr. Beale expects the 1970 census to show another increase in the average age of farmers.

In 1964, 41 percent of the farmers who sold between \$2,500 and \$10,000 in farm products were 55 or over. This size farm does not provide a good living for most farmers in this category.

Only 24 percent of farmers selling \$20,000 or more of produce were 55 or over.

MEASURE OF SELF-CORRECTION

These figures indicate that retirement has tended and will tend to remove many surplus farmers from the land. They also show that younger men generally do not enter farming unless they can do so on a large enough scale to obtain a reasonable standard of living.

Thus, to a limited extent, the farm problem is self correcting.

One other population trend that concerns farm policy is the change in small towns. Many congressmen suspect that land-retirement programs would hurt these small towns.

Mr. Beale says overly pessimistic views of population trends in small towns are common.

In fact, more than three-quarters of all nonmetropolitan urban towns of between 2,500 and 25,000 population increased in population between the past two censuses. Their overall growth was 21 percent. That exceeds the growth rate of the U.S. as a whole.

Those towns of 2,500 to 5,000 population grew by 18 percent, equal to the national growth rate.

TOWNS OF 500 SHRINK

It is only those places of less than 500 population where population loss was more common than population gain. Some 57.5 percent of them declined in population. But the gainers more than made up for the losers, with a small aggregate growth of 3 percent for the class.

Mr. Beale admits these tiny towns may have had more serious business problems than mere population losses, as some gas stations, local retail stores, and farm-implement dealers closed up shop to concentrate on their more active locations. Also, some regions declined more than others, such as in the Midwest.

Despite the decline in the number of farmers there as still too many to match the demand for farm products.

Says Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin: "I know that when I leave this office, be it four or eight years from now, we are still going to have excess farm capacity."

"But I think everyone should be glad they are living in a country where the problem is surpluses and not shortages."

Urban congressmen undoubtedly agree. But they are not grateful for having to pay large subsidies to agriculture. It seems likely that Mr. Hardin will see substantial farm-policy reforms in his term of office even if it is only four years.

VIETNAM PEACE AND THE BUDGET

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum, Ph. D.—an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and former professor of economics at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., has written a most interesting article for the magazine *Nation's Business*.

In his article, Dr. Weidenbaum discusses the potential effect of peace in Vietnam on this country's budget. I know the Assistant Secretary and serve on the Committee on Armed Services. We must not engage in a postwar debacle as we did in the post-World War II era; at least until our arsenals are restored and our deterrent ability is preserved. His analysis is most provocative and enlightening.

VIETNAM PEACE AND THE BUDGET

The Viet Nam war's demands for men, materials and other resources of the American economy resulted in much of the inflation that we have been experiencing; thus, peace should help to ease inflationary pressures.

However, inappropriate economic policy after Viet Nam could generate another round of inflation.

Many people hope the war's end will bring massive increases in federal civilian expenditures. It is easy enough to conjure up visions of so-called fiscal dividends and peace dividends totaling more than \$40 billion in the year after peace is achieved.

That \$40 billion of monetary "manna" appears to consist of two parts.

The first is about \$12 billion a year which the progressive income tax brings forth in the form of increases in federal revenues at current levels of income and economic activity.

The second consists of almost \$30 billion a year which the United States is spending to sustain the war.

In addition to making some allowance for built-in increases in such federal commitments as social security and veterans' pensions, I suggest we take a harder look at the federal budget, before we start spending those fiscal and peace dividends.

On the revenue side, the major item that warrants our attention is the temporary increase in income tax rates—the surcharge. It seems likely to me that all or most of the surcharge will be allowed to expire soon after the war's end.

The surcharge is raising over \$10 billion a year. In the year that it lapses, then, we lose an amount of revenue almost equal to the fiscal dividend.

That still leaves us the \$30 billion peace dividend that so many people anticipate will result when the military budget declines from the current \$80 billion height to the pre-Viet Nam \$50 billion annual level. However, if there is any prediction I can offer with considerable confidence, it is that the military budget will not decline to anything close to \$50 billion a year.

For one thing, we have had very substantial inflation during the past four years and, hence, large increases in prices of equipment that the military buys and in wages it pays.

Thus, just to devote the same amount of real resources to defense programs as prior to the war will require a substantially higher level of expenditures than in 1965, before the Viet Nam buildup. With the continuing high level of international tensions, it is hard to see how we would do any less than

maintain at least the 1965 level of military effort.

Moreover, many upward pressures on the non-Viet Nam part of the military budget already are visible. Considerable deferred maintenance and depleted inventory positions will need to be taken care of. Also, under legislation already passed by Congress, the pay of the armed forces and of the military establishment's many civilian employees is to rise by well over \$2 billion this year.

Of perhaps greater fiscal significance is the fact that several large weapon systems are in early stages of production and large expenditures are anticipated in the next year or so.

Thus, should peace in Viet Nam be achieved in the near future, I would estimate a peace dividend closer to \$10 billion than to the \$30 billion we hear so much about. In a sense, that would just about replace the fiscal dividend we would lose when the surcharge is lifted.

Hence, the immediate post-Viet Nam fiscal outlook is not one of great liberality. Rather, it is likely to involve many difficult choices among a large array of alternative claims on our federal revenues.

One striking indication of these potential demands on the public purse was contained in former President Johnson's "swan song" economic report, released in January.

There were items such as \$9.5 billion for more social security and income support, \$7 billion for further increases in federal education programs, \$5.5 billion for model cities and other urban development, almost \$3.8 billion for "kiddle-care" and other health activities, almost \$2 billion for more public jobs and \$1 billion for science and further space exploration.

Will it be worth the effort to balance the budget after peace is achieved? My vote is affirmative.

To the extent that it takes more purchasing power out of the economy in the form of taxes than it pumps in via expenditures, the federal government will be helping to reduce inflationary pressures. And the Federal Reserve system might ease its pressure on interest rates.

As an economist, I might find on occasion some justification for running a budget deficit during a period of recession. But that is hardly the situation we have been facing. The gross national product rose from \$790 billion in 1967 to \$861 billion in 1968. The GNP is expected to exceed \$920 billion this year.

The advent of peace in Viet Nam can lead to balanced federal budgets. Whether the federal government actually will achieve a budgetary surplus will depend on several key factors, such as the state of the national economy and the uncertain international situation.

However, the most important factor is likely to be the willingness of the American people and their elected representatives to make the difficult choices among the many pressures for government spending increases. A tough-minded sense of priorities and a careful weighing of benefits against costs will be needed.

DETENTION CAMP PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the recent convention of District Four of the B'nai B'rith Women held in Beverly Hills, Calif., this respected organization

of 12,000 members unanimously adopted a resolution supporting repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. I bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues to further illustrate the need to erase the anxiety among our citizens that exists because this law is in existence and could be enforced. This is just one example of the increasing demands to eliminate this threat to our basic rights as established by the Constitution. To this end the honorable gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) and I have introduced a bill to repeal the so-called Emergency Detention Act, title II of the Internal Security Act. I am pleased to be able to record that as of this date that 128 of my colleagues have joined in cosponsoring the Matsunaga-Holifield bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution adopted by District Four of the B'nai B'rith Women in the RECORD at this time:

DETENTION CAMP PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted this 2nd day of July, 1969.

Mrs. MORRIE LANE,

President.

MILDRED FAULKNER,

Executive Secretary.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.

TO SHARE AMERICA'S AFFLUENCE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times has presented an excellent editorial in support of President

Nixon's proposal to revamp our entire public aid program.

The President's proposal is particularly gratifying to the Chicago Sun Times because on several occasions this very distinguished newspaper had editorially urged changes similar to those incorporated in great measure in the President's proposal.

In a recent editorial, the Chicago Sun Times called for a family assistant program and national standards.

The Sun Times editorial follows:

TO SHARE AMERICA'S AFFLUENCE

President Nixon has proposed a giant leap forward in dealing with modern industrial society's great dilemma and moral obligation: the ending of poverty in the midst of 20th Century affluence.

Only America's affluence can make possible Mr. Nixon's proposals for far-reaching reforms in the nation's welfare system. What he proposes goes far beyond President Johnson's war on poverty; it is far more imaginative and pragmatic. No other nation, except New Zealand, has even considered the concept he proposes. The United States, traditionally about 50 years behind industrialized Europe in social legislation, now has an opportunity to lead the world in showing how to share the benefits of the capitalistic system with all citizens.

Mr. Nixon would put a floor under the incomes of all families. He would help the working poor wherever they may live who now are excluded by federal law from welfare benefits. This is the big breakthrough. The working poor comprise two thirds of the poor persons of this country. Two-thirds of the poor are white. Nearly half are 21 or younger.

The cost—\$4 billion a year at the start—is not high in comparison with the cost of the Vietnam war, which is about \$36 billion a year. Mr. Nixon expects funds for the new program to be available beginning next June when, presumably, American extrication from Vietnam will be well along.

Mr. Nixon's plan would make federal payments to low or no income families based on the size of the family and the amount of its earnings with built-in incentives to encourage members of the family to earn as much as possible; the government would provide job training and placement to help increase that earning power; day care centers for children would be provided to give mothers an opportunity to work.

This is not a flat guarantee of an above-poverty-level income regardless of need or ability or willingness to work. Nor is it like the family allowance plan, in effect in 62 counties, in which a specified amount is paid for each child rich and poor alike.

Mr. Nixon's plan is an answer to criticisms that have been piling up of the present welfare system.

The present system was created during the Great Depression of the 1930s; before that, help for the poor often was little more than a Christmas basket from the City Hall or private charities.

The present system represents a compromise between the Judeo-Christian belief that the poor deserve help and the Calvinist doctrine that the poor are a shiftless lot who have only themselves to blame for their troubles.

Out of this schizophrenic concept came the system which forbids help to families if there is an unemployed man in the house—a man presumably who can and should go to work. Twenty-seven states have this rule. This causes many fathers with low incomes to desert their families so they may qualify for aid. (Assistance will be provided in Illinois if the father agrees to accept necessary employment or appropriate training.)

As a consequence, some women with large families have received welfare payments that are as large or larger than the income of other families with working husbands. Resentment has grown among the working poor against the welfare recipients. And yet, both need help.

Resentment also has grown, justifiably or not, over the migration of families from the South to the North, where welfare payments are higher. Most families migrate for better working conditions and wages. An incentive to stay put would exist if the welfare floor was the same in Mississippi, now \$8.50 per person monthly, as in Illinois, now \$46.

Mr. Nixon would set a floor of \$1,600 a year in all states for a family of four. States could add to that amount; Illinois, for example, now has a base of \$1,932. The family could build on this foundation, earning outside income. After the first \$60 a month, the \$1,600 would be reduced by half the amount earned. If the family earned \$2,000 a year it would end up with \$2,660 federal minimum which presumably could be sweetened by the state. Differences would still exist between states but not as much.

Mr. Nixon's plan has been criticized because it will give more help, proportionately, to states like Mississippi that have not been as concerned about the problem as some other states, like New York and Illinois. This may be true, but the important matter at hand is to make a start.

The most important thing about Mr. Nixon's proposal, which we shall discuss in more detail later, is that it has brought into the national forum for debate a great change in public attitude toward poverty-amidst-affluence; the debate has opened in much shorter time than anyone could have expected when the basic ideas he has embraced began to be seriously discussed seven years ago.

Looking back to 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt began great innovations in the government's attitude toward social problems, few could ever imagine then that a Republican President would propose the changes now advanced by Mr. Nixon. But the nation has changed greatly since those years. If it can put a man on the moon, it should be able to give the least of its working citizens a better chance to share the general affluence.

HOW REAL IS OUR NATIONAL DEBT?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Lithopinlon, a graphic arts and public affairs journal of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, Mr. Robert Sherrill has raised an important issue in his article "How Real Is Our National Debt?"

He demonstrates that the assets of the Federal Government exceed the national debt by many times. In accord with good business practices, a debt of \$350 billion is small when compared with assets that total \$17 trillion.

More importantly, Mr. Sherrill demonstrates that the controversy generated over this relatively small national debt obscures the deplorable policy of the Federal Government in generously cutting up the national pie, saving the biggest pieces for the favored buyers. He points out that lumber and railroad companies were given huge supplies of resources by the Department of the Interior during

the period he refers to as "the great giveaway." He warns that the problem continues today:

The atmosphere is not quite so easygoing today, but neither is it of the strictest. Great portions of the federal lands are unsurveyed and are at the mercy of the exploiters. The bureaucrats who are paid to be guardians do not always seem sufficiently concerned with this. They sometimes seem more determined to keep the public in ignorance than to keep special interests at bay. What goes on these days is likely to be more subdued and sophisticated. The Great Giveaway has perhaps given way to the Great Slipaway. But by any name, federal generosity continues.

Exaggerated arguments over the national debt must not avert our attention from the mismanagement of the Nation's assets.

The article follows:

HOW REAL IS OUR NATIONAL DEBT?

(By Robert Sherrill)

(NOTE.—Robert G. Sherrill lives with his wife in a charming old Washington house a few blocks from the nation's Capitol. This is handy for his work, which consists of descending on surprised bureaucrats and coming up with harvests of facts. They then appear in *Lithopinion*, *Esquire*, *Harper's*, *The Nation* and *The New York Times Sunday Magazine*. Sherrill's recent book, "Gothic Politics in the Deep South," has reddened many cheeks below the Mason-Dixon line.)

There must be a reason for it, when the most capitalistic nation on earth—a nation dedicated to the principles of profit and business—violates the most basic rules of bookkeeping. Any business that kept its books as the federal government keeps its tally sheets would have to close its doors after the first day, for our federal budget tells only half the nation's financial transactions; it shows the debts, but it does not show the assets. Put simply, the problem is that the same item that a corporation would list as a capital investment is listed in our federal budget as an expense.

Out of this lopsided approach to federal expenditures has arisen the queer, pernicious myth that the government is suffocating in debts. Some of our most august politicians—men such as Senator John Williams—have built their careers around the perpetual warning that if the national debt is allowed to increase much more, the whole economic structure of the United States will likely come crashing down and with it the government itself. Some of our politicians—men such as Senator Strom Thurmond—even view the debt as a Communist trap.

So intimidated has Congress been made by these warnings that each year it approaches the construction of the budget in a ritual of fear, with endless wrangling over the relative risks of raising the "debt ceiling" another inch. Typical of the atmosphere in which Congress operates, the Democratic Study Group of the House of Representatives sent to its members early in March 1969, a "Special Alert" bulletin, urging them to be ready to fight for a piece of legislation that would raise the permanent debt ceiling to \$355 billion and the temporary ceiling to \$377 billion. The air crackled with adventure.

The implication of these debates is that the government is actually on the town, a beggar; that the American people have made a botch of their business. The psychological effects are bad, the budgeting effects are even worse. When requests are made for money to rebuild slums, or to support the food stamp program, or to set up anti-pollution machinery, fiscal conservatives point to "the national debt" and insist that the nation cannot afford such expenditures. Usually

their argument prevails, and progress is once again victimized by the debt myth.

Admittedly, if we use the term "debt" to indicate the money borrowed by the government from commercial banks, federal reserve banks, insurance companies, a variety of corporations and a clot of individuals through the sale of government securities, then there is in fact a paper debt. It is insignificant—a mere \$350,000,000,000—but it does exist.

On the other hand, if by "debt" we mean liabilities bigger than and overwhelming assets, then we are about as far from being in debt as any nation could possibly be.

Even by the most conservative estimates, federal assets as of now total \$400,000,000,000. If the government were really operated by the principles of private business which the politicians are constantly touting, the balance sheet would show that we are not in debt, but that we are in fact \$50 billion ahead of the game.

The \$400 billion estimate on the assets is made by the General Services Administration and by the House Committee on Government Operations. But the situation is actually much better, much sounder than even this figure indicates. For, among other defects, it does not include items that the government received at no cost. (For one homey example, the \$2 million Hope diamond is carried on the books at zero value because it was given to the government.) But even if \$400 billion were an accurate figure of our national assets it would not be bad, considering that the settlers of this country parlayed that amount from a cash outlay of only about \$85 million for land (the costliest items being the Louisiana Purchase for \$15 million, Florida for \$6.6 million, the Mexican cession, \$16 million, and Alaska for \$7.2 million).

The fact is, however, that the federal holdings—land, minerals, real estate, and luxuries—are almost immeasurably greater than the Budget Bureau's bookkeeping would indicate. They are so enormous that—as one eminent economist expressed it—we could pay off the national debt, turn the continent back to the Indians, and all depart for our favorite dream spots abroad with \$8,825 in the pocket of each of our 200,000,000 citizens.

WOULD YOU BELIEVE \$23 TRILLION?

The following evaluation of the government's worth is incomplete. It does not include, for instance, the value of our national parks to their estimated 800 million annual visitors, or the value of our fish and wildlife to the 14 million people who buy hunting licenses and the 20 million who buy fishing licenses. It does not include many of the priceless relics and art and personal effects that have been given to the government. Also, the values of many minerals are excluded. The following inventory is based on judgment of data supplied by Congressmen, officials of the Interior Department, the Bureau of Roads, officials of the oil, coal and natural gas industries, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Corps of Engineers, and the Navy's Bureau of Docks and Yards. The values are for replacement, not cost. They go like this:

760,000,000 acres of land.....	\$100,000,000,000
Buildings.....	120,000,000,000
Armaments.....	225,000,000,000
Space equipment.....	10,000,000,000
Oil.....	1,900,000,000,000
Natural gas.....	78,000,000,000
Coal.....	15,000,000,000,000
VA and FHA homes (defaulted).....	601,000,000
Highways.....	40,900,000,000
2 airports (Washington and Dulles).....	500,000,000
Locks, dams, levees, canals.....	45,000,000,000

Military bases, docks, shipyards, hospitals.....	120,000,000,000
Electric generating facilities.....	\$12,500,000,000

Total (we're in the trillions here) - 17,652,501,000,000

Federal officials have always put the public down in estimating the commonwealth's worth. The figures they use invariably reflect purchase and cost prices, which, of course, are often totally unrealistic as evaluations of contemporary values. Ironically, only the Defense Department—from whom one is not always accustomed to candor—states this accurately in its report: "The values reflected in the report for land and buildings and for long-life equipment, such as ships, represent acquisition cost. Acquisition costs of ships as well as land and buildings are often substantially below current replacement values."

SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION TIMES \$70

A great deal of the government's 760 million acres is arid and seemingly almost worthless, but appearances in this instance are deceiving indeed. For example, the flats around Salt Lake City appear to be as inhospitable and unprofitable a stretch of land as man is likely to cast his eyes upon. As a place for habitation this land does look worthless. But the State of Utah and the federal government are today litigating the ownership of it because of the mineral content; some officials of the Interior Department privately estimate that it is worth \$1,000 an acre, which would make it some of the most valuable wild real estate in the western states.

The bureaucratic estimators pretend that the public land is worth a little more than \$5 an acre; this is the figure they file with Congress. But a much more realistic estimate was given in *Lithopinion* by Mo Udall, Congressman from Arizona and brother of the past Secretary of the Interior; "The public land in the West [which is where most of the public land is] would be worth between \$50 and \$100 an acre." If the frozen tundra of Alaska is averaged out with the highly valuable timber and grazing lands of the more southern states, we can hit an average of \$70 an acre, which would give us a barely reasonable minimum value of \$51 billion on the land, rather than the present absurd figure of \$4.8 billion.

But even this new \$51 billion evaluation looks woefully short when we consider that for what they spend on one year's defense budget the Pentagon generals could, at that price, buy all the U.S. land there is. Too cheap. Double it again, and it will still be a conservative figure.

Evaluations placed on the federal buildings come closer to reality, but, in some instances, not much closer. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, places a book value of \$217 million on the U.S. Capitol, the new and the old Senate Office Buildings, the Cannon, Longworth, and Rayburn House Office Buildings, and the Senate Garage. Reputable architects (Stewart is not really an architect; he is an engineer) estimate it would cost at least that much to replace the Capitol alone, to say nothing of the other buildings, of which the Rayburn Office Building—said to be the only building in the world where 1,500 persons can go to the bathroom simultaneously—is the most costly by far, with a price tag of about \$130,000,000. It happens that on another occasion Stewart admitted that all of the legislative buildings but the Capitol would cost a quarter billion to replace—which by his figuring, would leave the Capitol worth nothing.

WHAT DOES A SHRINE COST?

The original Capitol cost only \$2,432,851, but that was in the days when real craftsmen could be hired for pennies: bricklayers

who worked on the original Capitol earned \$1.50 to \$1.75 a day, carpenters \$1 to \$1.50 a day, stonemasons \$1.25 to \$1.35 a day, straight laborers 75 cents a day. Merely to extend the central portion of the East front by 32 feet a few years ago cost \$24,000,000, or ten times the entire price of the original Capitol. If one were seriously to set about duplicating that structure down to the last detail, including such virtually irreplaceable decorations as the Brumidi murals, the price would be a bargain at a half billion dollars (which is, by the way, less than one-third the project costs of producing just one experimental model of the supersonic transport airliner.)

Admittedly, these gross errors of evaluation have to do with buildings which are more than buildings and are more accurately considered national shrines. For most of the federal buildings across the country the replacement problem would not be concerned with architectural art but merely with the natural rise in labor and materials. If we make a modest allowance of 100 percent increase in these costs since the "buildings, structures and facilities" (to use the bureaucratic catch-all) went up, a replacement price would be \$120 billion rather than the official price of \$60 billion.

For those who are inclined to defend the bureaucratic estimators and to argue that they could surely not have missed the true worth of the land by such a wide margin—an error of 80% is rather wide—there is the following evidence that such a blunder is within their capabilities:

The Capitol architect's budget for 1969 contains a \$1,250,000 item for buying a 95,000-square-foot chunk of land for constructing a Capitol police headquarters. This site is four long blocks from the Capitol. Obviously it is choice land, but it is far from being the choicest in the District of Columbia. Using his evaluation of this land as our average, we see that the true value of the federal portion of the District of Columbia is, in his eyes, \$556,280 an acre or \$6,720,000,000—which is *thirty-eight times* higher than the present official evaluation of the federal land in the District and is, in fact *one-third higher* than the present official evaluation placed on the entire federal land holdings in the District and in the 50 states combined.

WHAT WE GOT FOR THE MONEY

The nation's arsenal is difficult to put a price tag on because the generals and the admirals are so quick to call their weapons obsolete. But there are now in operation or available: 26 intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons, 41 Polaris submarines equipped with 656 missiles, 35,114 active aircraft (plus many that could be put into commission) and 960 commissioned ships (plus several thousand in mothballs), plus all sorts of tanks, trucks, shovels, rifles, sidearms, can openers, bombs, and that ruffian et cetera that always goes with military activities. To replace these, \$225 billion would be a bargain price.

In the last five years the government has put about \$30 billion into its space program for research and technology. The replaceable value of the usable hardware resulting from that effort (not to count the more ancient products) would come to at least \$10 billion.

Those who run the country, both industrially and politically, are well aware of the fact that the federal riches are vastly greater than those listed in the formal inventories issued by the GSA and the various Congressional committees. These inventories are undervalued and played down quite purposefully.

WHY THEY MAKE A POOR MOUTH

There are two main reasons for this. First of all, if the American taxpayer were straightforwardly told that his government is worth \$17.6 trillion, he might question the reason-

ableness of feeling forever depressed by a debt of \$350 billion. This would make it more difficult for economic conservatives to dictate management of the government. Secondly, if the public were told the true value of its lands and natural resources and other possessions, it might be more concerned with the protection and management of these things; and lobby-led looting would thereafter be more difficult.

There is political-economic collusion in the drawing of the curtain of ignorance around these operations; there is great profit to be made behind this curtain so long as the general public is unaware of what is going on. Only occasionally, when political jealousies momentarily make the fatcats careless, does the public receive any intimation of the wealth at stake.

This was the significance of the fight over the Senate confirmation of Walter J. Hickel to the office of Secretary of the Interior.

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST LANDLORD

The biggest landlord in the world is the Interior Secretary. The territory directly measurable as his domain exceeds the land area of England and the friendly portion of Europe combined. The hydroelectric dams that are operated under his jurisdiction could light a bulb in every home in the Western hemisphere. The petroleum and coal deposits that repose underneath his land are so immense that one can, without much exaggeration, speak of them as being capable of meeting the world's fuel and energy needs virtually forever. His grazing lands mean, and will no doubt continue to mean, the difference between the nation's livestock growers making a good living and just scrimping by. And, of course, if it were not for the land holdings of the Secretary of the Interior, the great wilderness playgrounds of the nation would already have disappeared; hunters and fishermen and campers more and more have come to depend on the areas he provides for their pleasure.

Obviously a caretaker of this magnitude is subjected to enormous pressures. Here are some major decisions he must make, siding either with exploiters or with the general public:

Just before leaving office, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall jumped the grazing fee ten cents a month per cow and issued a regulation that would result in future increases. Since range management experts concede that the rental was only about one-third or one-fourth what should have been charged, why had he waited until the eve of his departure to raise the fee? Perhaps he merely wanted to leave a touchy situation for his successor to deal with. In any event, Hickel is now under tremendous pressure from sheepmen and cattlemen to lower these fees. Many millions of dollars are at stake—millions that will go either into the ranchers' pockets or into the public treasury, depending on his decision.

A TREASURE IN WOOD

In today's building market, timber is almost worth its weight in gold. The federal government talks of needing 26 million new housing units over the next ten years; of these, the six million public housing units alone will cost \$12 billion. It is boom time for the big lumber companies—whose profits have soared to such heights that Congress is investigating them—and the future is dependent at least in part on the generosity of the Secretary of the Interior, whose department supervises lands that hold about a quarter of the nation's timber supply. This is leased to private companies. Hickel is now being bombarded by the rhetoric of lumbermen who wish to cut more wood at fees that have little relationship to the market value of the timber.

The federal government's trees—based on the value of all timber-supported industries—are worth at least \$8 billion a year,

notwithstanding the fact that the government's income from its timber annually comes to little more than \$50 million. This is just one more of those friendly government-industry relationships.

THE POWER BROKERS

Then there is the matter of electric power. Most people do not realize it, but in terms of gross capital assets (over \$70 billion) electric power is by far the nation's largest industry (compare this with the \$40 billion-plus assets of the next, largest, petroleum refining). Much of the power sold privately comes from government generating sources, managed either by the Tennessee Valley Authority or four Interior agencies. The federal government sells it to the private companies. The private companies sell it to you. It's a multi-billion dollar business, and a friendly Interior Secretary can affect it hugely.

There is another way for the private utility companies to profit. The big companies don't want to pay for the building of power-generating dams, and they often fight this construction, but when it is completed they come in and say, "We'll take the burden of building the transmission lines off the public's back. We will 'wheel the power' anywhere you want it, and it won't cost the taxpayer a penny in construction costs." This argument has been bought for many of the major power projects across the country. The end result is that the major private companies actually control generating facilities that they did not build. Co-ops and municipalities and states that under the law should receive preferential price privileges from the federally-owned generating plants find that they have to do business with private power companies first, and must pay transmission fees in order to get the public power. Thus the major private utility companies are riding piggy-back on public power projects and are receiving large profits from them.

As for the value of the federal government's mineral holdings, the official estimate of that is the most strikingly stingy of all. The Interior Department says that the mineral resources of the public domain are worth \$2.5 billion. This is most unusual restraint, considering the fact the Geological Survey has admitted that there are at least 150 billion barrels of petroleum under the U.S. government's portion of the continental shelf, to say nothing of the oil deposits under the federal government's mainland holdings. Recent oil strikes on federal property in Alaska have in themselves promised reserves of perhaps 30 billion barrels—which is three times more than all the oil produced to date from Saudi Arabia.

These are slippery estimates and it is easy to become too generous in predicting the future, but inasmuch as there are undoubtedly many billions of barrels of oil still to be discovered, we can be conservative by stopping with the oil already discovered (or predictable on the basis of explorations already carried out) for our figure.

Settling, then, for 200 billion barrels of offshore and mainland oil, and figuring from the conservative market value of \$3 a barrel, we find that instead of the government's mineral deposits being worth only \$2.5 billion, as the Interior Department tells us, they are really worth a minimum of \$600 billion in oil alone. This does not include numerous other valuable minerals being tapped on federal land, or, most significantly, shale oil deposits.

Chris Weiles recently wrote in THE NATION: "In all, there are 16,000 acres of shale land in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, 80 percent of it federally owned. It is estimated to contain as many as 5 trillion barrels of oil—400 times the annual world consumption and worth \$10 trillion."

OIL ALONE COULD WIPE OUT THE "DEBT"

Disregarding the total value of this oil field and settling only for the normal 12.5 percent and 15 percent royalty that the fed-

eral government demands of private companies which exploit federal petroleum properties, this means that the national "debt" could be wiped clean with about \$1 trillion (that's \$1,000 billion) to spare—from royalties alone.

As for other mineral deposits available to the exploiters of federal lands, these are wrapped in especially heavy secrecy. It is not generally known, but more coal lies west of the Mississippi River—where Interior controls 80 percent of the land—than in the East. The Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management will not make public how much coal is under its dominion, but it is known that there are at least three trillion tons of coal in the continental "recoverable reserves," excluding Alaska, and the Bureau of Mines admits that between 24 percent and 40 percent is federal. The general public will never know whether this coal is sold at a price that protects the public's interest, nor will it know if it has been taken advantage of (via the Interior Department) by companies that will eventually exploit the federal government's share of the 500 trillion cubic feet of natural gas (minimum estimate) in our known and estimated reserves. These are riches that will be passed around at the bureaucratic and corporate level without the slightest attention from the mass of people.

Then there are those even more mysterious—to the public—minerals, uranium and thorium, from which will come much of the energy of the future. Do not bother to inquire of the Interior Department as to how much of these rich minerals are controlled by the government; it will not tell you. This is another of the secrets which are reserved for the corporate intelligence alone. But here and there we can find hints. In a 1964 power survey published by the Federal Power Commission one finds this statement: "The latest estimate of total known and undiscovered uranium resources mineable at \$5 to \$10 a pound of uranium oxide is about 900,000 tons of metal." This is the most profitable quality; less profitably quality ore runs into the millions of tons, the report tells us. Much of this is on federal land.

For some reason only oil—which is hardly more profitable than natural gas and will eventually be less profitable than atomic fuels—has captured the public's imagination and has stirred the public's watchfulness. It was this fixation that caused trouble for Secretary of Interior Hickel, whose past actions as governor of Alaska as well as his career associates and his corporate ties did not exactly inspire vast confidence that he could resist the blandishments of the major oil companies.

After all, the man he had appointed as Alaska's Commissioner of Natural Resources—in other words, the man he named to control the oil companies in that state—himself owned \$60,000 worth of oil and mineral stocks, including 1400 shares of British Petroleum, which happens to be the company which subsequently made one of the most fabulous oil strikes in Alaska that any company has made on this continent. The man he appointed to stop pollution in Alaska also had oil holdings.

A MOST POWERFUL MAN

The powers of the Secretary over oil matters are so enormous it is unlikely that the public quite understands them all. Aside from holding the key by which he can open—or keep closed—the oil shale treasures of the far West, he can decide whether the public should put up with pollution to make corporate profit (as Udall decided Santa Barbara should put up with pollution for the sake of Union Oil's explorations), and he can decide whether or not to alter the present oil import program by which a select group of major oil companies are given a gift of more than \$1 million a day by being permitted to bring in the cheaper foreign oil.

As a general rule, the Interior Department makes its choices quietly and without disturbing the peace. This, of course, is the best way to avoid public attention and criticism. But sometimes its confidence runneth over, as it did in 1968 when then-Secretary Udall issued an order granting permission for the construction of highways, dams, powerlines or other structures on certain tribal lands without the Indians' consent. The 500,000 Indians under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs have been wretchedly treated by Washington's officials over the years, but there is usually at least a pretense of amiable paternalism. In this instance, it took a Congressional investigation to reverse the Department's action.

LET'S THINK ABOUT OUR ASSETS

When one appraises our national assets, one better understands why some of our political and business leaders would prefer that we give all our thoughts and all our concern to a "debt" that need not exist and that in fact exists only in a casual way. If we worry about the debt rather than about our assets, we may leave the assets to be cut up without due public attention. This is a nasty suspicion, to be sure, but unfortunately, it is firmly based on our history.

In the late 1900's the government gave lumber companies enormous fortunes in timberland. Between 1850 and 1967 the government gave railroad companies an area equal to France, 94 million acres directly, and another 37 million acres to the state for conveying to the railroads—enough choice acreage that, if it were on the market today, could more than pay off the national debt by itself. It was a period which went into the history books as The Great Giveaway, and for good reason.

Up to the present the government has given away or sold, usually at cut-rate prices, more than one billion acres to individuals, businesses and other governments—more than it retains under its control. The atmosphere is not quite so easygoing today, but neither is it of the strictest. Great portions of the federal lands are unsurveyed and are at the mercy of the exploiters. The bureaucrats who are paid to be guardians do not always seem sufficiently concerned with this. They sometimes seem more determined to keep the public in ignorance than to keep special interests at bay. What goes on these days is likely to be more subdued and sophisticated. The Great Giveaway has perhaps given way to the Great Slipaway. But by any name, federal generosity continues.

A TRIBUTE TO CHAD

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 1960, a huge but impoverished nation located in the center of the African Continent—Chad—marks the ninth anniversary of her independence. Chad is deserving of mention on this day not so much for her scenic beauties or her economic marvels, but mainly for her perseverance in the face of enormous problems.

Centrally located in the forbidding expanses of the southern Sahara, Chad is a clear example of a country created by colonial whim rather than reason. The southern regions of the nation are closer to the black African Nations of West Africa, while northern Chad is

Moslem, more akin to the North African Arab Nations. Colonial mapmakers and their astounding ability to ignore ethnic, climatic, and cultural divisions among their colonial peoples created in this case a country which is at best awkward. Aside from creating Chad, though, the colonial presence—France in this case—did not leave an indelible imprint. It is at least understandable if not justifiable, France ignored her distant war, for Chad had little to offer gainseeking French colonialists. Remote, land locked, and inaccessible, Chad never received the full impact or benefits of colonial rule—schools, modernization, industry, et cetera. Effectively, the 20th century had never come to Chad.

As an independent nation, Chad has tried to come into the 20th century—a gallant enterprise which has foiled other, better-endowed nations. While Chad would be the first to admit she is not a marvel of modernization, her modest record is impressive considering the difficulties she faces. Among these difficulties are a scattered population, lack of mineral resources, and extreme transportation difficulties. At independence, she had only 1 mile of paved road. Climatic conditions make much of the land unusable. What is referred to as "Chad utile"—useful Chad—is small indeed. As a landlocked nation, she is dependent on neighbors such as Nigeria, through which the rail supply lines must pass.

Considering such problems, Chad has made impressive attempts to modernize. She is trying to raise the level of agricultural output. At the same time, she is encouraging crop diversification to make her more self-sufficient. During the Algerian war, Chad supplied the French forces with beef; she is now trying to further develop the cattle industry. A sugar mill, a cigarette factory, a meat-processing plant, and most importantly, road-building are all indicative of the efforts Chad is making.

The most heartening aspect of Chad today is her political stability. This stability has proved one of Chad's most vital natural resources, giving her time to proceed with her efforts for progress. Chad's stability can be largely attributed to the careful leadership of President Tombalbaye, who has been an important progressive force. On this anniversary, it indeed gives me great pleasure to salute President Tombalbaye, Chad, and her people. I wish them every success for the future.

SHABBY POLITICS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last week statements were made in the other body to the effect that President Nixon is not honoring his promise of last June 8 that approximately 25,000 American troops would be withdrawn from South Vietnam by the end of this month. The clear implication of these statements, which included figures on troop strength,

was that the administration is playing some kind of numbers game with the American people on this matter—a matter so close to the hearts of all of us, and especially those whose relatives or friends are fighting for their country in that unhappy land.

Let us first consider the figures which were set forth in the other body. It was said that on January 18, 2 days before President Nixon took office there were 532,500 U.S. troops in Vietnam; that on July 17 there were 535,200; on July 26, 536,000; and on August 2, there were 537,000. Therefore, it was said, we have 4,500 more troops in Vietnam than when the President was inaugurated. We were also reminded that since January 18 there have been 55,462 U.S. casualties in Vietnam.

The hope was then expressed that there will be quicker results henceforth than we have had to date.

Now what are the facts? President Nixon did not commit himself to troop reduction until June 8 at the Midway meeting with President Thieu of South Vietnam. He said at that time:

As a consequence of the recommendation by (President Thieu) and the assessment of our own Commanders in the field, I have decided to order the immediate redeployment from Vietnam of a division, equivalent of approximately 25,000 men. This troop replacement will begin within the next 30 days and will be completed by the end of August.

Obviously, troop replacements cannot be retroactive. President Nixon is not responsible for the troop strengths which greeted him last January when his administration began. He made no promises of troop withdrawal prior to the Midway conference of June 8. And on that day, he said that the troop replacements would be completed by the end of August, a date still more than 2 weeks away.

By the end of August, I am informed, the Defense Department expects to have an actual troop strength of 515,000, compared to an average strength of 540,500 during fiscal 1969. This is a reduction of about 25,000, just as the President promised.

I would suggest that those who try to discredit the President's word before he has had a chance to live up to his word, who try to use January figures to disprove August estimates, are playing a shabby game of politics with the American people, a game they cannot win.

PRESIDENTS DREAM THE IMPOSSIBLE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable and experienced observers of the Washington scene is the distinguished correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, Walter Trohan.

In his Tribune column Wednesday, August 6, he comments as only a keen student of history can on the inherent frailty in presidential diplomacy.

The column follows:

PRESIDENTS DREAM THE IMPOSSIBLE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—It is sad but true that the 12-day, around the world trip of President Nixon produced little more concrete than the usual array of glittering platitudes and pious incantations that have marked Presidential foreign travel for a half century.

Crowds and courtesy exchanges do not make or temper foreign policy no matter how devotedly hopeful hearts may pray for it. Unfortunately, about the most a Presidential traveler can expect from foreign travel is to boost his political stock at home.

Nixon characterized his trip as a "quest for peace," reflecting the "spirit of Apollo 11." He said everywhere, deep in their hearts, he found that people desire peace. This he knew or any American could have told him before he set out on his tour, because man has longed for peace thruout history, but greed, distrust, suspicion, and hate have denied it to him.

"Deep differences in political philosophy cannot permanently divide the peoples of the world," Nixon said on his return.

They not only can, but they have thru recorded history. In particular he is questing for peace in southeast Asia and in the middle east where men have been fighting for 5,000 years.

Fifty years ago President Woodrow Wilson set out on a quest for lasting peace based on open covenants openly arrived at, but was persuaded to sow the seeds of World War II in deals made in secrecy. Almost 33 years ago President Roosevelt capped a triumphant reelection by journeying south in a quest for hemisphere peace and 9 years ago President Eisenhower launched a quest for peace on a vague intangible known as the spirit of Camp David, where he had conferred with Deposed Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Peace shrieked when FDR went to Quebec, Tehran, Cairo, and Yalta. It was outraged when President Truman went to Potsdam to confirm captivity for many peoples. The building of the Berlin wall followed President Kennedy's quest for peace in Vienna. Travels by President Johnson in search of peace, once hailed as promising, are now all but forgotten.

Nixon was cheered by the outpouring of crowds in communist Romania, but that nation still remains captive. If it should bid for freedom, it is certain that planes and tanks and guns would be moved in as they were in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

The President was made so happy by the sight of waving American flags that he joined in dancing the national hora. He must have known that American flags could not be purchased in Romania unless they were provided by a government seeking trade and other advantages, and that the crowds would not have been there unless they were mobilized.

In 1936 this observer saw thousands of cheering Latins race after FDR's automobile in Rio de Janeiro and Montevideo. In 1959 I saw Eisenhower address a seething mass of one million, the largest assemblage many eyes have beheld, in New Delhi.

I have seen other outpourings for other Presidents. Often the visits were timed to coincide with luncheon crowds or the home hour rush. Frequently they were organized on what would correspond to American precinct levels. Generally nations visited want money or aid and crowds are one way of attracting it.

Peace remains the impossible dream, but that does not mean man, especially Presidents, should stop dreaming. Yet, when one wakes up from a beautiful dream, possible accomplishment is brought closer by a sound evaluation of aspiration.

LOW WAGE IMPORTS GRAVE THREAT TO OUR TEXTILE INDUSTRY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been struggling night and day to save our textile industry and the jobs of its employees from low-wage foreign imports were shocked to see an editorial in the Wall Street Journal on July 30 entitled "A Synthetic Case for Quotas."

Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated and outstanding leaders in the textile industry is Morris M. Bryan, Jr., of Jefferson Mills, Jefferson, Ga. Mr. Bryan very effectively responded to this editorial. I commend Mr. Bryan's letter to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our county:

THE JEFFERSON MILLS, INC.,

Jefferson, Ga., July 31, 1969.

Mr. VERMONT ROYSTER,
Re editorial Synthetic Case for Quotas,
Editor, Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ROYSTER: It falls my lot to be president of a small textile manufacturing company employing about 400 people.

For ten years we have worked and researched and developed new technology and put into operation what is generally regarded the most modern mill in the world. It produces corduroy. We can make and sell cloth as cheaply as anybody in the world and still pay the highest textile wages in the world. It is small, representing only about 3% of total U.S. corduroy production—but it cost \$6½ million to complete.

To get this cloth to ultimate consumers it must go through the U.S. garment industry which, though the most efficient garment industry in the world today, still utilizes much manual labor per dollar of sales—manual labor paid at rates at least ten times that of low wage countries. Distributors of garments (chain stores and others) buy their garment needs cheaper from low wage countries. So, we have lost this business to cheaper imports.

Having lost this market we tried to export, hoping our corduroy could be sold to garment manufacturers abroad so that it could be used in garments coming back to American consumers. The many barriers encountered—freight rates, size of rolls of cloth, duty, commissions, pilferage insurance, credits, local government restrictions—could not be discussed in detail in this small space, and these efforts failed.

So, the most modern mill in the world is likely to go out of business due to our government's policy of failing to regulate in some orderly fashion imports from countries paying what would be called starvation wages in this country and, therefore, illegal wages under American law. This, sir, to me and my people is not synthetic.

Corduroy imports now exceed 25% of the domestic production. Small mills like ours are not diversified nor can they be shifted quickly and easily from one merchandising direction to another.

Two things must be done: (1) Give us an orderly growth of imports related to the growth of U.S. markets regulated by fabric, by country while our technology of weaving cloth, dyeing and finishing cloth, making cloth into garments can finish the job of cost reduction; and (2) insist other countries which enjoy the privilege of access to U.S. markets eliminate trade barriers so that we might enjoy the same opportunity to their markets.

Correct these two gross inequities in the free trade policy of this great nation and maybe some years from today we will compete with any nation on a free trade basis.

We invite you to see our new modern mill, but hurry. It might be closed.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS M. BRYON, Jr.,
President.

NEED FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, inflation has imposed heavy hardships on people depending on fixed incomes such as pensions or social security. Those living on social security alone have been especially hard hit. Social security was intended to be a supplemental retirement income. However, one-half of the retired people on social security today depend totally on these benefits; therefore, it has become obvious that increased benefits under the social security program are needed.

Much of my mail reflects the seriousness of the situation that confronts many of our senior citizens. After a long and productive life, such should not be the plight at old age.

President Nixon has proposed an increase of 7 percent effective January 1, 1970. I feel this is not enough and we should act to raise benefits at an earlier date.

I would like to insert at this time into the RECORD an editorial by WCBS-TV, channel 2, New York, N.Y., which describes the dilemma of many of our older citizens on social security:

SOCIAL SECURITY

In today's inflated economy the elderly are caught in a squeeze. Old age survivors insurance, i.e., Social Security, does not provide enough benefits for an elderly person to live on. In New York State the average yearly income for those on Social Security is \$1,118. Certainly not enough on which to live.

Many people believe that Social Security is supposed to provide retired men and women with enough income to live a comfortable life. This is, regrettably, not the case. Social Security from the beginning was intended as a supplemental retirement income. It was designed to encourage working people to save for their retirement years.

However, many did not save. Fifty percent of the retired people on Social Security in the United States today depend totally on their benefits and another 30% depend heavily on their benefits. What all this means is that only 20% of the retired people receiving Social Security have put aside enough additional income which combined with Social Security allows them to live comfortably.

Because of the low benefits, many retired persons must either try to supplement their income through work, or they must receive public assistance in the form of welfare.

For many retired persons—including those who have written to us—the humiliation of having to ask for welfare assistance is almost unbearable for they have led productive lives until forced to retire because of illness or age. Furthermore, those who can work part time to supplement their benefits are restricted to earning only \$1,680 addi-

tional dollars a year before losing a part of their Social Security benefits, hardly an incentive.

In our opinion the Social Security law as now written must be amended to provide enough income for the elderly to live on. It must allow those retired persons who wish to work part time to retain their earnings in order to better their lives.

With affluence all around, it is only fair that our senior citizens enjoy the fruits of their labor with comfort in their retirement years.

LOSS OF BUSINESS FIRMS CAUSED BY SHRINKING FARM POPULATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that there is a high mortality among family farms in America. The migration of these farmers to the cities accounts for some of the ills of those high population centers.

There is talk that part of our future agricultural policy will include the retraining of entire farms from production and retraining their occupants for productive jobs in the cities.

One aspect generally overlooked in these plans is the impact of this shrinking farm population on our small countryside communities.

Every dollar of newly earned farm income is said to generate \$7 in national income. Much of this newly generated income starts in the small towns where the rural producers do their shopping.

The impact of a shrinking farm population on these small towns was graphically pointed out in an editorial appearing in the July 31 issue of the Sacred Heart News in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, tax records show that 47 business places in Renville County closed within the past year. Oliva, population about 2,400 and Fairfax, population about 1,800, had the dubious distinction of losing 12 businesses each.

I urge my colleagues to read the following editorial from the Sacred Heart News which deals with this subject:

LOSS OF FARM FAMILIES

Loss of farm families in Renville county is a subject that has been discussed long and often during the past few years—but we wonder if our readers realize that the loss of business firms in the county is also a very serious matter. According to tax records Renville county lost a total of 47 business firms during the period from May 31, 1968 to June 1, 1969. Of these 47, four have been consolidated with others firms, so the actual loss is only 43. Hardest hit appears to be the cafe business, where six have closed their doors during the year. One of these, and the only business loss in Sacred Heart is the Silver Dollar Cafe, while two cafes have closed in the city of Renville. Fairfax and Oliva had the largest number of losses, 12 each, while the smallest villages of the county, Morton and Franklin, had none. (They had lost heavily in preceding years). However, in the larger towns especially, there have also been several new businesses started during the year which would cut down their net loss somewhat.

Renville county towns and losses reported:

Bird Island	3
Buffalo Lake	1
Danube	5
Fairfax	12
Hector	9
Morton	0
Olivia	12
Franklin	0
Renville	4
Sacred Heart	1

CAN WE SAVE OUR SICK GREAT LAKES?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an admirable article appeared in the August issue of True magazine by the Honorable Stewart Udall entitled, "Can We Save Our Sick Great Lakes?"

The pollution level of the Great Lakes has reached a frightening point. Enormous effort is required to clean them up and to preserve them. In order to accomplish this goal a number of Members of this body will be shortly seeking to fund at a fairer and more constant level the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by raising the appropriation level to \$1 billion, the amount authorized by law.

It is my hope that this article will, in the minds of my colleagues and others who will read it, fully justify maximum feasible expenditures in this area in order to preserve great national treasures enormously jeopardized by wasteful foolish actions of the men who are dependent upon them.

The article follows:

CAN WE SAVE OUR SICK GREAT LAKES?

(By Stewart L. Udall)

Our Great Lakes, which make up the largest body of fresh water on earth, are under sentence of premature death. Born 20,000 years ago when the glaciers gouged out their huge basins, then retreated and filled them with the crystalline waters of melting ice, the Great Lakes are beginning to show signs of old age at a time when they are still geological youngsters. In Lake Erie great green skeins of algae have broken loose from rocky moorings and washed ashore to rot in long, malodorous, fly-infested windrows. At Green Bay, Wisconsin, people sun themselves on park benches that look out on Bay Beach—shut down by pollution in 1941, and now covered by marsh grass and weeds. In Chicago United States Steel Corporation's south works inflicts dark-purple bruises on Lake Michigan from its daily discharge of 440 million gallons of waste water. Just below Niagara Falls, the city of Niagara Falls, New York, pours sewage into the Niagara River after giving it what is euphemistically called "preliminary treatment": the raw sewage is merely passed through a screen. The oil-thick Buffalo River, a tributary to Lake Erie, necessarily, though perhaps unbelievably, has been declared a fire hazard by the Buffalo fire chief.

Since Samuel de Champlain first sailed into Lake Ontario in 1615 seeking a north-west passage to China but finding instead a waterway into the heart of a continent, the heavy hand of man has aged the Great Lakes at a rate exceeding geometric progression. It is quite likely that in the last 20

years more deterioration has occurred than in the previous 20,000, and that in the next 80, the remaining life expectancy of the lakes will be unconsciously and unconsciously compressed.

How did this happen? How could we have squandered this great treasury of fresh water to the point of bankruptcy? For years people had thought these inland seas capable of absorbing all the wastes of society. The attitude is summed up in the engineering profession's old bromide, "The solution to pollution is dilution." Rapid industrialization and a booming population left their mark, accompanied by a "robber baron" mentality that held economic progress—at any environmental or social cost—to be sacrosanct. All of a sudden, there were more than 25 million people congregated along the shores of the Great Lakes; industries were consuming more than 2,660 billion gallons of water a year; cities were drawing 1,400 billion gallons annually from the lakes and their tributaries to provide drinking water for over 15 million people.

As early as the turn of the century, events had forced the city of Chicago to act. Following a series of typhoid epidemics, engineers undertook to reverse the flow of the Chicago River. Instead of discharging into Lake Michigan, the river was caused to flow backward and now carries its enormous quantities of treated waste into the Illinois River system. This arrangement has provided protection for the Chicago area's freshwater supply and bathing beaches, but at the expense of other water users down the Illinois. Even so, Chicago's costs of treating its water supply have doubled in the last 20 years because of the contaminants from neighboring Indiana carried by lake currents into its water intakes.

The reversal of the river, however, has kept Lake Michigan from deteriorating with the rapidity that has marked Lake Erie's decline. In the summer one-fourth of Lake Erie's 9,930 square miles of water is "dead." The water at the bottom of the lake is completely without oxygen. And this suffocating phenomenon not only lasts for longer periods each summer but covers more area.

Yet scientists feel that Lake Erie's recovery could be spectacular—possibly within 10 years—if all sources of pollution were given adequate treatment, for Erie is flushed by the still relatively clean waters of Lake Huron. Lake Michigan, by contrast, is a cul-de-sac that receives no flushing action. If ever it slips to Lake Erie's degree of degradation, anywhere from 100 to 1,000 years would be required to restore its water quality. Indeed, despite all the technical skills that man might finally muster, some pessimists say that Lake Michigan might never recover from such pollution.

There is no single villain but we are all—individuals, even industries—victims. On the Cuyahoga River, which enters Lake Erie at Cleveland, a steel company must play a constant stream of water on the surface to keep floating logs, oil and debris away from its water intake.

The biggest single industrial polluter of the Great Lakes is the United States Steel Corporation. Its Gary, Indiana, plant alone discharges more than 330 million gallons of wastes a day into the Grand Calumet River, a tributary of Lake Michigan. This carries a load of pollutants equivalent to daily dropping 130,000 full-size automobiles into the lake.

The worst municipal polluter in the Great Lakes region is the City of Detroit, which discharges more wastes into Lake Erie than all other cities in the basin combined. Yet Detroit is one of the many cities that has agreed, in compliance with the Lake Erie Enforcement Conference, to install secondary treatment facilities by 1970. U.S. Steel's sheet and tin works at Gary has four new water-pollution control systems in operation; these

are among the most modern in the country.

Lake Ontario, the easternmost and last link in the lake chain, receives its flow and, therefore, the pollution, from all of its sister lakes. It is also doused with staggering amounts of pollution from cities and industries discharging into the Niagara River, the connecting waterway between Lakes Erie and Ontario. The river, which flows over Niagara Falls, disgraces local communities along its banks, demeans the State of New York and the nation, and does violence to an otherwise peaceful border. The Genesee, Oswego and Black Rivers also spill wastes into the lake.

Lake Ontario resembles Lakes Erie and Michigan, with piles of rotting algae and dead fish besmirching its shores. While all three lakes have alewives, a tiny inedible "trash" fish, nothing in history rivals the huge die-off of some 16 billion alewives in Lake Michigan in 1967. No evidence has been found that poisons in the water caused their deaths, but the huge numbers of fish washed ashore became a major pollution problem with both odor and economic consequences. Moreover, an example of the interrelationships in our world cropped up when a predatory fish, the coho salmon, was introduced to feed on the alewives. The coho have now become so contaminated with pesticides washed into the lake from farmlands that this spring the Food and Drug Administration seized 22,500 pounds of commercially landed coho, which contained up to 19 parts per million of DDT. (The maximum safe limit for human consumption has been set by the FDA at five parts per million.)

Another critical problem is caused by the combined sewer systems used in most communities which have progressed beyond the privy and septic tank. These sewers carry both sewage and rainwater, and during heavy rains a sewage treatment plant often bypassed capacity loads into lakes and streams. Thus, while the plant is not flooded, there is a resultant discharge of raw sewage. Whiting, Indiana, whose beach has been closed off and on for the past 10 years because of bacterial pollution bypasses to Lake Michigan. On a rainy day, one can see a black puddle of pollution spreading out—much like an ink stain on a blotter—near the deserted Whiting Beach, and similar scenes can be observed on all the Great Lakes.

While old problems press in, new problems are appearing. The large-scale planning of nuclear utilities on or near the Great Lakes is an example. Near Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota, residents have protested the construction of a nuclear power plant at Monticello, located on the Mississippi River north of the source of the Twin Cities' drinking water. They complain that radioactive wastes contaminate the water supply and maintain that the standards approved by the Atomic Energy Commission are much more lenient than those adopted by the World Health Organization. Nuclear utilities also add substantial amounts of heat to the water—even moderate increases in temperature have killed fish or made them more susceptible to disease—and encourages the growth of new crops of algae. A committee formed at the Lake Michigan Conference has been meeting with AEC personnel to develop guidelines for the control of thermal and radioactive pollution.

A controversy also erupted in Ohio and Pennsylvania this past year over the potential pollution threat of offshore oil and gas drilling which, though a possible economic bonanza, could result in another nightmare.

Lakes Huron and Superior are being scarred for the first time by pockets of pollution. The Saginaw River system which drains approximately 6,000 square miles, carries a heavy burden of industrial and municipal pollution into Huron. The Superior, largest, deepest, coolest and cleanest of the Great Lakes is developing pollution sores from steel, sewage and paper mill discharges pouring down the St. Louis and Montreal rivers

and from Duluth Harbor; red TNT wastes from the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Company plant at Barksdale, Wisconsin, bloody Lake Superior's Chequamegon Bay.

Recently hearings have been held and a bitter argument has broken out over whether the Reserve Mining Company's taconite processing plant on Superior's Silver Bay is polluting the lake with its dull-gray outpouring of 59,000 tons a day of ore residues.

Thus, the next 10 to 15 years may require our spending as much as 15 billion dollars to save the Great Lakes. For we are not only dealing with a situation brought on by decades of neglect; we also face the prospect that industrial water use may triple with municipal consumption increasing at almost the same rate during the next 50 years.

In the Lake Erie Basin alone, construction costs just to provide adequate secondary treatment facilities for all municipalities will run to \$1 billion. Equivalent industrial treatment facilities will add \$285 million to the bill. By 1990 municipalities will have to spend another \$1.4 billion to expand facilities. Secondary treatment, which is required by the 1965 Lake Erie Federal Enforcement Conference, achieves up to 90-percent removal of wastes. Advanced waste treatment, which has a 99-percent effectiveness, will ultimately be needed, along with techniques for removing phosphorus to curb excessive algae growth. These refinements will raise costs still higher, for the Great Lakes receive more than 75.5 million pounds of phosphates a year. A four-state Lake Michigan Enforcement Conference which I called in January, 1968, at the request of former Illinois Governor Otto Kerner will require all municipalities to achieve at least 80-percent reduction of phosphorus by December 1972.

To control agricultural runoff of pesticides into Lake Erie alone, we would have to invest approximately \$400 million in a system of drains, dams, channel improvements and in grassing the slopes of waterways.

The cost of replacing combined sewers with separate systems for carrying storm water and sanitary wastes is also prodigious. In the Lake Erie basin, it would cost in the vicinity of \$3 billion, and in Chicago, close to \$2 billion. Yet such construction projects must one day be undertaken out of dire necessity. And certainly separate systems should now be installed in all urban reconstruction projects and new developments. The city of Chicago has received federal financial assistance to experiment with the retention of storm overflows in deep underground reservoirs. During rains the water would be stored in the reservoirs for future treatment, avoiding the bypassing of sewage to the lake or a tributary.

However, muscle as well as money is required. The Oil Pollution Act, which covers petroleum dumping into the lakes, is woefully inadequate. It requires proof that the pollution results from gross negligence or willfulness, a charge almost impossible to substantiate in a court of law against those ships which nonchalantly pump oil into the water when cleaning their bilges. And this act does not cover oil discharges from shore installations; that is the responsibility of the Army Corps of Engineers under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Legislation is now before the Congress to streamline and strengthen these laws, and a uniform law has also been proposed to regulate control of pollution from commercial and pleasure vessels. Needed legislation to control drainage from mines of acid and other pollutants also is pending.

Money and technical skills must also be applied to finding alternate sites and methods for the disposal of polluted dredgings. For years the Corps of Engineers dumped material dredged from harbors and channels into the open waters of the lakes. As Secretary of the Interior, I entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretary of the Army as a step toward solving this problem, and some progress has been made

in finding other locations where polluted dredgings will not be harmful.

We must also enforce existing laws. We must hold industries and communities to the deadlines for cleaning up wastes that they agreed to meet at various enforcement conferences; and we must uphold the water quality standards established for interstate waters under the Water Quality Act of 1965. Under the law, these standards were made subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and while in office I approved in whole or in part the standards developed by all the Great Lakes states.

This is also an appropriate time for the United States and Canada to determine if more international efforts should be applied to lake pollution problems. While Canada, which borders four of the lakes on the north, needs to improve its treatment facilities and is acting to do so, the bulk of pollution comes from the United States.

In a number of Great Lakes states, the people now are being asked to decide on their future. Yet Illinois voters last fall rejected—I note with objective regret—an opportunity to pass a \$1 billion bond issue for air and water conservation. What will other voters do in the critical years ahead when they have pollution control referendums in their own states?

UN Secretary General U Thant stated not long ago: "The truth, the central stupendous truth, about developed countries today is that they can have—in anything but the shortest run—the kind and scale of resources they decided to have. . . . It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decision that makes the resources. This is the fundamental revolutionary change—perhaps the most revolutionary mankind has ever known."

If this were ever true anywhere on earth, it is true in America today. We do have the technology. Desalinization, for example, when coupled with power generation, is on the way to providing economical access to the greatest water resource of all—the seas. We do have the wealth: our gross national product is closing on the trillion-dollar mark. We have the resources and resiliency but we await the decision, the commitment.

Far too long we have viewed conservation as a peripheral endeavor to save a species, to clean a river or to restore a forest. Now, however, there is a growing awareness of a new dimension of conservation whose subject and substance is man himself. We are at last beginning to realize that all of life is a system, not unlike the Great Lakes, which is an intricate web of interdependent relationships. There is an ecological discipline that operates in nature to which man is subject. For every action there is a reaction; for every consequence, a cause. As man's power and prowess increase, so does his responsibility.

Instead of a fragmented look at the pollution problem, we must examine the total system by which our industry, economy and society transform energy and materials from ground resources to finished products, to ultimate use and finally disposal. We must begin to examine the very goods and services we produce for their inevitable environmental impact before we produce them.

If, in the future, we are to make those decisions that will in fact create our resources, our wisdom must match our wealth. The present condition of our nation's waters is grim testimony to the fact that we have not done this. We have treated water as if we could make it when in reality we can neither make nor destroy—but only transform—it. We have used it and discarded it when it became overburdened with the chemicals and heat of our effluents.

It is a magnificent testimony to the indomitability of nature that the evolution of man's technical genius that at first threatened him with extinction has the potential now to save him.

But beyond any attempt to quantify our resources by their magnitude and to qualify them in terms of the manner of their use, is the overriding necessity to also view them in terms of the number of humans who must share them. The plentitude of resources on our planet is a constant; the only factor which bears on that constant is the variable of man's numbers. If we double our numbers, there will be only half as much water per person. The same is true of our foodstuffs, parklands, air, and physical space. Therefore, it is no longer possible to consider a program to extend, enlarge, and protect our resources or our environment without concomitantly considering what a rational population policy might be for our nation.

Adlai Stevenson in his last speech said: "We travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable supplies of air and soil . . . preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love, we give our fragile craft."

Even since Prometheus, of Greek mythology, stole fire from the gods to give to mankind, man has been trying to impose order on his environment; far too often he has created havoc. Of all the ransacked rooms in nature's house, none has been more abused—nor in so short a time—than the Great Lakes. Patchwork repair jobs will no longer do. We have not only exhausted our excuses for inaction and apathy; we have also run out of time. Quite simply, it is up to us. Man—if he wants—can be master of his fate. Indeed, he has no alternative.

COAST GUARD COUNTRY

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, northern Michigan is Coast Guard country. The 1,600-mile Michigan shoreline is dotted with Coast Guard installations. There are major Coast Guard bases at Traverse City, where the air station is located, and at Sault Ste. Marie. The vessel, *Sundue*, is moored at Charlevoix, and just across the Straits of Mackinac at St. Ignace, a \$600,000 search and rescue station was recently completed.

These facilities serve, of course, only to harbor the dedicated men and women that have made the Guard the competent and professional service that it is today. I am proud that the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. Willard J. Smith, was raised in Charlevoix County which is located in the 11th Congressional District. Nearly 1,200 officers and enlisted men are manning Coast Guard installations in Michigan; many of these men, too, come from northern Michigan homes. These talented individuals are continually, but quietly, making a great contribution to our Nation's strength.

I was honored to share with them, and with the people of Cheboygan, Mich., in the 25th anniversary celebration for the Coast Guard Cutter *Mackinac*. The history of the cutter is much like that of the Coast Guard itself. It is the story of a ship that steadily, but unobtrusively, contributes to our Nation's might.

The *Mackinac* was built as part of the war effort in the 1940's; her mission was to keep the shipping lanes open a little longer and to increase the move-

ment of cargo and raw materials on the Great Lakes. Built to cruise through an area that sometimes sees 200 inches of snow and ice in the winter, her ice-breaking capacities were unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Today—25 years later—as a harbinger of spring, she still glides into the ice-choked Great Lakes and opens shipping lanes with an ease and skill still unsurpassed in the United States.

It is difficult to assess the magnitude of the contribution of the *Mackinac*. Before she went into service, the shipping season was closed about 4½ months per year. The *Mackinac* cut this time to an average of 3 months. When one realizes that 480 million tons of cargo move on the Great Lakes in one day during the navigation season, one begins to sense the great importance of the Coast Guard cutter.

The 25th anniversary celebration in Cheboygan is over, and the fanfare has ended. But, the unforgettable *Mackinac* will continue to fulfill her mission—steadily, with determination.

MINNESOTA EXPERIMENTAL CITY MAY CONTAIN A NETWORK OF TUNNELS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in most cities, driving and parking are problems, especially in high-density population areas. Utilities and services are fragmented even in new, suburban communities. Planning on a coordinated systems basis for utilities and services is difficult because of diversity of ownership—public and a variety of private concerns—coupled with locked-in ownership of existing land and buildings.

For a completely new city, many of the subjects noted above can be planned on a systems basis without any of the constraints of existing cities. A unique and exciting proposal for utilities and services and possibly for movement of people and parking is the use of a tunnel complex. This proposal, made by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, envisions a coordinated tunnel services system in the higher density population areas with the possibility of extension into lower density areas.

Following is a discussion of the tunnel complex proposal, extracted from volume II of the Minnesota experimental city progress report, dated May 1969:

TUNNEL COMPLEX

A tunnel complex for utilities and services has been proposed by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Their initial investigations in this field suggest that a coordinated services tunnel system might be used for the movement of goods, mail, solid wastes, and even perhaps the movement of people as well. Certain conveniences and efficiencies would result for the new City which would not otherwise be possible. (One need not compare this concept to the present city modes of burying each utility in a separate trench or the repeated "digging

up" of city streets to refine or modify distribution lines.)

Question has been raised about security and policing in such an extensive system. Special consideration should include the "security" of the service itself; video surveillance might, perhaps, serve in a coordinated system to provide detection of service interruptions, breakdowns, or failures.

The economics of tunnel complex branches in residential areas would obviously relate to length of runs plus the frequency and quantity of services provided. American suburbs, as now constituted, seem unlikely clientele for the tunnel complex. "Clustering" of dwelling units in recent community development does, however, suggest some possibility. An important study would be the examination of "tunnel economics" in terms of the minimum densities and appropriate patterns of development. Similar studies should consider other low density, low intensity land users in the city.

One principle might be applied with regard to tunnel economics; that of developing *multiple-shared uses*—new uses as well as combined uses. Thus, study of the use of the underground structure might well explore the inclusion of a simple pattern of automobile circulation such as an underground street with parking along either side, underground garages hundreds of feet long but 40 feet wide. What promise might this have for low residential densities?

Multiple-shared uses does raise questions of compatibility, and these questions should be viewed in terms of coordinated *developmental work* which will be needed. An integral part of this work must be the development of individual and organizational interaction which will assure coordination.

Infrastructure as a *building foundation* might well be one of the multiple uses. While it seems most natural to speak of infrastructure as a grid of services buried in our streets, it may be that greater efficiency could be derived were service tunnel complexes beneath the structures and functions they serve. This might lead to radically different ways of conceiving of the central city and its form. In addition to its service functions, the tunnel complex grid would become the "foundations" of city structures, three-dimensional space being leased or sold to private developers, "plug-in" services being immediately available.

GLOBOLINKS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review of Gian Carlo Menotti's opera, "Help, Help, the Globolinks," by Paul Hume, the noted music and theater critic of the Washington Post. "Help, Help, the Globolinks" had its American premiere last week at the Santa Fe Opera, for many seasons now one of the outstanding opera companies in the entire world. Mr. Hume's review testifies to the remarkable accomplishments of this country, which is a credit to New Mexico and America.

The article follows:

GLOBOLINKS

(By Paul Hume)

SANTA FE, N.M., August 10.—Between Gian Carlo Menotti at the very peak of his vivid imagination and the superlative staging of the Santa Fe Opera, the American premiere

of Menotti's newest opera, "Help, Help, The Globolinks," is a smash hit of unqualified proportions.

Into its single act, Menotti has poured all his love of children and of music. And he has done it in a style wholly fun, with brilliant forays against those who rank science high above the art of music and by superb use of electronic music in combination with his own finest inspirations in solo and ensemble writing.

Globolinks are dangerous creatures from outer space. Their invasion of earth is boomed out at the beginning of the new opera, which had its world premiere last December in Hamburg, Germany. No known weapons are effective against the strange visitors, but they are strongly allergic to music. Any human being touched by a Globolink immediately loses his powers of speech, and, within 24 hours becomes a Globolink himself.

The opera is a melodramatic account of how the children and faculty of St. Paul's School meet and overcome the invaders, though not without some losses.

Santa Fe's opera house, open at the top, sides, and even the back of its handsome stage, is uniquely equipped to present Menotti's marvelous fantasy, and the composer's own stage direction took advantage of every possibility. As the announcement of the Globolink invasion was heard, fireworks rocketed through the air surrounding the theater while strobe lights flared across the stage.

Suddenly, with all the lighting flashes, weird creatures began to appear, some leaping, while others moved awkwardly around, all the more frightening because of their unearthly appearance. Much of Menotti's admiration for the choreography of Alwin Nigolais underlies all of his new opera, and it was Nikolais who designed the costumes for the creatures from outer space. He was originally intended to do the choreography as well, but for some undisclosed reason, and even though he and Menotti worked closely together on the opera, the ultimate dance movements of the Globolinks were the excellent work of Willa Kim, who also did the costuming of the human members of the cast.

The opera's action centers around a group of children returning to school after a spring vacation. Their bus is mysteriously halted in a forest, where they are promptly menaced by the Globolinks. When the sound of the bus horn obviously slows down the unwelcome visitors, the bus driver asks Emily, the only one on the bus who has brought her instrument with her, to play her way through the Globolinks in search of help from the school's faculty. Emily timidly sets off.

The faculty, meantime, is finding out, in its own way, about the invasion. The school's headmaster, falling asleep in his office, is touched by one of them, and for the rest of the opera, John Reardon, one of the finest singers in the country, is reduced to singing nothing but "la."

However, under the inspired guidance of Mme. Euterpova, the school's music teacher, the faculty is marshaled into a marching band—they suddenly take a startling resemblance to the famous faculty of St. Trinian's—and the Globolinks' ultimate defeat is assured.

Menotti, as his own stage director, has loaded his latest brainchild with all kinds of wizardry. His score includes the most brilliant use of electronic music I have yet heard in any score. When audiences hear this opera, they will realize how magnificently electronic music can take its place in the developing history of the art.

Along with this latest musical innovation, Menotti has made touching and hauntingly beautiful use of a single soprano voice in combination with a violin. In Judith Blegen, who was Monica in The Washington Opera Society's recent production of "The

Medium," Menotti has found a remarkable, if not unique, artist. Not since the days of Marcella Sembrich at The Metropolitan a half century ago has a prima donna both sung and played the violin in an operatic production.

One of the loveliest lyrical passages in the opera is the melody with which Miss Blegen, as Emily, walks off stage, playing her violin as she goes to find help for the other children. And the children's chorus, sung by the Texas Boy Choir, which is in residence at Santa Fe this summer, is a fine touch.

The school faculty, headed by Reardon's marvelously comic Dr. Stone—a figure that later turns to something near tragedy as he turns into a Globolink—is a great collection of characters.

As Mme. Euterpova, Margaret Willauer has taken advantage of Menotti's offer, and, with him, creates one of the strongest comic figures on the opera stage.

William Workman, emerging in a number of major roles this summer in Santa Fe, is excellent as Tony, the bus driver.

In its total impression, "Globolinks" is so strong that members of the audience began to clap in time with its faculty march, and mature businessmen, caught up in its drama, were heard exclaiming, when Emily was driving back the advancing Globolinks with her violin, "Come on, give it to him. Atta girl, give 'em hell."

FREE PRESS OR FEDERAL PRAVDA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if government is going to promulgate guidelines on what is published in a theoretically free press, a real Pandora's box is opened because someone must make distinctions between editorial comment, news reporting, and paid advertisements. If this distinction is to be made by any agency of the Federal Government—relying on the commerce clause—not only is the first amendment violated, but to the extent that newspaper space, which is sold to advertisers, is appropriated by a Federal agency, the fifth amendment prohibition against the taking of private property for public use without just compensation is broken.

The FCC control over radiowaves in the "public good" was limited to the determination of broadcast frequencies, not content.

The psychedelic reasoning of the Supreme Court in plain contravention of this long understood rationale of the Federal Communications Act will not be available to any "judicrats" seeking to circumvent the Bill of Rights respecting newspaper space.

While pretty words can be written about public ownership of such a thing as the ether, it is extremely difficult to find any public ownership of the inkwell.

David Lawrence has put his finger squarely on the trend in a recent editorial, recognizing the problems created by forbidding certain television advertising on the theory that the product might not be good for the public. This is bare-faced Government censorship.

At about the same time, an FCC Commissioner, at the American Bar Association meeting in Dallas—logically following the illogical Supreme Court decision—has called upon Congress to plainly violate the first amendment by requiring newspapers to give free "right of reply" to personal criticism in print.

It is in the traditional American spirit of free competitive enterprise for individuals to own newspapers, for men to disagree, and for people to try to affect public opinion through their privately owned papers, but it is a completely different thing for the Government to step in with this direct control.

The policy of any American newspaper can be legally influenced by other Americans—by letters to the editor, advertising, subscriptions. Can you imagine a Russian citizen influencing Pravda? This is what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I include the several articles that follow:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 4, 1969]

GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP OR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that incitement to violence is not protected by "freedom of speech," but proof is required that the remarks or speeches actually produced the violence.

What shall be said then of the threat by the Federal Communications Commission to ban the broadcasting of all cigarette advertisements without any proof that seeing or listening to these presentations actually prompted the purchase of the tobacco which allegedly produced ill effects in certain instances?

What shall be said also of the reluctance of Congress to forbid the manufacture, sale or distribution of cigarettes, while at the same time an advertiser is being denied the right to assert on television or radio that his cigarettes are as good as, if not better than, those of a competitor?

We are currently witnessing a kind of governmental blackmail. The Federal Communications Commission has no legal right to tell broadcasting stations what they shall say over the air. "Freedom of the press" applies to the spoken as well as the written word.

The Commission nevertheless let it be known recently that, unless all cigarette advertising on radio and TV were stopped, an order would be issued forbidding such advertisements. Coerced by the warning, the broadcasters felt that they had to make a "voluntary" agreement by which tobacco companies would not be allowed to do radio or TV advertising. It is being asked why the National Association of Broadcasters yields to such pressure by the Commission instead of resorting to the courts.

The constitutional question is whether a governmental agency or even Congress may interfere with the right of free expression in extolling the merits of any product which it is lawful to manufacture and sell.

Perhaps one reason the broadcasting industry has hesitated to go into the courts to obtain a ruling on its rights is that the Federal Communications Commission wields a tremendous power through the authority to grant or deny licenses to radio and television stations.

The existing law states that such licenses are to be issued on the basis of "public interest, convenience and necessity." No right is given to the Federal Communications Commission to censor any program or to withhold a license just because it does not like what is being broadcast. The purpose of licensing is

to enable the Commission to decide whether the use of a frequency by one station might collide with another and interfere with transmission. The intended emphasis was on the assignment of wave lengths—not on program content.

Usurpation of power unfortunately grows when challenges are not made in the courts. If cigarettes are bad for people, the lawful way to deal with the problem is to enact an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the manufacture, sale or distribution of tobacco products in the various States of the Union.

This was how the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors was prohibited in 1920—by adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Prohibition laws, however, were ignored by millions of people, and the illegal marketing of alcoholic beverages developed into an undercover business known as "bootlegging." Finally, in February 1933, Congress, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, decided to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. In less than 10 months, this measure—the Twenty-First Amendment—was ratified by three fourths of the States.

For the country had discovered that individualism is paramount. Each person chooses for himself what he likes to eat or drink, and laws are not going to stop him.

There are millions of persons who smoke and do not believe it has any harmful effects. There are many foods which are injurious to some persons but not to others. The individual has a right to determine for himself whether he should stop smoking.

In England and Ireland, where cigarette advertising on television has been prohibited since 1965, consumption has gone up year by year. In Italy, where all advertising of cigarettes has been outlawed since 1962, more are being smoked today than ever before.

There is still a dispute between medical authorities as to whether cigarettes are always a hazard to health. The relevant question really is how the Government of the United States shall deal with the problem.

This writer has been a non-smoker for many years, but believes that if people are to be deprived of the privilege of smoking, the prohibition should be imposed in a lawful manner—by the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution. Meanwhile, neither Congress nor a governmental agency has the right to threaten that, unless cigarette ads are banned, broadcasting licenses will be withheld.

The contest today is between Government censorship and maintenance of freedom of the press.

"EQUAL TIME" PRINCIPLE SUGGESTED FOR THE PRESS

DALLAS, August 11.—Newspapers and magazines should apply their own version of the "equal time" principle that requires broadcasters to air both sides of controversial issues, Federal Communications Commissioner Kenneth A. Cox said today.

And, Cox said, Congress should require newspapers to give free "right of reply" to persons criticized in print.

The FCC commissioner said his views were a logical outgrowth of a Supreme Court decision last June upholding FCC "equal time" and "right of reply" strictures on broadcasters.

"Congress could—if it wished—constitutionally apply counterparts of our equal time and right of reply obligations to most newspapers," he said, "since they move in, or clearly affect, interstate commerce and since the public interest in their providing their readers with both sides of important questions is clear."

Cox spoke at an American Bar Association meeting on "Mass Media—Rights of Access

and Reply." His major theme was that newspapers, as well as radio and television, "must serve much more effectively than they have as forums for the discussion and resolution of the complex issues now facing us."

Clifton Daniel, associate editor of The New York Times, said that access to the press is a problem, but he added that because of space problems newspapers "must discriminate or drown."

"Every day of the year," he said, "The New York Times receives an average of a million and a quarter to a million and a half words of news material. At best, we print only a tenth of it."

"A highly skilled, high-speed process of selection is involved—a massive act of discrimination, if you like—discrimination between the relevant and the irrelevant, the important and the unimportant," Daniel said.

Richard W. Jencks, president of CBS Broadcast Group, reserved for the news media the function of making "some sense-making whole" out of the welter of events that occur every day.

Corydon B. Dunham, vice president and general attorney of the National Broadcasting Co., said: "Selection, which is to say the editorial process, is essential if broadcasters are to perform effectively the task set for them by the public of providing a flow of information and ideas."

[From the American Mercury, Summer, 1969]

IS THE FREE PRESS STILL FREE?

(By John H. Hutchinson, Jr.)

Increasing numbers of professional newspaper people are becoming concerned that something is radically wrong with our free press. Long one of the super-sacred cows of our society, ready to criticize individuals and institutions at will, the free press has come under sharper and more penetrating criticism recently than at any time in its history.

Some of the critics would prefer the news they dislike be completely censored. These critics neither appreciate nor understand the legitimate function of a free press and deserve little attention.

A few newsmen are slowly becoming aware that the critics of the press are not all asking for a muzzling of the Fourth Estate, but rather, a more completely balanced coverage of the news. This segment of press critics merits careful attention. The press is viewed by them as having failed to fully cover all aspects of news events; particularly those in the fields of civil rights, riots and campus turmoil. It has become an advocate rather than a chronicler of events, they complain.

Has the press really failed to present a balanced news accounting? Does this explain the loss of trust by the people in the mass media today? How is the free press, an indispensable guardian of liberty, performing in these critical times?

No less an impeccably Left-wing publication than the November, 1968 issue of *The Crisis*, official organ of the NAACP, deplored "a tendency on the part of the news media to by-pass spokesmen for the majority and to project the minority spokesmen as the authentic voices of the Negro community."

JUDGE BY WHAT IS AVOIDED

Our Nation cannot rise above the responsible behavior of its free press. Freedom of the press, as guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution was intended to permit responsible citizens to present differing views and to insure the truth in news presentation. Not only must the press thus be judged on what it does print but also on what it does not choose to permit the people to read, see or hear. What kind of judgments go into the selection of the news?

By its own definition Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism society is the "Badge

of the Professional in Journalism." The author has been a member of this fraternity for over twenty years and has observed the profession from a close vantage point. Writing in the December, 1968 issue of *Quill*, the Sigma Delta Chi national magazine, Mr. Hal Bruno, news editor of *Newsweek* magazine stated: "If public opinion now favors the use of night sticks instead of arresting those who violate the law, then people should be told what it looks and sounds like when a policeman's club hits a human head. It's not our fault if the telling stirs sympathy or hostility for one side or the other."

NO SYMPATHY FOR POLICE

No mention was made, of course, of the need to tell the people how the policeman feels when he gets hit with a sack of human excrement or a potato loaded with razor blades. Obviously the news reporters are not to take any chances that might stir up some sympathy for the policeman who is holding the line against the law-breakers and anarchists in American streets and on the campuses.

The difference is that Mr. Bruno and the brand of wolf-pack journalism that he defends are simply interested in only one side of the story, a half-truth approach. The importance extends far beyond Chicago and the August problem to which he referred. Indeed Mr. Bruno goes on to insist that in the case of a mob "They have a right to demonstrate and be heard and we have a responsibility to report their protest in its proper context." The incredible assumption that a mob is entitled to the same rights as an individual is perhaps a key to Mr. Bruno's philosophy and remember he holds the highly influential position of news editor at *Newsweek* magazine. Is it any wonder that journalism finds itself losing public confidence?

In defending newsmen Bruno brushes off criticism of leftist oriented reporters. "The implication is that they are anti-cop, pro-demonstrator, left-wing radicals. A few may be, but most are not." Why should even a few such biased reporters be assigned to a situation where riots are almost sure to develop? How many pro-cop, anti-demonstrator, Rightwing radicals would Bruno brush off so lightly?

Behind the generally favorable public reaction to police methods in Chicago lies a much deeper and dangerous problem for the free press of America. A growing proportion of the American people, unfortunately, no longer trust the Fourth Estate to provide them with honest, unbiased news coverage. The American people are aware of the biased anti-cop, pro-demonstrator, Leftwing radicals that Bruno admits are in the ranks. They feel this group is more than a few. Their judgment is based on experience including such news shows as those controlled by educational television.

ANATOMY OF A NEWS FRAUD

The tax free Ford Foundation gave \$6 million to educational television in 1968. The nightly news show on KQED in San Francisco, incidentally, is paid in part by funds from a Ford Foundation grant. On the evening of Friday, December 13, 1968 KQED news people introduced Carl Braden as a Southern journalist. They proceeded to interview this man without further explanation of who he was.

It soon developed that Mr. Braden was in San Francisco to observe the goings on at San Francisco State by demonstrating students. It was stated by Braden that he had been convicted of sedition in Louisville, Kentucky for selling his home to a Negro and that he had served eight months before being released because of a United States Supreme Court decision voiding state sedition laws. He was obviously fawned over as a civil rights worker by the men of the press during the interview. Mr. Braden predictably used the

opportunity to accuse the authorities of San Francisco State of racist tactics designed to cause conflict between Whites and Negroes.

COMMUNIST IDENTITY NOT REVEALED

Why was it predictable? The news men didn't bother to tell their audience what they should have. Carl Braden is one of the top Communists in the United States and he accused his enemies of exactly what he himself is doing, fomenting racial conflict. His wife, Anne, has long published the subversive *Southern Patriot*, and is also a Communist. Carl Braden was not convicted of sedition for selling his home to a Negro but for a matter involving dynamiting that home which stirred considerable racial strife in Louisville.

Simply put, both Carl and Anne Braden have been an active part of the Communist apparatus in the South for years. Was it coincidence that Braden showed up just after acting president S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State charged outside agitators were being brought on the campus? Possibly, but KQED saw no reason to query Braden on the matter. Should legitimate news media present known Communists in interviews without making any attempt to alert their audiences to who these people are? KQED never tells. Can the public make rational judgments of the news when presented in this manner? Of course not. It is no wonder that informed people are rapidly losing faith in the integrity of the press.

PROFESSIONAL NEWS MANIPULATION

Perhaps it is time the news media began to get objective, at least about themselves, if they cannot be objective about the news. The press is as guilty of manipulating the news and stifling objective reporting as those it accuses. In covering its own convention in Atlanta in 1968 the Sigma Delta Chi journal, *The Quill*, made no mention of a resolution that was noted in *Editor and Publisher* on November 30, 1968: "A resolution proposing that representatives of the so-called 'underground press' be accredited to the Society's 1969 convention, at San Diego, was approved."

If you haven't read a copy of one of these "underground" newspapers you certainly should. They are the most filthy, foul and distorted publications ever conceived. You should know what they are. To consider representatives of these publications fit for accrediting to the convention of an organization that calls itself the "Badge of the Professional in Journalism" is incredible. It is no wonder they were ashamed to admit the resolution in their own publication. Our Nation had better begin to wonder about the behavior of its free press.

TELL IT AS IT IS

The same permissive, no-nothing attitude that is afflicting our schools can be observed in journalism today. The profession is slowly but surely dropping into disrepute, disrespect and general contempt because of its failure to say "No" to the radicals' demands for preferential treatment. A free country cannot exist without a free press. But it must be an honest press. It must begin soon telling the real story of the Leftwing, Communist influence on American youth, on churches, on tax free foundations and all the other aspects of the continuing war against this Nation by the International Communists if the story is going to be told at all.

A genuine free press must soon develop the courage to "Tell It As It Is" if it intends to remain free. They must stop making heroes and martyrs of those trying to destroy our society. A free press can meet the challenge. It has the all-powerful swords of mass communication.

There are three possible approaches to the use of this power: (a) Report and print the full truth. (b) Continue the half-truth approach defended by Mr. Bruno of *Newsweek* and exemplified by the educational television

newsmen. (c) Encourage development of the distorted, pornographic ravings of the mysteriously financed, so-called "underground press."

Journalism cannot serve multiple masters. If professional journalism feels it can solve its credibility gap with the American public by crucifying a few Chicago police who lost their cool after days of unbelievable abuse it is sadly mistaken.

Mr. Bruno tells us "editors should be even more determined to 'Tell It As It Is,' especially if it means telling the American people some unpleasant things they don't want to hear."

Fine. If America really has a free press when does it intend to start this commendable effort?

THE SENIORS WHO STAYED AWAY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, during this session, the halls of Congress have been filled with bitter cries of anger and anguish at the actions taken and the attitudes held by the campus militants throughout our Nation. We have complained that they show no respect for authority; we have decried their violent methods; and we have even passed legislation which would punish them.

At the same time, all of us have called upon the majority of students to seek peaceful regress of their grievances. Use the democratic process, negotiate with school officials, we urged and wrongs would be righted. One hundred seniors at Bellaire High School in Houston, Tex., protesting the fact that their graduation was to be held on Friday night, the Jewish Sabbath, followed our advice.

They discussed the problem rationally with their principal 8 months prior to their graduation date; they wrote letters of protest to the Houston Independent School Board; they sought and received the aid of the Houston clergy, both Jewish and non-Jewish alike; and they presented several practical alternative dates on which their graduation could take place; dates which would have caused inconvenience to no one.

These students, taught the essential American doctrines of freedom of religion and freedom of conscience in the Houston schools, now sought the school board to practice that which it had others teach. To them, the Biblical command to "guard the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and the words of Shakespeare, "to thine own self be true," were more than mere phrases taken from past ages; they were guidelines for all men, young and old alike.

Despite their efforts, despite their pleas, despite the fact that they followed all of the "rules of the game," the graduation exercise was held on Friday night, May 30. That night, 100 idealistic high school seniors failed to attend their own graduation.

Rather, they sat praying in a Houston synagogue, proclaiming their faith in and their devotion to a principle. That night, also, and herein lies the great tragedy of this episode, the American sys-

tem of peaceful and lawful redress also failed. Its failure, in this instance, may seem insignificant to us; however, the damage it has caused and the scars it has left on the minds and thoughts of 100 young men and women is truly beyond calculation.

Mr. Speaker, next month, as the colleges of the Nation open their doors for another year, the choice will be made by students whether to seek changes through violent means, a course which has proven successful at numerous schools, or through peaceful means, a course which failed in Houston. For 100 college freshmen from the Houston area, this choice will not be an easy one to make.

Mr. Theodore Freedman, the southern director of the antidefamation league of B'nai B'rith, has written a stirring account of this sad incident in the June issue of the ADL bulletin. Under unanimous consent, I submit that article for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENIORS WHO STAYED AWAY

(By Theodore Freedman)

We live at a time when adults lament some of the actions of the young and show both disdain and concern for hippies, yuppies, dropouts and a wide assortment of campus radicals. Moral and spiritual values must be strengthened, they say sanctimoniously.

This is the story of nearly 100 high school seniors in Houston, Texas, who deliberately dropped out of their own commencement exercises because they were taking place on a Friday night, the Jewish Sabbath. It is not a big story, although it was reported in the local papers, but it is a story with big implications. A group of bright, idealistic youngsters, convinced that there are no limits to freedom and a just cause, were let down by adults they had been taught to respect.

The students, about two-thirds of the 1969 graduating class at Bellaire High School, took the drastic action of not attending graduation after school officials had refused to change the date. They made their decision after careful thought and after all other efforts had failed. It was a decision they never should have been forced to make.

The Bellaire graduation date—May 30—was set last summer. Attempts to change it began in October. The high school principal was approached first. He regretted the conflict but said there was nothing he could do about it.

The issue was discussed next with the school superintendent who seemed receptive to changing the date and said he would look into the matter. When he wasn't heard from after a reasonable length of time, the Anti-Defamation League was asked to contact him. It was now four months since the original protest had been made.

On February 26, a letter addressed to me as ADL regional director advised that my request for a change in date had been considered and discussed with the school superintendent's administrative assistants—who said a change was impossible.

Several days later about 30 Bellaire seniors met to discuss the problem. At their request, I sat in along with two other adults. The students were most impressive. There was no emotionalism. They dealt with facts and with the public relations aspects of the situation. They wanted to avoid any unnecessary embarrassment to their school or principal, but they were determined not to violate the Sabbath even if they had to forgo graduation exercises.

It was obvious that the students had done their homework. They reported that the Coliseum, the site of their graduation and

of other local schools, had two open dates the first week in June—on a Monday and a Wednesday. They had also checked and found that graduation invitations had not yet been printed. They voted to convey this information to a group of rabbis who had a meeting scheduled with the high school principal and to defer any action on their own until after the meeting.

The rabbis were unsuccessful and an issue which could have been, and should have been, resolved easily had now become hopelessly bogged down in "procedure" and "the time element."

The Houston Independent School Board, despite appeals by the Houston Rabbinical Association, the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston and the executive committee of ADL's local advisory board, insisted it was too late to change the date. A motion to reschedule this year's graduation and to adopt a policy that future commencement exercises not be held on the Sabbath, either the Jewish or the Christian Sabbath, died for lack of a second.

Members of the Houston Clergy Association, an ecumenical group, were asked to, and did, sign a statement expressing displeasure at commencements held on the Sabbath. The Rev. Park Allis, minister of Christ Church Episcopal and secretary of the Association, asked its members whether "in times of world uncertainty, when the Judeo-Christian communities are deeply concerned for the spiritual, moral and ethical values transmitted to our children, should we condone a mocking and curtailing of spiritual underpinnings which our society sorely needs?"

In a letter to the president of the Houston school board, the Rev. J. E. Christensen of the Catholic Council on Community Relations, said "it may be too late to change without inconvenience, but it is not too late to change."

Rev. Christensen said it was the burden of the school administration to undergo inconvenience "to undo the damage caused by conflicting with a religious minority's imperative of conscience."

He went on to say that he regarded the school board's lack of action as "an example of the anti-Semitism of insensitivity."

In a letter headed "Dear Fellow Student," the youngsters announced that a successful appeal appeared dim and that many Jewish seniors had decided to attend *Shabbat* services with their families instead of graduation. The letter spelled out the students' position:

There are Jewish seniors who have strong commitment to their Jewish heritage and the Sabbath which would have to be violated in order to attend graduation;

There are Jewish seniors whose commitment is not as strong but who nevertheless believe that as long as one person wishes to keep the Sabbath he should be supported, not forced to compromise his convictions;

The apathy and lack of consideration given the matter by school officials is appalling.

"All of us have worked hard to reach this day," the letter said. "Graduation is and should be an important part of our lives. However, the situation is a clear cut matter of principle which must be weighed carefully by you as a member of the Jewish faith and of the Jewish community. To take a stand on this issue is an opportunity to champion the dignity and convictions of the Jewish community and of our heritage . . . It is up to you."

The students were right in their assessment—successful appeal was indeed dim. They had one small victory. Following a complaint from the Anti-Defamation League, the school board voted to direct Bellaire High School authorities to drop their requirement that Jewish seniors wishing to be excused from graduation exercises sub-

mit a note stating the reason and signed by the student, his parents and rabbi. The board refused to do away totally with the note requirement, however, and asked that one simply indicating absence be submitted and signed by a parent.

Nearly 100 Bellaire High School seniors did not attend their graduation exercises. Their names were not mentioned during the proceedings—not even those of the honor graduates among them.

They are not likely to forget the experience. Neither are those of us who supported them, worked with them, and respected their stand.

Many of them went instead to services in Congregation Emanu El, Houston, where Rabbi Robert J. Kahn commended them for "their devotion to the principle of religious freedom."

"I know how difficult a decision this must have been to make," the rabbi said, "because the pomp and circumstance of the robed march, the sense of being part of something very large and very important, the receiving of a diploma from the principal's hand is a thrilling experience. And for you to have given it up means the kind of self-sacrifice for principle that I admire."

Discussing what had happened and other instances of conflict when school exams were held on religious holidays, Rabbi Kahn said that through the years the rabbis had done what they could to defend the religious rights of Jewish students in Houston. Each year, at their urging, the school board sends out a list of Jewish holidays on which teachers are asked not to give exams, but each year, the rabbi pointed out, there are anguished calls from parents about an exam on a Jewish holiday.

This year, he went on to say, "It has been a student movement. When they heard that Bellaire graduation had been set for Friday evening, they themselves, without any pressure, without any violence, made their representation through the administration and then, because the principle was worth defending, decided to attend religious services instead of graduation."

Rabbi Kahn said that there is a tendency for people to feel that the individual doesn't really count for much.

"I would like to give you the feeling that the individual is important . . . and he has value if he does what needs to be done . . . Rights can be written down on paper and then very easily ignored or whittled away," he declared. "Every Supreme Court decision in the past fifteen years has been in objection to the whittling away of various human rights guaranteed by the Constitution. People ask what is so important about graduation on Friday night. How many are going to suffer, and is it really suffering? It's very easy for rights guaranteed on paper to be whittled away. But if a human being recognizes his obligations then he responds. Perhaps a lawyer offers to take a case to the Supreme Court to appeal some individual's rights, one unimportant individual's rights. Or perhaps the seniors at Bellaire High recognize that something is wrong and do what they can. . . ."

He ended the service, the "substitute commencement," with this prayer:

"Eternal Father, our lives are in Thy hand and our souls in Thy keeping. Humbly do we thank Thee that Thou has given health and growth to these, our children. Thou has shielded them during infancy, strengthened them in their growth, and brought them now to the thresholds of adulthood. Now they are about to observe another milestone in their young lives.

"They have chosen to celebrate their graduation day here, in Thy house. They have demonstrated their loyalty to Judaism and their dedication to the dignity of every man. Inspired by the teachings of the prophets, they have spoken out, in word and deed,

against the wrongs which men do to their fellow men.

"May their actions, O Lord, be an example to all of us. May it inspire us to rededicate our lives to the noble principles which have directed their actions. May we, their elders, learn from their example and be renewed in our faith and strengthened in our courage . . ."

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert L. Birch, who is president of the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia, gave the Memorial Day address at the Battle Ground National Cemetery, Washington, D.C. His address is thought provoking and I commend his address to all Members:

THE MIDWIFE OF FREEDOM: THE MEANING OF OUR EFFORT IN VIETNAM

(Memorial Day Address by Robert L. Birch)

It is a duty of mixed sadness and pride to welcome you to this gathering in honor of those who died so that freedom might live.

The men who died here during the Civil War, defending the city of Washington and of Lincoln, were the worthy successors of those who died during the Revolution at Lexington and at Bunker Hill. Their own successors are now in Viet-Nam. Many of those who are now in Viet-Nam, or who have given their lives there, were the newsboys in our neighborhoods a few short months or years ago. My own four sons may soon be called to the service of their country.

It is right that we remember the past. We should be prepared for the future.

The men who died at Lexington and Bunker Hill, at Gettysburg and Vicksburg, were the fathers, sons, or brothers of Americans in communities all over the nation. In remembering the dead, we are reminded of their relatives. The question which rises in the heart, if not also from the lips, is: "Why this one? Dear God, why this one?"

Abraham must have asked this question when he was called on to sacrifice a life dearer than his own. He had been asked to have faith that somehow this would make possible a new birth of freedom.

At the time of the American Revolution, many mothers in France must have asked the same question: Why our sons? France had been called to serve as the uneasy midwife at the birth of freedom in a little-known land beyond the ocean to the west.

The nation which grew from that birth has now been called, in turn, to help as midwife at another birth of freedom. Her own sons, and sons of the neighbor, have been called to fight against the blindfold forces of the masters of the lands of slavery. Those masters have determined that there must be no new birth of freedom, anywhere.

We cannot always hope that freedom, once established in a country, will continue to bless that country without further sacrifice or effort. Freedom makes possible the continual renewal of freedom. But the renewal of freedom calls for the dedication and sacrifice of some hearts in each new generation.

Slavery makes possible the continual building of walls. Eventually the pressures of history collapses those walls on the tyrants and on their captives. The masters of the slave lands feel that they must destroy the example of freedom, since otherwise they cannot remain in their rigidity. They have no shock absorbers to permit non-violent change.

We can hope that all Americans will always honor a small gold star. But how dead it sounds, how philosophical it sounds, to ask a mother to remember freedom when a gold star is being pinned above a breaking heart. The dead died only once. Each met his God. This meeting may have been strangely beautiful. The living can die again each time the knife of memory turns in the heart. Only slowly will the nation learn the meaning of the scar beneath the golden star which reminds us of the nation's dearest treasure.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago, a tiny African nation embarked on the unfamiliar journey of becoming a state. Located at almost the exact center of the continent, this landlocked French colony appeared to have a difficult path to follow in striving to achieve complete independence. With its history of dependence on France dating back to 1894, and a backward if not a faltering economy, little more than faith and determination were the resources at hand. Yet today it is with a feeling of pride and confidence that I salute the Central African Republic.

The chief economic activity in the Central African Republic—it occupies approximately 90 percent of the population—is its agriculture. Since the beginning of independence in 1960, the Government has wisely concentrated its efforts toward developing an efficient agriculture and making it an asset to its economy. Government-sponsored programs have provided farmers with instruction on the myriad aspects needed to attain rural success, from the rudiments of proper timing of planting and harvesting to the complications of operating sophisticated equipment. The emphasis has been on modernization and mechanization, with encouraging results. Production of the chief cash crop of cotton soared 25 percent above that of 1967, reaching a record level of 49,000 tons in 1968. In addition, diversification is not lacking, with increased production in tobacco, rice, coffee, and other food products.

Nonetheless, the Central African Republic is not without its share of industry. A significant increase in diamond production—the output in 1968 was five times that of 1960—accounts for slightly more than half of their exports. New projects, under the guidance and foresight of the Government, include a recent completion of a \$10 million textile plant and a \$2.5 million group of plants for manufacturing oil and soap, flour, and animal feed.

One of the problems the Central African Republic has had to grapple with has been the difficulties involved in transporting their goods. Rightly so, the current 1967-70 development plan has provided for an extensive roadbuilding program. Over the 4-year period covered by the plan, some \$36 million has been allo-

cated for this vital necessity. The Government has worked hand in hand with private investors, supplying 75 percent of these funds.

But if the goods have a hard time getting out, what else can be done? You can bring people to them. Last year found our African friends with a modern jet airport and an international-class hotel. To further entice visitors, not to mention the promotion of tourism, there are game reserves for hunters or photog-

To the Central African Republic, which has established a substantial foothold as a thriving nation, to her leader Geography hobbyists, water-skiing, boating, or other forms of recreation. The dry season in this rolling, grassy, and wooded highland is pleasantly cool.

eral Bokassa and to her people, I extend my warmest wishes on this ninth anniversary of independence.

THE CONSUMER PAYS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in reading our Sixth Congressional District newspapers, I find an increasing awareness on the part of our editors about the dangers of inflation and resulting high prices. This concern is a reflection of the mood of our people.

This was the theme of an editorial which appeared in the Hendricks Pioneer of July 31.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of this editorial, which follows, to my colleagues:

THE CONSUMER PAYS

The arithmetic of high and rising prices was recently explained with dramatic clarity by Mr. Gerry Pratt, Business Editor of The Portland Oregonian. He presents the tragic toll of inflation in a tone of neither blame nor rancor.

First he takes national figures that show average earnings of retail chain food stores at 1.1 percent net profit on sales. Then he describes the effect of a more or less typical new wage contract signed by a grocery workers union that over a three-year period will add 24.5 percent to retailer wage costs—not unusual in the light of current contracts. Then Mr. Pratt translates this increased cost into the additional sales that will be required to make it up. The figure runs about \$450 an hour or \$3600 a day per cash register.

In Mr. Pratt's words, "The vicious part of the cycle is that labor leaders are trapped. They must produce better and better contracts—or give way to younger, more aggressive men who will. Management is trapped too, by investors looking for profits to give them a fair return on investment equal to the inflation cycle that is making other investments more attractive. They don't want to take the strike—and they have to have profits. Who pays?"

There is no one to pay but the consumer. And as Mr. Pratt points out, the tragedy of inflation involves the consumer who has worked a lifetime and is living on a fixed income. In reality, he has become the victim, rather than the benefactor, of the welfare state philosophy—and if he is around long enough, we might even starve him to death."

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.'S GIFT TO
NATURE CONSERVANCY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, an editorial appeared in the Oregonian which I feel is of vital interest to my colleagues, since it presents a different view of the so-called timber barons, and demonstrates that at least one of the largest forest products producers, the Georgia-Pacific Corp., is vitally interested in the preservation of one of the Nation's greatest natural resources; namely, our redwood forests.

The following is the full text of that editorial, by Mr. Herbert Lundy:

GEORGIA-PACIFIC'S REDWOODS GIFT REVEALS
NEW FACE OF TIMBER BARONS

(By Herbert Lundy)

The timber industry took a fearful beating from outdoor conservation spokesmen in their commendable and successful efforts to set aside large areas of redwoods in California as a national park. To whip up public support, lumbermen were pictured as the beasts of the forest out to lay low every tree and leave the giant redwoods only a memory.

But now comes the Georgia-Pacific Corporation, one of the largest forest products companies, with a gift of two redwood groves totaling 390 acres on the Van Duzen River in northern California. The groves contain an estimated \$6 million worth of timber, including 206 acres of old growth up to 800 years in age and 15 feet in diameter.

With the national goal established by Congress being 26 million homes by 1978—an average of 2.6 million a year compared with the present construction rate of 1.5 million—some eyebrows may be raised by Georgia-Pacific's donation to the public. After all, the prime redwood in this gift package would provide houses for a million people.

But the national interest also demands preservation of large stands of these magnificent trees, not as "wilderness" but as protected areas to be visited by millions of Americans and visitors from afar. The deed was given to The Nature Conservancy, a privately organized, national, nonprofit organization formed to acquire and protect outstanding natural areas. The California Park System will administer the tract 12 miles from Fortuna, Calif.

Georgia-Pacific is only one of the many large wood products firms which recognize responsibility to communities and the public generally. But in Oregon alone, Portland-based Georgia-Pacific provides 500,000 acres of deer hunting territory and maintains several parks for public recreation.

It is a pleasure to report G-P's interest in recreation and conservation because, as almost everyone in Oregon knows, Georgia-Pacific's intentions were viewed with much suspicion when it entered Washington and Oregon after World War II and started buying vast timber acreages and operating companies.

Robert B. Pamplin, president, made no bones of this the other day in addressing a luncheon of Oregon business leaders on behalf of his board of directors at the Portland Hilton.

"Most of you can remember then that the 'common gossip' among a lot of people around town was that we would be broke within a few years and that we were 'cutting out and getting out,'" he said. Then he gave some statistics:

Georgia-Pacific's sales in 1954 were \$65 million, profit that year was \$1,794,000 and net worth was \$22 million.

"It is with pleasure that I can state today our sales last year were over \$1 billion and our profits were \$76 million—or, in other words, our profits last year were more than our sales in 1954. From this you can see we are quite a long way from being broke! Furthermore, instead of cutting out and getting out, we now have in Oregon an investment of over \$300 million, and over 5,500 employees whose annual payroll last year topped \$47 million."

Georgia-Pacific, on the basis of this phenomenal growth, evidently could afford the redwoods gift to the nation. Still, the company didn't have to do it. There ought to be a big public hand for the enlightened management and public conscience of this group of "timber barons."

BREZHNEV SETS THE CLOCK BACK

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a sobering account of life in the Soviet Union is contained in the Sunday Magazine of the New York Times for August 10, 1969. The article is written by Henry Kamm, until recently chief of the Moscow bureau of the New York Times.

I describe the article as "sobering" because it certainly should be for those Americans who euphorically look for better things within the Soviet Union on the basis of the slenderest indications that life in that oppressive country is being even infinitesimally lightened. The article is simply confirmation for those of us who realize the awesome extent of centralized governmental power of the Soviet Union. The New York Times can hardly be accused of being a "hard-liner" on the subject of the Soviet Union. Other of its correspondents as well as the American people should read Mr. Kamm's article. It follows:

BREZHNEV SETS THE CLOCK BACK

(By Henry Kamm)

Five years ago, Nikita S. Khrushchev found himself swiftly transferred from supreme rule over the Soviet Union to tending flowers and cucumbers in exile in a V.I.P. cottage colony outside of Moscow. And five years ago hope faded once more for the oppressed human spirit in that unhappy land.

Somehow, this truth does not seem to have reached the West. A reporter, back after two years in the Soviet Union, finds himself constantly answering questions and replying to comments based on an appraisal of the Soviet Union that is now five years out of date and was from the outset rosier than reality. What do you mean there are no rebellious poets? Aren't there Voznesensky and Bella Akhmadulina? And how about Yevtushenko? Well, I explain, the first two are having trouble getting anything published, certainly nothing even vaguely unorthodox, and it's been a long time since Yevtushenko has felt rebellious at his type-writer, and still he has been fired from the editorial board of the literary monthly *Yunist*.

And the man named to succeed him, Anatoly Kuznetsov, a novelist, so despaired of the future of his country that he reached the heart-rending decision to defect on a

visit to Britain last month. Heart-rending, because he knew that his choice of freedom—as a writer in a country whose language he does not speak—will make it unlikely for a long time to come for any Soviet artist suspect of liberal leanings to visit the West.

But isn't Igor Blashkov performing cycles of concerts of avant-garde music, including works of Soviet composers, in Leningrad? Mr. Blashkov has been fired, I say, and is now working in the Ukraine. And how about that daring film about the life of Rublyov, the ikon painter? Didn't it win a prize in Cannes? Yes, but more than two years after its completion it has not yet been shown to the Soviet public. And so on.

Not the series of political trials beginning with the writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel nor even the invasion of Czechoslovakia has succeeded in dispelling the illusion that somehow the Soviet Union has overcome Stalin's legacy and is engaged on the road toward decency and liberalization, allowing for the occasional detour.

No one knows better how far the ruling group, headed by Leonid I. Brezhnev, has turned back to clock than those who had their hopes stirred during the erratic rule of Khrushchev. For reasons connected more with the infighting for power than a devotion to truth and freedom, Khrushchev raised the curtain on the carnage and incarceration of Russia's best by which Stalin had ruled. While incomplete and self-serving Khrushchev's de-Stalinization marked the first time that the Soviet Communist party, the absolute and infallible guardian of the revealed truth by which 240 million Soviet citizens must pretend to live, confessed to the world that for three-quarters of the period of Soviet rule that rule had been exercised by a megalomaniac madman.

This first flickering of truth raised hopes in some Russian breasts, hopes that the truth might some day come to the Soviet Union and that a measure of freedom must follow. The present leaders have extinguished that hope. Khrushchev has become an unperson, while all public references to Stalin serve to restore to him a measure of his former glory. And not only in the public prints.

"The most despairing thing about my country is that if you ask any normal person what he thinks of Stalin and what of Khrushchev, Stalin will be talked of with respect and Khrushchev with disdain," a friend, a scholar of democratic convictions, said.

During my travels—to Siberia and the Soviet Far East, Central Asia and the Caucasus, to Minsk and Leningrad—I asked as many Russians as I could to make that comparison. Invariably, Stalin emerged as a revered father figure, a great man—"He had his faults, but so did Napoleon"—and a dignified leader of a nation that wants to be great. Khrushchev, by contrast, was depicted as a rustic buffoon, a braggart, a plotter of harebrained and wasteful schemes, uncultured and undignified to the point of banging his desk at the United Nations with his shoe. The people had no share in the removal of Khrushchev, but his barefoot outburst helped immeasurably in making his ouster popular. The Russian people forgive no breach of dignity by their rulers.

A high Soviet official told a French diplomat who had tried to explain why the French allowed General de Gaulle to resign, "I don't understand, when we have a good czar we keep him." To the average Russian, Stalin fulfilled the role of a good czar—distant, aloof and authoritarian—and Khrushchev did not. So Khrushchev's great accomplishment on behalf of truth and enlightenment counts only with the handful who think like my democratic scholar friend.

The plodding and insecure team that followed the reasonably benevolent dictator it toppled is not the pure evil that the Soviet

Union endured for three decades in the person of Stalin. It is doubtful that Brezhnev and his associates possess the perverted greatness and the evil boldness of vision that enabled Stalin to rule his anarchic and amorphous realm by sheer terror. They are ruling, instead, by sheer weight, a concentrated bureaucratic mass of heavy specific gravity that presses down on the loose mass below but moves very little. They have made no bold departures, at home or abroad, except the negative initiatives of undoing some of Khrushchev's most disastrous agricultural errors immediately after they took power and invading Czechoslovakia last year. How then does the Soviet Union look after five years of such rule?

To see the country in meaningful perspective, a foreigner must try to view it through the eyes of Russians with whose way of looking at the world he can identify. They must be people who through a mysterious alchemy of their own have managed to shake off the never-ending pressures on all Soviet citizens to forget that Russia was once part of the world in cultural and political tradition.

The foreigner's own vision during his stay in the inhospitable country is distorted by his being forced to live in compartments and passageways reserved to outsiders, rigidly screened off from the realities of life in the Soviet Union. It is possible for the foreigner to make friends with those few who because of their hunger for contact with the life and culture of the world they are not allowed to visit and from no disloyalty to their own country, which they love, cast aside normal Soviet fears and associate with foreigners. I never dared ask any of my Soviet friends to what harassment from the authorities this may have exposed them.

They were intelligent men and women of various arts and professions, some young, and some not so. I love them not only because they dared to walk past the policeman posted at the entrance to the foreigners' ghetto in which I was required to live, but also because they were all that made my two years in the Soviet Union bearable. In the mass of homogenized homo Sovieticus—the "New Man" Pravda is so fond of boasting the Soviet system has created—they were the only human beings who retained the familiar virtues and vices of the world beyond, individuals with whom normal communication on any subject was possible. Their conversation did not have to be translated from the special Soviet vocabulary. They proved to resilience of the spirit under the most concentrated onslaught that has ever been mounted against it.

There is no letup ever in the process of converting men, women and children into homo Sovieticus and to prevent backsliding. It is hardly possible to leave one's home without being constantly confronted by banners, posters and billboards bearing slogans. Stepping into the street, he may be greeted by a poster declaring that the ever-present Lenin lived, lives and will live, or urging him to work for the victory of Communism. On the bus, he is likely to face a sign celebrating the glory of the Soviet people, or of labor, or of the army. Arriving at his job he may find the uniqueness of Marxism-Leninism proclaimed. The posters are alike in the repetitiveness of the slogans, low quality of design and draftsmanship, and hideous colors.

Soviet newspapers are made up in great part of sermonizing articles. Whether they deal with achievements of the petrochemical industry, relations with Afghanistan or the successes of amateur choral groups, the tone is heavily self-satisfied, calling on all concerned to continue the good work for the greater glory of Communism and the fatherland.

Radio and television news broadcasts are songs of praise to the Soviet Union and hymns of hatred to the other side, known collectively as the imperialists, and to Com-

munist China. Announcements of Soviet achievements—the winning of an Olympic gold medal in weight lifting or a successful venture in space—are usually preceded by fanfares, and the announcer speaks in nobly solemn tones, reserved elsewhere for the death of kings. Programs abound in patriotic poems with interminable numbers of verses.

There are compulsory political education meetings at places of work and in schools, required courses in Marxism-Leninism, meetings of the party and its affiliates, obligatory participation in May Day parades, protest marches against the foes of the Soviet Union and similar festivities. (These activities have been stepped up since the plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee in April, 1968, when, in response to the liberalization then under way in Czechoslovakia, an intensification of the "ideological struggle" was called for.)

The result of this sustained cradle-to-grave barrage of stridently one-sided propaganda, unrelieved by the expression of differing views, has been an almost total deafening of political receptiveness on the part of the overwhelming majority of Russians. "We have to turn off our ear trumpets to be able to live," an establishment Russian said to me during the ballyhoo that preceded the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1967.

Thus, the never-ending wave of *agitprop* (agitation and propaganda) has produced the most nonpolitical large nation on earth. The contrast between the loudness of the propaganda and the sullenness of the response is astounding. There is more concern, for instance, among Americans for the plight of their long-suffering North Vietnamese foes than there is among their Soviet allies, who are exposed to ceaseless propaganda on behalf of their fighting comrades.

In a way, the present heavy-handed and unenterprising leadership looks like the most truly representative Government the Soviet people have had. Russians of independent mind say that the lethargic and unimaginative Brezhnev team is the Government the Russian people deserve. Just as their leaders, the overwhelming mass of the people seem possessed by feelings of inferiority, blinded by ignorance of the world outside, fearful of taking initiative and unwilling to accept responsibility for their fate.

"But what can we do? We have no power and no rights," the bright and beautiful wife of a friend said with a sigh when the parallel between the leaders and the led was discussed.

"And we will continue to deserve what we get as long as we look at it like this," her husband turned on her angrily. "This is the way we stand before authority," he said, lowering his head in mock submissiveness and holding out his arms, crossed at the wrists, like a prisoner's. "That's the great Russian people."

"It takes courage to demand freedom openly, as you do," I said.

"No," he replied, still angry. "Courage comes from here or here," he continued, pointing to his head and heart. "With me it's here," he said, jabbing his stomach with the same finger. "I just can't live with it."

This unwillingness to coexist with the system is exceedingly rare, even among intellectuals. The Soviet people don't seem to object to things done to them nor things done to others in their name. The throttling of hope for internal freedom has aroused no more open discontent than the aggression against Czechoslovakia. There was almost no spontaneous public reaction to the invasion of last August. Even months after the event, it appeared as though it was a visitor's questions that first prompted people to define their own reactions. The answers revealed two prevalent attitudes, indicative of how Russians view the world.

One was inferiority feelings expressed in remarks like, "Why were the Czechs shouting so much anyway? We know they already have a great deal more than we do, so what else do they want? Serves them right. We have to pay the bill one way or the other."

Most Russians are convinced that their allies sponge mercilessly on the Soviet budget. They consider this an act of particular ingratitude because they feel that the Soviet Union has already made enormous sacrifices for them by liberating them in World War II. The number of Soviet soldiers buried in Czechoslovakia was frequently cited as an argument against liberalization in that country.

Cynicism about all political statements, from any government, was equally prevalent. The average Russian believes that all governments lie most of the time. They may not believe their own Government's explanation of the invasion, but they also believe that all major powers are rapacious. "It was either us or you together with the West Germans," was a frequent comment on the fate of Czechoslovakia.

Russians explain that the blend of political apathy and cynicism derives from a Russian attitude toward government that is far older than the Soviet system. Government is considered by the average Russian to be an unavoidable evil with which he feels no sense of identification. His optimum expectation from government is that it will stay far away, in Moscow, and not pay too close attention to what he is doing. Then he will continue to get away with as much shirking on the job, petty theft of government property and general cutting of corners as he can.

In this respect, the Soviet dictatorship is far removed from Hitler's Germany. The Kremlin rules over an anarchic people, keeping them nonmutinous but failing to instill in them the fanatic discipline and unquestioning obedience that distinguished the Nazi regime.

Although the Soviet Union makes a cult of labor and claims to have created a New Man who rejects the greed and cupidity of the capitalist societies and forsakes personal gain for the benefit of the *kollektiv*, the actual workdodging and inefficiency of labor and the single-minded concentration on the acquisition of material possessions are one of the great initial surprises to foreigners.

Western businessmen and visitors are struck by such things as the overstaffing and absurdly intricate bureaucracy of business organizations, the amount of time workers spend sitting at their work sites without actually working, the frequency with which construction equipment stands idle at one site while its absence is obviously making workers idle at another and the amount of building material stacked away at construction projects, often deteriorating from exposure, while no work is done.

"I bought more than 50 rubles worth of groceries the other day at the supermarket because my wife and the children are going to spend the summer in a *dacha* far from any store," a friend reported. "I imagine in America the shopkeeper would be very happy with such a big customer. But look what has happened to such normal instincts in Russia."

"First, the old woman with the abacus who adds up the bill complained because I bought so much. Then the people waiting behind me joined in, and the other women working in the store. There was a whole group around me. 'Why should you buy so much?' they asked, or 'He must be profiteering on a black market somewhere,' or 'Where did you get so much money, comrade?' They refused to let me buy it."

My friend is a mild-mannered man with a firm belief that the Soviet Constitution and laws allow more individual rights than So-

viet citizens have the spirit to claim. Nothing will change for the better in the Soviet Union, he believes, until this spirit is aroused. He insisted on his right to buy all the groceries he wanted and demanded to see the manager. He came, not because my friend asked for him, but because others had complained to him about my friend.

"The manager asked me the same questions as the others, but I told him it was none of his business and asked him on what grounds he refused to sell me what I wanted to buy. He said he didn't have to tell me but finally, because he realized that I was in the right and would not give in, he gave in. He said that this time he would let me buy all that but don't do it again, comrade.

"What happened next would also not happen in America, I think. The woman adds up on her abacus what you bought and you take the slip to the cash register to pay. But nobody trusts anybody in this country, so no slip can be for more than three rubles. Otherwise, I guess, somebody could put a one before the three and collect 13 rubles' worth of goods and pay only three. So the limit is three. My 50 rubles' worth had to be divided in groups worth no more than three rubles each and separate slips written for each. And the people behind me started to argue all over again because they had to wait while the woman did this.

"If you understand all the tragedy and all the comedy of trying to buy 50 rubles' worth of groceries in the most modern store in the capital of this great country, you Westerners will understand what it means to be a Russian," my friend said. "And the greatest irony is that the only ideal of most Russians is to live like you Americans do. But their ideal is limited to your material life. The ideals of this country are the ideals of your bourgeoisie."

How does the spirit of an intelligent and sensitive man survive in so hostile an atmosphere? "By blotting out your sensitivity as early as you can and using your intelligence to get the most out of the system," a Russian, who has never tried either, said. But many have followed that pattern, giving rise to a class of intellectuals of extraordinary cynicism.

On a recent visit to the Academy of Science of the Soviet Republic of Georgia, a dozen academicians talked with me over glasses of the sweet local champagne. They were distinguished men from various academic disciplines, sure of their value and high station. Their ease and bearing, the cut and cloth of their suits, the fact that they had traveled abroad, set them apart from Soviet Man, even of high rank. They would have looked at home at the United League; they were the most worldly group I met in the Soviet Union.

But what these extraordinary men said on any subject—the moral problems of scientists, youth questioning established values, the role of the modern university, Czechoslovakia, China—was Soviet-ordinary. Soviet intellectuals who have made it speak about the great issues in the same terms as politically well-drilled farmers or mechanics. The language is that of Pravda.

The problems I raised, they said, were strictly the problems of the West, did not exist in the Soviet Union and could never arise. Soviet scientists are not bothered by the knowledge that much of their research might some day be used to blow up the world because they know their country would never make aggressive war. Soviet youth is joyous and happy in the knowledge that it is living in the best of all possible worlds and knows that it will get even better. Problems in the university? What problems? Not here. There was never a wink or the redeeming shadow of a doubt.

The few who have not sold out suffer, mostly in silence. To possess a sense of truth and beauty when one must live surrounded

by lies and ugliness is painful. When I told a friend that a mutual friend, a Westerner, had fallen ill from the bitterness of living in the Soviet Union, the Russian asked, "How long has he been here?"

"Three years."

"And I've been here for 43," the 43-year-old Russian said dryly.

An artist whose work is not exhibited and who drives a taxi because he says he cannot bear to work in a Soviet organization said, "You may not believe me, but I spend 80 per cent of my vital energy just on remaining human." It takes that much energy, he explained, actively resisting the influence of the ceaseless propaganda, resisting getting depressed by the ugliness of so much of material life and objects, studying English, French and German to be able to listen to Western news broadcasts and trying to find at least moderately attractive things with which to decorate the one room he and his wife have in an old apartment, in which they share kitchen and bath with five other tenants.

Most Russian consumer goods—clothes, furniture, utensils—are ugly. Former Western residents who return to Moscow these days are struck by the improvement they see in this respect, and Russians say that that is true, but things are still far from beautiful—only less ugly. Houses being built now, for example, are no longer the richly ugly confections of the Stalinist period—like the All-Union Exhibition of Economic Achievements in Moscow, or the entire city of Minsk—but resemble the drabest of modern Western buildings. And the same buildings are going up from one end of the country to the other. Arriving in Khabarovsk from Moscow, after eight hours of flight and 3,800 miles further east, one has the sensation of never having gotten off the ground. The scene is the same.

Because of the ugliness of Soviet cities, those who respond to beauty like to visit regions that have not yet been Soviet for a long time and retain a European aspect—like the Baltic countries, or the Carpathian region annexed from Czechoslovakia after World War II—or undeveloped and exotic parts of Central Asia, Siberia or the Caucasus. For similar reasons, household objects and clothes of peasant origin are greatly prized by people of taste. But there is no relief for such people from the pervasive barrenness of cultural life.

The major novels of Alexander Solzhenitsyn circulate in Moscow only in typescript or in Russian-language editions brought in from the West. Most works of originality and imagination do not even have underground circulation. They are written "for the drawer" of the writer's desk in the feeble hope of a better day. Room for innovation in theater, music and dance is infinitesimal. Yuri Lyubimov, director of the Haganka Theater, the most adventurous in Moscow, is proudest of his production of "Ten Days That Shook the World," after John Reed's book. His daring has consisted in staging a rhetorical and clumsily propagandistic play in the manner of the German expressionist theater of the twenties. Even such a deviation from the prevailing Socialist realism is considered daring modernism.

The Bolshoi Opera and Ballet are dusty museums of outdated styles, with repertoires that, with few exceptions, leap directly from the Romantic to the Soviet period. A conductor, asked whether he saw any possibility of mounting Berg's "Wozzeck" at the Bolshoi, replied sadly, "We haven't even reached Wagner and Strauss yet." Concert and recital programs are equally unadventurous, and, because of the infrequency of performance, those works of the later repertoire that turn up tend to be badly and unidiomatically played. The plight of the composer of genuinely modern music—not of the spurious, folk-derived, approved style—is even sadder than that of the writer, poet or

painter who works for his desk drawer. The composer's work is incomplete without performance.

The museums of the Soviet Union are filled with acres of academic and bigger-than-life paintings of the approved school. It is ironic and sad that on this level of creation the ideal communication between the creator and the public seems to exist far more fully than in the West, where works of originality and imagination often go unnoticed. I have seen groups of eager people seriously discussing and appreciating the works of nonart that face them. Equally sad is the fact that very few of the "underground" painters whose work is seen only in their houses or at friends', show enough talent to be taken seriously.

Alcohol is the great substitute for printing, performance or exhibition for people with creative talent. Haunted by the absence of the essential public for the works they have created or feel stirring within them, they drown their gifts in vodka. It destroys the talent first and the man later.

People of artistic and intellectual predilections look for ivory towers in which they can lead satisfying lives without having to prostitute themselves. They may find their havens in mathematical linguistics, or musicology, or pre-Columbian art. A woman, replying seriously to the joking question what her year-and-a-half-old son would be when he grew up, said, "A classicist, it's safe." But for every Solzhenitsyn or Voznesensky, or those who write in the hope of some day being published, for every painter and musician who lives as an artist only in the stillness of his room, there are thousands whose integrity as men and artists is tempered by the all too human wish to live well and raise their children in tranquillity.

And for every Sinyavsky or Daniel, or Larisa Daniel, or Pavel Litvinov, or Aleksandr Ginzburg, or Yuri Galanskov, or Pyotr Grigorenko, or Pyotr Yakir, or Natasha Gorbanevskaya—the heroic and lonely few who, like my friend, cannot coexist with the system and must say so—there are hundreds of others who see the same wrongs but have not found the tongue and the heart to say so, and thousands who also see them but pretend that they don't, and hundreds of thousands who hate those that say so, because to say so is rocking the boat and the rulers reward a peaceful, well-behaved citizenry with more bread, and it is bread most Russians want and not freedom.

The hopeful image of the Soviet Union still common in the West is so wrong that even some strongly anti-Soviet groups are basing their protests on unduly positive ideas. The Jewish groups that protest, justifiably, against the deprivation of full cultural and religious rights from Soviet Jews raise the impression that the 3,000,000 Soviet Jews are asking such rights and are heartened by such demands from beyond the borders. The truth is blacker.

The typical Soviet Jew feels, like other Soviet citizens, deprived of his human right, only more so. He knows he lives in a country that is as anti-Semitic as the rest of Eastern Europe. But he is not outraged. He knows his place. He hopes that he will be left alone, if he keeps quiet, and his brothers abroad do the same. And who knows, perhaps, if he is allowed to live in peace, some day a leader will come along who will not require a Jew to be twice as good as all the other candidates to get the job.

The doubtful image of the Soviet Union as a country that, while somewhat behind the West in standards of living and freedom, is heading in the same direction is due, I believe, to the unswerving commitment of the United States and the rest of the West to the unproved idea that the peace of the world can be assured only by assuring the Soviet Union of our wide span of tolerance.

To a Czechoslovak, it would be difficult to see the difference between this policy and what was once known derisively as "appeasement," an idea that proved notably unsuccessful in dealing with Hitler.

Why should the average citizen of the West think too badly of the Soviet Union when the total American riposte to the rape of Czechoslovakia by broad daylight was a brief delay both in the negotiations about arms-reduction negotiations and the tour of the Soviet Union by the University of Minnesota Band? (The belated arrival of the Midwestern pipers and drummers in April came, fittingly, at the time Moscow finished the Prague job with the removal of the liberal Czechoslovak party leaders.)

The Soviet Union has also been remarkably successful in creating conditions in which Western news media find it difficult to present a true and complete image of the country. The methods are crude pressure or gentle persuasion and they work.

By crude pressure, the authorities have frightened the bulk of the 100 or so Western correspondents into thinking twice before writing an article that might expose them to warning, retaliation or expulsion. The threat of being expelled hangs over Western newsmen, and those who think twice almost always conclude that expulsion is a greater evil than silence.

The Western news agencies have minimized their coverage of Soviet dissidents, for example, because their bureaus might be closed and they would find it difficult to sell their service if it did not include the vital Moscow dateline. As a result, their junior correspondents, some of the brightest journalists in town, find it impossible to write the stories they have gathered.

Among the senior resident correspondents, there are representatives of important newspapers whose chief stock-in-trade is expertise on the Soviet Union. For them, expulsion might mean the end of their journalistic careers or, at least, recall to less profitable assignments at the home office. It proves an effective deterrent to full coverage. Similarly, visiting scholars tend to pull their punches when writing because their careers will be enhanced by being allowed to visit the country in which they specialize.

Because of the physical and professional discomforts of working in Moscow, there are newspapers who find their Moscow bureaus a staffing problem. They tend to send journalists who are easily persuaded that, news being difficult to come by and social life in the artificially self-enclosed foreign community free and easy, there is no great point in trying. This attitude endears them to the authorities, who reward them with the things that in most other countries are free to all journalists: the right to travel, to see innocuous public figures in pursuit of non-political stories and to attend public events.

Radio-television correspondents know that if they say unfriendly things on radio they are likely to find their next request to do a television show turned down or their film held up from shipping until it has lost its news value. Since the glory is in television rather than radio, some correspondents tend to keep themselves in check in their radio news and commentaries. This is particularly true for correspondents from Western countries that control their broadcasting networks and cultivate good relations with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's power to intimidate correspondents derives from the extraordinary controls it puts on their activities. The press department of the Foreign Ministry insists that all contacts journalists have with Russians for the purpose of gathering news must be cleared through it, as well as all travel beyond the suburbs of Moscow. In effect, this means that a correspondent who is considered less than friendly will not be

allowed to leave Moscow or to write even about such noncontroversial subjects as plans for the Moscow musical season or electric shock therapy. Dozens of such requests that I made must still be in the files of the ministry. They went unanswered because Soviet authorities do not like to say no.

In return, there are rewards for well-behaved correspondents. An agency reporter who derisively refers to political dissenters as professional protesters may find himself getting news of a Soviet space shot an hour before his competitors, an important coup.

Because the Soviet Union has made it so difficult for journalists to gather news, it has been able to create a source of foreign-currency earnings by selling news it refuses to give. This part of foreign trade is conducted through Novosti, a news agency believed to be controlled by the K.G.B., the secret police. Its agents, posing as fellow journalists, put newsmen or authors of books in contact with Russians who can be relied upon to present the glossiest facade of the Soviet Union. The fee for the service averages \$50 a day.

Because of the dearth of real news from the Soviet Union, a great part of the material published in the West is speculative. There may have been a time when the science of Kremlinology—the divining of what may be going on within the Soviet leadership—had its uses. During the reign of Khrushchev, when the leader himself spoke publicly not only to his people but also to journalists, and when various Soviet newspapers were known to represent different centers of power, a study of the minutiae could yield bits of information. But even in the heyday of Kremlinology it must be observed that none of the practitioners, in Moscow, in editorial offices or in foreign ministries, perceived any signs that Khrushchev's hold was slipping.

Perhaps to avoid being caught out once again, Kremlinologists are feverishly active now, picking over the scantiest of material. Brezhnev and his colleagues rarely speak, and when they do it is hard to tell their last speech from their previous one, which may have been two years ago. The closest readers of the press find nothing but leaden uniformity. The wisest of the diplomats are the first to admit their ignorance of whether there is a struggle for power in the Kremlin and who is on whose side.

When I arrived in July, 1967, Aleksandr N. Shelepin had just been assigned to head the trade union organization. All experts were agreed that for a member of the ruling Politburo this was a serious demotion. He was down but not quite out. Since then, all that has happened to Shelepin is that he also has been removed from his Central Committee secretaryship. Yet as I left Moscow, the same experts were convinced, without further knowledge, that Shelepin was now the major threat to Brezhnev's power.

With the total absence of reliable Soviet sources, and the secrecy in which the leaders of the Soviet Union conduct their affairs, newspaper readers should have the right to demand that Moscow correspondents take a pauper's oath, confessing that they do not and cannot know what goes on inside the Kremlin. If tomorrow's newspapers brought news that the new leader of the Soviet Communist party is Ivan V. Gusev, until yesterday a regional chief in the boondocks, I would be no more or no less surprised than if five years from now the leader were still Leonid I. Brezhnev.

Soviet democrats refuse to build hopes on the possibility of a leadership change. No known political personality is presently suspected of liberal tendencies, but so little is known about anybody that there seems no more ground for pessimism than for optimism—only ignorance.

"We live in a perfect vacuum," a world-

weary, aging painter, who long ago despaired of being allowed to be an artist, said, "except for fear. It is the only freedom left to us—the freedom to fear."

NEW SYSTEM FOR AUTO ELECTRICITY DEVELOPED BY ESSEX INTERNATIONAL OF FORT WAYNE, IND.

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a revolutionary computerized energy system and automotive control system which will replace automotive circuitry was recently unveiled by Essex International, Inc., of Fort Wayne, Ind. Consumers will be greatly benefited by this system as the system is more reliable, and makes trouble diagnosis easier, parts are replaced easier, design flexibility is increased, assembly procedures are better, and it results in improved safety with more driver convenience. The following description of the system appeared in the August 5 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

ESSEX INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPS NEW SYSTEM FOR AUTO ELECTRICITY—COMPUTER-ACTIVATED SIGNALS SEEN REPLACING CIRCUITS; OUTPUT OF COMPONENTS STARTS IN FALL

FORT WAYNE, IND.—Essex International Inc. introduced a new electronic computerized control system designed to replace electrical circuitry now used in automobiles.

The system, called Computerized Energy Distribution and Automated Control System, or Cedac for short, is expected to be in component production this fall. Paul W. O'Malley, Essex president, said. The target date for full-system placement in cars is the mid-1970s. Essex also is introducing a new computer to be used in diagnosing automotive problems.

Commenting on the complex electrical wiring systems now used in automobiles, Mr. O'Malley said that Cedac "utilizes electronic signal information, along with electric and pneumatic power, and virtually does away with the automotive electrical system as it is known today by eliminating most of the terminal connectors and electrical wires."

In place of the present automobile wiring method, which utilizes hundreds of electrical circuits, the Essex system will use only three electrical wires and one pneumatic air tube, he said.

Through a "matchbox-sized computer" the system will control a wide range of automobile operations including power doors that lock at a predetermined speed, electronically controlled power windows and safety lighting. The computer will be connected to a single energy distribution and control harness, which will be routed to sensors and actuators about the size of nail heads.

Other possible uses, the executive noted, include a digital display panel that will give the driver instantaneous speed readouts, engine revolutions per minute, oil pressure, fuel level, time, engine and car temperatures, and lamp outage warnings.

With the increased emphasis placed on automotive products, Mr. O'Malley estimated that by 1978 Essex's sales to the auto industry would amount to \$550 million annually. The automotive product market accounted for \$142 million of Essex's \$426 million sales total in 1968.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING GOES TO MORGAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL TO STUDY DECENTRALIZATION AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, this summer the House Republican Task Force on Education and Training has focused its attention on the problems of urban education. We have found that one of the most frequently voiced complaints is that the large and rigid bureaucratic structure of many big city school systems prevent response to the special needs voiced by members of individual communities.

It has been suggested that administrative decentralization and community control of schools offer solutions to some of the persistent problems of urban education.

In an attempt to find out more about both the problems of urban education and their possible solutions, the task force met at the Morgan School on August 8 with a cross section of the educational community in Washington, D.C. There we gained firsthand knowledge about Washington, D.C.'s, experimental projects in decentralization and community participation, and we learned more about the nature and extent of the problems urban educators confront daily. Finally, we came away with added knowledge about the effects of community participation in school decision-making.

A summary of the major points brought out at that meeting follows:

SUMMARY OF MEETING AT MORGAN SCHOOL
GUESTS

Dr. John Sessions: Elected at-large to the D.C. Board of Education, he has been instrumental in the Board's approval of the Washington pilot projects in community participation and control of schools.

Sylvester Williams: An Assistant to the Superintendent of the D.C. Public School system, presently serving as Coordinator for the Special Projects Division. (The Special Projects Division coordinates the four community based projects in the Washington area: Morgan Community School, Anacostia Community School Project, Model School Division, and Fort Lincoln New Town.)

William Rice: Director of the Anacostia Community School Project, a subsystem of 10 schools governed by a locally-elected Community Planning Council. Mr. Rice was the past director of the Special Projects Division.

Charles Cheng: Assistant to the President of the Washington Teachers' Union. The Washington Teachers' Union, a local of the nationally-organized American Federation of Teachers, has been directly involved in the planning of the community school project and strongly favors local involvement.

John Anthony: Principal of the Morgan Community School, nationally acclaimed for its large degree of functional autonomy and local control. The Morgan Community School Board has been granted the responsibilities for expenditure of funding, and control of both curriculum and personnel.

Josephine Butler: Chairman of the Morgan

Community School Board, elected from the community and composed of parents, community leaders, young adults (ages 16-23) and teachers.

Julian West: Director of the Special Projects Division in the Office of the Superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PRESENT

John Dellenback, of Oregon.

Margaret M. Heckler, of Massachusetts.

Earl B. Ruth, of North Carolina.

(Each guest was asked to express his views regarding the major problems and possible solutions confronting education in Washington, D.C.)

REMARKS

SESSIONS. Our need is for a system that is more responsive than the highly bureaucratic structure we have. But the procedures developed at Morgan School are showing the ways in which a school can be responsive to the needs of the community.

There are special problems which come from being in the District of Columbia. The most difficult of these is that the Morgan School Board wants powers that the D.C. Board itself does not possess. But when this happens, we try to work around the situation.

For example, this building we're meeting in today is going to be replaced and the Morgan School Board wanted to choose the architect responsible for designing the new structure. The D.C. School Board couldn't delegate this responsibility to the Morgan Board for the simple reason that the city government has the right to select the architect. We eventually managed to work it out, and Morgan was able to choose its own architect.

But, we still often feel that the D.C. Board of Education would be low on the list of people who control education in this city.

WILLIAMS. The most difficult thing has been the attempt on the part of the school system to move into more responsive programs. The Morgan pilot project represents one division's efforts to cut red tape and allow for meeting special needs.

Internal operation within the school system is difficult because the people inside are more concerned with what you can't do than how you can get something done. We must try to change the "can't do's", but we keep meeting with resistance from upper echelon people who are already oriented to a certain way of doing something.

Much of our time is also spent in encounters with the D.C. Government. It often seems that when the Superintendent and the Board of Education have tried to facilitate things, they have run into the D.C. Government and it then becomes a question of the school people against the city government. One example of this concerns the question of interpreting building codes.

We also find ourselves in direct involvement with other government agencies trying to bring about change.

Another difficult task is relating to the community. People were initially suspicious of the system, and at Morgan we had to develop a posture not of supervising but of facilitating their needs.

The biggest problem, though, is making the school responsive is its bureaucratic structure, with all the clerks, secretaries and aides who cut off any attempts at work and improvement somewhere along the line. The answer to this is to deal only with the heads of departments, but this isn't always possible.

Central Boards of Education don't really give up that much, and they can bring about great changes and involvement by letting the people in the communities make their own decisions. The local people can set up priorities that are more realistic than those of the central board.

RICE. What should our role as public edu-

cators be? To listen and then to translate what the community is saying into programs. We cannot turn away from their needs.

The ingredients for success include dedication, a friendly school board, a friendly administration and a friendly teachers' union. Our people, poor people, come to the meetings without fail, even refusing to allow themselves, or us, a vacation. The community has grown in sophistication because they sat down and thought things over. The Board has supported us, although there were questions.

The community holds the system accountable for all their children. Educating 90% is not enough anymore and they refuse to consign 10% to the garbage heap. Instead, they are willing to help in order to see that every kid gets an education. In fact, over 175 community people are being used as reading assistants and in other capacities, and they are taking quite an active part in the running of the schools.

CHENG. The teachers and the community should be natural allies in fighting for a just school system. Right now, however, teachers are not being involved in many decisions, or even consulted about room design in the new building. This failure of teachers to make decisions stems from other, higher-up people who don't allow it. They have no say in forming the curriculum they have to teach and are often denied the opportunity to use supplies that are on hand in the same building because of stingy principals who enforce a quota system.

I do not share Mr. Rice's view that there is a friendly administration. Many principals have left the Anacostia project because they could not work with the community. While some of the people downtown are friendly, others would like to get rid of these two men. In fact, the school administration is supposedly holding up the transfer of two teachers because it doesn't like this project.

The greatest tragedy of education is the professional isolation of teachers from social issues such as Vietnam and housing. With their Alice-in-Wonderland attitude, the closest they come to politics is listening to the Huntley-Brinkley Report in the evening. Teachers should be involved, concerned with housing and welfare and active in the issues important to their communities.

Finally, the Teachers' Union is supporting community control. Not only have we written a paper taking this stand, but we have implemented the paper by working in Morgan, Anacostia and other projects. And we have developed a subcontract, similar to that of the UAW, whereby the union would supplement existing contracts to meet the needs of teachers in special projects such as this.

ANTHONY. The role of the educator must be redefined to include commitment, dedication and action.

A key issue is the red tape which the school must go through. An example, right here at Morgan, concerns the supplies we requested for the last school year—they didn't arrive until May.

It's not that the school system didn't have them; it just took that long to process our request. How can we provide an education when this happens?

Then, there is a serious problem in the inadequate financing of Morgan School. Until the necessary funds to support quality education are available, a truly responsive school is impossible. How can we provide compensatory education when we don't even receive as much as the regular per pupil expenditure allocated out in the suburbs.

We have been able to depart from the traditional system to some extent here at Morgan School. We have tried to get a relevant program here by dealing with the problems of the community and the children.

There is a unique amount of input in terms of the participation of the parents. The Morgan Community School Board is made up of 15 members: 7 parents, 3 community representatives, 3 young adults from the community (ages between 16-23), and two staff representatives (one community intern and one professional representative). We feel this gives us a good cross-section of community and staff on our board.

Educators often have been frightful of getting involved with the problems and leery of possible backlash. But here they have found that we all contribute to meeting the needs of the community, and are accountable to the community.

The school should fit the community and should take its style and character from the community.

BUTLER. My interest in schools was first aroused when I discovered that the textbooks being used in the Junior High School were printed in 1919 and predicted that some day man would fly nonstop across the Atlantic.

By working with problems like this, we came to the conclusion that community control is the only answer. We know the problems. People here take pride in their schools and that is why we have gone as far as we have—everybody here is involved.

But when we talk about decentralization, sometimes I wonder whether we are just adding another layer rather than helping things.

WEST. When our people hear what is going on in the schools, they become dissatisfied; They want what everyone wants: an intelligent population.

I attended a meeting at Adams, the new community school, last night. They are still not united about what they want, but they are one rung up because Morgan has opened the way for them. They will never have to go through the pain Morgan went through.

Community control has meant that we now have to know so much more about the whole bureaucracy than before. We have to deal with HUD, the RLA, the National Capital Planning Commission, with those concerned with licensing and inspection and contracts. And this places a burden on the community.

HECKLER. I have certainly gained a new insight here today in an area where I felt a lack of understanding before. It is great to see how much the community has been aroused. Jo Butler, a member of the community but not a mother herself, has shown us that the people care. And I'm relieved to hear about the involvement of the teachers. A child who goes to school where the whole community cares will be a different person.

One thing still unanswered, though, is the question of objective criteria. Do tests and academic records show educational progress?

ANTHONY. Yes, Morgan is way up in improvement. SCAT and STEP tests were administered last year and Morgan was one of six schools in the entire District of Columbia (which includes 176 schools) to show progress. It raised its scores significantly and this year its reading levels were at the national norms.

DELLENBACK. It's interesting to note that out in the West, in many areas, they are still trying to improve education by bringing small isolated schools together while here, in a large city, they are trying to improve education by making school units smaller. So we can see things moving in opposite directions at the two extremes.

RUTH. What we are really talking about here is a battle for the reins. The more involved, the better if they all cooperate. The community could discover that a text being used was printed in 1919, but does the community feel able to choose the correct text to replace it?

RICE. The community doesn't want to take over the school. There must be a definition of roles. The people don't want to be the teachers and they know that the

professional must handle things like selecting the texts.

RUTH. Is the community group more interested in enriching the program or in taking it over?

RICE. They're interested in getting the best possible education. They chose teachers from a list according to their qualifications. When I pointed out that many of those selected were white, they stuck to their choices because they wanted the most qualified teachers, regardless of race.

RUTH. What if someone tries to use the community board to his own advantage?

RICE. People know when you start preaching your own sermon.

RUTH. If Anthony resigns as principal, who would decide on his replacement?

ANTHONY. The board. This has already happened, in fact, when we lost the principal we had last year.

RUTH. Do the other districts dislike Morgan's having this kind of privilege?

WILLIAMS. Yes.

DELLENBACK. How is the Board selected?

BUTLER. The whole community participates.

ANTHONY. One month before the election, a petition is circulated by those interested in running and signatures are obtained. All those age 16 and older are eligible to vote.

DELLENBACK. How many voted?

ANTHONY. 400.

DELLENBACK. How many were eligible?

ANTHONY. 30,000 live in the entire Adams-Morgan area which is serviced by three elementary schools. But there are only 285 families represented in the Morgan School, although technically the entire district was eligible to vote.

DELLENBACK. Who chooses the three young representatives? Do the young people choose their own?

ANTHONY. Not yet.

DELLENBACK. Does the Board decide on courses?

ANTHONY. The principal does this. The teachers are picked by the people—the board interviews the teachers. Although the principal has veto power, it hasn't been used so far, and the Board hasn't overruled the school's selections.

DELLENBACK. What impact has community control had upon the curriculum?

ANTHONY. The curriculum is left to the teachers.

DELLENBACK. Is education different under community control?

ANTHONY. Yes, for example, Morgan has picked its own texts, entirely different ones from those we had before. They are still standard texts however. And we now have teaching teams, consisting of one coordinator and teachers for language arts, science, mathematics, and social studies, together with a community intern.

So far, there have been no real disagreements and the principal has not had to overrule any decisions. The teachers heading the teams decide on the general guideline concerning what to cover during the year, and then each teacher works together with her own team to decide how to approach her section.

DELLENBACK. Do teachers want to come here to teach?

ANTHONY. Yes, we have about 75 applications from all parts of the country. The salary here is comparable to other schools in large cities.

DELLENBACK. Why is the situation with the teachers' union so different here from New York City?

CHENG. There are several key differences in the two situations.

First, the blacks in New York had been unable to break into the system and you had a situation where the schools were 57% black and the teachers' union was almost entirely white. You don't have that kind of

racial polarization here. We have a black local here and a black system.

Second, the union leadership here at all times supported philosophically the community control concept, whereas in other places it has not.

Third, the only way to overcome the educational system was for the teachers and the community to come together. This has meant a political uplifting for all teachers. We can't separate community control from the black struggle for freedom.

Fourth, there are many young teachers coming in.

And last, the obsolete evaluation system has been used to intimidate and fail teachers, and now the community wants to see the procedures well used.

DELLENBACK. What effects have followed from the election of the D.C. School Board?

SESSIONS. The Board has been more responsive since the election. Even though the record hasn't been entirely successful and the elected board has spent too much time reinventing the wheel, it has been more responsive.

STUDENTS LEAGUE AGAINST NARCOTIC TEMPTATION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the narcotics problem is one of the most serious facing our Nation. This problem reaches into every community and is much more serious that we realize because of its growing influence on the youth of this country.

While we are well aware of the fact that there is a great deal of narcotics traffic in high schools and colleges, in some instances, according to reports, this drug problem is reaching into the elementary schools. This is a shocking revelation.

Every parent, every school, every church, and every community should be aware of this problem and be prepared to answer questions truthfully and frankly that young people may raise on drugs and the abusive use of them.

There are widespread pressures among the young to use dangerous drugs and, unless this situation is changed, as much as half of this generation of young people may acquire drug habits and crippling drug addiction.

In the past, our culture rejected drug addiction as improper and foreign to our way of life. The drug addict was an unpopular outcast. However, the general attack on all authority that is a part of the recent sweep of revolutionary forces has created a pressure to use drugs of all kinds and a drive to liberalize restrictive laws.

The drug user is unprepared to understand the long-range hazards of drugs. The individual whose personal experience with drugs has not yet created a serious problem for him is usually convinced that drug use is safe. Apparently only those who have had a frightening experience with drugs give them up.

Every community and every school has to some extent become infected with this newly unleashed social disease. It appears

that the entire problem can be traced to misinformation about drug use or abuse. To this end, I have cosponsored legislation which would authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the activities of the Students League Against Narcotic Temptation, formed in 1968. In this matter, I would like to include, as part of my remarks the SLANT position paper on bringing the truth about drugs to the school student.

The position paper follows:

SLANT POSITION PAPER

In a society where sickness is the exception rather than the rule and epidemic a word rarely used, a contagious disease is infecting a large portion of our teenage population.

The disease is drug addiction. It is contagious because those who contract it are more than willing to contaminate others. We have spawned it and insured its longevity by creating an environment conducive to its growth and development. The war and the uncertainty that it has caused, racial strife, and the great disparity between rich and poor have provided a ready market for the pushers and junkies who peddle "the stuff dreams are made of."

Drugs have become the "in" thing. More than one quarter of all the teenagers in the United States have experienced or are regular users of some form of narcotic or hallucinogen. At a time when adolescents are faced with the fears and seemingly hopeless problems involved with growing up, drugs provide at least a temporary escape. The hard core addict is still considered a social outcast, but the opposite holds true for those who experiment with marijuana or the hallucinogens such as LSD. Users of these so-called non-addictives often consider themselves the new intellectuals, seekers of the truth through experience. But to the contrary, drug usage is a sign of ignorance and mental instability.

The source of most addiction problems can be traced to information, or to be more exact, misinformation. Usually the only knowledge a teenager has about drugs has come from a pusher or a user with whom he has come in contact. The information they provide is misleading and distorted to their own point of view. They present an attractive picture of the experience to be gained by drug usage, but gloss over or completely avoid mentioning the ill effects. The unsuspecting teen usually learns the truth when it is too late. In order to counteract the spread of misleading information, an informational-educational program must be established.

While detection and apprehension by police agencies and rehabilitation represent necessary aspects of a program to combat addiction among teens, it is obvious that a program of prevention through education should hold first-rank priority. The degree of success obtained in the preventive sector determines the allocation of resources in the two remaining areas. Hence, it is of critical importance that maximum effort be given to this first line of defense. The first major step in this regard in our community was taken by Hudson County Prosecutor James A. Tumulty, Jr.

In September, 1968, Tumulty decided to take some positive steps in forming a drug preventive education program in the county's high schools and junior highs. As a result his office set up the "Students' League Against Narcotic Temptation" with Leonard Ford as

director. The program was to move along on three fronts. One major thrust was to be aimed at the teenage population in the schools. The second was directed toward teachers and administrators in the schools. The third was to obtain an increased awareness among all county residents as to the general nature and seriousness of the drug problem.

Initial steps in the preventive education sector included the recruiting of interested students from each school. Ironically, the response was so overwhelming that the success of the entire program was threatened. So many students volunteered their services that it was impossible to establish and train any workable size group for each of the schools. Clearly, a set of practical guidelines had to be written.

In November of 1968 Dr. Silvio R. Laccetti, an assistant professor of Humanities at Stevens Institute of Technology came to SLANT as an advisor. With his special insights into the problems of youth and education, he assumed the responsibility of setting up the necessary guideline to make SLANT a working organization. The result was the core-group concept; a small number of students in each of the county schools was chosen to serve as SLANT representatives, or workers. Their job is to conduct information programs within the school, arrange meetings, sponsor poster and essay contests and various other projects that will bring the truth about drugs to light.

SLANT operates on the premise that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and has set out to provide more than that proverbial ounce for the teenagers in the county's secondary schools. The program advocates a student-to-student approach; that is, one student is able to help another avoid the pitfalls of drug addiction. The program is by no means a police informant group. It is a sincere and honest effort of a group of students to offset a problem that affects a large segment of their peer group. It is unique in the fact that students have a chance to manage their own affairs. To emphasize the fact that SLANT is a program of students for students, the core-groups meet without any faculty supervision. However, the groups do seek advice and suggestions from faculty members.

Although SLANT operates in a particular school system, the problem cannot be solved in one location if efforts are not made to solve it everywhere else. Drug abuse is, as previously mentioned, a contagious disease, one that spreads rapidly. One infested area influences another uninfested area. Because the scope of the problem is so large, it is the opinion of the Students' League Against Narcotic Temptation that a preventive education program such as ours should be implemented in every community regardless of population or location. Only on such a scale can the full aims and hopes of SLANT be realized.

In conclusion we believe that the SLANT formula offers the best hope for halting the spread of drug abuse because

1. It seeks to involve young people in active and meaningful roles.
2. It relies on a peer group (student to student) approach.
3. It offers a real chance to change attitudes of young people throughout the nation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the suggested method of establishing a SLANT program in any individual community which wishes to combat the problem of drug use among its students. This is only a guideline to the actual setting up of a group of students who are eager to undertake this program and can be adjusted to fit any school group interested in working for the eradication of drugs use in their own school.

The suggested program follows:

You can be instrumental in helping to establish a SLANT program in your community. To guide you in your endeavors we set forth suggestions on how one might go about doing this.

I. GENERAL SLANT MEMBERSHIP

Announcement of the SLANT anti-drug program may be made to the entire student body at assembly. Invitations to general membership should be offered to all students. If a large registration results it will be necessary to isolate those students who are most interested and able to work in the program.

II. QUALIFICATIONS FOR STUDENTS OF THE CORE GROUP

(A) That they be conscientious students (not necessarily high average students) who have records of dependability throughout their school years.

(B) That they have limited extra-curricular activities, so that they may be available for planned SLANT activities. Availability and interest of the student are of the greatest importance to this group. Those students who are "joiners" will be of little service to the organization. One who is president of a half-dozen activities already has too much to do.

(C) That interested students volunteer officially through the principal's office by written registration.

When this procedure is complete, the Core group should meet as an extra-curricular club activity without any obvious direction from faculty. The group will, hopefully, consist of 30-40 students at most, with a close to equal representation from each class (in a Core group of 40 students, 10 students from each class might be members). From this group the SLANT Coordinating Committee (SCC) should be elected.

III. THE SLANT COORDINATING COMMITTEE

(1) This committee will consist of two students from each grade level who shall regulate the activities of the CORE group.

(2) The SCC shall fill vacancies caused by withdrawal.

After enough of these Core Groups have been set up in a given area, a Regional Slant Organization can be set up so that guidance may be given to the individual Core Groups.

IV. ACTIVITIES OF CORE GROUP

There can be no single schedule of activities for all schools since circumstances will vary in every instance. However, some or all of the following might be instituted:

1. Open-ended discussion about narcotics and drugs at regular meetings with a view to uncovering gaps in information and critical differences of opinion.
2. Sponsorship of essay contests: all SLANT members (the mass of certificate holders) might submit essays to the Core unit of its own evaluation. The best of such essays might be given publicity in school or local newspapers.
3. Sponsorship of poster contests: again, open to all SLANT certificate holders.
4. Maintenance of bulletin board and/or display case to influence and inform not only SLANT members but all in the school.
5. Assembling a "library" of pamphlets, articles, and student essays on drugs.
6. Attendance at outside educational programs, clinics, which may be given by local county, state, or federal agencies.
7. Periodic meetings of the group with the SCC.

V. DUTIES OF SCC

1. Maintain guidance of school program for SLANT.
2. Report to Core group on information received from regional organization if such organization exists.
3. Deal with outside agencies in preparation for in-school assemblies, talks, movies.

Given advance approval of school administration, SCC will contact appropriate people and set agendas.

4. Maintain communication with SCC of other schools in the region through the Regional Slant Organization.

VI. IF YOU ARE A PRIVATE CITIZEN OR PARENT WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Contact civic officials and the local board of education as to the possibility of establishing a SLANT program in the school system.

2. Bring the idea before the PTA and other civic organizations.

3. Enlist the support of the students in the schools, for without them, all efforts will surely fail.

VII. URGENCY OF THE PROBLEM

Daily, the spread of drug abuse continues. Every day of delay is a valuable day lost to the effort of containment. We urge you to act quickly today. Tomorrow is at stake.

MILITARY RACE RIOTS—THE EXPERIMENT A CONTINUING FAILURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some 20 years ago, President Harry S. Truman used his authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to conduct a social experiment of complete integration in the services.

There was not then, and there is not now, the slightest indication that this experiment improved the fighting quality of any military unit or increased the effectiveness or chances of survival of any member of the Armed Forces.

Artificial race mixing in military units will surely draw applause—and a certain number of votes—from people who have no military experience or responsibility.

It creates nothing but unnecessary problems in the unit effected.

As a combat soldier, I well know the mutual trust and respect which men who fight together must have for one another. Any situation which detracts from such unit feeling lessens the effectiveness of the military unit and endangers all of the men who serve in it.

After a generation, we see plainly the deterioration of military units brought about by this discredited social experiment.

We should admit its failure. It is an appalling thing for men serving in the uniform of their country to be attacked in their training centers by other men wearing the same uniform—their supposed comrades in arms.

These shameful disorders cannot be blamed on the men themselves. Nor can they be blamed on the leaders of our Armed Forces. Military race riots are the clearly demonstrated result of attempting to use the restrictions of military service to change social habits.

What the leaders of our country are going to have to decide is whether they are going to draft young men for an effective military force or for race-mixing sensitivity training by the numbers. Young Americans who associate with

members of other races in military service are not so easily fooled. They are going to form their own opinions from their own personal experiences, and are not going to be permanently influenced by sociological indoctrination. The failure should terminate.

I include several news clippings, as follow:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal & Constitution, Aug. 10, 1969]

LEJEUNE RIOT "WAS EXPECTED"—MARINE PANEL WARNED GENERAL 3 MONTHS AGO OF RACIAL DANGER

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON.—The commanding general of Camp Lejeune, N.C., was warned three months before a fatal racial clash there that a lack of leadership was contributing to an "explosive" racial situation at the Marine Corps facility.

The warning was contained in an April 23 report and statement of policy from an ad hoc committee appointed by Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Wheeler, commander of the 2nd Marine Division, who since has been transferred to Vietnam on Normal rotation.

"The lack of informed, courageous leadership in dealing with racial matters is widening the gulf of misunderstanding between the races," the committee of seven officers told Wheeler. The report, a copy of which has been obtained by The New York Times, also warned of "an explosive situation of major proportions has been created and continues to be aggravated."

Less than three months later—on July 20—a group of 30 Negro and Puerto Rican Marines attacked 14 whites after an enlisted men's dance in a fight that led to the death of one white enlisted man and severe injuries to another. Three Negroes and two Puerto Ricans two days ago were charged with murder, rioting and assault and now face a general court martial.

Cpl. Edward Bankston, 20, of Picayune, Miss., died of a fractured skull he received in the attack. Pfc. James S. Young, 19, of Rockledge, Ala., was badly injured but has recovered.

Maj. Gen. Michael P. Ryan, who succeeded Wheeler on May 19, has said there were "indications" but "no tangible evidence" that the Negro Marines were members of the Black Panther party.

Wheeler, in a letter last April 5 to Col. Louis S. Hollier, head of divisional personnel, asked that an ad hoc committee be set up to look into the question of equal treatment and opportunity and report to him.

Hollier headed the committee. Included were two Negro officers—Lt. Col. H. L. Maxwell, commander of the 1st Battalion, 6th Regiment (the battalion to which the Negroes and Puerto Ricans involved in the clash belonged) and Capt. Mel Nolley, an aviator. The committee reported to Wheeler on April 23 and also submitted "a proposed statement of policy."

The committee apparently intended the very frank report for the commanding general only but hoped the statement of policy which was equally blunt in its description of the situation, would be circulated within the command structure. This was not done.

One officer said that he suspected the document had not been distributed because "it was considered too open and shocking," and that he felt the committee's criticisms and recommendations had fallen "on deaf ears."

However, in a telephone interview Saturday, Hollier said that "the intent of the report was to bring the subjects in the problem areas to the attention of the general and not to circulate it."

He further said that the subject matter in the report had been circulated and "the problem has been the subject of detailed discussions."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 11, 1969]

MARINES HAD RACE-TENSION WARNING

CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.—The study report by a biracial group of officers warned in April an "explosive" racial situation existed in the Second Marine Division.

It added that "the lack of informed, courageous leadership in dealing with racial matters is widening the gulf of misunderstanding between the races."

The report was made public yesterday. On July 20 a brawl between white, Negro and Puerto Rican Marines at a base service club resulted in the death of one Marine and serious injury to a second.

The dead white Marine, Cpl. Edward Bankston, 20, of Picayune, Miss., suffered a fractured skull in the melee at a going-away dance at a servicemen's club. Authorities said 30 Negro and Puerto Rican Marines attacked 14 white Marines.

Five Negro and Puerto Rican enlisted men charged with murder in the case face general court-martial. A congressional subcommittee headed by Rep. William Randall, D-Miss., completed a preliminary investigation of the incident Saturday.

Maj. Gen. Michael P. Ryan, commander of the Second Marine Division, said he had studied the officers' report, ordered by former commander Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Wheeler, and completed April 23. After reading the report, Ryan said, "I discussed the situation with commanders and Gen. Wheeler. On the basis of these discussions, I prepared a division order" included in the platoon leader pamphlet.

Ryan said the officers' report, prepared by a panel headed by Col. Louis Hollier, divisional personnel head, "was not as appropriate as it should be."

That report, described as frank and bold, said "failure to take corrective steps to assure racial harmony would produce more deeply seated prejudices when the Marines left the service."

The report charged that white officers and noncommissioned officers were prejudiced and that black Marines were subject to discriminatory action by the military police.

It recommended that there be a continuing program of frank education on racial topics, and a revitalization of a program called "Request Mast" which allowed Marines to take personal problems directly to their superiors.

Ryan said his pamphlet covered all these areas. He said he had ordered his officers to review the "Request Mast" procedure and conceded that some enlisted men "simply distrust the system."

Ryan said he had constantly checked charges of NCO prejudice and found the charges were true in a limited number of cases.

"I don't think, however, that a general condemnation is right at all," he said.

Ryan said his pamphlet encouraged commanders to establish biracial discussion groups to promote "racial understanding and cohesiveness."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 12, 1969]

BLACK, WHITE SOLDIERS CLASH AT TWO BASES

Hundreds of Negro and white enlisted men clashed Sunday in brawls at two military installations—sprawling Ft. Bragg, near Fayetteville, N.C., and a Marine Corps Air Station near Honolulu.

Army officials at Ft. Bragg said the trouble began over a woman in an enlisted man's club and eventually involved nearly all of an estimated 200 men in the club.

"This was not a racial riot and it was not a racial fight. It was just a helluva fight," said a Ft. Bragg spokesman. But authorities at nearby Fayetteville said one white soldier reported he was beaten and thrown off a bus

near the base. The city officials declined, however, to say that the problems were racial.

Four men, including two military policemen called in to quell the fighting in the club were injured, none seriously. Four men were arrested.

"It was mostly fist-fighting," a base spokesman said. "There may have been a knife or a chain (used), who can really tell when 200 men are fighting."

Sixteen Marines were injured in a brawl between Negro and white enlisted men in a barracks area at Kaneone station, 12 miles from Honolulu.

The free-for-all involved about 250 men, most of them onlookers, and was ended when a military policeman fired shots into the air.

Isolated incidents continued throughout the night, and witnesses said there were shouts of "black power" and "white power" as gangs of Marines armed with clubs, rocks and belts roamed the bases.

The brawl is still under investigation.

Both incidents followed by a few hours the release of a report by a biracial group of officers at Camp Lejeune, N.C., that warned of an "explosive" racial situation in the 2d Marine Division as early as last April.

The report charged that "the lack of informed, courageous leadership in dealing with racial matters is widening the gulf of misunderstanding between the races."

It was made public after a July 20 brawl at the Marine Corps training base between white, Negro and Puerto Rican enlisted men resulted in the death of one Marine and serious injury to another.

Meanwhile, the Marine Corps said 25 Marines have been returned to Camp Lejeune in connection with an investigation of the July 20 melee. The 25 had been participating in Mediterranean maneuvers.

ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE TO THE IVORY COAST

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with many of our colleagues in recognizing and paying tribute to the Ivory Coast Republic on its ninth anniversary of independence. Situated on the West Coast of Africa, the Ivory Coast proclaimed itself a republic on December 4, 1958. It was not, however, until August 7, 1960, that its independence from France was proclaimed and recognized. On October 31, 1960, the infant country adopted its present constitution.

The country is building roads, schools, ports, dams. In fact, there is so much work going on in the Ivory Coast Republic that they must import labor to keep up with production schedules.

Economic progress has continued a spectacular pace and the ever-increasing demand for American construction and roadbuilding equipment in addition to electronics and plastics is a clear indication that Ivory Coast is rapidly approaching the stage of self-sufficiency. Ivory Coast has consistently maintained a favorable trade balance and has attracted increasing amounts of foreign investments.

The Ivory Coast today is enjoying the benefits of its booming economy based on private enterprise. Its industrialization is proceeding at a regular and rapid pace.

The people of the Ivory Coast have clearly demonstrated their maturity and sense of national responsibility in the 9 years of their independence. We congratulate them on their impressive internal achievements and do not doubt that they will continue to progress; we wish the people of the Ivory Coast the best in all their future endeavors.

GOVERNMENT AND PENSIONS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech recently delivered by Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, entitled "Government and Pensions." Mr. Myers delivered this speech before a symposium sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute on Private Pensions and the Public Interest.

Mr. Myers is one of the outstanding experts in the world in the field of social security. He has served as an actuary with the Social Security Administration since 1934, and has been Chief Actuary since 1947. Mr. Myers has been an actuarial consultant to foreign countries in every area of the world, and recently returned from Saigon where he assisted the South Vietnamese Government in developing plans for a social security program.

Mr. Myers is a vice president and fellow of the American Society of Actuaries. In 1965, Mr. Myers' book on social security, entitled, "Social Insurance and Allied Government Programs," was published by Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and since that time has become the leading textbook for students of our social security system and allied Government programs.

During Mr. Myers' long service with the Government, he has consistently advised the congressional committees concerned with social security legislation on actuarial problems. His counsel has been invaluable to the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, in developing social security legislation.

In view of Mr. Myers' distinguished record of service and demonstrated expertise in matters pertaining to social security, I am including his recent speech in the RECORD so that all of the Members may have the opportunity to read it. The role of private pension systems and governmental retirement programs is an important one in need of careful definition as Congress proceeds to enact legislation in this field. Mr. Myers' paper presents a cogent analysis of the philosophical and practical considerations that bear on this question. The speech follows:

GOVERNMENT AND PENSIONS*

(By Robert J. Myers)

The topic "Roles of Private Pension Systems and Government in Retirement Income Maintenance" is indeed a very broad one and of extreme significance in regard to the future course of our nation's social and economic structure. This paper will primarily cover the two philosophies of the role of the social security program and their implications as to what role the program should play in the future. In passing, there will be a brief consideration of the government's proper role in the supervision and regulation of private pension plans.

The results of these deliberations will then permit us to decide whether the private pension plan system and the social security program are compatible by being complementary and thus on parallel courses, or whether they are in conflict and in a war of survival of the fittest.

In an unorthodox manner, and lest you are impatient to know the results of my thinking, I shall first formalize my conclusions before presenting my detailed analysis and deliberations on the subject. In brief, I believe that there is an appropriate role for both private pension plans and social security and that it is important, even vital, that each should have such role.

At this point, I should make it clear that I am not hedging in using the word "appropriate." Specifically, I believe that each system should be of about equal importance. Those who have an expansionist philosophy of social security would likely assert that social security should provide the lion's share of old-age security and that private pension plans should complete the job. Of course, the purist would logically and correctly point out that, according to Aesop, in this instance, the "lion's share" really means "all."

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL SECURITY AS BASIC PENSION SYSTEM

It can fairly be said that the social security system has widespread, almost universal, acceptance by the American people. This is not to say that they fully understand its various complex provisions or its financing nature and aspects. I believe, however, that most people have a reasonably good knowledge of what the system provides and what it costs. A small proportion of the public might wish to do away with the program, but the vast majority are convinced that it is desirable and should continue.

The real differences of opinion arise in respect to the future course of social security and its relative importance in the economic-security picture. Labels of categorization are often difficult to define because of the possibility of slanting the argument by the nomenclature adopted. Nonetheless, let me designate as "moderates" those who believe that the present system is reasonably adequate and plays a proper role in our society. Such viewpoint, of course, recognizes that modifications in the program will be necessary in the future; primarily to keep the system up to date with, or to reflect changes in, economic, demographic, and social conditions, and also to remedy any significant problems.

On the other hand, there are the "expansionists," who believe that the social security program should provide the full economic security for the vast majority of the population (say, all but 5 or 10 percent). The expansionists hold the philosophy that pri-

* The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Social Security Administration. This paper was presented at a Symposium on Private Pensions and the Public Interest, sponsored by The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, May 8, 1969, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

vate efforts in the economic security field have little likelihood of success. (A vivid example of this was in the late 1930s and in the 1940s, when the advocates of national health insurance proclaimed that voluntary insurance could not have any significant impact in providing health insurance protection for persons of all ages. Despite this, the developing experience has shown otherwise. Several pertinent specific quotations on this matter are contained in the paper "Trends in Health Insurance," by J. F. Follman, Jr., *Best's Insurance News*, October, 1958.

Quite naturally, there are views intermediate to those of the moderates and the expansionists, with a considerable degree of spread of such views. In fact, there are a few who hold more extensive views on both sides. However, it is not unreasonable to carry forth the following discussion on the assumption that the vast majority of views on any given issue can be classified in either one camp or the other.

For purposes of simplicity and brevity, I have adopted the aforementioned two terms. Neither is intended to carry any connotation of disapproval or any stigma. I have purposely avoided the terms "liberal" and "conservative," since they are often misused.

We have often heard it said—perhaps *ad nauseum*—that the social security program should provide only "a floor of protection" in the economic security area. This, however, is not a precise concept, and one cannot say exactly just how low or how high the floor should be. In fact, one eminent student of social security, who belongs to the expansionist school, has suggested that, desirably, the floor should have a luxurious carpet laid on it through government action. One might well raise the question as to why this expansion is necessary and desirable, since there are always two sides to the coin—in this case, not only who receives, but also who pays. There might also be asked why should not such supplementation be done through private action?

In the debate as to what is the proper level of the floor of protection that social security should provide, the moderate tends to be placed in a difficult defensive position by the aggressive expansionist. The latter attempts to set the conditions for the debate on the grounds that a person is either for or against social security; then, if he is in favor of social security, he must therefore support a complete expansionist approach, and if he is against this almost total role for social security, he obviously favors its complete repeal. In other words, the expansionist argues that, if some social security is good, then the ideal is to provide complete economic security for the vast majority of the population through governmental means.

The answer to this argument—although one which may be somewhat difficult to convey to the general public under some circumstances—is to draw an analogy to the value of taking medicine. Twice as much is not twice as effective as the prescribed dosage—and, in fact, not nearly as good. Nonetheless, the moderate can, unless he is quite alert and skillful, be placed in the "villain's position" of being selfish, not interested in the welfare of his fellow man, etc.

Now let us examine what the concept of social security as the floor of protection might be for those whom I have classified as moderates. Later—in discussing the possible future changes in the role of the social security program—I shall point out in detail what the aims of the expansionists are in this area. It may be said, insofar as the moderates' viewpoint is concerned, that a governmental program of retirement benefits should provide only a certain level of benefits, available to the vast majority of people who must retire from gainful employment. Such level of benefits should be sufficient so that, with assets and real estate normally accumulated, the vast majority of benefi-

ciaries will be able to have at least a reasonable subsistence.

This, of course, is still not a precise mathematical formula for measuring whether a floor of protection is being provided—and such is not really ever possible, as I will mention later in discussing the related concept of poverty. A good, although rough, indicator is the proportion of persons receiving social insurance benefits who require supplementation through public assistance payments. Many persons believe that if less than 10 percent of social security beneficiaries fall in such category, the level of benefits is adequate and that this is a reasonably good yardstick of the adequacy of social security benefits. At present, this ratio is only about 7 percent, so that, even if we recognize that public assistance programs in some states may be somewhat inadequate, the test is readily met.

In summary then, the position of the moderates is that, if a small minority have needs beyond the protection provided by social insurance, the solution is not to raise social security benefit levels, but rather to have adequate supplementary public assistance. This is especially so when a substantial proportion of the minority involved is of a transitional nature, such as being cohorts who were not covered under the social security program during their working lives, or who were not covered as extensively under private pension plans as is the case for current workers, or who were adversely affected by the great depression of the 1930s and could not as readily accumulate individual resources as could individuals who began their working careers in the 1940s and later. Of course, there will always be a small residual of persons who have only sporadic employment during their working lives or who have unusual needs, and in these cases public assistance will be necessary.

CONCEPT OF POVERTY

Closely related to the concept of social security as being the basic pension system and providing a floor of protection is the subject of poverty. As a matter of historical interest, this concept, as it is applied in the political field, was developed for the late President Kennedy as one of the prospective major talking points for his 1964 presidential campaign and was taken over by President Johnson.

Poverty, like sin, is something that nobody really favors. It seems to me that a clear distinction must be made between "poverty" as now defined and "want and destitution" or "need." Social security was established to prevent "need." It was not intended to deal with this new measure of poorness called "poverty." It so happens, however, that the social security program, established more than 30 years ago, has been the most important governmental program in combatting poverty. Of course, really the most important way to eliminate poverty among those in the working ages, or those being supported by such persons, is by education and employment training, rather than attempting to cure it through monetary grants.

Nonetheless, those who are of the expansionist philosophy have employed the poverty label to support their aims. One way in which this can be done is to define poverty in a mechanistic style and at a higher level than is really justified by a true analysis of the concept. At one extreme, we can never eliminate poverty in the sense that some have less income than others—unless we completely equalize all income. Under a more flexible interpretation of this concept, however, problems as to its validity still persist.

The concept of poverty that is so widely used currently is the mechanistic approach of proclaiming that poverty is present if the individual has less annual income than a certain prescribed amount of dollars. Such amount will vary by size of family and, in some discussions, by geographical or farm-

nonfarm location. The illogical approach is taken by many who use these data that, if an individual is \$1 short of the so-called poverty amount, then he is indeed in very bad shape. On the other hand, once his income has reached this level, then he is in entirely different status. The situation is almost as though one were to leap across a crevice, where the situation is entirely different when the jump is one inch short, as against its being sufficient.

Looking more intensively at the mechanistic approach at measuring poverty, numerous weaknesses can be pointed out—in fact, to such an extent that serious question can be raised as to whether this approach has any real validity or significance. The question of whether the individual has assets, including real estate, is usually ignored—as is also, for those aged 65 and over, the value of their Medicare protection. Yet, this is most important because if the poverty level for a married couple is promulgated at \$2,000 a year, then there is an entirely different situation between a couple with slightly less income than this who lives in an owned home with a garden plot in a small town and a couple with the same income and no assets living in the middle of a metropolis.

Also often ignored by the exponents of the mechanistic poverty concept is the possibility of the individual living with his or her close relatives. Of course, some people deplore such situations, but I am strongly of the belief that firm family ties are most desirable. If the mechanistic definition of poverty for a single person is having income of less than \$1,500 a year, is a widow with a \$1,300 income who is living with one of her children truly in poverty?

The foregoing discussion should not be taken as implying that the moderates are aloof to the matter of poverty and human need. Rather, they believe that the facts of poverty should be demonstrated by objective realistic standards and not by mechanistic approaches. Consistent with this view is the approach mentioned previously of having social insurance programs that cover the vast majority of the economic-risk problem and public assistance programs that cover the residual needs of the remaining small minority.

Before leaving this subject, I believe that it is appropriate to make a comment on the work of many researchers in the social sciences and of those who direct their research, as I have observed this matter over a period of three decades. Too frequently, there is the view that the purpose of research and of collection of statistics is to gather data to substantiate a predetermined conclusion or reach a desired social goal.

This viewpoint holds that valuable research time and talent are wasted unless aimed only at proving a preconceived conclusion; otherwise, the efforts will be diffused by searching for all the facts, rather than by seeking only those which will "prove the point"! Specifically, in the area of research into the poverty field—and particularly as to the presentation of the results of such research—some people have approached the matter along the lines of a theology of making the extent of poverty appear to be as large as possible.

POSSIBLE CHANGES IN THE ROLE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

It is impossible to predict with any exactitude whether there will be any changes in the relative role of the social security program in our society—and if so, specifically what the changes will be. If the philosophy of moderatism largely prevails, the relative role of the social security program will not change significantly. Its provisions will be modified from time to time to keep it up to date and to solve such problems and anomalies as arise, especially those which are not being handled in a reasonably satisfactory manner by the private sector. On the other

hand, if the expansionist philosophy prevails the role of the social security program would be greatly enlarged.

The moderates argue that the social security program has now developed to the point where it has reached relative maturity and should be maintained at about its current size. The argument further goes that a satisfactory economic and political balance has now been reached between those who currently receive benefits and those who currently finance them through payroll taxes or contributions.

Those of the expansionist school who would have the social security program be predominant or virtually monopolistic in the economic-security field have goals that can be described relatively simply. As a subsidiary matter, essentially they would eliminate the private pension system, except for persons with the highest earnings.

The expansionists have very definite ultimate goals for the social security program. They do not always express these goals in a single "bill of rights," but instead they advocate various steps at different times. Nonetheless, a fair, unbiased picture of the entire "iceberg" can be obtained.

The expansionists, as a matter of strategy, frequently use the "ratchet" approach—namely, not unrolling their ultimate goal in its entirety, but rather advocating only part of it and then being satisfied, for the time being, when they get only a fraction of that part. They believe that there is always another day to push further forward toward their goals, and they know that once a certain expansion has been achieved, a retreat from it is virtually impossible, so that hopefully tomorrow they can make another advance from their partially achieved gains until eventually their entire goal will be achieved. In fact, the ink is scarcely dry on a newly-enacted amendment before plans are being developed for the next legislative effort.

The general goals of the expansionists in the social security field can be given in three areas—cash benefits, health benefits, and financing of such benefits. Let us consider each of these areas in turn.

Cash-benefits objectives

In the cash-benefits field, the first goal of the expansionists is to increase the maximum earnings base that is creditable for benefit purposes to a level such as \$15,000 currently, and to adjust this base upward automatically in the future according to changes in the general earnings level. This course is pursued primarily so that full economic security can be provided under social insurance to the vast majority of the population.

On the other hand, the moderates argue that, over the past two decades, the earnings base has been maintained at about the same level relative to earnings (see Table 1) and that this relationship should be continued in the future. If this is to be done, and if a change from the present \$7,800 adopted effective first for 1968 is to be made for 1970, an increase to \$8,400 at most is warranted. This is so because the change to \$7,800 somewhat over-compensated for past experience, relative to that in 1950 and after. Even if the change to \$7,800 in 1968 is considered to be "proper" and should be used as the benchmark for the future, the data show that the change in 1970 should be to \$8,470, which under the customary rounding procedures would be taken as \$8,400.

The expansionists argue that a \$15,000 earnings base will merely restore the situation to what it was in 1937, when the program began (see Table 1). The moderates rebut this argument on the basis that Congress re-examined this matter in connection with the 1950 Amendments (and affirmed their action then by all subsequent amendments) and decided that the depression-influenced original basis was not proper.

TABLE 1.—PROPORTION OF TOTAL EARNINGS IN COVERED EMPLOYMENT COVERED BY VARIOUS TAXABLE EARNINGS BASES

Year	Earnings base	Proportion of earnings that is taxable (percent)
Actual experience for 1st year for which base was effective:		
1937	\$3,000	92.0
1951	3,600	81.1
1955	4,200	80.3
1959	4,800	79.3
1966	6,600	80.2
1968	7,800	82.1
Projected experience for 1970 under present base and under various possible bases:		
1970	7,800	79.6
1970	8,400	81.9
1970	9,000	83.7
1970	15,000	92.3

The next step of the expansionists, then, is to double the present benefit level—or, to begin with, to increase it by at least 50 percent. This step, combined with the previous one, would then make it virtually unnecessary to have private pension plans, private insurance, and other forms of long-term private savings for the vast majority of the population. The benefit payments would, under the expansionist approach, be automatically adjusted for changes in the general earnings level (and not merely for changes in the price level) in order to maintain the so-called adequacy of the benefits. In this manner, virtually no individual and group supplementation would ever be needed.

Still another goal of the expansionists is to liberalize greatly the various eligibility conditions for disability benefits—such as the definition of disability, the length of the waiting period, and the prognosis of permanency or length of disability. Consequently, the present basis of permanent and total disability benefits would be extended to include all short-term, temporary sickness cases. Then, the expansionists argue, there would be adequate universal protection against this sickness risk. Obviously, there would thus be no need for sick-leave plans, for employer- or union-sponsored group insurance plans or individual private insurance in this field, or for private savings to help take care of this problem (essentially for very short periods of illness, when no income is earned).

If the foregoing goals of the expansionists as to levels of social security benefits were achieved, the consequences must be clear to anyone. There would not only be the direct effect of eliminating most private-sector efforts in the economic-security field, but there would also occur a most significant effect on our national economy. Private savings of all types, including pension plans and deferred profit-sharing plans (which had assets of \$104 billion at the end of 1967), would be greatly diminished. This, in turn, would result in a shortage of investment funds for private industry to maintain and expand its economic-productivity activities. Accordingly, private industry would have to turn more and more to the government for such funds, and this could well mean increasing governmental regulation, control, and even ownership of productive activities.

Medical care objectives

Now considering medical-care benefits, again the ultimate goal of the expansionists is a relatively simple, but comprehensive, one—to provide Medicare benefits for the entire working and retired populations and their dependents. Quite possibly it would be advocated that there should be less cost-sharing, such as deductibles and coinsurance,

to be paid directly by the beneficiaries. This would be argued on the basis that such cost-sharing imposes financial barriers which prevent adequate medical care being sought and which do not prevent over-utilization (as the moderates believe).

Once again, the expansionists would take the gradual approach to their desired social goal. This would be done by first extending Medicare to some or all of the persons under age 65 who are receiving cash benefits. Then, there might be instituted the so-called Kiddicare proposal (prenatal care, obstetrical care, and infant care—up to age 1, or age 6, or age 18, as much as can be obtained at the moment—all financed through Medicare).

Some discussion of the Kiddicare proposal may be worthwhile. This is an outstanding example of the technique of solving a small, but important, problem by discarding the highly successful private-sector procedures that apply to the vast majority of the population. This would be another step toward the attainment of the expansionist social goal of nationalizing medical care.

The argument given by the expansionists for the need for the Kiddicare program is that infant mortality in the United States is higher than in about 10 other countries throughout the world. No mention is made of the fact that the absolute differences in infant mortality between the United States and the countries with the most favorable experience are quite small, or that there are certain reasons for these differences, which reasons are in considerable part being eliminated.

It is often argued that the financial barrier prevents many people from obtaining necessary health services. Yet, about 98 percent of the births in the United States now occur in hospitals. Accordingly, the Kiddicare proposal could produce relatively little improvement in this area. Probably the major problems in the infant and maternity medical-care area are getting adequate prenatal care at an early enough stage and environmental factors such as working during pregnancy. The vast majority of the population has no problem in this respect. The difficulty for the remaining minority is both educational and economic. Both of these causes could be eliminated through properly directed welfare activities, without the necessity of setting up a huge new government program applicable to the entire population.

Certainly the consequence of establishing a Kiddicare program would be to reduce further the potential scope of private insurance. As a result, the relative operating costs of private insurance for the limited benefit area in which it would operate would become high. Private insurance would thus be subject to adverse criticism, and it would be suggested that the governmental plan might as well take over the entire load since it can operate more efficiently from an administrative standpoint.

Once again, there is an important indirect effect if this goal of the expansionists to have virtually complete and comprehensive national health insurance were to be achieved. When medical-care costs covered by a social insurance program are for only a portion of the population—as with Medicare now—it is possible to have standards against which program reimbursement bases can be measured. However, under a complete-coverage program, there would be no private-sector standard against which to measure reasonable and customary charges of physicians. Accordingly, physician fees or remuneration could be established only by agreement between the government and the physicians (with the latter perhaps being at a considerable disadvantage). As a result, the practice of medicine as we know it today would be considerably altered—and this is what the expansionists seem to desire.

How expansions would be financed

Finally, as to that most important element, financing, the expansionists seek to tackle this unpleasant item in as "painless" and "unobtrusive" a fashion as possible. The maximum taxable earnings base for employees would necessarily be the same as for benefit purposes—namely, at an initial level of about \$15,000 per year, automatically adjusted in the future in accordance with changes in the general earnings level. Employer contributions would be based on the entire payroll, without any maximum taxable earnings base. Moreover, the employer contribution rates would be double those for employees, instead of the present equal-rate basis.

Further, to make the greatly increased financing more "palatable" the expansionists strongly favor a government contribution out of general revenues in an amount equal to 50 percent of the combined employer-employee contribution receipts. At present, except for certain transitional provisions and except for the voluntary-individual Supplementary Medical Insurance program, the government makes no contributions to the program. A government contribution of this type is, of course, a very easy and simple way to increase the benefit level significantly without any apparent direct tax cost to anybody.

Since a government contribution on the order of 50 percent of the combined employer-employee contributions would involve an annual cost to the general treasury of \$15 billion or more, the approach of gradualism is sometimes suggested by the expansionists. Instead of an immediate 50 percent matching, continuing in all future years, a graduated basis is proposed. For example, the matching proportion could start at a modest 5 percent and increase slowly each year until attaining the ultimate level of 50 percent (or more).

In the field of financing, the moderates believe that the primary sources of any additional financing necessary are the savings to the system due to the rising trend of general earnings and to the increases in the maximum taxable earnings base required to keep it up to date with this trend. Then, any further financing needed should come from increasing equally the contribution rate on workers and employers, but this should be done with restraint and caution. Such procedure would make the real increases in the cost of the program readily apparent to all. In no instance, according to the view of the moderates, should the additional financing come from an increase in the earnings base beyond that called for by changes in the general level of earnings or from introducing a government contribution.

Pros and cons of a Government contribution

It is worthwhile considering in some detail the arguments for and against general government contributions to the social security system, because such financing is the keystone of the expansionist philosophy. If all benefit liberalizations were to be financed by visible direct payroll taxes, it would probably be impossible to achieve them. In this respect, it may be noted that, for several decades, the congressional committees concerned with social security have always strongly favored the self-supporting principle for financing the regular program and have thus opposed general government contributions.

Several arguments have been given for introducing government contributions as a major financing source of the social security program. One argument is the "logic" approach. Three parties are involved in economic security—the worker, the employer, and the government—and it is reasoned that each should pay equally.

Another argument in support of government contributions is that there would be

substantially higher general-revenue costs for public assistance if there were no social security system. Therefore, it is argued, some of the resulting savings to the general treasury because of the existence of the social security program should be given to that program.

Another argument given in favor of a government subsidy is that higher direct contribution rates would be difficult to levy. Accordingly, this is the only way that benefits can be increased substantially. Quite obviously, if equal tripartite financing were put into effect, the general benefit level could immediately be increased by 50 percent.

This is, of course, part of the expansionist philosophy—to raise the general benefit level without making the increased cost readily (and perhaps painfully) apparent to the public. For somewhat the same reason, the expansionists favor eliminating the direct premium payments made by the enrollees under the Supplementary Medical Insurance program by placing the cost on the payroll tax, where it would be less obvious to people.

Those advocating a government contribution to the social security system often do so by analogy with private pension plans. There, the employer usually bears the entire cost for service rendered before establishment of the plan and for the higher cost for benefits based on subsequent service because initial members are older than future entrants will be. Accordingly, some expansionists argue that the government, through general revenues, should pay the "past-service" costs of benefits for social security beneficiaries.

Those favoring continuation of the present self-supporting financing basis and thus opposing government contributions—and I number myself among them—argue that the introduction of such contributions will seriously weaken cost controls over the program. Changes in the program might be voted without regard to the cost considerations—on the grounds that the necessary financing can always be easily obtained from general revenues. On the other hand, under the present basis, the costs of any benefit changes are fully recognized; they are met by direct, visible financing changes applicable to workers and employers.

One problem which may occur is that, for budgetary or political reasons, the government contributions may not be paid in the amount required or at the time specified. Several times in the past, government contributions to the social security system were legislated, but were not actually made, or were delayed for long periods. For example, appropriations from the general fund of the treasury for the cost of benefits arising from "gratuitous" military-service wage credits (for periods before 1957) have either not been made at all or have intentionally been made at a lower amount than according to the required actuarial determination. Then, too, general-revenue appropriations authorized for the Medicare program have frequently been delayed considerably beyond when they were due (although generally an appropriate interest adjustment is provided for).

It is not inconceivable that reliance on government contributions for financing a major portion of the cost of the social security program could lead to its collapse or to partial repudiation of benefit obligations.

Another difficulty which may arise is the pressure that would be generated to impose a means test on the beneficiaries, so that those who have substantial other income would not be paid benefits—on the grounds that people with large incomes should not receive payments which are partially financed from general revenues.

Those who oppose government contributions do not necessarily oppose benefit changes that will involve substantially increased costs. They believe that such costs should be as openly and completely recog-

nized in the direct financing provisions as is possible.

Why the expansionist philosophy?

Having seen what the ultimate goals of the expansionist philosophy are, we should perhaps turn back for a moment to consider why these views are held. Briefly speaking, the expansionists argue that the present system of distribution of economic-security protection, even though built on a basic floor of protection from the social security program results in unequal and thus inequitable treatment. It is pointed out, for example, that in the cash-benefits area, some persons receive both social security benefits and private pensions (which is a rapidly growing category), while others receive only social security benefits.

Further, the argument goes that it is inefficient to have such a multitude and diversity of private employee benefit and health plans. Accordingly, why not have a single uniform governmental program that will provide completely adequate protection at the lowest possible administrative expense? Carrying this argument to its logical conclusion in other fields would, of course, mean the end of our competitive individual-enterprise system, which is probably the major element responsible for the phenomenal success in the economic development in this country.

Those with the expansionist philosophy in social security frequently argue for their goals as though governmental programs are the only way to achieve the betterment of our society and the brotherhood of man. This is well expressed by the following statement of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, as to his function—"the only national official paid by all the people whose full-time job is to guard and strengthen the people's health, education and social opportunities."¹

Mr. Cohen has also pointed out that in fiscal year 1968, expenditures for health, education, and welfare in the United States amounted to 19.8 percent of the gross national product, of which 31.7 percent is from private sources—a proportion that has been steadily decreasing (with a relative decline of 13 percent between 1955 and 1968). He then went on to recommend that, by 1976, the proportion for health, education, and welfare activities should increase to 25 percent; although he did not specify whether the growth should be in the public sector or in the private sector, I believe that it can safely be assumed that he anticipates that it would be the former. Even keeping the public-sector percentage for such expenditures constant would result in a large increase in available funds, as a result of the increasing GNP.

Under these circumstances, one might wonder why the proportion would have to increase, and further whether 25 percent is to be the ultimate level desired by the expansionists (why not 30 percent, or 50 percent or more?). The expansionist philosophy might even go so far as to say "Would not people be healthier and happier and have greater social opportunities if the government took over more and more responsibilities?" For example, many (if not most) people—especially teenagers—do not have the ideal diet that is essential for good health, even though they can afford it. So, under the expansionist philosophy, why not prohibit the public sale of food and the right to raise one's own food, and instead have the government tell each person what they should eat, then provide it, and see that they eat it?

The moderates say in reply that there should be a certain amount of government control and regulation—the familiar floor

¹ Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Fiscal Year 1968.

of protection concept—but there is certainly a limit that should be set.

Objectivity role of the social security staff worker

One admirable and desirable human tendency is to advocate strongly whatever one's efforts are deeply engaged in. Workers in the private sector, accordingly, have the primary incentive and drive that their business organization should continually expand, seeking increased activity and profits. The worker in the social security field—just as in any other area of governmental activity—should ideally, at least according to the viewpoint of the moderates, have a somewhat different approach. This difference has as its foundation that the government employee is supposed to be working for all the people—not merely those who would benefit by the expansion of any particular program, but also those who would pay for it.

Turning back specifically to the social security program, we often hear statements of pride from top-level political figures and key administrators that benefit outgo has increased from only \$X billion a few years ago to as much as \$Y billion this year. This fact may or may not indicate a desirable situation, even though it is always implied that an increase is good—and the larger the better. Under these circumstances, the opposite side of the coin is that, for every increase in benefit outgo, there was a corresponding increase in contributions, or taxes collected. When a benefit increase goes to the 25 million social security beneficiaries, it is paid for by the 70 million active workers. This is one reason why Congress obviously considers benefit liberalizations only after thoughtful consideration as to who pays for them—and with due regard for the payors as well as for the payees. Accordingly, social security officials should point out the increases in contributions as well as the increases in benefits.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN SUPERVISING PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Assuming that there is a significant role for private pension plans—even though some social security expansionists do not believe so—then what should be the role of the government in supervising and regulating them? This subject in itself is sufficient for a full paper, so I shall touch on the matter only briefly here.

Many of those who propose extensive regulation and controls on private pension plans basically believe that such plans have little value and should be superseded by a greatly expanded social security program. Thus, one must wonder whether some of their views and recommendations are for the real purpose of making the private pension plan system more viable and more effective.

The moderates take the viewpoint that many improvements should take place in the private pension system, such as more vesting. The moderates believe that these improvements will come about voluntarily, and that they are occurring relatively rapidly, and thus governmental action is not required. It can be argued that the very nature of the voluntary private pension plans is such that compulsion as to benefit structure is anomalous.

Such argument does not necessarily follow in the field of financial security. Certainly, it is reasonable, at the least, to require open disclosure of the financing of private pension plans, assurances that investments will be properly made, etc.

Along these lines, some people incorrectly believe that it would be relatively simple to have a governmental requirement that there should be certain minimum funding of prior-service liabilities so that pension expectations will be fulfilled. This, however, is not nearly as simple as it seems, because the calculation of benefit liabilities and the adoption of different financing methods produces widely diverse results, even when performed in a highly professional manner. The

situation is quite different from that of individual savings accounts or individual life insurance, where the financing bases and principles are much more precise. Some of the well-meaning, but poorly-informed, students of private pension plans who wish to reform them just do not realize this!

The governmental requirement of reinsurance of the obligations of pension plans against the risk of their being terminated without sufficient assets to meet the accrued liabilities has great popular appeal. Some individuals erroneously believe that this would be a simple matter, as it was in the insuring of bank accounts by the government. The situation, however, is vastly different, because of the lack of precision possible in making cost estimates of future operations for many decades hence and because of the different, but equally acceptable, financing methods possible. Another difference is that the proposed reinsurance of pension obligations would "insure" something that has never actually been in existence (namely, the unfunded portion of what may be an imprecisely-calculated liability), rather than something tangible as is the case with bank accounts.

It would seem that the possibilities of abuse and manipulation make impossible the establishment of a sound system of insurance of pension plan liabilities in the event of plan termination. Certain requirements could, however, be instituted that would probably solve the vast majority of the problems arising in plan terminations. It has been suggested that it should not be possible for an employer to determine his pension plan for part of his operations and not recognize the accrued liabilities if he continues in operation elsewhere; of course, he should have the right to terminate the plan as to future service and not have any liabilities therefor. Similarly, it has been suggested that, if one firm is purchased by another, the latter should be required to accept the accrued benefit liability of the pension plan of the former, even though it would not be required to continue the plan with respect to future service.

CONCLUSION

Now, let us turn back to the basic question of whether the private pension plan system in the United States and the social security program are compatible by being complementary and thus on parallel courses, or whether they are in conflict and on a collision course. First, I should like to state my view that, if the latter is the case, the loser most certainly will be the private pension system; under these circumstances, it will come out second best and will sink to the bottom.

I hasten to point out, however, that I do not believe that such dire circumstances will result, but rather that the two systems are compatible. This desirable result will occur, however, only if the future role of social security follows the lines of the views which I have termed as those held by the moderates. Certainly, if the expansionist philosophy should prevail in the future, my optimistic prediction that both the private pension system and the social security system can have significant and more or less equal roles to play will not materialize.

MILITARY SPOKESMEN EULOGIZE REPRESENTATIVE BATES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our esteemed late colleague, William H. Bates, of Massachusetts, was at the time of his death the ranking minority member of the House Armed Services

Committee. Since his untimely passing, it became my duty to carry on his minority leadership duties on that committee. It is on an official, as well as personal basis, that I know the high regard in which Bill Bates was held by military people everywhere.

The messages of condolence received by Bill's lovely wife, Pearle Jean Bates, are illustrative, and I should like to quote some of these. Everywhere, both in and out of Congress, wherever Bill Bates was known he was held in the highest regard.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Mrs. Wheeler joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to you at the loss of your fine husband, Congressman William H. Bates.

For more than a quarter of a century, your husband served our country with true distinction both as a Naval Officer and as a Member of the United States Congress. I shall miss his counsel on matters affecting the Armed Services.

While words are small solace indeed, you may take pride in the length and quality of your husband's service. Again, our deepest sympathy.

Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army:

It was with deep regret that I learned of your husband's untimely passing. I wish to extend Mrs. Westmoreland's and my heartfelt sympathy in your great personal loss. I admired your Bill very much and considered him a warm friend.

All members of the Army join me in the hope that the memory of his distinguished service to our country will be of some comfort to you and your daughter in your bereavement.

Adm. T. H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy:

It was with great sorrow that we learned of the loss of your husband on Sunday. Bill was a great man and a staunch American who served his country with peerless dedication.

Mrs. Moorer and I and all the men and women of the Navy offer our prayers and heartfelt condolences for the untimely loss of your beloved and respected husband.

Gen. J. P. McConnell, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force:

It is with deep regret that I learned of the passing of your husband. On behalf of the men and women of the United States Air Force, I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Gen. L. F. Chapman, Jr., Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps:

It was with the deepest regret that I learned of the death of your husband, the Honorable William H. Bates. Both personally and officially on behalf of all Marines, I extend to you my sympathy in your bereavement.

The memory of his selfless devotion to our country and the world will serve as an inspiration to those who follow. His courage, dedication, and love for humanity will always serve as a shining example of those noble qualities which have made our country great.

It is my sincere hope that the memories of your many years together and the knowledge that Marines throughout the world share your sorrow at his passing may be a source of some comfort to you in the days to follow.

For the past several years, Congressman Bates was one of the U.S. Representatives to the Parliamentarians' Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and he served on the Military Committee at these annual Conferences.

These two messages from NATO headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, therefore, are of special interest:

William Dixon Boggs, First Secretary, U.S. Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization:

Rein and I were deeply saddened to receive the tragic news of your husband's death. We will remember him as an intelligent and friendly man and as a wonderful servant of his country.

Please accept our sincere condolences.

Ph. Deshormes, Secretary General, North Atlantic Assembly:

It was with much sorrow that we learned of the news of your husband's death. Please accept, on behalf of the President of the North Atlantic Assembly, Dr. Kasim Gulek, and in my own name, our most sincere condolences and deep sympathy for you and your family on your bereavement. I know that your husband's loss will be deeply felt by all of us who had the privilege of knowing him.

The Honorable Robert E. Quinn, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, Washington, D.C., wrote about Mr. Bates:

He was a fine Congressman and a great American.

Rear Adm. B. H. Bieri, Jr., Chief of Supply Corps, Department of the Navy, had reference to Representative Bates' service in the Supply Corps when he wrote to his widow. Mr. Bates enlisted as a seaman and nearly 10 years later held the rank of lieutenant commander when he resigned upon being elected to Congress. When he died, he was a captain in the Naval Reserve Supply Corps. Admiral Bieri's letter to Mrs. Bates read:

It was with profound sorrow that I learned of Congressman Bates' passing, and on behalf of his many friends in the Supply Corps I extend my deepest sympathy for your great loss.

Congressman Bates served his country with patriotism and honor for many years, both as an officer in the active naval forces and as a Member of Congress. We can never repay him for this service, however, if we can be of any assistance to you we would consider it a privilege.

May God give you strength and courage through this most trying time.

Vice Adm. B. J. Semmes, Jr., commander of the U.S. Navy's 2d Fleet, dispatched this message to Chairman MENDEL RIVERS of the Armed Services Committee:

With a deep sense of loss we join with other military in expressing our sympathy at the passing of Capt. William Bates, U.S. Naval Reserve, Member of Congress. His dedication and effectiveness as a member of your committee resulted in many actions in behalf of servicemen and in strengthening the readiness of the U.S. Armed Services. Please pass our deep sympathy to his family and to your committee.

Rear Adm. F. Massey, commander, Fleet Air, U.S. Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I., wired Mrs. Bates:

Mrs. Massey and I are deeply saddened at the death of your husband. A truly great and dedicated man, he represented the finest qualities of a Naval officer and an American. Our prayers join those of your family at this time of great sorrow.

Capt. Raymond A. Komorowski, commanding officer, U.S.S. *Boston*—CA-69:

The Officers and men of U.S.S. *Boston*, CA-69, in South East Asian waters wish to extend their condolences to the family of

the Honorable William Henry Bates, esteemed Congressman from Massachusetts.

We who are adopted sons of Boston and Massachusetts know full well his accomplishments—for the nation, the Commonwealth and the Navy. He will be sorely missed. We grieve with you and add our measure of prayer to that of the country.

Capt. Alfred R. Olsen, Jr., commanding officer, U.S.S. *Biddle*—DLG-34—of which Mrs. William H. Bates was sponsor in 1965:

Words are inadequate at a time like this, but I want you to know that you both are in our prayers and that you have our heartfelt sympathy in your tremendous loss.

Comdr. John W. Peterson, commanding officer, U.S.S. *Glover*—AGDE-1—named for a Revolutionary War hero from Marblehead, Mass., in Congressman Bates' district:

Officers and men of *Glover* join me in sending deepest personal regrets upon receiving the news of your husband's death. The warm bonds of friendship between *Glover* and the town of Marblehead which were fostered largely through his efforts will never be forgotten.

Brig. Gen. Felix J. Gerace, commanding, U.S. Army Natick Laboratories:

All of us here at Natick Laboratories are deeply grieved by the loss of our dear friend and supporter, Congressman William H. Bates.

Through the years he worked tirelessly to increase the responsibilities and to improve the capabilities of these Laboratories, even though the Installation was not in his District. We all remember the personal interest he took in the "fight" to move the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, and like most of his battles, he won that one, too. A Food Radiation Laboratory was established here in about the same time frame because of his great interest in the applications of atomic energy for the betterment of mankind.

Please accept this letter as representing the feelings of all of the employees here, because we want you to know that we are thinking of you, your daughter and Bill's mother at this time.

Col. Frank P. Bane, New England division engineer, Corps of Army Engineers:

The tragic passing of your beloved husband is a personal loss to me and the entire staff of the New England Division of the Corps of Engineers. May I express my sincere condolences to you and your family.

We at the Division had worked closely with Congressman Bates and are keenly aware of his dedication to his country and to the district which he served so well for many years.

Mrs. Bane joins with me in expressing our sorrow. It is our hope that time and happy memories will ease the days ahead.

Adm. Gordon McIntock, Superintendent, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy:

All hands at the United States Merchant Marine Academy join me in sending you our deepest sympathy. Congressman Bates was a very good friend to all of us who served the United States of America upon the sea. We shall miss him but we will not forget him and we will go forward in the Bates tradition.

FORMER COMMITTEE LEADERS

The Honorable Carl Vinson, the eminent former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, a few years ago wrote to Bill Bates on the anniversary of his coming to Congress:

You have made a great record. When you take the gavel to run the Committee, the defense and security of the nation will be in a strong hand.

Bill naturally felt pleased and complimented, but destiny was not to permit fulfillment of the Vinson prediction. Upon learning of Mr. Bates' death, Chairman Vinson wrote from his Georgia home to Mrs. Bates:

I was profoundly sorry and deeply grieved to learn of the passing of your husband. In your hour of bereavement and sorrow you and your family have my deepest sympathy.

Bill was one of my best friends and my life was enriched by my association with him during the years we served in Congress together.

You and your daughter have the satisfaction of knowing he was an outstanding American, and he made a very fine record during the years he served in Congress and on the Armed Services Committee of the House.

I mourn deeply his passing as I have lost a close friend.

Former Representative Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia, with whom Bill Bates worked closely on the Armed Services Committee for many years wired to Mrs. Bates:

Deeply distressed by Bill's death. He was one of our great statesmen and my good friend.

Another former Congressman, the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, who, like Mr. Vinson, served on the Armed Services Committee with both Bill Bates and his father, the late George J. Bates, had campaigned for Bill during that historic special election campaign of 1950. His letter to Mrs. Bates after the sudden end of Bill's brilliant career read as follows:

It was a source of personal sadness to learn of the death of your beloved husband and I extend my deep sympathy to you in your bereavement.

Bill as he was affectionately known by a large circle of admiring friends attained a high place in public life. He and I were close friends as well as colleagues when I was a member of Congress and I also knew his father quite well. As you know, Bill and I were in the Naval Reserves together and served on the Armed Services Committee as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Bill's death will be mourned by countless persons who have benefitted from his active and fruitful life. As far as I am concerned personally, I have lost a true friend.

It is my fervent prayer that God will give you the necessary strength and courage to accept your great sorrow in the knowledge that death is not the end but in reality is the opening of the portals to a richer and more abundant life.

NAVY LEAGUE TRIBUTES

James M. Hannon, national president, Navy League of the United States, wrote to Mrs. Bates:

It was with the deepest sorrow that I learned of the tragic death of your husband. In sending our heartfelt sympathy, the Navy League of the United States joins with you and the Nation in mourning the loss of a great leader.

Though I know there is little that I can convey to alleviate your anguish and that of your family, I sincerely hope you will find consolation in the magnificent contribution Bill Bates has made to the strength and well-being of the Nation over his span of years in public life. Members of the Navy League shared your husband's deep devotion to the sea and his profound grasp of the importance of the world ocean to the public welfare.

His brilliant leadership ever served to foster progress that would reinforce this strength, in a way that was a source of inspiration to each of us. His profound conviction was a source of marked admiration, and I was especially pleased that our organization was able to pay tribute to his leadership through a resolution commending him, prior to his death.

Our prayers are with you and your family as we send our condolences in having lost a friend, who had gained our deep respect and affection, and one whom we greatly admired.

John G. "Jack" Norris, editor in chief of Navy magazine, official publication of the Navy League, paid this editorial tribute in the July-August 1969 issue:

WILLIAM H. BATES, 1917-69

Although coincidental, it was altogether fitting that Navy bandmen were playing the National Anthem when Representative William Henry Bates (R-Mass.) died of stomach cancer at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

For the distinguished 52-year-old Congressman had devoted his life to his country. He entered the Navy well before Pearl Harbor, saw combat in the Pacific and was a career lieutenant commander until he resigned after running for and winning his father's seat in Congress in 1949.

Representative George Bates for years had been an influential member of the old House Naval Affairs Committee and the new House Armed Services Committee, playing a major role in the B-36-carrier controversy. His career ended tragically in a plane crash over Washington at the height of his Congressional prestige.

After Bill Bates took his seat on House Armed Services, his brilliance, strength of character and military and naval expertise also won him a coveted spot on the powerful Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He was ranking minority member and a top decision-maker of the Armed Services Committee and would have become chairman had he lived and the Republicans won control of the next Congress.

His popularity, standing and respect among his colleagues was shown by the 107 speeches of eulogy delivered in Congress after his death. Mr. Bates was a power in Congress, a strong advocate of a powerful nuclear Navy and a constant advocate of adequate American defense forces. His passing is an irreplaceable loss to the Navy and the nation.

HALL OF FAME AWARD

Brig. Gen. Homer I. Lewis, national president, and Col. John T. Carlton, executive director, Reserve Officers Association wired to Mrs. Bates after the 43d national convention of ROA at Las Vegas, Nev.:

The Reserve Officers Association in National Convention assembled has voted unanimously to express our sorrow in the untimely passing of our great friend and statesman the Honorable William H. Bates and has awarded in tribute to his memory the ROA Minute Man Hall of Fame Award.

Details about this special award and plans for its presentation are expected to be announced shortly.

VIET TRAP KILLS HYATTSVILLE GI

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker Pfc. Bobby R. Quesenberry, a fine young man from Maryland was recently killed

in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIET TRAP KILLS HYATTSVILLE GI

A 19-year-old Army private first class from Hyattsville was killed August 7 when he stepped on a booby trap while on combat patrol in Vietnam, the Defense Department said yesterday.

PFC Bobby R. Quesenberry enlisted in the Army last January because "he wanted to fight for his country," his mother, Mrs. Opal Quesenberry, said yesterday. "We didn't think about it going this far," she said.

Private Quesenberry had worked in the die shop at the National Fence Company in Bladensburg before enlisting, his mother said. He had been in Vietnam a month.

Besides his mother, and father, Archie Quesenberry, he is survived by his wife, Mrs. Deborah Woodard Quesenberry, at 6809 Riggs Road in Hyattsville a daughter, Darlene Quesenberry; two brothers, John and Barry Quesenberry, and a sister, Mrs. Brenda Smith.

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news article that appeared in the Baltimore, Md., Sun under date of August 11, 1969, with respect to the appointment of Helen Delich Bentley as the first woman to be appointed to the Maritime Commission or to be named chairman of a Federal regulatory agency by the President and will rank as one of Mr. Nixon's top female appointees.

I have known Mrs. Bentley for many years as an outstanding news reporter for the Baltimore Sun whose knowledge of maritime affairs would be difficult to match. The problems of the American maritime industry are most complex and we must get on with the job of solving them as soon as possible.

I congratulate Mrs. Bentley on her new position and wish her every success in this very important and challenging post.

The article follows:

MARITIME CHAIRMAN

Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley is taking on a difficult assignment as chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, the position to which President Nixon has announced her appointment. She knows that the task is difficult, of course, but, more important, she has definite ideas of what to do about it. Mrs. Bentley will take to Washington the special combination of determination, ability, knowledge and unflagging energy which has brought her distinction in the maritime field and has amply qualified her, in our opinion, for the task ahead.

As the maritime editor of *The Sun* Mrs. Bentley has long distinguished herself in what is often thought of as a man's world. She has helped, among other things, to underscore to this community the great importance of the port of Baltimore and to describe the complexity and scope of its operations. Her appointment thus is a tribute to her work as a reporter and editor—President Nixon said she "has established a record

of professional excellence unsurpassed by any maritime expert in the country"—and a recognition of the position of the port of Baltimore in national and international shipping. Mrs. Bentley goes to her new position with the best wishes of this newspaper and with our confidence, which we believe many others share, that the President has made an outstanding choice.

THE GRIP OF THE MAFIA OVER GOVERNMENT WITNESSES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Mafia, whose activities often go unreported in the newspapers, remains a powerful force in this country and maintains a reign of terror over many Americans. This week, the Village Voice of New York City, is carrying an exclusive interview by Mary Perot Nichols with Herbert Itkin, an agent for the CIA for 14 years and an agent for the FBI for 5 years. Mr. Itkin is perhaps best known to the public for his association with James L. Marcus, New York City's former water commissioner who was convicted last year in a bribe case.

Mr. Itkin told Mary Nichols, one of New York City's leading investigatory reporters, that he will not be a witness in the Government case against top Mafia figures because he is afraid that to do so would imperil the lives of his wife's two sons and because he claims he cannot get any protection from the Government for them.

Of course, I am not in a position to attest to the validity of any of Mr. Itkin's allegations. I am concerned about the dangers which may exist for persons who may be willing to testify against Mafia operations.

The text of the Village Voice article follows:

ITKIN WON'T TESTIFY; MAY BLOW FEDS' CASE (By Mary Perot Nichols)

The federal government lost its star witness in a series of major Mafia cases this week because it has failed to protect his family. The development may well turn the long battle against organized crime into a total rout.

The witness, Herbert Itkin, who was also the chief witness in the trial of former City Water Commissioner James Marcus, told *The Voice* in an exclusive interview on Monday night, "If the government cannot arrange to protect the children of witnesses as promised by Robert Kennedy when he was attorney general, then not only will I not testify but there will be no war on organized crime because no one will be willing to testify and endanger their own children's lives."

Itkin has been an agent for the Central Intelligence Agency for 14 years and an agent for the FBI for five years. In a state court last November, Itkin became the only agent on whose behalf the CIA ever filed an affidavit. Itkin was expected to be the leading witness in an upcoming trial of top Mafia figures in Pittsburgh, Detroit, and New York. He was also expected to be a witness in the trial of former Tammany chief Carmine G. DeSapio.

In an interview in an East Side restaurant, Itkin and his wife, Ada, said they had been unable to find any court that would put Mrs. Itkin's two sons into protective custody.

They said they feared the children would be killed or maimed by the Mafia. Mrs. Itkin's sons, by a previous marriage, live with their father, Frederick Hersh, in Peekskill, New York.

The Itkins said that Mrs. Itkin lost custody of the boys on a legal technicality in 1965 when they went to England on assignment by the CIA. Itkin's assignment in England was to set up a business as a cover. He set up a partnership with James Marcus, then an assistant to Mayor Lindsay; Peter Littman, a Swiss banker; and Littman's brother-in-law, Philadelphia businessman Albert Greenfield. Itkin said that at that time he was assigned to investigate the flow of gambling funds from organized crime in this country to Swiss banks and the influx of American gangsters into British gambling.

What prompted Itkin to call The Voice and seek an interview was that last Friday the Itkins apparently thought they had exhausted all the legal remedies to get protection for the children. The Itkins also indicated they now felt the CIA had not lived up to their promise to protect the children. The Itkins now live on a federal government military installation and, during dinner, they were guarded in the restaurant by two federal marshals.

According to the Itkins, Judge Edmund Palmieri of the United States District Court ruled on Friday that his court had no jurisdiction over the question of the children's protective custody. The Itkins claimed that on Wednesday the Westchester Family Court also ruled it had no jurisdiction. They also claimed that in the three and a half years since Mrs. Itkin lost the children, she had been unable to get a full hearing in the Westchester Family Court on the custody question.

Itkin said that Judge Palmieri told his attorney, F. Lee Bailey, last Thursday—before he ruled that his court had no jurisdiction—that the situation with the children was "horrendous" and that "while we are sitting right here something could be happening to the children."

Judge Palmieri declined to comment on the case but it was learned from informed sources that the federal court has not closed the case. The sealing of Judge Palmieri's decision and the retention of possible jurisdiction in the case is regarded by close observers of the situation as a pressure on the state courts to watch their step in this case.

Informed sources also confirmed Itkin's statement that Judge Palmieri is concerned over the safety of Mrs. Itkin's two children. Itkin's own four children and his previous wife are already in federal custody.

Mrs. Itkin said that what was now needed was the appearance of Lawrence Houston, chief counsel of the CIA, and Richard Helms, director of the CIA, "to go into the Westchester Family Court and fight. Would the judges in that court," she asked, "refuse to listen to Richard Helms?"

The Itkins claimed that undercover agents all over the country were watching to see if the CIA and the FBI are able to protect their own. If the federal agencies cannot, the Itkins maintained, there can be no war on organized crime because other agents will not "blow their covers" and testify.

WRONG MOVE

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, while the citizens of San Fran-

cisco are attempting to expand employment opportunities for minorities, the Federal Government sometimes seems intent upon frustrating their efforts. Some 1,600 persons—most of them residents of San Francisco—find that their place of employment may be moved to an outlying community. The San Francisco Examiner called attention to the consequences of this proposed action in an editorial of June 27 of this year:

WRONG MOVE

The Social Security Administration's tentative plan to move its payment center out of San Francisco carries damaging implications for the City.

A total of 1600 jobs is at stake, half being clerical posts held by workers of minority origin, the very class of citizen toward whom job-finding efforts are most energetically directed. As Congressman Phillip Burton warned, "The plan at best could turn (them) into commuters to the suburbs and deprive the City of employment opportunities it desperately needs."

The payment center's operations currently are spread out in five San Francisco locations, admittedly not a desirable situation. But the employment needs of the central city—certainly one of the keystones of the Nixon Administration—must take a higher priority.

Job accessibility is of unusual importance to the minority worker. A lengthy commute by bus or auto—or later even by BART—is expensive and, at this stage of the game, contrary to the life style of many.

No obstacle should be put in the way of minority hiring. Since one of the main thrusts of the Administration is toward the rehabilitation of the core city, any policy that reduced employment opportunities there would be destructive of the central purpose.

City officials should join with Congressman Burton in forcefully impressing this indisputable fact on the proper authorities in Washington.

POPULATION GROWTH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HORTON, Mr. Speaker, modern medicine and nutrition have cut the death rates throughout the world, producing unprecedented population growth. And if left unchecked world population will double to 7 billion persons by the end of the century.

The very quality of life on this planet is at stake. Such growth cannot continue indefinitely without serious social and environmental problems.

Eighteen months ago, Secretary General U Thant made public a "world leaders declaration on population."

The declaration signed by the heads of 30 nations, including the United States said:

The population problem must be recognized as a principal element in long-range national planning if governments are to achieve their economic goals and fulfill the aspirations of their people.

As a member of a special congressional task force on earth resources and population, I have been studying this problem on a worldwide basis.

Yesterday, I cosponsored legislation to create a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The thrust of this act would be to study population problems and to educate the country to an awareness of these problems.

When you are told that only a dozen or so countries around the world now have efficiently functioning population programs, the importance of broadening public awareness and expanding family programs becomes even more evident. We must erase the unjustified stigma associated with such phrases as "birth control" and "family planning."

Population growth is a serious problem because it affects health and nutrition, literacy and education, productive employment and living standards. It becomes obvious that overpopulation is much more an economic and political problem than a medical one.

The late President Dwight D. Eisenhower recognized this problem.

He said:

The population explosion has already become one of the most critical world problems of our time and daily grows more serious.

It threatens to smother the economic progress of many nations and endangers the free world struggle for peace and security.

While the current rate in the United States is a low 1 percent a year, this natural population increase cannot be maintained. By the year 2000, the population of our country could reach 360 million.

In this country and elsewhere, the basic problem lies with persons, most of them poor, who are unable to limit their families to the number of children they desire and can feed and support.

It is a fallacy to believe the poor have children only because they want to stay poor. Unfortunately, they have more children and these children are condemned to perpetuate the poverty of their parents.

For the majority of Americans, birth control can be attained through current research and family training programs.

But for one-fifth of the Nation—those who are poor or nearly poor—such programs will not be enough. The current family planning programs are of little help to those who cannot afford the services, who do not know that they are available or who live where medical facilities are scarce.

The lack of family planning services among the poor is not a problem confined to one race, nor is it confined to the urban areas.

In fact, two-thirds of the Nations' poor are white and only one-third live in the central city slums. Neither is the problem confined to any particular geographic area. The people needing such services live in all sections of the country.

The Federal Government must undertake a much larger effort if this Nation is to play its proper role in attaining a better life for our people as well as for the people of developing nations.

To preserve and improve the quality of human life here and abroad, we must focus attention on the quantity of population now. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

U.S. TRADE WITH JAPAN OMINOUS PROSPECT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit the following analysis of U.S. trade with Japan for consideration by the Members. It was prepared by O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, and one of our country's most knowledgeable men in the field of international trade.

The analysis follows:

Our trade with Japan has undergone a radical change in recent years.

As recently as 1964 we had a surplus of exports with that country, according to our official statistical reports. We exported goods valued at \$1.9 billion in that year to Japan whereas our imports were only \$1.7 billion. In 1965 we imported \$350 million more from Japan than we exported to her. By 1968 the turnabout was so complete that any idea that the reversal was merely a temporary phenomenon was shattered. In that year we imported \$1.1 billion more than we sold there. Our imports were 38% higher than our exports.

The 1968 deficit in our trade with Japan was greater than our total trade surplus.

There are other aspects about our trade with Japan that set it apart from our trade with most of the other areas of the world.

In 1968, for example, at least 91% of our imports from Japan consisted of manufactured goods, or \$3.7 billion of the total of \$4.0 billion.

With respect to our exports to Japan the same classifications of manufactured goods represented only 31.6% of our total exports to Japan.

It goes without saying that more labor goes into producing manufactured goods than into raw materials and partially manufactured goods. Therefore our trade with Japan, aside from showing a broad deficit in total dollar value, represented a heavy labor deficit in 1968.

Predominantly we are selling low labor-content goods to Japan and importing high labor-content goods.

Whatever may be said about the stake of labor in foreign trade, our trade with Japan does not provide us with a happy example of an exchange beneficial to labor.

It represents an exchange in which a high-wage economy is pitched against a low-wage economy in a competitive contest in which relative productivity must be the arbiter of where the advantage lies. If our wages are four or five times as high, including fringe benefits, as the Japanese counterpart we must enjoy a wide margin of higher productivity per man-hour than the Japanese if we are to be able to compete. It does not follow that we must be exactly four or five times as productive per man-hour as the Japanese, because other factors intrude; but since employee compensation is by far the greatest part of the cost of production incurred in bringing goods to market, it is clear that we must enjoy a formidable lead in productivity if we are to compete with wages as low as the Japanese.

Of course, we find some market in Japan because that country is deficient in certain resources. She must import heavily if she is to manufacture extensively. Therefore we can sell raw cotton, coal and a large variety of other raw materials to Japan, not because we could undersell her if she had the same resources, but because she is not self-sufficient in those products. This is not a test of relative competitiveness.

We compete with other countries in selling these products to Japan. In the case of cotton, wheat and wheat flour, we sell Japan at world market prices thanks to our policy of subsidizing the production of these commodities in the United States and offering them to the world at the world prices. But for this subsidization we would have little hope of selling cotton and wheat to Japan in competition with other countries.

As for coal, which is another important export to Japan, the opening is genuine because we are a low-cost coal producer among the countries of the world. We achieved this competitive stature in coal by virtue of extremely drastic displacement of labor in our coal mines. In some fifteen years before 1965 the mechanization of our coal mines sacrificed the jobs of two out of every three coal miners in this country. In terms of total jobs lost, it was in the magnitude of some 350,000 miners of a total of some 485,000. The economic result in this country of the mechanization was what is referred to as Appalachia. It meant the transfer of miners to the relief rolls on a large scale and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars by the Federal government. The adjustment has not yet been more than partially completed.

Here we can see the raw bones of what is implied in being or becoming competitive with imports from Japan. The same drastic adjustment that made us competitive in coal with Japan (and elsewhere) is a stark reminder where we stand in terms of many other products.

Sometimes there are special conditions or developments that hold the umbrella over our trade; but these cannot be depended on to assure us normal outlets for our exports or defenses against low-cost imports.

In the case of our trade with Japan it is becoming increasingly obvious that we are running out of special conditions and developments of the kind on which we have depended to keep our trade in balance or in surplus. The great strides of the Japanese in technological development and the persistent wide differential in her wage costs per unit of production compared with ours, clearly pose the question of what can or should be done to prevent the capture of increasing shares of our market by Japanese goods, particularly consumer goods, while our hope of selling in Japan continues to rest on the export of raw materials in which she is deficient.

On occasion Japan voluntarily limits her exports; but this is a self-defeating undertaking if other countries export the same kind of products to us. Japan learned to her disadvantage that after a voluntary cutback on her shipments of cotton textiles to this country in the late 'fifties other countries quickly took up the slack while the Japanese share of our market just as quickly shrank. That experience explained her willingness to enter into an international arrangement under which other countries also consented to a restriction on their own shipments to this country.

Many of our consumer goods industries are wholly at the mercy of Japan in point of rising imports. Only Japan's own limited range of production provides a containment; but the expansion of Japanese production has been such that little hope can be placed in any continuing limitation from that source. According to the Statistical Yearbook of the United Nations Japan outdid the remainder of the world in the growth of industrial production during the 1958-67 decade.

The Japanese expansion was 245% compared with 69% for the United States, 77% for Canada, 113% for Italy and 121% for the Soviet Union.

Unquestionably Japan represents the principal threat to our industries producing consumer goods, ranging all the way from radio and television receiving sets, tape

recorders, sewing machines, pottery, wearing apparel, footwear, athletic goods, toys, household and kitchen ware and much else. In other fields, machinery, steel and more recently automobiles, represent durable goods in which Japanese competition is severe and growing.

Thus the energy and efficiency of Japanese industry, combined with her low wages, pose the gravest competitive problem to American industry and labor.

The least objectionable and the fairest recourse would lie in an import-containment policy that would offer a fair share of our market for specified products to other countries, including Japan. The share-of-the-market concept would permit imports, including those from Japan, a rate of growth in proportion to the increase in our domestic consumption. Japan need not then fear a loss of her share of the market, and our industries and other countries need not fear a Japanese take-over of our market.

Unless such a step is taken scores of our industries will face the same imperative of retreat as a number of industries have already experienced. They have invested heavily in foreign countries, in new plants and going concerns. While seeking by this route to recoup their own finances in self-defense, their employees have no similar escape. Some industries, indeed, have little hope of expanding successfully abroad. Japan is not favorably disposed to foreign investment in her borders.

While the foreign investments temporarily increase our exports of machinery and equipment, they will in the end reduce our export markets. Were the investment climate at home improved vis-a-vis imports, the flow of investments abroad would soon be tempered without the imposition of governmental restrictions.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF CYPRUS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout its long history, the island of Cyprus has been a crossroads of commerce, a steppingstone of empire builders, a center of the arts, and the seat of political institutions often far advanced over its neighbors on the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Cyprus was the site of colonial enterprises of the ancient Egyptians, the Phoenicians and the Greeks. During the Ionian revolts against the Persians in the fifth century B.C., the people of Cyprus joined with their island friends in trying to cast off the bonds of the Asian conquerors, but the attempt was unsuccessful. After the meteor-like passing of Alexander the Great, Cyprus became a province of the Ptolemies of Egypt. When the Romans were destroying the Temple at Jerusalem, Cyprus was a refuge for the fleeing Jews of Palestine. After the Arab armies had reached northward in their search for converts to their new Islamic faith, Cyprus became the meeting ground for the conflict between the Byzantines and the Arabs that was to rage for three centuries.

The Crusaders under Richard Coeur-de-Lion conquered Cyprus in 1192, and the island of the Mediterranean became a Crusader stronghold under Western rule until the coming of the Turks in

1570. Through a treaty with the Turks in 1878, Cyprus became a British base against the encroachment of the Russian Czars into the area of the Middle East. After World War I, the island of Cyprus became a possession of the British Crown, assuming the status of crown colony in 1925. On August 16, 1960, the island of Cyprus became an independent nation.

But Cyprus was to be plagued by a series of constitutional problems which revolved around the rights of the two dominant ethnic and national groups on the island, the Greeks and the Turks. The unrest finally erupted into a civil war in 1963, and the eventual establishment on Cyprus of a United Nations force for the purpose of keeping the peace until the two communities could settle their outstanding differences and resume the work of building a viable and progressive society. Presently, the problem of finding an amicable settlement of the conflict between the Cypriot Greeks and the Cypriot Turks is under discussion by the principals and representatives of the two parent nations of Greece and Turkey.

We, and the many friends of Cyprus, hope that the deliberations between reasonable men will find an equitable solution to the dilemma of Cyprus, and that the people of this ancient and noble island will soon be able to continue the tasks of establishing a modern nation of Cyprus. On this anniversary of their independence, we wish the people of Cyprus every success in their endeavors and express the fervent hope that soon they will be again at peace and will achieve the greatness of which they are capable.

THE INDIAN SICKNESS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very frank and sound editorial commentary in the Chicago Tribune, Thursday, August 7, analyzed Government complications in India. India possesses obvious importance due to its strategic location and the size of the populace but in administrative talent and political philosophy its governmental leaders have failed to meet the needs of the populace.

This editorial commentary hits the nail on the head.

The editorial follows:

THE INDIAN SICKNESS

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's prime minister, told a wildly cheering mob outside her palatial residence in New Delhi Tuesday that the nationalization of her country's major banks, just completed, was only a small step toward her goal of "democratic socialism." A dispatch to the Times of London, which also appeared in The Tribune, said the mob was "led by prominent communist leaders."

Mrs. Gandhi fired Morarji Desai, deputy prime minister and finance minister, from her cabinet because he opposed the bank nationalization program. She threatened her conservative critics with further collectivist innovations less than a week after she had welcomed President Nixon on his visit to

India and heard him praise its "sense of independence and nonalignment."

Independence? Since 1945, India has received aid of more than 9 billion dollars from the United States. In recent years the level has been about 800 million dollars a year and the Nixon administration has proposed no decrease.

Nonalignment? Before 1962, when Red China attacked India, the Indian government was passionately attached to Red China; now it is passionately attached to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Nixon and Mrs. Gandhi discussed only global and extraterrestrial affairs. The Indians, especially Mrs. Gandhi, do not hesitate to tell the United States to get out of Viet Nam, but they would violently resent any criticism of their domestic socialist program, which the United States has financed to the extent of more than 9 billion dollars. For years, however, leading Indian economists and industrialists have contended that the worst evil afflicting their country, not even excepting overpopulation and the high birth rate, is the government's socialist policies and its indolent, incompetent, tax-eating, corrupt, and oppressive bureaucracy.

Mrs. Gandhi's father, Jawaharlal Nehru, and the other intellectuals who founded the Congress party and led the struggle for India's independence were Marxists. They were also parlor proletarians, convinced that Lenin was right when he said that a socialist revolution must be based upon a proletariat. For a proletariat you must have industry. Hence India's government adopted a program of rapid industrialization and neglected agriculture, on which 80 per cent of India's 550 million people depend for a living.

The government's official industrial policy statement proclaims "a socialist pattern of society as the national objective." It contains a long list of basic industries which are reserved for the state and another long list which are to be progressively owned by the state, but with participation by private enterprise.

Overexpansion of the public sector and overregulation of the private sector have produced industrial stagnation, widespread unemployment, and severe inflation.

India has abundant resources of iron ore, coal, and manganese, but it would be far more economical to buy steel from Japan, paying for it with raw materials, than to produce it at home. India's food shortages could have been prevented by encouraging private initiative in the production of fertilizers and the introduction of high-yield strains of wheat and rice. India has more land under cultivation and much more under irrigation than the United States, and has more acreage per capita under cultivation than has Japan. With technical assistance from United States foundations and universities, particularly the University of Illinois, India is improving its agriculture, but whether it will ever become self-sufficient is doubtful.

Chester Bowles, former ambassador to India, and other zealous Indophiles have supported American assistance to India's "democratic socialism" as the Asian alternative to communism. It's about time for Congress to realize that the Indian sickness is a transition stage, not an alternative, to communism.

BRONZE STAR AWARDED MASTER SERGEANT

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, M. Sgt. Albert T. Jones, a fine man from

Maryland, was recently awarded the Bronze Star for meritorious service in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor him by including the following article in the RECORD:

M. SGT. JONES AWARDED BRONZE STAR

Master Sergeant Albert T. Jones, Augusta Court, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., was awarded the Bronze Star Medal at the U.S. Army Ordnance Center and School July 11, 1969.

He was cited for meritorious service in connection with ground operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam from May 1968 to May 1969. His loyalty, initiative, and perseverance were in the highest traditions of the military service.

He is assigned to Headquarters, Second Battalion, USAOC&S.

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL BOYS' CLUB OF SAN PEDRO, CALIF.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding organization, the boys' club, and a remarkable chapter of that organization, the Boys' Club of San Pedro, Calif.

My colleagues in the Congress may remember that clubs affiliated with "Boys' Clubs" of America operate under a charter, granted by Congress, which reads, "to promote the health, social, education, vocational, and character development of boys throughout the United States."

A boys' club is a licensed, private, social service agency. It is the most exclusive club in town. It is open to every boy between the ages of 8 and 18, regardless of his racial, religious, economic, or cultural background.

Particularly inspiring has been the history of the Roosevelt Memorial Boys' Club of San Pedro, Inc.

The Boys' Club of San Pedro was organized March 1, 1938, under the leadership of John S. Gibson, with the assistance of the San Pedro Civitan Club and a large number of other San Pedro groups and individuals.

The first clubhouse was located at 718 West Sixth Street and had a membership of 225. Today it is located at 1200 South Cabrillo Avenue in a facility valued at over \$750,000 with a membership of over 2,000, and a daily use of over 500 members.

The program from its inception proved popular and larger facilities were soon needed. After a few years the boys' club was moved from its first location to the abandoned San Pedro High School shop buildings. In 1947, the condemnation of these shop buildings forced the boys' club to move into the old high school made usable largely through the efforts of the San Pedro Lions Club.

During this transition, the efforts of the board of directors, in negotiating an agreement with the local shipyard union and the late Mr. Skourous of Fox Theaters resulted in the boys' club gaining title to the property upon which the present structure stands.

A fund-raising drive in 1965 secured such wide community support that the facilities are now completed and entirely paid for. The structure has foresight incorporated into its architecture. It was designed to serve the present and the future, for it is to the future to which the boys' clubs are dedicated.

The boys' club operates upon a budget of \$62,000 a year. Approximately two-thirds of this comes from United Way contributions. The other third comes from local fundraising activities. This year the Keystone 100 Dinner is the major fundraising activity.

I am pleased to add my congratulations to the board of directors; to the officers; to Mr. Nick N. Trani, the executive director and his staff; to the many past officers and leaders; and to the parents of San Pedro; all who have made the boys' club a great success. The youth of San Pedro are fortunate indeed to have been served so well by so many over so many years.

THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tax reform bill, passed last week by the House, has generated a great deal of interest among the general public as to what are the provisions of this legislation.

I wish to make it clear to my constituents that I voted for this tax reform measure, but had great reservations on the legislation which was adopted by a vote of 394 to 30. Although not a perfect solution to all our tax problems, it is, nevertheless, a step in the right direction. I have listened very carefully to the debate on this bill and find that there is still much to be desired in a way of a genuine tax reform measure.

Mr. Speaker, because of the very technical nature of this tax bill, I would like to bring to my constituents a general summary of the key provisions it contains.

The tax bill, passed by this House, breaks down into two main sections: One contains the provisions that grant tax relief while the other embodies reforms that close or narrow certain loopholes in the Federal tax structure.

Added to the measure is a section which I opposed, that extends the income tax surcharge at a 5-percent rate for 6 months beyond January 1, 1970, repeals the 7-percent business investment credit, and extends excise taxes on automobiles and telephones.

The following is a summary of the major provisions dealing with tax relief and tax reform:

TAX RELIEF

Individual income tax cuts are spread over 3 years, rising to a total of \$8 billion in 1972. Virtually all taxpayers will get some relief under the bill.

The present top tax rate of 70 percent would be reduced to 65 percent for invest-

ment income over the 2 years and a maximum rate of 50 percent would be imposed on earned income.

The standard deduction, for a person who does not file an itemized return, is raised from 10 to 15 percent over 3 years. The maximum amount of the deduction is raised from \$1,000 to \$2,000, also from 1970 through 1972.

Each taxpaying unit, whether a single person or a family, would be given a minimum standard deduction of \$1,100. For 1970, this amount would be available only on a limited basis to incomes above the poverty level, but after that it would be fully effective.

By adding the minimum personal exemption of \$600 per person to the new \$1,100 standard deduction, single persons with gross incomes of up to \$1,700 would be exempt from any Federal income tax. Incomes up to \$3,500 for a family of four would be similarly exempt, and so on.

Single persons 35 years of age or more and any person whose spouse has died would benefit from reduced tax rate—halfway between the lower rates available to married couples and the higher rates currently applicable to single persons.

This change would be effective next year as would one permitting widows and widowers with dependent children or children in school to file on the present split-income basis open to married couples. The children must be under 20 years of age.

The present deduction for moving expenses, when changing jobs, is expanded to cover expenses for house-hunting trips, temporary living expenses prior to finding a new home, and expenses related to selling an old home or buying a new one. Total deductions for these additional categories is limited to \$2,500.

The bill would simplify an existing income-averaging provision that lets the taxpayer with unusually large earnings in a single year spread them over several years for tax purposes.

TAX REFORM

The capital gains tax on individuals and corporations is altered in a number of respects:

For an individual, the present maximum tax rate of 25 percent on capital gains would be repealed. The rate for those in the top brackets could go up as high as 32.5 percent under the bill. The period that assets must be held before profits from their sale are eligible for capital gains treatment would be extended from 6 months to 1 year.

The corporate tax rate on long-term capital gains would be increased from 25 to 30 percent. Employers' contributions to pension plans, when paid as part of a lump-sum distribution, will not receive capital gains treatment.

These changes along with several others affecting individuals and employers, are expected to increase Federal revenue by nearly \$800 million a year.

An individual having income from any of five types of sources that now goes untaxed would be required to pay taxes on half of such income above \$10,000. Among these income categories are interest on tax-exempt State and municipal bonds and the excluded half of long-

term capital gains when the plan becomes fully effective after next January 1 would be \$85 million annually.

A companion provision would require allocation of personal deductions between taxable income and tax-free income on the same five sources, plus two others relating to percentage depletion and intangible drilling allowances. This provision could increase yearly revenue by more than \$450 million when fully effective.

Any stock dividends that increase the holder's proportionate interest in a corporation's assets and earnings would be taxed. Preferred stock and preferred stock-rights distributions would be treated as taxable income. Certain stock transfers to employees under stock plans also would be taxed.

A Federal subsidy is authorized to States and municipalities on bonds they issue, making the payment equal to the average cost of the additional interest plus some additional amount. The revenue gain by taxation of previously tax-exempt interest has been estimated at \$100 million a year.

There would be tightened tax treatment on charitable contributions by phasing out an unlimited deduction now allowed in some areas.

There would be prohibitions against wealthy persons operating farms at a "paper loss" through accounting gimmicks and removal of capital gains treatment on certain farm operations. These changes would eventually bring in an added \$20 million a year.

Topping the major new business tax provisions in amounts of anticipated revenue are:

Restrictions on accelerated depreciation of real estate and tightening of real estate tax recapture provisions, except for housing construction, that may bring in as much as \$1.3 billion in new revenue in 10 years.

A reduction of the 27½ percent gas and oil allowance to 20 percent, discontinuance of it on foreign production, and a scaling down of allowances on most other minerals. Annual revenue is estimated at \$450 million.

Another provision to remove capital gains treatment for commercial banks on profits from bonds, special tax advantages on bank reserves and listed debts, and remove previous tax advantages given to special reserves for bad debt losses. Annual revenue gain is set at \$300 million.

Among other business tax provisions are:

Revision of the foreign tax credit to allow recapture of tax benefits claimed due to a loss in a foreign country to the extent of profits realized in subsequent years in that same country. Another change would limit the tax escape on foreign mineral income. The estimated revenue gain is \$40 million a year.

Elimination of multiple tax exemptions over a period of 8 years. These have permitted a corporation to divide up into branches to get down to a 28-percent rate on the first \$25,000 of income for each branch instead of the regular 48 percent for larger businesses. Revenue gain is seen as \$30 million.

Disallowance in some cases of interest deducted in connection with bond issues used to purchase other unrelated businesses—the conglomerate mergers. This, along with other new tax methods on corporate mergers, would eventually bring in an added \$40 million.

There are other provisions that would prevent companies from passing on accelerated depreciation to stockholders in a tax-free manner, set new yardsticks for determining depreciation and the income or loss of certain corporations, apply the new taxes on bad debt reserves proposed for commercial banks to savings and loan associations. They would bring in about \$75 million yearly.

The bill calls for substantial curbs on activities of foundations to: First, prevent self-dealing—borrowing—between a founder and his foundation; second, require distribution of their income for charitable purposes; third, limit their holdings of private businesses; fourth, assure that their investments are not endangered by financial speculation.

Foundations not living up to these and several other new requirements would pay additional taxes or penalties. In addition, foundations would pay 7½ percent on net investment income.

Other present tax-exempt organizations—churches, social welfare clubs, civic league, and fraternal organizations—would pay taxes on unrelated business income.

A patronage dividend deduction allowed to cooperatives would be continued only if at least 50 percent of the dividend allocated is distributed by the end of a 10-year period.

All told, the bill provides for tax cuts for individuals that would total a little over \$8 billion by 1972. Its reforms—eliminating some deductions and restricting others—would bring in an estimated \$7 billion by then.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this bill, in its present state, has a long way to go to achieve adequate tax reform. We are headed in the right direction and this should not be the end of our quest for a proper tax reform. We must continue our efforts in this direction until all the loopholes and unjustifiable preferences are stricken from the Federal tax laws.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS TO PROVIDE IMPROVED SERVICE TO GUAM

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, anything of a positive nature that encourages mainland citizens to get out and look at some of our territories is of interest to me, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

That is why I am gratified that Pan American World Airways, this country's pioneer air carrier in the Pacific, has an-

nounced that it will be providing faster and more convenient service to and from the island of Guam, commencing September 1.

Under the new schedule, Pan Am will provide a daily 10 a.m. departure from Guam to Tokyo and New York. Flight time to New York will be cut by almost 7 hours. In the opposite direction, the new daily flight to Guam from New York and Tokyo will arrive at a more convenient hour.

This news is most pleasing, Mr. Speaker, because it will doubtless mean that this fall and winter, the most delightful periods to be in Guam, will see a greater abundance of stateside visitors than ever taking advantage of the unique attractions offered on our tiny island possession in the Pacific.

POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN SURVIVORS' BENEFITS BILL GAINS SUPPORT IN HAWAII

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1969, I joined more than 100 of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation which would provide benefits to policemen and firemen who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

Specifically, the legislation would eliminate the provision under existing law which limits coverage under the Federal Employees Compensation Act to cases where death or injury occurs during the enforcement of Federal law. The proposed new extended coverage would insure the well-being of families of those public safety officers who are killed or are totally disabled while protecting our general welfare in all instances, whether engaged in the enforcement of Federal law, State law, or local ordinance.

Believing that my colleagues would be interested to know that the council of the county of Maui, State of Hawaii, and the Honolulu Police Patrolman's Association have endorsed this proposed legislation, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the Maui County Council's resolution of August 1, 1969, and the Honolulu Police Patrolman's Association letter dated July 31, 1969:

RESOLUTION

Resolution supporting legislation which will provide the families of policemen and firemen with survivors' benefits

Whereas, Representative Spark M. Matsunaga has joined more than 100 of his colleagues in co-sponsoring a bill to provide the families of all policemen and firemen with survivors' benefits; and

Whereas, said bill would extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to all policemen and firemen killed or disabled in the line of duty, whether they were enforcing Federal law or not; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the County of Maui that it does hereby support legislation which will provide the families of all policemen and firemen with survivors' benefits; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, Representative Patsy T. Mink, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, and Senator Hiram L. Fong, Hawaii's delegation to the U.S. Congress.

HONOLULU POLICE PATROLMAN'S ASSOCIATION,

July 31, 1969.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
U.S. Congress,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MATSUNAGA: This letter is in response to a July 27, 1969 newspaper article which appeared in the local newspaper. The article stated that you and some 100 other colleagues were co-sponsoring a bill to provide the families of all policemen and firemen with survivors' benefits.

The organization we represent is the Honolulu Police Patrolman's Association which consists of over 400 members primarily of the patrolman rank within the Honolulu Police Department.

As you may know the patrolman is the one most vulnerable to being killed on duty since he is the "front line" of any police force. So it behooves our organization to seek your assistance in this endeavor.

This newspaper article excited our organization into writing you and asking for your continued support on this subject matter. The security this bill would afford our families is certainly of great concern to all who may be eligible.

Our membership will be informed of your bill and we will be watching ever so closely for further developments. If you have a copy of the bill, we would like to have it for our records and information.

If there is any way in which our organization can assist you in passing this bill, we would be more than willing to carry a share of the load.

In closing we would like to extend our sincere aloha for your thoughtfulness in considering the problems of the policemen and firemen. But more important is your actions which make us appreciate your presence in Congress.

Mahalo Nui Loa,

A. KELIINUI,
President.
M. JOY,
Vice President.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I entered in the RECORD my objection to the proposed jetport near the Everglades National Park in Florida. This project, as I said then, concerns not just Miami, or Floridians, but all Americans.

Now the New York Times has written a major feature on this important issue. It pinpoints the two viewpoints that clash to make this issue controversial.

On the one side, is the man who values progress without evaluating its consequences; he states his case with understanding:

The preservationist wants everything to remain the way it was. He's right in a sense. But it's not the way the great American system operates.

On the other side is the preservationist, who respects progress, but is highly concerned with conserving the natural beauty and natural resources of this Nation; he pleads his case with simple eloquence:

You can't make it. You can't buy it. And when it's gone, it's gone forever.

I am entering this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I hope that after a thoughtful reading on it, they will support the efforts to preserve the natural beauty of the Everglades National Park.

NATURALISTS SHUDDER AS OFFICIALS HAIL EVERGLADES JETPORT (By Homer Bigart)

HOMESTEAD, Fla.—At the bottom of Florida, beyond the burgeoning Miami suburbs, past the last television tower, the last alligatorium, the last serpentarium, the last used car lot, the last snakorama and pancake house, is a wonderfully quiet place where the only offending spoor of civilization is a rusty litter of beer cans along the infrequent trails.

The Everglades National Park is the last refuge of solitude along the Eastern Seaboard. And it is surely doomed, conservationists warn, by a jetport under construction just north of it.

An aquatic wilderness, the glades have faced many crises in this decade.

Consecutive seasons of subnormal rainfall, combined with the wasteful diversion of water by drainage canals, produced droughts that decimated the alligators and threatened several species of birds with extinction.

Oil exploration and urban and agricultural development intruding close to the boundaries of the park brought an increasing menace of pollution.

AT CENTER OF SWAMP

But these were lesser perils against the threat posed by the new jetport. That facility, covering 39 square miles, is right in the middle of the Great Cypress Swamp, which supplies 38 per cent of the water flowing into the park.

Water pollution, air pollution, a shattering of the stillness by overflights of jets will be inevitable when the project is fully developed, park officials warn. The impact on the glades, they contend, could be catastrophic.

This is sharply denied by the Dade County (Miami) Port Authority, sponsors of the project.

"No pollution is anticipated," Port Authority officials assert. "The operations are not expected to create excessive noise. Wildlife will be protected."

Alan C. Stewart, Port Authority director, dismisses conservationists as "butterfly chasers." To him the rare and endangered bird species in the park—the wood stork, the bald eagle, the roseate spoonbill, the great white heron, the pink and wood ibis, the noddy and sooty terns—are just a bunch of "yellow-bellied sapsuckers."

SEEN AS BAR TO DEVELOPERS

If conservationists want to stop the development of south Florida, says Mr. Stewart, "it behooves them to save up their pennies and buy up the land."

In a more diplomatic vein his deputy, Richard H. Judy, assures visitors that work on the jetport would be halted immediately if it was proved that the project would spoil the Everglades. But he is currently convinced that the jetport will serve the park as a buffer, saving the environs from greedy developers.

"The preservationist wants everything to

remain the way it was," Mr. Judy observes. "He's right in a sense. But it's not the way the great American system operates."

"We can't escape reality. People are coming here to live. This is going to be one of the great population centers of America in the next 20 years."

"Great Cypress Swamp is just typical south Florida real estate. It's private property; eventually it's going to be put to human use."

APPEALS TO VOLPE

A word from the Department of Transportation in Washington would halt the project. Conservationist leaders throughout the country have appealed to Secretary John A. Volpe, urging him to order relocation of the airport.

But the Department of Transportation has already provided \$500,000 toward construction of the first runway, a pilot training facility scheduled to go into operation next month, and \$200,000 more for a study of a high-speed transportation corridor slashing across the wilderness and linking the airport with the east and west coasts of Florida.

These grants were made without consultation with the Department of the Interior, where sentiment against the jetport is hardening.

Meanwhile, an interdepartmental committee headed by Dr. Luna Leopold, of the United States Geological Survey, is preparing a report on the potential effects of the jetport on the park.

Conservationists are hoping that a strongly negative report by the Leopold group will persuade both Secretary Volpe and Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel to condemn the airport.

Last week, the Dade County Commissioners hired Stewart L. Udall and his environmental planning consulting firm, Overview Group of Washington, to prepare a plan that would keep to a minimum any adverse effects of the jetport on the national park.

The Udall organization will first conduct a four-month feasibility study to determine whether the jetport can be built without destroying or severely damaging the Everglades. This "first-phase study" will also consider alternate sites.

To a nonconservationist, it is difficult at first to see why opposition to the jetport is so intense. The site is six miles from the nearest park boundary. And at the outset the jetport will be used merely as a training field. Only one runway will be used in the initial development.

However, a second training runway may become necessary in three to five years, the Port Authority says, and by 1980 the jetport would be transformed into a giant commercial operation, the nation's biggest air terminal, covering more land than the entire City of Miami, and able to accommodate jumbo jets and supersonic planes.

Conservationists warn that even before that materializes the delicately balanced ecology of the park could be upset by polluting and altering the flow of water in the park.

The park is absolutely dependent on a cycle of summer flooding and winter drought. Any change in the quantity, quality and rhythm of the flow threatens the incredible diversity of plants and wildlife established there.

The true Everglades are sawgrass prairies stretching to the horizon, a vast green blanket dotted with wooded hammocks, the grass hiding the shallow water of a strange river, 30 miles wide, that creeps imperceptibly southwestward toward the Gulf of Mexico.

CHANGES IN PLANT LIFE

A few years ago, when the water table in the park began falling, changes were noted in the plant life. Poisonwood, buttonwood, willow and other scrubby vegetation began

shouldering into dried-up areas where formerly they had been drowned out. They threatened a drastic alteration in the appearance of the glades.

Today, after three years of abundant rainfall, the river of grass seems revived, and the invasion of brush has been slowed. The river, starting as seepage from Lake Okeechobee, 100 miles north, enters the park from the north and east.

The flow of the river has been impeded, before reaching the park, by a complex system of drainage and flood-control canals and by two highways, the Tamiami Trail and the newer Alligator Alley.

A bill passed by Congress last year provides for the release to the park of 315,000 acre-feet of water annually from conservation districts north of the park. This would meet the park's minimal needs, but the plan will not be implemented before 1976, and the interim release schedule is tied to the water level in Lake Okeechobee.

Frank Nix, park hydrologist, said the jetport threatened the last unimpeded flow of water into the park. All the northwest corner of the park, he explained, is dependent on water from the Big Cypress Swamp.

Dr. William B. Robertson Jr., the park's research biologist, noted that "substantial residues" of DDT were found recently in bald eagle eggs. The poison had apparently been ingested by fish, and the fish, in turn, eaten by the eagle.

Most birds may adjust to the noise of jet engines, Dr. Robertson suggested, but there is danger of collision with aircraft for some soaring species, especially the wood stork, which likes to ride the thermal updrafts. There is a major colony of wood storks in Big Cypress Swamp.

In a recent test, it was found that birds in the park flushed whenever a plane flew over at less than 5,000 feet. Consequently, park officials have asked for an airspace reservation of at least 5,000 feet. The Federal Aviation Administration contends that 3,000 feet is enough.

In their concern for plants and wildlife, conservationists tend to forget the 400 or more Miccosukee Indians living along the Tamiami Trail near the jetport. Initially the Indians went along with the project, hoping it would give them jobs. Now they oppose it.

USED TO HAVE GOOD LIFE

At the tribal office in Miami, Chief Buffalo Tiger told why:

"It happens to Indians year after year: progress wasting the hunting grounds."

"Indians used to have good life here; clean air, clean water, plenty of food."

"We used to see two or three raccoons on every hummock, a lot of otters, turtles, alligators in every pond."

"Now even the snakes are scarce. The fish and turtles are going. It's hard to make a living in the glades."

Buffalo Tiger, 49, said the Port Authority had usurped sacred Indian ground where the annual tribal festival, the Green Corn Dance, is traditionally held.

At this affair, which usually lasts five days, boys are given new names and inducted officially into manhood.

Eating the new corn crop at the close of the ritual marks the start of a new year for the tribe.

There is also a display by the medicine men of sacred tribal relics; dried seeds, little shards of glass, and what looks like the shriveled claws of animals. These are kept by medicine men in buckskin bags and revealed only at Green Corn dances, Buffalo Tiger said.

Turning back to the despoiling of the Everglades, Buffalo Tiger said:

"You can't make it. You can't buy it. And when it's gone, it's gone forever."

TRANSFER TO FOREIGN FLAGS OF AMERICAN SHIPS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting correspondence from the Brotherhood of Marine Officers re transfer to foreign flags of United Fruit Co. vessels.

Apparently Mr. Speaker, the job drain from the United States to foreign countries is being carried out at record pace. For many years some of us have tried to warn the Congress and the country of the serious economic dangers involved in the runaway industry and runaway ships that give jobs to foreign workers while curtailing our job opportunities. Unless we follow some of the suggestions made by the Brotherhood of Marine Officers and by other right thinking persons and organizations, we face inevitable economic catastrophe. The letter is self-explanatory, and I want to add my voice to those of others in protesting this latest job transfer to foreign countries.

BROTHERHOOD OF MARINE OFFICERS,
Hoboken, N.J., July 31, 1969.

Re Transfer to foreign flags of United Fruit Co. vessels.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: As you know by our previous letters, we are the Collective Bargaining Representatives for the Licensed Deck and Engineering and Staff Officers of the U.S. Flag Fleet of the United Fruit Company.

Up to very recently this fleet consisted of 18 vessels all of which were completely refrigerated and were the only ones of this kind under the U.S. Flag. Because of these desirable qualities fourteen of these vessels were chartered by M.S.T.S. to carry military refrigerated foods to our armed forces in Viet Nam, serving for the past four years in that capacity and doing a job that no other vessels under the U.S. Flag could perform. This establishes the need for the unique and essential nature of such vessels in the U.S. Maritime Fleet.

Now due to the reduction in the requirements for Viet Nam several vessels were released by the M.S.T.S. In two transactions a total of six of these highly specialized vessels have been transferred to foreign flag with the permission of the Maritime Administration as required by law.

Following transfer these vessels are continuing the same operations, to the same ports, carrying the same cargoes as they did before the transfer. In other cases these transferred vessels relieved company owned or chartered foreign flag ships and who then took over the run of the American Flag vessels.

The transfer therefore is simply a method of depriving the United States and its citizens of the benefits of ownership, taxes, control and jobs enjoyed while under the U.S. Flag. The United Fruit Company's basic income is derived from the American domestic market, yet the company prefers to utilize foreign transportation facilities to transport its products. In this light it is clear that the transfers are chiefly for the purpose of a few additional dollars in the pocket of the company and causes disproportionate injury to the welfare of the United States and its citizens.

Rumor is now abroad that the Company is

contemplating an additional request for permission of the Maritime Administration to transfer several more vessels, and that in the near future the United Fruit Company will operate only a foreign flag fleet.

In the interest of preserving the U.S. Merchant Fleet against losing further vessels of this unique type the Brotherhood and other labor organizations representing the seamen sailing these vessels have offered to meet with the Company to discuss modification of the labor cost of these vessels in order to alleviate the claimed financial loss caused by operations.

We plead with you for the welfare of the U.S. Merchant Marine, and to protect jobs of American citizens, to voice a strong protest to the President, Mr. Nixon, Andrew Gibson, Maritime Administrator and in Congress where it will no doubt do the most good. Since the United Fruit Company has definite intentions of transferring its entire American Flag Fleet to its foreign owned tonnage, our unsuccessful effort to stop the transfer of the SS Quisqueya, SS Santo Cerro and the SS Morazan to Dutch Registry and the ultimate approval of the transfer by the Government has paved the way for the complete transfer of their fleet over the next several years. Only the efforts of yourself and others in Congress can now stop this mass transfer.

The approval was granted by the Government partially on the grounds that the vessels would be under effective control of the U.S. Maritime Administration in case of emergency. The effective control of vessels transferred foreign is nothing more than a farce, as was proved during the Viet Nam conflict, when crews of vessels under effective control refused to carry essential war cargo to Viet Nam.

This effective control clause simply allows the United Fruit Company and other American Companies, who derive their income in our country, to transfer considerable assets in the form of vessels to foreign countries, hire cheap foreign labor, avoid our taxes and in turn use these transferred assets to drain more money out of our country which is further invested foreign.

We ask that you, as an elected representative of the American people, to protest this abuse, which will have far flung effects for once a vessel is transferred foreign these vessels are repaired foreign, a loss to our shipyards. The uses of foreign stores and supplies instead of American, will further affect many of the people who build, make and supply these vessels.

Our Government has set a goal of 30 new ships over the next 10 years to replace and rebuild our Merchant Marine, yet how can the transfer of a total of 18 refrigerated vessels, over half the amount to be built in the next 10 years, be allowed if we are going to revitalize the Merchant Marine?

We know that certain foreign countries have been expanding their merchant marines and navies at a time when the U.S. Merchant Marine has been shrinking at a horrible rate. Considering the uncertainties in foreign affairs, the U.S. Merchant Marine has deteriorated beyond the critical point making it absolutely essential to stop further deterioration, pending adoption of a vigorous policy of renewal.

The United Fruit Company has a ship replacement program, building vessels in Japan and France, yet there is no replacement program for the United Fruit Company American Fleet. If the United Fruit Company was replacing or intended to replace its fleet, the transfer would have little overall effect on the American Merchant Marine, but by insisting on building no American vessels and building only for their foreign fleet, we feel a great injustice is being done to the American people who support and provide the majority of the profits of the Company.

We need your help and support in a loud clear voice and we ask that you join us in insisting that not only the United Fruit Company but also other Companies be informed by our Congress and the Maritime Administration that no further applications for transfer to foreign flag will be approved. Such support from you will stop the planning and scheming that goes into such transfers and would further the interest of the American Merchant Marine, the American people and our Country.

Respectfully yours,

E. JOSEPH FARR,

President.

FREDERICK B. TROXWELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

PLIGHT OF GRAPEPICKERS FASHIONABLE CAUSE FOR LIBERALS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troublesome labor disputes has been the attempt to unionize the California grapepickers, one of its features we are all aware of, is the organized effort to boycott California grapes.

My attention has just been directed to a very penetrating article in the Friday, July 18, New World, the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, written by Jeffrey Hart which properly and effectively discusses the great boycott controversy.

PLIGHT OF GRAPEPICKERS FASHIONABLE CAUSE FOR LIBERALS

(By Jeffrey Hart)

The movement led by Cesar Chavez to unionize California grape pickers has become so involved with liberal emotions, and also so fashionable a "cause," that the substance of the whole controversy—though fascinating—is seldom discerned.

Liberalism springs from such deep psychological needs that many actually prefer its myths to the less satisfying actuality. Looked at psychologically, liberalism is really a secular mechanism designed to generate the confidence that one is virtuous: redemption—the conviction that one is virtuous—requires that an endless series of situations be structured as melodrama, with victims and villains; and the "right-thinking" individual earns his redemption by espousing the side of the virtuous victim. The desire to be virtuous is so deep and so natural, and the need, consequently, for moral melodrama so continuous, that the melodramatic structure tends to be imposed even where the actuality is more complex and problematical—and interesting.

From the Volkswagen with its "Boycott Grapes" sticker, to the pages of the National Catholic Reporter, to Southampton, L.I., where beautiful people like Anne Uzielli and Ethel Kennedy stage elaborate bashes in support of Chavez, the satisfying myth prevails: migrant workers, grossly underpaid and living in wretched conditions, pick the grapes in the San Joaquin valley; they are naturally eager to join Chavez' union; but they are prevented from doing so by fear of the growers, who comprise a fascistic oligarchy. Hence national, and even global, moral indignation.

The reality is much more complicated and ethically problematical. In Delano, the major grape-growing area which is central to the whole controversy, 90 percent of the pickers

aren't migrants, but year-round residents. They are also exceptionally well paid, the best paid agricultural workers in the continental U.S., averaging between \$2 and \$2.50 per hour—much more, for example, than the \$1.69 per hour of the average California farm worker. Delano workers also enjoy more comprehensive extra benefits than farm workers in any other state.

But Chavez has concentrated on Delano precisely because the pickers are well paid and are not migrants. He in fact abandoned his earlier attempt to organize migrants in Texas, for their very mobility makes it difficult to collect dues efficiently, and in states like New York and Florida migrants aren't paid enough to make the dues worth collecting. But in Delano the workers are on the scene, and they have the money.

Which is precisely why they have not been eager to join Chavez. So far, only about three per cent have signed up. And this wariness about Chavez is why there has in fact been no "grape strike"; thus making the consumer boycott Chavez' chief weapon. The "pickets" Chavez has been able to muster are not Delano grape pickers but Chavez followers from elsewhere.

What, then, is going on? In order to have a viable union, Chavez needs the dues of the relatively well paid and established, but therefore reluctant, table-grape pickers in the San Joaquin Valley. He also wants a closed shop—i.e., a monopoly—and so opposes placing farm workers under the NLRB, which would make a closed shop illegal. Now if this were all, one would conclude that Chavez is merely on the make, and wants the power and profit such a situation would bring him.

But this is not so. Everything we know about his life and his ideals goes against such a conclusion. The truth appears to be more complex and more ambiguous. Chavez conceives of the grape-picker drive in the context of the entire Mexican-American problem.

If he can force unionization on the grape pickers, he will have an organization in being, with funds, and such an organization would apply economic and political pressure on behalf of Mexican-American migrants, on behalf of the urban barrios, and so on. The reluctant dues of the Delano pickers are only the essential foundation of his efforts to improve the lot of Mexican-Americans generally. Like the Mafia for the Italians, like the urban political machines for the Irish a generation ago, the grape-pickers union will be an instrumentality of Mexican-American community power.

All this may be admirable, and may even be practicable (though the growers say that if Chavez succeeds, they will simply switch to wine grapes, which can be harvested by machine). But it is all pretty remote from the melodrama of liberal myth.

Those who boycott grapes are penalizing growers, most of them small, family owned enterprises, which pay good wages and provide good working conditions, in order to force pickers, mostly against their will, to pay their dues to Chavez in order to organize economic and political power on behalf of the Mexican-American community.

BRADSHAW NAMED PRESIDENT-ELECT AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, in the bulletin just received from Atlantic City,

N.J., we have learned of the announcement that Mrs. Lillian M. Bradshaw, Dallas, has been named as the president-elect of the American Library Association. Everyone in Dallas shares this great honor and recognition with her. Mrs. Bradshaw has been an outstanding participant in all of our community activities. She will bring this same charm, enthusiasm, and intellectual drive with her into her administration as the head of the American Library Association.

The following is the complete report on Mrs. Lillian M. Bradshaw, who is now serving as the director of the Dallas Public Library, and who will become president of the American Library Association in 1970.

Mrs. Bradshaw received her undergraduate degree from Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md., and her library science degree from Drexel Institute of Technology in Philadelphia.

She has served on the staff of the Utica Public Library, N.Y., from 1938 to 1943; as assistant coordinator of young adult work at the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, Md., from 1943-46. She has held positions of director of reader's services, coordinator of adult services, assistant director and acting director of the Dallas Public Library from 1946-62. In 1962 she was appointed director of libraries for the Dallas Public Library System.

Mrs. Bradshaw has previously filled various offices in the American Library Association, including president of the adult services division, 1967-68; director of the executive committee for the public relations section of the Library Administration Division; and has diverse responsibilities in the Public Library Association. She is currently a member of the American Library Association Council and chairman of the Association's National Library Week Committee. Mrs. Bradshaw has also served as President of the Texas Library Association, 1964-65, and is now chairman of that association's legislative task force.

In other activities, Mrs. Bradshaw has served as a member of the national steering committee for National Library Week; as a member of the advisory council and board of trustees of the association for Graduate Education and Research in North Texas; director of the Texas Municipal League; director of the Dallas County Community Action Committee; a conferee and assistant task force leader on the goals for Dallas program; and president of the Dallas Metropolitan Area Public Libraries Association. She is a member of the Zonta Club of Dallas and the Dallas chapter, American Association of University Women. Mrs. Bradshaw is listed in Who's Who in America and Who's Who of American Women. She was a representative of the American Library Association at the Swedish Public Library Conference in 1960, was chosen Librarian of the Year by the Texas Library Association in 1961, was chosen B'nai B'rith Woman of Awareness in 1965 and has been the recipient of numerous local honors for civic endeavors.

AN ACHILLES HEEL—THE GREEK POST

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very highly respected member of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, Mr. Phillip Warden, has written a very timely article about the selection of an American Ambassador to Greece.

Mr. Warden's column appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Warden's column follows:

AN ACHILLES HEEL—THE GREEK POST

(By Phillip Warden)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 11.—The choice of an ambassador to Greece threatens to become an Achilles heel for the Nixon administration.

Greek-Americans want to see one of their own chosen. They look to Vice President Agnew, the son of a Greek immigrant, to influence the administration in its choice. Agnew, however, has refused to become involved.

The state department proposes to give the post to one of its career diplomats, Henry J. Tasca, now ambassador to Morocco. His post-doctoral studies in the London School of Economics and his service as economic adviser to W. Averell Harriman on North Atlantic Treaty organization matters make his political views suspect to many Republicans.

"The liberals are trying to ram him thru as ambassador to Greece," a Member of Congress who has worked closely with the Greek-American community in Chicago, said last week. "The reports we receive from Sweden say that the state department has chosen Tasca. The Kennedy-Johnson carryovers in the state department have been pushing him."

Ever since Nixon chose Agnew to be Vice President, the Greek-Americans have contributed heavily to the Republican Party. Consequently, no one wants to bite the hand which is feeding it.

The naming of an ambassador acceptable to all the Greek-Americans has been complicated by the growing debate over the Greek government. The once-powerful support for the Greek military junta has waned.

These undoubtedly are among the reasons why Agnew decided not to become involved. But stronger reasons are found in Agnew's background. Agnew's father drummed into the mind of his son the fact that Spiro was an American, not a Greek. The elder Agnew would not allow Greek to be spoken at home. The Vice President speaks no Greek. Agnew is proud of his Greek ancestry and his immigrant parents, but the Vice President stresses that he is "an unhyphenated American."

The state department has received a number of nominations for the ambassadorship. Anthony Angelos, a business man of Chicago, is among them. Sen. Dirksen (R., Ill.), Senate minority leader, asked for the appointment of his close friend, Kimon T. Karabatsos, a banker. Karabatsos lives near Dirksen in suburban Virginia. George Christopher, former mayor of San Francisco, is another nominee.

Sen. Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.) has pushed Lt. Gen. William W. Quinn, chief of the army section, United States military advisory group to Greece from 1953 to 1955, as a nominee. Quinn has been extremely popular with the Greek-Americans. If they cannot have an ambassador from their own ethnic group, members of Congress say that

Quinn probably would be the first choice of the group.

Whoever is chosen by the White House will have to first be cleared by Thomas Anthony Pappas, millionaire food importer and capitalist, and a member of the Republican national finance committee, administration officials said.

Ultimately a far greater problem for the Nixon administration will be whether the man finally chosen will be acceptable to the Greek government.

Tasca, who will be 57 this month, did his undergraduate work at Temple university. He pursued his economics studies at the University of Pennsylvania and the London School of Economics. He received a post-doctoral social science research council fellowship and was a Penfield traveling scholar in Europe in 1938 and 1939.

SECONDARY MARKET FOR STUDENT ASSISTANCE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal guaranteed loan program was enacted in 1965, there was great optimism that it would fulfill a real national need, particularly in alleviating the increasing burdens of a college education for middle-income families. Although the concept is sound, the program has, unfortunately, been unable to meet the need for a variety of reasons.

The program now faces a crisis situation. As a result of soaring interest rates and the tight money market, one-third or more of the students seeking guaranteed loans in order to enter college this fall are being rejected.

I commend the administration for offering proposals to help solve this immediate problem and I am pleased that hearings in both Houses of the Congress have made this acute situation nationally visible.

Concern for the immediate needs is not enough, however, as we contemplate the educational demands of the country over the remaining years of this century. What is needed, in my opinion, is creative arrangements utilizing the strengths of our private lending sector to unlock yet untapped pools of money to meet these increasingly pressing demands. Lender participation must be increased by several magnitudes if we are to achieve a meaningful "breakthrough."

One of the key problems is the lack of a secondary market mechanism to allow lending institutions to avoid or minimize their liquidity problems in connection with long-term loans. Testimony at the recent hearing acknowledges that this is a major part of this complicated situation and certain of the proposals are thought to indirectly enhance the potential for a secondary market and thereby bring in new sources of loan funds.

What is needed, as I see it, is a direct and determined effort to do for education in this country what has been done for housing through the FHA with its secondary market.

I have recently written to President Nixon advocating the establishment of an FHA-type mechanism for education in order to assure the needs of lending institutions who might be induced to participate in the student loan program. And I was very pleased to note, shortly thereafter, that in testimony before the Senate, the American Bankers Association devoted a goodly portion of their testimony to this point; indicating, among other things, that they were appointing a special force of experts in the investment and student loan areas to formulate a specific proposal for a secondary market. I commend them for this initiative and trust that this will contribute to the much-needed discussion on this issue. With such discussion, we should be able to frame specific proposals and identify alternatives.

Admittedly, this is a difficult area to work in—statistics are meager and advice is often conflicting. But the national interest makes it imperative that we attack the problem head on. And we must start now so that we can have workable possibilities available when the economy allows for improvement in the money market.

In this regard, my understanding is that the Joint Economic Committee is tentatively planning to hold hearings this fall on the structure and financing of higher education and I would hope that this matter of a secondary market for student loans would be given in-depth attention.

My feeling is that it is none too early to be working hard to substantially increase the quality and quantity of opportunity in education available by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Perhaps the most appropriate way to mark this significant date would be to have available to all our people a comprehensive "bill of education rights."

SALUTE TO GABON

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, although Gabon is a small and relatively unknown country on the West Coast of Africa, it has the highest per capita income of all the former French African territories. The economic outlook for the future of this palmy, mountainous, forested country which straddles the Equator on the West Coast of central Africa, holds more promise still. Currently, Gabon's most important natural resource is its forests; the lumber industry is the country's largest employer and main source of revenue. Perhaps more significant for the country's long-term development, however, are its rich mineral resources, which have only begun to be exploited in recent years.

Gabon is bounded on the north by Rio Muni and Cameroon, and on the south and east by the Congo Republic—Brazzaville. Unlike many of its sister republics, Gabon enjoys a favorable bal-

ance of trade and payments, and its per capita gross national product is the highest among the independent states of black Africa. Gabon finds itself in this fortunate situation partly because it has a relatively small population and partly because it possesses enormous wealth in natural resources.

Gabon is rightly proud of her development since independence. The country's burgeoning economy is an encouraging contrast to the economic problems of many of her neighboring states in Africa. In 1967, Gabon's total exports represented a 19.3-percent increase over exports in the previous year.

Gold, uranium, and petroleum are other natural resources expected to bring in increasing amounts of foreign exchange in future years. Thus, in Gabon's rich minerals would seem to be the key to her development as a modern self-sufficient nation. Like all of the other new nations, however, Gabon badly needs foreign capital to build up her economy. But Gabon has been more successful in attracting foreign capital than some of the other new countries. Realizing that foreign private capital investment is necessary to the development of the country, the Government has made significant efforts to encourage the inflow of investment capital. Gabon's Investment Code provides liberal terms for private investors and makes no distinction between foreign or locally owned firms concerning privileges and guarantees. Gabon has had an investment guaranty agreement with the United States since April 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to congratulate the people of Gabon on their achievements since independence and to express my hope that they will continue to enjoy the blessings of steady economic and social progress in years to come.

ANATOLY KUZNETSOV

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an article from the New York Times of Sunday, August 10, by Anatoly Kuznetsov. This is an interesting article by a man recently a resident of Russia. I feel sure my colleagues will be interested in reading the article:

SOVIET DEFECTOR TELLS HOW SECRET POLICE USED HIM

(NOTE.—The following article, "Russian Writers and the Secret Police," is by the 39-year-old Soviet author who received asylum in Britain on July 30, saying that he could no longer work under repression and censorship. He describes the surveillance directed against him, and his enforced role in overseeing other prominent writers. He also tells of his long yearning, frustrated by the secret police, to go abroad.)

(By Anatoly Kuznetsov)

It is a frightful story that I have to tell. Sometimes it seems to me as though it never happened, that it was just a nightmare. If only that were true.

The Soviet system remains firmly in power in Russia only thanks to an exceptionally powerful apparatus of oppression and primarily thanks to what has been called at various times the Cheka, the G.P.U., the N.K.V.D., the M.G.B. and K.G.B. In other words, the secret police, or the Soviet Gestapo.

Everybody knows that the number of people murdered by the secret police runs into many millions. But when we come to reckon the number of people who are terrorized and deformed by them, then we have to include the whole population of the Soviet Union. The K.G.B.'s tentacles reach, like cancerous growths, into every branch of life in Russia. And in particular into the world of Soviet literature.

I do not know a single writer in Russia who has not had some connection with the K.G.B. This connection can be one of three different kinds.

The first kind: You collaborate enthusiastically with the K.G.B. In that case you have every chance of prospering.

The second kind: You acknowledge your duty toward the K.G.B., but you refuse to collaborate directly. In that case you are deprived of a great deal, and in particular of the prospect of traveling abroad.

The third kind: You brush aside all advances made by the K.G.B. and enter into conflict with them. In that case your works are not published and you may even find yourself in a concentration camp.

How all this works out in practice I shall explain by reference to my own experience. As a matter of fact a similar story could be told by any Russian writer who is even slightly known. But they are there, and they want to live, and so they keep quiet.

In August, 1951, I was preparing for the first time in my life to travel abroad, to France. I had been included in a delegation of writers. It was a most impressive experience (because in the Soviet Union the only people who are allowed to travel abroad are those with "clean" records, who have been thoroughly "vetted," who have not been in any trouble at their work or in their political activities, who have never in their lives consulted a psychiatrist, who have never been before the courts, and so on and so forth).

What is more, the whole process of getting one's papers in order lasts many months and requires a mass of references, questionnaires, secret signatures and confidential advice on how to behave. By the time a person has gone through this procedure he is so intimidated and tensed up that the trip begins to seem like some religious ritual.

I had already gone through this intimidating procedure and was packing my case when someone telephoned to say that people from the secret police were going to visit me. A couple of men appeared and showed me their identity cards. They made a few jokes, chatted about literature, then got down to business:

"You realize, of course, why we've come. One of our comrades will be traveling, as usual, with your delegation. But it will be difficult for him to cope on his own. So you will help him. You just keep an eye out to see that nobody slips away and stays abroad, to see who talks to whom, and to see how people behave."

"No, I don't want to," I said.

"You must."

"Let somebody else do it."

"Others will be doing it."

"I don't want to."

"Well, then, we shall have to reconsider. In that case, what's the point of your going?"

I remained silent, quite overcome. And the two men started to explain to me that this was the most usual and most natural thing: No group of tourists and no delegation could do without its "comrade" and the voluntary assistants attached to him. The Western world was devilishly cunning, and we had to

be incredibly vigilant. Either I would undertake to maintain contact with the "comrade" or else my trip would be canceled and I would never be allowed to travel anywhere abroad. The "comrade" would be a very pleasant person, and he would approach me himself, saying: "Greetings from Mikhail Mikhailovich."

Our delegation consisted of some 15 writers and editors of Moscow magazines, and we all gathered at the harbor in Leningrad to embark on the liner *Latvia*. I looked at each of the delegates and wondered: Which one of them is it? The person in charge of the delegation was a woman from Intourist who kept counting everybody as if we were chickens. Maybe she was the "comrade"?

But when we were aboard the ship it was one of the editors who came up to me and, with a crooked grin, said "Greetings from Mikhail Mikhailovich."

He was a boorish fool, who spied openly and cynically on everybody, who also kept counting up the delegation, and who listened greedily to every conversation. But I noticed that some of the writers were also keeping their eyes about them, especially a certain Sytin, who now holds one of the key jobs in the Soviet film world. Of the 15 members of the delegation, one was from Intourist, one was the "comrade" and at least five were "voluntary assistants." Later I came to understand that this was the usual arrangement.

WRITING OF REPORTS

If five people are traveling abroad, at least two of them are informers. If two are traveling, at least one must be an informer. And if there's only one person, then he is an informer on himself.

Perhaps some other Russian writer will also, like me, be reduced to blind horror and will wrench himself out of the control of the K.G.B. and reveal what they did to him. Perhaps Yevtushenko will one day tell of the conditions on which he was allowed to travel round the world and the reports he had to write.

Because we are all obliged to write reports after a trip abroad.

I was ordered to write such a report after my trip to Paris. I went through agonies trying to guess what our "comrade" would write, so that I would agree with him. On one occasion someone had turned up late for the bus, and the "comrade" had been green from fright. I described that incident in detail and others like it. I devoted about half the report to reporting on myself, because that is essential—where I had gone, whom I had met and what had been said.

But my report wasn't to the liking of someone high up. Eight years passed before I was again allowed to travel abroad, this time to Britain. You will now learn the price I had to pay for that.

RESIDENT OF TULA

I lived the whole of those eight years in Tula, and throughout that time the "comrades" kept coming to see me. When I came to inquire of other writers it appeared that this was the most ordinary occurrence—they went to see everybody, everybody. And it depended on the extent of the writer's decency which of the three categories of collaboration he would choose.

They would ask me gently and politely about my life, about what I was working on, what my friend's Yevtushenko, Akhmatova, Gladilin and others were doing, what they were saying and what sort of people they were. At first I said only favorable things and spoke highly of them. But they objected. Yevtushenko was committing mistakes, I was not watching carefully enough, I must provoke him to argument and report what was really going on inside him. They started to talk to me more sharply and to use threats.

At this I could not take no more. I shouted at them that it was not proper behavior and I asked them to keep away from me. I said I

didn't see anything bad around me, no conspiracies and nothing anti-Soviet. If I did see anything, then I would ring them up. And with that they vanished.

I couldn't believe my luck. So that, it seemed, was the way to talk to them. After all, what could they do to me? I was already a well-known writer, my books were being published in 40 different countries, and I could permit myself the luxury of having nothing to do with such characters.

How very wrong I was! I was simply transferred to the second category.

My home in Tula was open to everybody. One day there appeared a very pleasant young man, a student at the Polytechnic Institute, who unburdened himself to me at great length. He told me that he and his fellow students were being taught how to make missiles and were made to sign terrifying documents about the preservation of state secrets. He said he had dreamt of being an inventor, but instead of that he was obliged to work out according to special "man-kill" formulas, how many missiles were needed per thousand human lives.

The Soviet Union was, in his opinion, a fascist country. The students, he said, were publishing a handwritten magazine and were being arrested. Finally he burst into tears. I tried to calm him. Through his tears he screamed that he would produce the magazine himself. I said that was stupid and that he would prove nothing like that.

A MEETING IN SQUARE

Not long afterward somebody phoned me and asked me to meet him on the square outside. It was one of the "comrades" I knew, who invited me to sit on the bench and said: "Why didn't you ring us up? Somebody reveals state secrets to you and tells you various formulas, gives you information about underground papers, and you simply object that that is not the right way. What is the right way, then, in your opinion?"

I tremble when I write now about that conversation on the bench in the square. For me it was like a red-hot frying pan. I was forgiven and allowed to go, but I was warned.

From that time in 1963 I was regularly followed. Not, of course, that I was an anti-Soviet element or that I was intending to organize some plot. On the contrary, I was a member of the Communist party, a recognized Soviet writer, and I wanted only one thing: to go on writing. But I had automatically to be followed, because I came in the second category.

STAY AT YASNAYA POLYANA

Then I took a room in Yasnaya Polyana where I wrote a novel. I became friendly with the scholars working in the Tolstoy Museum, and they were very kind to me, especially the intelligent and attractive Luiza Senina.

One day she came to my room and told me she had been appointed to follow every step I made and report every word I said. But, she said, I was good and trusting and she couldn't do it any more; she was having nightmares.

One of the "scholars" at Yasnaya Polyana was an officer of the K.G.B. and everybody, from the director down to the guides, had to report to him. Every foreigner who visited Yasnaya Polyana was kept under specially strict surveillance. The fact that I had taken a room there was especially suspicious and they were trying to get something out of her about me. What was she to do? She would be sacked!

I was particularly shaken by the fact that this was taking place on the revered territory of Tolstoy's estate. "Well," I said, "let's try and save you; let's make something up together."

MAN-TO-MAN TALK

I did not succeed in saving her. On the contrary, out of inexperience I wrecked her

life. One day in the cafe a K.G.B. officer in civilian clothes sat down opposite me and started joking and asking odd questions. I looked him straight in the face and said: "Listen, by dint of pure logic, I have realized that you are from the security and that you're interested in me. So let's talk like man to man. What do you want to know? You ask the questions and I'll give you straight answers. It'll be easier for you and for me."

He was terribly embarrassed and started muttering that he was not interested in me personally, that I was above any suspicion, that I had well-known friends in Moscow, that they sometimes behaved rather strangely, and that in general my circle of acquaintances. . . .

Later, in his own time, he reached his own conclusions. Luiza Senina was dismissed after a frightful row, was given a hopeless reference, was a long time without work until she was given a job as a librarian in some trade school, where she still is today. I hurried away from Yasnaya Polyana as if a curse had been laid on it.

But wherever you live you still have contact with people. Young writers kept coming to see me, bringing their works with them. There was one very sweet girl, a student at the teacher's institute, Tanya Subbotina, who came along in this way and then one day asked me to go outside on the street with her.

Once she was sure we were alone she said she had been forced to come to me and told to try and become my mistress and report on everything I did. Otherwise, they threatened, she would be turned out of the institute. She was not doing very well there, and they could well have done it.

Heavens above! I have recounted only two incidents, because they are no longer secret and everything is already very well known to the K.G.B. In Tula. Poor Tanya got completely confused and told everything to her "comrades."

But I was struck with the way people would immediately tell me everything, warn me and give me advice. I cannot say any more, so as not to harm them. After all, they are there, they are not to blame, they are the victims.

A STRANGER TELEPHONES

There are others whom even I do not know. A stranger phoned me from a call box at a tram stop and told me what was in my letters to my mother and which foreign magazine I had at home:

"What on earth are you doing? Don't you realize that all your mail is opened? That your neighbors on both sides and above you are watching you? That your phone conversations are recorded?"

He gave no name and hung up. Thanks. But I just couldn't understand: What was the point of this horror? I was writing literary works and had no intention of engaging in political activity. I was a writer. What do you want from me? That I should stop to think before every word I said on the telephone?

In fact, on one occasion the telephone at home started tinkling in an odd way. I took off the receiver but heard no ringing tone, so I started banging on the cradle. Suddenly a tired voice at the other end of the line said: "Please don't keep banging; have patience. We're switching you over to another recording machine. It's a complicated system—you understand. . . ."

Later an electrician appeared and changed the electricity meter, fitting a new one, freshly sealed, with a microphone, no doubt.

In 1967 I locked up my flat and went off on a long trip. Two days after I left, in the middle of the night there was a fire in my study and everything in it was destroyed. The firemen who came to the scene prevented the whole flat from being destroyed but never

discovered what caused the fire. But my papers and manuscripts escaped by a real miracle: Literally on the day of my departure I had moved the cupboard with the manuscripts into another room, intending to move my study there on my return.

After that I kept my manuscripts buried in the ground. Another reason was that, whenever I left my flat for any length of time afterward, I recognized by various signs that someone had been in the flat in my absence.

I frequently asked various top people about my having a trip abroad but without much hope. I wanted to see the world. They were always ready to promise me, but that was the end of it. Others went traveling, but not me.

Then, unexpectedly, the Paris publishers, Les Editions Francais Réunis, invited me to spend a month in Paris as part of the payment for my 'Babi Yar.' I thought that the authorities must understand at last that I was no enemy, so I made my application and started to go through the procedural marathon. I got right on to the end of it only to be told that the Union of Writers had no money for my trip. Then they told me in a whisper that it was simply that the authorities in Tula had formally sanctioned my departure, but that Safronov, the Propaganda Secretary, had said by telephone that I should not be allowed to go.

EVERYONE IS SUSPECTED

I said in my statement [syndicated last week] how my writings were maltreated. But they also deformed my whole life. I couldn't speak on the telephone; I practically stopped writing letters; and I saw an informer in every one of my acquaintances. I began to ponder: What sense is there in such a life at all?

Here is an extract from my diary in October 1967. "I have not been able to sleep for several days now. I am just a great lump of nostalgia. I turn over in my mind what I have written and compare it with what I would like to write and what I could write. I see before me years and years of life in which I could have got to know and study and understand and create so much and which have been wasted. On what, it is frightful to think about. . . . When I quote what I wrote in 'Babi Yar' I feel like an ant, cemented up in the foundations of a house. All around there is nothing but stones, walls and darkness. To live to the end of my life with this feeling of being stifled, in this state of being buried alive. . . ."

CLASH OVER "BABI YAR"

That was just after the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel. Solzhenitsyn's writings were no longer being published. The process of rehabilitating Stalin had begun.

I had my own troubles. There was an unpublished row over "Babi Yar." They suddenly decided that it ought not to have been published. At Yunost they told me that it was practically an accident that it had ever appeared at all and that a month later its publication would have been out of the question. In any case they forbade the reprinting of it.

Before the writers' congress to which I was to be a delegate from Tula, Solzhenitsyn sent me a copy of his famous letter [in which he denounced censorship]. I spent several nights thinking it over. At home they wondered what was the matter with me. I said: "Solzhenitsyn is inviting me to commit suicide with him."

Yes, I could not find in myself the courage, and I probably fully deserved Solzhenitsyn's contempt. I simply did not attend the congress. I signed no protests, either then or later. I saved my own skin and kept out of things. Others were expelled from the party and from the union and were no longer published. But they continued to publish me, and the "comrades" resumed their kindly and friendly attention.

How movingly they explained to me that the situation among the intelligentsia was very complicated. That people as high-strung as the writers, however clever they were, were in revolt and they did not want to resort to tough measures. . . . I had done very well, they said, not to sign any protests; that was not the business of an artist. But I ought to try and influence my misguided friends and make them understand that if they did not stop causing trouble, then—well, you understand.

I went from town to town trying to keep out of the way of these "comrades," from Moscow to Leningrad, to Kiev. Many people there probably remember my asking: What are you going to do? What is the way out? What is there to hope for? Nobody knew anything. Intelligent people in Russia feel only horror. There is nothing but darkness ahead.

EFFECT OF THE INVASION

On the night of Aug. 20, 1968, Russian tanks entered Czechoslovakia. I spent several days listening to the radio. Many people in Russia wept during those days. It marked, they said, the turn to fascism.

It came over me somehow of itself. I realized that I could not remain there any longer, that every day, every month and every year would see only a piling up of horror and cowardice inside me. . . .

But Russia is as well defended as a prison. Just read Anatoly Marchenko's remarkable "My Testimony." He wanted only one thing: to get out. They caught him 40 yards from the frontier and threw him into the same camp as Daniel. Marchenko's description of that present-day concentration camp is enough to make your hair stand on end.

Then I received another invitation, this time from America, from the Dial Press, which had allotted \$5,000 for my trip. I began to attend all the meetings in Tula; I presented Safronov with signed copies of my books; and I always turned up on time for talks with the "comrades" and spent six months fixing my papers for America.

U.S. TRIP TURNED DOWN

Then I was turned down again, with the explanation that the Dial Press had published Solzhenitsyn as well as me and they were therefore enemies. It was clear from certain details that once again it was the K.G.B. that would not let me out. This coincided with some fierce criticism of my latest writing in the press.

Now I began to feel myself run down and hemmed in like a wolf. I went down to Batumi to study the life of the land. The whole of the holiday coast of the Black Sea is under the strongest guard. When darkness falls patrols drive everybody away from the water. Searchlights play over the beach and the sea. Radar installations detect even a child's ball floating on the surface of the sea.

But I had made up my mind to swim under water to Turkey with the help of an aqua-lung, entering the water before the patrols appeared and pushing in front of myself an underwater raft with spare oxygen containers. I would swim by compass just one night, otherwise, I would be detected in the morning by the helicopters that were about like flies. I had trained myself to swim without stopping for 15 hours. I started on the building of my raft.

FINAL EFFORT TO LEAVE

It was frightening all the same. I imagined myself being cut in two in the darkness by a submarine at full speed. They are about the place like sharks. Or I would drown.

So I decided to make one last desperate effort to obtain permission for a trip abroad. I no longer thought of anything but getting out, at any price.

Night and day I had going round in my mind only that: to get away, away, away from that monstrous country, from those scoundrels, from that K.G.B. Let me get out, even to the Antarctic, even to the Sahara,

so long as they are not there. I just could not go on.

It was stronger than me; it was the animal instinct for self-preservation. Probably—I was at least a living being. I wrote in "Babi Yar" that by the time I was 14 I should have been shot 20 times. That I was still alive was practically by a miracle, a sort of misunderstanding. So there we are: According to the rules of the K.G.B. I should now be shot for the 21st time. If only because I went straight at them and got out. If only because I am writing this. And I shall go on writing, as long as there's life in me.

Now listen to what the Russian Writer, Anatoly Kuznetsov, did. He said to himself: "You have to imagine that they are the Gestapo and think what they like most of all. Informers are what they like. Fine. So they'll get a real piece of informing." I hinted to the "comrades" that it seemed as though an anti-Soviet plot was being hatched among the writers. They were really impressed and believed me. They demanded some facts, and of those I had a handful.

My report revealed that the writers were preparing to publish a dangerous underground magazine called "The Polar Star" or "The Spark," but they were still arguing about the name. I said that the people who are going to publish it included Yevtushenko, Tabakov, Arkady Raikin, etc., etc. I said they were collecting money and manuscripts. The first number would start with Academician Sakharov's memorandum. I very much wanted to add that they also intended to blow up the Kremlin, but that would have been too obvious an exaggeration. I was transferred to the first category.

That's how I came to be in Britain. I brought a copy of my report with him, photographed on film, because it is the most remarkable work I have ever written. The rest was easy. Only six months' filling in forms, a promise to write a novel about Lenin, just one personal agent—Andzhaparidze—and I didn't have to go swimming in the Black Sea. (Who knows? Maybe they have got radar that operates even under water.) On July 24 I got out of Russia on the same plane as Gerald Brooke, and I don't know which of us was the more moved, as he looked out at the blue sky.

WIDE INVOLVEMENT SEEN

I managed to get out and I'm still alive. You can try me if you wish. I have still not come round; I still feel as if I lay on the edge of a sea, groaning, exhausted and bleeding. But it is the sea, I have got away from them.

I now believe that the main reason why many highly intelligent and able people do not escape from there is that the Soviet regime has forced them to commit such cowardly acts that no amount of repentance can absolve them. There is no way out.

But really, what would you say if you learned that Leo Tolstoy had been a secret police agent and had written reports on all the foreigners visiting his Yasnaya Polyana? Or, that Dostoyevsky informed on his best friends? Would it be possible after that to have any respect for their works, however brilliant they were? I personally have no answer to that question. The only thing I can say is that Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy did not live in Soviet Russia.

If you are a citizen of Soviet Russia, you automatically cannot be a 100 per cent decent person. Cowardly silence or half-truths—are those not lies? I have told you only about myself. But, believe me, there are very many others who could tell a similar story. Let me leave it at that.

PEOPLE AND PLACES CITED BY KUZNETSOV

Following are identifications of personalities and places cited by Anatoly Kuznetsov in his article "Russian Writers and the Secret Police":

Aksyonov, Vasily, 37 years old, Moscow novelist.

Andzhaparidze, Georgi, Moscow University instructor of English literature who traveled with Mr. Kuznetsov to Britain.

"Babi Yar," Anatoly Kuznetsov's documentary account of the execution of Kiev Jews and others by German occupants in World War II.

Batumi, Black Sea port near the Turkish border.

Brooke, Gerald, British Russian-language teacher who was arrested in Moscow in 1965 on charges of anti-Soviet activities and exchanged last month for Soviet spies held in Britain.

Daniel, Yuli, writer, sentenced in 1966 to five years' forced labor for having published abroad material judged anti-Soviet propaganda.

Gladiilin, Anatoly, Moscow novelist.

Marchenko, Anatoly, 31, worker, imprisoned 1960-66; his account of prison-camp conditions, "y Testimony," written in 1967, was published abroad; rearrested 1968.

Raikin, Arkady, well-known Soviet satirist. Safronov, Tula, party secretary for ideology.

Sinyavsky, Andrei, 44, writer, sentenced in 1966 to seven years' hard labor for having published abroad material judged anti-Soviet propaganda.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksander, 51, writer; his work has been published in Soviet Union only briefly (1962-63); since then it has appeared only abroad.

Sytin, Viktor, Moscow essayist and novelist; former head of Auditing Commission of Russian Republic's writers union.

Tabakov, actor of the Moscow theater Sovremennik.

Tula, industrial city, 100 miles south of Moscow.

Yasnaya Polyana, Leo Tolstoy's estate, seven miles south of Tula; tourist attraction. Yevtushenko, Yevgeny, 36, Soviet poet who has frequently traveled abroad.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT: AN EARLIER VIEW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul H. Gantt, is a member of the Board of Contract Appeals for the Atomic Energy Commission. He is also a former president of the District of Columbia Lincoln Group, and recently published an article entitled "Old Abe and Government Contracts" in the Public Contract Newsletter. In view of the extensive discussions recently on the subject of military procurement, I felt Mr. Gantt's article was quite timely.

The article follows:

"OLD ABE" AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS (By Paul H. Gantt)

President Lincoln had an inquisitive mind. "It ranged over the abstract and the infinite, the absolute and the immediate. It was philosophical, and at the same time practical." And he was, first and foremost, a lawyer.

During the War Between the States, Lincoln turned his mechanical bent to the improvements of the weapons. He tested them; inspected them; expedited the procurement; and wrote a legal opinion. The latter is the subject of this article.

During April 1862, the New York firm of Solomon Dingee and Company offered to furnish 53,500 Austrian rifles at \$19.4 There were several contracts made for European arms, but this was the particular one to which Lincoln gave considerable attention.

General George McClellan realized the need for additional rifle sources and considered the offer a bargain. The representative of the Ordnance Department, Major Peter V. Hagner, considered the Dingee offer to be "fishy". However, the heat from above became too hot and he ordered the rifles. When the first delivery fell short of contract specifications as to caliber, weight, material and finish, Hagner terminated the contract for default *in toto* although "most of the guns were serviceable."

Dingee's New Jersey lawyer, Oliver S. "Pet" Halsted, Jr., who had access to Lincoln, showed him a letter from Captain Silas Crispin, the New York Ordnance Officer, to Dingee of April 1, 1862, which in part read as follows:

"In accordance with instruction received from Ordnance Department this day I have to offer you a voucher for that portion of last inspected lot of your arms. . . . As regards the balance of the lot I conceive it to be clearly my duty . . . to assess their value before issuing voucher, and as you have expressed yourself to submit to any other basis of settlement that heretofore offered you by Maj. Hagner I have referred the matter to Washington for decision."

Lincoln without hesitation, immediately wrote the following endorsement on the letter to General James W. Ripley, the Chief of Army Ordnance:

"What reason is there that the appraisal by Major Hagner, and adopted & acted upon by Capt. Crispin, should not stand, so far as it went."

Lincoln, according to Halsted, said that he "wanted substantial justice done" and ordered Hagner to accept all Dingee arms that met specifications, reject those that were, in fact, unserviceable and buy the remainder at a reasonable value. Exit Major Hagner to serve on a Commission to investigate the arms contract.

His successor was Captain Silas Crispin, "a man of erratic temper, a consistent drinker, and a bachelor".

Major Hagner had established valuations on certain arms offered but not meeting the specifications. Captain Crispin refused to allow these valuations. He insisted on evaluating each separate shipment at the market value at the time of the offer.

Again, on April 23, 1862, Lincoln wrote a memorandum to General Ripley as follows:

It is said that in the case of the contract of S. Dingee & Co. in relation to arms a dispute has arisen as to the proper construction of a clause in an order signed by me, which clause is in these words: "and that arms not conforming thereto" (the contract) "be appraised by the Ordnance officer at New York, and received at such price as he may determine."

"This order was prepared with reference to a definite number of arms expected to be delivered within a definite time, and not in reference to an indefinite number to be delivered in an indefinite time. I certainly did not expect that under the clause in question a lot of guns would be appraised at one price at one time, and another lot of precisely the same quality appraised at different prices at another time. I expected that when under the clause the price of a particular quality of gun was fixed it would stand throughout the transaction, neither going down or up. I still think this is the just construction."

The matter was finally settled by Dingee's offer, accepted by the Secretary of War, Edwin McM. Stanton to substitute English

Enfield rifles at \$19 in sufficient numbers to complete the contract within 90 days.¹¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ Foreword by the late Benjamin P. Thomas to Bruce, Lincoln And The Tools Of War (1956), VIII.

² Lincoln was the only inventor to become President of the United States. His U.S. Patent No. 6469 for "Buoying Vessels over Shoals" was issued on May 22, 1849. Judge Arthur M. Smith, A. Lincoln, Inventor, 22 Fed. Bar J. 274 (Summer 1960). Thomas Jefferson also was an inventor who became President but Jefferson did not patent any of his numerous inventions.

³ When Christopher M. Spencer of Connecticut called on Lincoln to demonstrate his rifle, Lincoln invited him to return to the White House the next afternoon when "we will go out and see the thing shoot." On August 18, 1863 Lincoln accompanied by Spencer, his son, Robert Todd Lincoln (later Secretary of War) and John Hay, his Secretary went to the Treasury Park. Secretary Edwin McM. Stanton sent word that he was too busy to join them. Lincoln shot at a target about 40 yards away. The target, which the author has examined, is about six by eight inches in size. Lincoln fired seven times. He hit a bull's eye; the other six shots were close to the bull's eye. Letter of Captain R. D. Descoteau (Army Materiel Command) of July 11, 1963 to author. J. O. Buckeridge, Lincoln's Choice (1956), Bruce, fn. 1. supra. The Army bought 106,000 Spencer Seven Shot Repeating Carbines and Spencer rifles during the period January 1, 1861 to June 30, 1866. H.R. Ex. Doc. 1, 39th Cong., 2d Sess. (1966), pp. 663, 664; Great Guns by Andy Palmer (1956); p. 65; Washington Post, May 30, 1963; W. A. Barlett, Lincoln's Seven Hits With A Rifle, 19 Magazine of History (1921), p. 68; 3 Lincoln, Day by Day, pp. 202-203.

⁴ While serving as a volunteer cadet in the Austrian Army in 1937, the author shot a bull's eye with an Enfield rifle and can attest to the excellence of the rifle.

⁵ Autograph Endorsement, signed by President Lincoln, now in Brown Un. Library, Providence, R. I. If offered at auction, the author estimates that it would bring about \$600.

⁶ Bruce, fn. 1 supra at p. VI, quotes The Scientific American of September 19, 1863 that Lincoln's first Chief of Army Ordnance, General James W. Ripley, exclaimed: "What does Lincoln know about a gun?"

⁷ Cf. Rules governing AEC Board of Contract Appeals, 10 C.F.R. Part 3: "The . . . rules of procedure seek to recognize the real nature of the contract appeals process, namely a means by which an agency can take a second, top level, independent look at the actions of its authorized agents and effect any necessary revisions of such actions dictated by justice and fairness."

⁸ No criticism is implied that these qualifications would disqualify any person to be a contract administrator. In fact, the author does know some bachelors who fall into that category.

⁹ 5 Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln 196.

¹⁰ Ibid, 197.

¹¹ Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 72, 37th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 116.

BERKELEY ARRESTS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Cali-

fornia Congressmen I voiced my concern about the violence in Berkeley in May. At that time I asked for an U.S. Attorney General's investigation of the events there.

I understand the investigation is still continuing, but that it is being slowed because of a lack of cooperation both from students involved and from law enforcement agencies. I would hope that at least the law enforcement agencies would cooperate.

Recent information has illustrated the need for a full and complete Federal investigation.

On May 22 protesting students and others conducted a march through Berkeley. Law enforcement agencies, including police, sheriffs' officers and National Guardsmen made mass arrests. In fact a total of 480 persons were arrested. None of this is news.

What is news is what has happened to that 480 persons.

In each and every case charges have been dropped. By July 9 all charges had been dismissed "in the interests of justice."

Let me submit to you that what we have witnessed in Berkeley was a complete failure of law and order. Four hundred and eighty persons are arrested, booked, jailed overnight, and then forced to the expense of putting up bail and then not tried "in the interests of justice."

What caused this breakdown?

First, many of those arrested were innocent of any involvement in the demonstration. Jesse P. Ritter, Jr., writing in this week's edition of Life magazine, tells of his experiences during these mass arrests. He describes those arrested with him:

Nineteen of us—17 men and 2 women—were packed into a paddy wagon. I was never able to identify myself or state my business. . . . Aboard were students with books and notepads who had been on their way to and from classes at the University. There was a U.S. mailman (with long hair), still carrying his bag of mail, and a resident psychiatrist who had stepped outside his hospital for a short walk during a 30 minute break.

Thus, the first breakdown in law and order on that day in Berkeley—the innocent were arrested along with the guilty.

The second breakdown came at the Santa Rita prison farm of Alameda County. The words of Sheriff Frank Madigan of Alameda County testify to what happened there. He said of his young deputies:

They have a feeling that these people should be treated like Vietcong.

The treatment, brutal treatment, was the same for all arrested, both innocent passersby and demonstrators.

The sheriff suspended 10 of his officers because of the treatment of the prisoners.

A full description of the events in Berkeley is provided by Mr. Ritter, and I include in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

But let me add, that the events there make clear the necessity for a full Federal investigation of what happened in

Berkeley. There are still many unanswered questions. The article follows:

NIGHTMARE FOR THE INNOCENT IN A CALIFORNIA JAIL

(By Jesse P. Ritter Jr.)

When I moved my family to San Francisco last year to teach in the English department at San Francisco State College, I did so with misgivings. I knew that the educational atmosphere in California was far from tranquil—Governor Reagan was waging virtual war against student protesters, and the political polarization between the left and the right could only be described in terms of paranoia. Through the year, my fears were confirmed as I witnessed student and faculty strikes, bombings, brawls, police assaults, mass arrests. But none of those events—brutal as they were—prepared me for the nightmare that followed my recent chance arrest this spring in Berkeley. Overnight that experience, which can be verified by many reliable witnesses, turned a father of five, veteran of the Korean war and law-abiding citizen into a bitter man.

On Thursday morning, May 22, I left San Francisco State College with four other teachers to drive to Berkeley. We were beginning work on an environmental art project one of the teachers was directing. We planned to borrow a sailboat from a couple I knew in Berkeley and dump a small amount of nontoxic dye in the bay water at strategic points to observe the action of the currents.

We arrived in Berkeley about noon. After a pleasant lunch and a trip to buy supplies for the sail we walked toward Shattuck on Addison Street. There we were to meet my friend's wife, Nora.

The city of Berkeley was then in something like a state of siege because of the People's Park issue. On the streets, under the command of Alameda County Sheriff Frank Madigan, was a vast force of National Guard troops, county sheriffs, San Francisco Tactical Squad units. Madigan had authorized use of shotguns against demonstrators. One man had already been killed, and many others wounded. Demonstrators, workers and on-lookers trapped in a plaza on the University of California campus had been sprayed from a helicopter with a virulent form of tear gas currently being used in Vietnam. To protest, approximately 2,000 students had now begun a spontaneous march from the university campus through downtown Berkeley.

We could see a concentration of National Guard troops, policemen and citizens several blocks east of us. I described what Nora looked like to the others and we stopped at the southwest corner of Shattuck and Addison to scan the crowd for her. We decided not to go any farther because we saw soldiers, police and people both to the east and south of us. The National Guard troops nearest us were climbing into trucks and moving out. Small groups of people on each corner of the intersection watched the troops; others walked casually on the sidewalks.

Berkeley policemen and Alameda County deputies began moving our way. An officer leading four or five others approached our group of 12 to 15 people and said, "Let's move out; clear the area!" Everyone on our corner obediently started walking away. Suddenly, a Berkeley policeman ran in front of us, spread his arms and shouted, "Stay where you are!" Behind us, two other policemen kept repeating, "Keep moving, clear out of here!" We said we were leaving, and at this point a Berkeley police sergeant approached and began pointing to various people in our group, saying, "Get that one, that one, that one."

An officer snapped handcuffs on me and joined me with the cuffs to a protesting youngster. I asked if we were under arrest

and the officer said yes—we were charged with blocking traffic. We were not allowed to talk to the policemen after that. The sergeant who had us arrested taunted us, using obscenities and accusing us of being revolutionaries, rock-throwers and hippies. Those not fingered by the sergeant continued down the street and were not apprehended. While we were being herded into the paddy wagon, however, officers continued to arrest people at random—mostly young people, and particularly those with long hair, mustaches, sideburns. Three of the teachers with me were arrested; our fifth companion was not, and he immediately began calling friends and relatives to arrange our release.

Nineteen of us—17 men and two women—were packed into a paddy wagon. I was never able to identify myself or state my business; indeed, the policemen threatened anyone who talked at all. We sat in the wagon for about 20 minutes, then it backed up the street a block, where we were transferred to a large bus. We were all being taken to "Santa Rita," a place I had never heard of.

During the 45-minute ride our feelings were reinforced that it had been an indiscriminate bust. Aboard were students with books and notepads who had been on their way to and from classes at the university. There was a U.S. mailman (with long hair), still carrying his bag of mail, and a resident psychiatrist who had stepped outside his hospital for a short walk during a 30-minute break. Others included several young divinity students and five medical observers—young men in white smocks with red crosses—who had accompanied the student march down Shattuck Avenue. The police blew it, I thought. They went too far this time. Most of us will be released when we get to wherever we're going.

The bus stopped inside the Santa Rita Rehabilitation Center and Prison Farm, an institution run by Alameda County. Prison guards who work under the jurisdiction of County Sheriff Madigan now took charge of us. We heard repeated orders through the frosted bus windows: "Unload single file and march. Anybody talks and he'll get a club up the butt!" As we filed off the bus the sight that greeted us was from a World War II movie—shabby wooden barracks, barbed-wire fences, rickety watch towers and rows of men lying face down in an asphalt-paved compound. We were marched into the compound and ordered to lie prone in rows. Those who looked around or stumbled or didn't move fast enough were prodded and hit with clubs. Frequently, men were dragged out of the marching lines and forced to kneel while being struck. The guards shouted and screamed, often giving conflicting commands and clubbing those unable to obey them. Our chief source of terror was not so much the beatings as the wild hysteria that had seized many of the guards. They walked up and down our rows of flattened men, striking up-raised hands with clubs, striking us on the soles of our feet with clubs to make us lie in even rows.

We were told we would be shot if we tried to escape. We were cursed continuously; we were called dope users, revolutionaries, filthy long-hairs. We would, they shouted, be taught such a lesson that we would never again cause trouble. All of us were identified as political troublemakers. No attempt was made to distinguish us by age, nature of charges or physical condition. Periodically we were ordered to turn our heads to the left or right. I experienced severe leg cramps and sharp twinges of pain from an arthritic elbow. From time to time we were forced to close up ranks by crawling across the asphalt, which was covered with sharp gravel. Those accused of speaking or looking around or moving slightly were dragged out and forced to kneel with their hands behind them in a separate group. Some remained kneeling

for hours. There were some 300 men on the ground.

After a few of us asked to use the rest rooms (and were abused for it), guards began allowing small groups to go. At times, the guards said, "You'll have to wait another half hour." One kid near me identified himself as a diabetic in the rest room and was cruelly beaten.

This savage parody of prison discipline had an obvious psychology behind it. Humiliate the prisoners totally from the beginning so they will obey orders and accept punishment without resistance. Of course, we weren't prisoners—we were simply being held for booking!

During the time I was lying in the compound, from approximately 4 until 8:30 p.m., new arrestees were brought in and forced to lie in rows. It was cold when the sun went down, and men around me were shivering. At 8 we were allowed to stand and exercise in place for a few minutes. We then lay back down on our faces. They had taken our names when we were first arrested, and about every 20 minutes a guard would call out some names in alphabetical order. At 8:30 my name was called along with seven others, and we were taken into an adjoining barracks for booking.

Here we experienced new refinements. We were forced to sit in single file on the floor, knees together, while a squat, dark-haired guard waving a blackjack shouted that if we didn't do exactly as he said he would beat us until we couldn't walk. He had us face the wall, spread our legs and place our hands high on the wall. We then turned and threw our jackets, belts and the contents of our pockets into a pile. During this procedure, the squat guard struck prisoners in the back, stomach, face and legs with his fist or the blackjack. He struck me four times with the blackjack during the booking process—either for not having my heels tightly together or for not clapping my hands in front of me. He assaulted one of us—a very young boy with long hair—by slugging him with his fist and then grabbing the boy's hair and slamming his face into the wall. Later, in the barracks, we saw that the boy's left eye had swollen badly and he could barely open his jaw.

After the booking and fingerprinting, we again had to sit on the floor with legs drawn up, heels together. We were then lined up and marched to Barracks B across the street. The guard in charge treated us firmly but decently, telling us that while we were in the barracks we could get together and talk, plan our bail procedures and wait our turn to use the telephone. He repeated what other guards had told us in the compound—that the regular prisoners were outraged at us because we were troublemakers, because we were responsible for the regular inmates' missing movies and other privileges. The inmates would beat us terribly, and the guards couldn't prevent it. We would be turned over to "hardened criminals and sex perverts."

At about 11:30, four lawyers from the People's Park Defense Committee appeared in the barracks. They told us they were trying to arrange bail procedures for as many people as possible, but they lacked funds and organizations for rapid release. We filled out forms giving information about our families and personal legal arrangements. We later were told that many of these forms were destroyed by prison guards who claimed they were "messages." At no time during our detention did anyone in my barracks have an opportunity to make a telephone call to relatives or lawyers.

During the night we were taunted and threatened by different prison guards. We left in small groups all through the night to have photos taken—I went in a group at 2:45 a.m. Few of us slept.

At 4:30 a.m., the door crashed open and three guards moved among the bunks rousting out people with curses, threats and blows. We were going to eat, they said, and we would eat what we took or it would be "shoved in your faces." Under continual threats, we were marched to the mess hall. Breakfast was Corn Chex and milk (no sugar), half-cooked prunes, white bread and artificial marmalade. We sat packed at the tables, ordered not to move or talk. Five men were dragged from their seats and forced to kneel before an empty table for such things as "looking around," "talking" or "moving." They were not allowed to eat. One boy was forced to lean his head on a post while the guards beat on the post. His nose began bleeding. Guards would prod him, pull him off the post and strike him, or kick his feet back farther until he was leaning at a severe angle to the post, his head and neck bearing the full weight of his body. After about 15 minutes of quivering spasmodically, the boy collapsed to the floor. Two guards dragged him over to the empty table and made him kneel, still twitching, with the others. After we finished eating, we were forced to kneel on the floor in columns of two and wait for about 15 minutes before being marched back to the barracks.

At 6 a.m. a new guard, a small man with reddish-blond hair on his neck, came into the barracks, yelling, "I had a good night's sleep and I feel like KILLING!" He announced that he was now in total control of us and said he needed a "boss" in the barracks. He grabbed my bunkmate, Professor Gary Oberbillig, by the shirt and dragged him out to the center of the floor. "Get out here," he said. "You're big; you want to take me? Come on, let's go outside. Want to go outside?" He then instructed Oberbillig that he, Oberbillig, was the "barracks boss" and was to "beat the —I out of anybody who don't do right!"

At 7:30 a guard came in and read off a list of names. We lined up and marched outside into the street, where several other guards spent approximately 30 minutes giving us military marching commands, making those who did not execute the commands smartly do calisthenics. (Ironically, not one of them was able to give an accurate "about-face" command, and our ragged "about-face" maneuvers enraged them.) We marched at double-time, forced to yell "We love the blue meanies!"

The guards were proud of this idea: I overheard one tell another, "Say, we've gotta do that Blue Meanies bit some more." We marched to what appeared to be the receiving center of the prison, where we were put in open-screen cells already occupied by new arrestees. It was here that we learned we would be released soon. While we waited in the cells, several men were dragged out and beaten in our presence and told that they were on the way to further beatings and a stay in the "quiet room."

My three companions and I were finally processed for release on bail by 8:30 a.m., Friday, May 23, nearly 18 hours after our arrest. All released prisoners had to catch rides out of the main gate, a distance of a half mile, with outgoing bail bondsmen.

The first thing I learned facedown on the Santa Rita asphalt was that I could make it without begging or breaking. This felt good; it was enough strength to counter the fears engendered by the heavy blue-black guards' shoes slowly crunching by my eyes six inches away. But to be put to these tests in America!

At a press conference, Alameda County Sheriff Frank Madigan admitted there had been "irregularities" at Santa Rita on that Thursday. He put the responsibility on his guards. Many of the deputies assigned there, he said, are young Vietnam war veterans and "they have a feeling that these people should be treated like Vietcong."

On July 2 Madigan suspended 10 of his

officers at Santa Rita for "violating civil service and or/departmental rules" in handling the mass arrests. The officers, all of whom were told they had the right to appeal (only four chose to do so), included the commander, his two immediate assistants and a sergeant. By July 9, charges against all the people who had been arrested—a total of 480—had been dropped by the court.

Still, several hundred young men and women came out of Santa Rita believing there is no middle ground anymore—nowhere to stand to reconcile the growing polarities of our political lives. I am haunted by the bitterness brought forth by such assaults on our humanness and human rights. When in the history of man have prisons and guards ever rooted out the ideas in which men really believe?

CONGLOMERATES—CIVIL RIGHTS STYLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, failing—discredited—and financially distressed, the so-called civil rights demagogues have now departed from nonviolent direct action and, taking a lesson from big business have now extended their organizations into "agitation conglomerates."

Old labor unions are to be replaced by new alliances, tenements are acquiring new landlords, and not even the sick and dying in our Nation's hospitals will be granted peace of mind from these self-serving exploitations of extremist has-beens.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 11, 1969]

UNION MUSCLE AND SOUL POWER EYE HOSPITALS

(By Stanley Levey)

Private hospitals in at least a dozen cities will be the target of a combined organizing drive by labor and the civil rights movement.

This same combination—Local 1199 B of the Drug and Hospital Union and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)—recently conducted a three-month strike in Charleston, S.C. While failing to win union recognition, substantial gains in salaries and other benefits were retained for 550 workers.

Moe Foner, the union's executive secretary in New York, said the widely publicized organizing drive in Charleston resulted in a "flood of requests" from other hospital workers across the country for similar efforts in their communities. He said the union would concentrate on "big, sophisticated cities" and would "pick our spots carefully."

Union-SCLC coalition groups already have been set up in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Detroit, Connecticut and New Jersey. Later, organizing drives will be scheduled for other major cities in Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh), Ohio (Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati), North Carolina, Florida, Georgia and Kansas.

In Baltimore, the union and representatives of the Johns Hopkins and Lutheran hospitals have met with officials of the state labor board to work out details of a representation election. Mrs. Coretta King, widow of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., will address a rally there tomorrow giving the

effort the civil rights movement's official stamp of approval.

The stakes in a nationwide hospital drive would be big for both the union and the SCLC. Workers in the country's thousands of private non-profit hospitals number about 2.5 million. Any union that could bring a large share of them into its ranks would soon count as a major labor organization.

For the SCLC, which lost momentum after Dr. King was assassinated in Memphis 15 months ago, a successful hospital drive would provide a focus for SCLC's activities and help cement a potential coalition with labor.

A principal factor in settling the Charleston strike was the threat of the International Longshoremen's Assn. to close the city's ocean port. Similar support probably would be forthcoming in the new target cities of the union and the SCLC.

"We don't have a million dollars or a million people," said Mr. Foner. "But maybe we have something even better—an alliance between union power and soul power. Together, we can do what neither the SCLC nor the union could do alone."

[From The Atlanta (Ga.) Journal and Constitution, Aug. 10, 1969]

CHARLESTON TO BE HOST FOR SCLC

Appearances by Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr., New York City Mayor John Lindsay and Fayette, Miss., Mayor Charles Evers will highlight the 12th annual convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference this week in Charleston, S.C.

The Rev. Thomas Kilgore, a Los Angeles Negro who is president of the predominantly-white American Baptist Convention, will deliver the keynote address at the Wednesday opening of the four-day meeting.

Mrs. King will take part in the organization's cultural program Wednesday night.

Lindsay and Evers will address a Thursday night banquet meeting which will also feature an appearance by gospel singer Mahalia Jackson.

SCLC president Rev. Ralph Abernathy will deliver the president's message Thursday morning and other officers, including Atlanta Hosea Williams and the Revs. Jesse Jackson and James Bevel, also will speak Thursday.

The Wednesday "Culture and Heritage Night" will include, in addition to Mrs. King, herself a singer, various choral groups and singers and a theatrical production.

Each day's schedule will begin with a worship service and panel programs will include "Poor People" and "Economic Development and Poor People." Tom Reaves of the National Council to Repeal the Draft will also appear on "Poor People, War and the Draft."

The session will close Saturday morning with a business meeting and a discussion of federal poverty programs.

WORK-WELFARE PLAN ATTACKED BY ABERNATHY

Rev. Ralph Abernathy, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Saturday branded President Nixon's welfare proposal as an insult and a political gimmick.

Abernathy said Nixon had proposed "an adequate, deceptive and repressive" welfare plan. He said the program also "calls for a system of forced work—even for mothers."

"Mr. Nixon's welfare plan is in reality a political gimmick designed to fool both the poor who need so much more and the rich who think they're already too generous with welfare," Abernathy said.

"First, it is inadequate. The Department of Agriculture says a family of four needs at least \$1,200 a year for food alone. Mr. Nixon proposes only \$1,600 for the total needs of such a family. The poor must be guaranteed an income that will bring them at least to the poverty line—\$3,000 for a family of four."

Second, Abernathy charged, the program would set up "forced work," adding:

"Everyone knows that decent jobs with decent pay are not available now and Mr. Nixon makes no provision for finding them. Also, Mr. Nixon should know that less than one per cent of all people on welfare now are able to work. All the rest are children, mothers with infants, the aged, the disabled and a relatively small number of men without adequate training."

"Third, Mr. Nixon would turn the main responsibilities of a welfare system over to the states," he said. "Does he mean to say he will let the State of Mississippi, where starving children now receive \$8.50 per month in welfare, control the new program?"

Abernathy said the only good features he saw in Nixon's proposal were in the establishment of minimum federal standards for welfare payments and the making of welfare available to families with unemployed fathers.

"These are demands of the Poor People's Campaign," the civil rights leader said. "They should have been met long ago."

SENTENCED TO TIME SERVED

NEW YORK.—Civil rights crusader James Meredith has been sentenced to "time served" on his conviction of harassing tenants who lived in a Bronx apartment building he owns. The sentence, handed down by Bronx Criminal Court Judge Ross Bach, meant that the two days Meredith has spent in jail since his arrest is the only penalty he will have to pay on the conviction.

[From United Press International, May 13, 1969]

HARASSMENT OF TENANTS IS DENIED BY MEREDITH

NEW YORK, May 13.—Civil rights activist James Meredith today denied charges he has harassed elderly white tenants in a rent-controlled Bronx apartment house he owns.

Three summonses charging harassment have been issued against Meredith, the latest Monday, and thus far he has refused to answer them.

Meredith today held a news conference outside his 34-family apartment house in the Highbridge section and told newsmen the tenants had told him, "We are going to force you out."

As he spoke, about 10 tenants came out of the building while others leaned out of windows to argue with him.

The tenants have charged that Meredith demanded a rent increase when he took over the building 17 months ago, and, when he did not get it, began to cut heat, hot water and elevator service.

Meredith said he had only asked "the co-operation" of the tenants in getting an increase in the rent-controlled building and denied he had curtailed services.

But one tenant produced a letter from Meredith to the occupants of the building. The letter, dated Feb. 15, 1968, said, "We are requesting that you sign a lease giving a 15 per cent increase in rent."

"Unless we get cooperation and all of the tenants sign such leases by March 31, 1968 effecting the change for April 1, 1968, it will be necessary for us to take immediate steps to vacate the building and convert it into a different kind of property."

Meredith admitted writing the letter but declined to elaborate on whether any threats were implicit.

Meredith said there are three Negro families in the 34-family, six-story brick building. All the tenants who complained to newsmen were white.

Meredith claimed he was losing \$18,000 in operating the building but said he was maintaining the ownership because "I'm interested in this city, in this neighborhood. I want to supply a decent place for Negroes and Puerto Ricans."

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 12, 1969]

FATHER GROPP, ARRESTED

MILWAUKEE, Wis.—The Rev. James Groppi and two youths were arrested yesterday when they refused to break their locked arms and permit employees of the Allen-Bradley Co. to pass through plant doors.

The Roman Catholic priest, who has been active in civil rights demonstrations, and the youths were charged with unlawful assembly.

The demonstration started when a small circle of 11 demonstrators marched in front of the employees' entrance to the plant, protesting what they termed "plant discrimination on all minority groups." Police said Father Groppi and the two other then locked arms at the entrance.

Onlookers cheered and applauded as the trio was escorted to a patrol wagon and their picket signs were trampled in the brief scuffle with police.

U.S. MOON TRIUMPH

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning, July the 21st, the morning edition of the Kansas City Star which carried the name of the Kansas City Times, published an extra edition. Across the top of the paper from margin to margin were 3-inch-high headlines with the words, "U.S. Moon Triumph."

One of the most interesting feature stories that it has been my privilege to read was the one written by Phillip S. Brimble and James J. Fisher, who are members of the Star's staff, writing from Houston, Tex.

Theirs is a fascinating article and contains such a vivid description of that first historic exploration of the moon that when you start their story, the reader cannot stop until he finishes. These able reporters start with the words of the first human to step onto another celestial body, and set out the first words uttered by Neil Armstrong, which as they point out ended the mystery of what the first man would say when he reached the lunar surface.

Every one of the articles written for the extra and commemorative editions of the Kansas City Times and the Kansas City Star are outstanding. The Kansas City Star is to be commended and congratulated for providing these editions as a lasting memento of these milestones in the history of man. To say that these editions have been accepted by the readers of the Star is an understatement. There has been an unprecedented demand for this most popular journalistic effort. It is my personal privilege and high honor to say that I know and respect these writers, Mr. Brimble and Mr. Fisher. It is my further privilege to congratulate them for an article which describes a portion of the greatest odyssey in all of our history. These reporters have done an outstanding job, in describing something unique. It is my privilege to share this story with my colleagues and to ask that this feature article be incorporated as a part of the permanent edi-

tion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

[From The Kansas City Times, July 21, 1969]

LIFT STARS, STRIPES

(By Phillip S. Brimble and James J. Fisher)

With the earth looming like a blue ball in the black bleakness of space above them, two American astronauts stepped onto the moon, which one of them described as a "magnificent desolation," and gave the world a moment of greatness last night.

An automatic television camera transmitted the feat live to millions of earth viewers. Neil A. Armstrong became the first human to step onto another celestial body, putting his left foot onto the lunar surface at 9:54 o'clock (Kansas City time).

"That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind," Armstrong said, thus ending the mystery of what he would say.

There was no awe or emotion in his voice, just the solid confidence of a man who set out to do a task and did it well.

Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., then began what shall rank as the most dramatic and unbelievable television show in history. They at times seemed to float across the lunar soil, which they described as "fine-grained and almost like a powder," leaning forward all the while to offset the weight of their life-sustaining backpacks.

After about 2 hours and 15 minutes on the surface of a world without air or known life, without any of the beauties that make a good earth, Armstrong and Aldrin returned to the safety of the lunar module, or Eagle.

They were expected to sleep—to close their eyes and lose consciousness and, maybe, dream—after having done what none before them had done, after having become special mortals: Men among men, pioneers of a new era just dawning.

About 30 minutes after Armstrong and Aldrin stepped onto the surface, and after they had erected the American flag—held outright in the airless surface with spring-mounted supports—they got a telephone message from President Richard M. Nixon. It was transmitted from the Oval room at the White House through the NASA radio network.

President Nixon said:

"Hello, Neil and Buzz . . . I can't tell you how proud we all are . . . for every American, this has got to be the proudest day of their lives . . . Because of what you have done, the heavens have become a part of man's world."

The President said the lunar landing by Armstrong and Aldrin had united the world as never before, in pride in their achievement and in prayers for their safety.

"Thank you, Mr. President," Armstrong said. "It is a great honor to be here, not only in representing the United States, but the world."

"We look forward to seeing you on the Hornet Thursday," Nixon said. (The USS Hornet is the recovery ship.)

"We look forward to that very much, sir," Armstrong replied.

After that brief exchange, interrupted occasionally by radio feed-back in the transmission, Armstrong and Aldrin returned to their tasks, mainly collecting rock and soil samples and deploying instrument packages.

Armstrong's first step onto the moon occurred at 9:54 o'clock (Kansas City time). Silhouetted against the stark lunar whiteness, Armstrong stretched his left leg toward the surface, then jerked it back up.

"That last step is a long one," he explained, adding later that the ladder was about 3 feet above the surface and that the Eagle had not sunk into the moon as deeply as expected.

"I can kick it (the moon's soil) up loosely with my toe," Armstrong said. "It is like powdered charcoal. I can see the footprints of my shoe tread . . . I seem to have no diffi-

culty in moving around . . . as we suspected, it's even easier moving than in the one-sixth g (gravity) simulation we performed on earth.

To demonstrate how easily he could move on the moon, Armstrong seemingly raced across the screen in bouncy, ballet-like steps, then turned and raced toward the camera. Equally at home on the surface was Aldrin, who, when finding himself at the bottom of the ladder, jumped up and down.

Aldrin's exit onto the moon came about 20 minutes after Armstrong's stepdown. Mission Control showed momentary concern about the contingency sample, which Armstrong was scheduled to pick up first and send back to the cabin on a pulley system. However, he seemed more interested in taking pictures with the still camera attached to his chest pack.

"I'm looking up at the LM, at Buzz in the window, and I can see everything quite clearly . . . everything is clearly visible," Armstrong said.

"Are you going to get that contingency sample tonight?" asked Mission Control.

"I'm taking pictures," Armstrong said, then turned his back to the television camera and took some photographs of the lunar landscape.

He then filled the contingency sample pack and passed it up to Aldrin, describing the lunar soil as "very soft at the surface, but difficult to scoop up . . . very cohesive material."

He said his boot footprints only sank into the surface about one-eighth of an inch, and that the Eagle had sunk but 2 inches.

"The rocks are rather slippery . . . finely porous," Aldrin reported. "You have to be careful and lean in the direction you want to go . . . it is not hard to lose my balance in one direction, but recovery is easy."

Aldrin then moved away from the Eagle, looking for rock samples.

"Remember them telling us we would find purple rocks?" Aldrin said.

Armstrong answered he did.

"Did you find one?" he asked.

"Yep," Aldrin said. "It is small, and sparkly . . . like agate. First, guess it is some sort of biotite." (Biotite is a mica substance, indicative of volcanic action.)

About this time Armstrong moved the television camera out of the storage rack on the LM, and out about 50 feet to give a wide-angle view of Aldrin standing before Eagle, a gleaming adventurer before his craft.

As the two men moved about setting up the experiments, they reported that the lunar soil smudged their gloves and covered their boots.

Perhaps one of the most dramatic shots was the one showing both Aldrin and Armstrong busy working about the LM, with Armstrong's footprints leading to and back from the television camera, footprints clearly visible on an otherwise barren plain.

The halfway mark to realizing that dream occurred yesterday afternoon when the lunar module landed, under the control of Armstrong's deft hands for the final few hundred feet.

Eagle landed at 3:17:42 o'clock (Kansas City time).

Watching and listening as the fragile craft started its descent from 50,000 feet above the lunar surface was an audience estimated in the hundreds of millions.

Armstrong was calm as he ticked off the readings from his instruments.

He had used those same instruments earlier in the first burn of Eagle's descent engine, a burn which shifted the craft out of a 60-mile-high orbit it had shared with Michael Collins in the Columbia, the command module.

The first burn changed Eagle's orbit to an exaggerated elliptical path with a high point, or apolune, of 65.6 miles and a low point, or perilune, of 9.8 miles.

The first burn was made on the backside of the moon, out of communications with Mission Control. At that point the computer on Eagle started the automated landing sequence.

That sequence began with the refiring of the descent engine for almost 12 minutes, starting soon after 3 o'clock.

At that point, Eagle was at 50,000 feet and about 14 degrees uprange from the second landing site.

Since the powered descent of Eagle put it into a lower and slower orbit than the Columbia, Collins was the first to return to radio contact with Mission Control as Columbia slipped from behind the moon at 2:44. Eagle reappeared from behind the moon two minutes later. Its rocket was firing, dropping it closer and closer to the moon below.

At 47,000 feet Armstrong reported fluctuation in the alternate voltage current.

Seconds later he said of Eagle:

"I think it's gonna drop."

At 40,000 feet, Mission Control told Eagle it was "go" for powered descent.

At that point several alarm lights came on in Mission Control. They came on once and did not reappear. It was later explained that the computers were receiving and processing so much information that they automatically recycled themselves and started their tasks over.

Readings of data at this point indicated Eagle was on its intended trajectory. Dr. Charles Berry, the astronauts' doctor, was getting readings that Armstrong's heart rate had increased to 156 beats a minute. Because of the limited space on the Eagle, only one pilot was hooked up for readings.

At 25,000 feet above the lunar surface, Armstrong started to throttle down on the descent engine, slowing both his descent rate and his forward rate. The computer on board Eagle was assisting his manual control of the craft.

At 3,000 feet, Mission Control told Armstrong and Aldrin that they were "go" for landing.

Eagle and its 2-man crew continued down—2,000 feet, 1,600, 750, 540, 150, 100, 75, 60.

At 40 feet, the blast from the descent engine kicked up dust from the surface of the moon.

"Drifting to the right a little," Armstrong said. Then:

"Contact light."

That referred to the 5-foot-long probes on the ends of three of the four legs of Eagle which activated a panel light inside the module on touching the lunar surface.

"Okay, engine stop. A. C. A. out of detent. Modes control both auto, descent engine command override off. Engine arm off."

"Houston, Tranquillity base here. The Eagle has landed."

Houston replied:

"Roger, Tranquillity, we copy you on the ground. You've got a bunch of guys about to turn blue. We're breathing again."

Inside Mission Control, there was cheering. Gene Kranz, a flight controller, keyed his microphone and told the other controllers: "Knock it off, we've still got work to do."

Sixty-nine miles above the lunar surface, Michael Collins frantically asked to hear the transmission of the landing. A tape was played to him immediately after Eagle set down.

"I heard the whole thing," Collins said. "Fantastic!"

That was the only superlative of the afternoon.

Eagle landed west of the second landing site and about 4 miles north.

Armstrong radioed that the auto targeting device aboard the spacecraft took the spacecraft into a crater the size of a football field with large rocks and boulders in it.

"It required flying manually over the rock field to find a reasonably good area," he said.

That fly-by was at 200 feet.

Collins quipped from the Columbia:

"When in doubt, land wrong."

Aldrin, looking out the triangular window of the module, calmly described the scene as "lots of boulders and smaller rocks . . . grays and some browns . . . littered with 2-foot craters around the area . . . There's a hill in view."

Apollo 11's day started at 6:30 o'clock yesterday morning when Mission Control awakened the astronauts.

The flight plan had called for nine hours of sleep, but the astronauts were undoubtedly eager to start their long day by getting ahead of schedule and keeping ahead of it.

By 8:30 o'clock yesterday morning, Aldrin had pressurized the tunnel to the LM, then the LM itself.

He entered the LM, and Armstrong followed moments later, wearing his bulky moon suit.

After a systems check by both men, Aldrin returned to the command module and donned his suit.

By 11 o'clock, Aldrin and Armstrong were in the LM. It was on its own electrical power, although still attached to command module.

At 12:45 o'clock, Collins undocked the LM by releasing the 12 latches which hold the command module and the lunar module together.

At 1:09 o'clock, just before the separation of Columbia and Eagle, a conversation occurred indicative of the laconic nature of the three astronauts.

Columbia: "Take care."

Eagle: "See you later."

THE APPROPRIATION AND SPENDING BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with the summer congressional recess beginning tomorrow, it seems timely to supply for the information of Members and others who may be interested a summarization of the appropriation business and spending actions thus far, especially with respect to bills dealing with the budget for the current fiscal year 1970.

Recommendations on the spending side of the budget are handled mostly in appropriation bills, dealing—in this session—with supplements to fiscal 1969 and with the main budget for the current fiscal year 1970. A handful of items relate to fiscal 1971. And a number of actions with impact on the pending budget have been taken in bills out of the legislative committees—the details of which are reported on in the latest budget scorekeeping report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

The House has acted on six of the fiscal 1970 appropriation bills. They involved consideration of some \$45 billion of the President's budget requests for new appropriations and other new budget—obligational—authority. In those six bills, the Committee on Appropriations, after

weeks and months of detailed hearings, recommended \$44.5 billion—a net reduction, overall, of nearly \$500 million.

But the House, through floor actions, made net additions of \$725 million to the committee's recommendations, with the result that the six bills—as finally voted in the House—are above the related budget requests by some \$247 million in new spending authority, counting a \$10 million reduction that technically relates to fiscal 1971. The figure is \$257 million above the budget requests that relate solely to fiscal 1970.

In respect to fiscal 1969 supplementals at this session, budget requests for new budget spending authority totaled nearly \$5.9 billion. Amounts approved totaled \$5.4 billion, a reduction of nearly a half billion dollars—\$461 million—from the budget requests.

In terms of expenditures—or more precisely, budget outlays—it is tentatively estimated that House actions to date in these six appropriation bills would result in increasing budget expenditures for 1970 by roughly \$337 million. The late passage of the second supplemental bill for fiscal 1969, in which reductions were made, resulted in some spillover effect of the reductions in relation to expenditures for fiscal 1970 which began July 1, in consequence of which it is tentatively estimated that the \$337 million increase is diminished to about \$227 million above the budget projections.

These increases are in the face of the action of Congress only a month ago in adopting an overall expenditure ceiling for 1970 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, directing a cut of at least \$1 billion below the \$192.9 billion expenditure budget for fiscal 1970 projected in the President's April 15 budget revision. Thus far, cumulative House actions in the individual spending bills have not matched up—they are in the aggregate tending in the opposite direction.

The principal reason can be found in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. The committee bill itself was a compromise with the budget—it reflected a number of reductions, and several increases. It was \$155,802,000, net, above the budget. The House added another \$922,563,000, principally through adoption of the nine-part amendment involving \$894,547,000 in various education programs. The bill total as adopted in the House is \$1,078,365,000 above the related budget requests.

This year, as Members know, the congressional budget business was understandably delayed with the change of administration involving a lengthy review of the budget of the outgoing administration. The new budget review was not released until April 15. And late consideration of some of the annual authorization bills has contributed to delays in reporting appropriations—notably the defense authorization bills, the foreign aid authorization, and the District of Columbia revenue bill, all of which are far from finalization.

Some \$87.5 billion of new budget spending authority requests are pending in connection with the seven regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1970 still unre-

ported. We hope to report two of them in September after Congress resumes its business. Others will depend largely on related authorization legislation.

OVERALL SPENDING ACTIONS ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, folding in the various spending actions in legislative bills with those in the appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, the latest budget scorekeeping report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures projects a more comprehensive picture of congressional actions thus far on the budget.

From the latest report of August 7:

SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

The new administration has made various revisions in the January budget estimates, in three steps, as shown in the summary table on page 2.

These actions changed the estimated surplus for fiscal 1970 from \$3.4 billion in the January budget to \$1.8 billion as a corrected budget to \$5.8 billion in the updated estimates, and finally to \$6.4 billion in the revised estimates being considered by the Congress. Without the new taxes proposed in the budget this estimated surplus of \$6.4 billion would become a deficit of \$4 billion.

House action to date reflects a net increase of \$525 million in the 1970 estimates for budget authority¹ and a net increase of \$523 million in the 1970 estimate for outlays.

Senate action to date reflects a net increase of \$649 million in the 1970 estimates for budget authority and a net increase of \$399 million in the 1970 estimate for outlays.

Mr. Speaker, the tables herewith carry supporting details in respect to both the appropriation bills and the applicable legislative bills, together with a capsule summary of the situation on both sides of the budget:

ACTIONS ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 91ST CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF AUG. 7, 1969

[Does not include any "back-door" type budget authority; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or "permanent" law,¹ without further or annual action by the Congress]

Bill and fiscal year	House actions			Senate actions		Enacted	(+) or (-) latest action compared with budget requests
	Budget requests considered	Reported by committee	Approved by House	Budget requests considered	Approved by Senate		
A. Bills for fiscal 1970:							
1. Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 11582) (net of estimated postal revenues appropriated) (Memoranda out: Total, including authori- zations out of postal funds).....	\$2,314,714,000	\$2,272,332,000	\$2,272,332,000	\$2,314,714,000	\$2,280,195,000		-\$34,159,000
2. Agriculture (H.R. 11612).....	(8,821,727,000)	(8,779,345,000)	(8,779,345,000)	(8,821,727,000)	(8,787,208,000)		(-34,519,000)
3. Independent offices—HUD (H.R. 12307) (including 1917 advance) (Fiscal year 1970 amounts only).....	6,967,562,050	6,806,655,000	6,806,655,000	6,967,562,050	7,642,797,650		+675,235,600
4. Interior (H.R. 12781).....	15,380,413,600	14,907,089,000	14,909,089,000				-471,324,600
5. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary (H.R. 12964).....	(15,205,413,600)	(14,732,089,000)	(14,734,089,000)				(-471,324,600)
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 13111).....	1,390,096,500	1,374,434,000	1,374,286,700				-15,809,800
7. Public works (and AEC).....	2,475,704,600	2,534,134,200	2,335,634,200				-140,070,400
8. Legislative.....	16,495,237,700	16,651,039,700	17,573,602,700				+1,078,365,000
9. Transportation (including 1971 advances) (Fiscal year 1970 amounts only).....	(4,176,978,000)						
10. District of Columbia (Federal funds) (District of Columbia funds).....	(309,374,273)						
11. Defense.....	(1,994,515,630)						
12. Military construction.....	(1,744,515,630)						
13. Foreign assistance.....	(190,106,000)						
14. Supplemental.....	(732,788,000)						
Total, these bills—							
As to fiscal 1970.....	44,848,728,450	44,370,683,900	45,096,599,600	9,282,276,050	9,922,992,650		+1,091,876,800
As to fiscal 1971.....	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000				
Total, 1970 bills.....	45,023,728,450	44,545,683,900	45,271,599,600	9,282,276,050	9,922,992,650		+1,091,876,800
B. Bills for fiscal 1969:							
1. Unemployment compensation (H.J. Res. 414).....	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	\$36,000,000	
2. Commodity Credit Corporation (H.J. Res. 584).....							
3. 2d supplemental (H.R. 11400).....	\$1,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	
Release of reserves (under Public Law 90-364).....	4,364,006,956	3,783,212,766	3,783,212,766	4,814,305,334	4,459,669,644	4,352,357,644	-461,947,690
Total, 1969 bills.....	(82,463,000)	(82,766,000)	(82,766,000)	(79,999,000)	(80,230,000)	(80,230,000)	(+231,000)
Total, 1969 bills.....	5,400,006,956	4,819,212,766	4,819,212,766	5,850,305,334	5,495,669,644	5,388,357,644	-461,947,690
C. Cumulative totals for the session:							
House.....	50,423,735,406	49,364,896,666	50,090,812,366				-332,923,040
Senate.....				15,132,581,384	15,418,662,294		+286,080,910
Enacted.....				5,850,305,334		5,388,357,644	-461,947,690

¹In round amounts, the revised (April) budget for fiscal 1970 tentatively estimated total new budget (obligational) authority for 1970 at \$219,600,000,000 gross (\$205,900,000,000 net of certain offsets made for budget summary purposes only), of which about \$80,700,000,000 would become available, through so-called permanent authorizations, without further action by Congress, and about \$138,900,000,000 would require "current" action by Congress (mostly in the appropriation bills). Also, the April Review of the Budget contemplates budget requests for advance fiscal 1971 funding in 4 items totaling \$1,661,000,000.

²These figures do not reflect the budget proposal for postal rate increases, valued in the revised budget at \$621,500,000 for fiscal 1970.

³Shifted from fiscal 1970 budget, a portion of which is technically classified in the budget as "liquidation of contract authorization" rather than as new budget (obligational) authority.

Note: House actions to date on bills for 1970 are tentatively estimated to increase outlays (expenditures and net lending) budgeted for 1970 by approximately \$337,700,000. Prepared Aug. 7, 1969, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—ACTIONS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF AUG. 7, 1969)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1970:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the budget):						
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office (H.R. 11582).....	-42,382	-34,519		-37,000	-30,600	
Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 11612).....	-160,907	+675,236		+53,000	+556,000	
Second supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400).....				-110,000	-82,000	-75,000
Section 401 outlay ceiling.....					(-1,900,000)	(-1,000,000)
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 12307).....	-471,325			-113,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 12781).....	-15,810			-15,300		
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 12964).....	-130,070			-71,000		
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 13111).....	+1,078,365			+521,000		
Subtotal, appropriation bills.....	+257,871	+640,717		+227,700	+443,400	-75,000

Footnotes on following page.

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—ACTIONS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF AUG. 7, 1969)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1970—Continued						
Legislative bills with spending authorizations (changes from the budget):						
Legislative and judicial salaries (H.R. 7206)	+313	N.A.		+313		
Civil service retirement benefits (H.R. 9825, S. 2754)	N.A.	* N.A.		* -55,000	** -55,000	
Defense: overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434)	+8,900			+8,900		
Veterans readjustment benefits (Public Law 91-22)	+1,362	+1,362	+1,362	+3,952	+3,952	+3,952
Veterans hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693)	+3,400			+3,400		
Veterans care in State homes (H.R. 9334)	+2,803			+2,803		
Veterans care in community nursing homes (H.R. 692)	+5,954			+5,954		
Veterans outpatient care (H.R. 3130)	+8,000			+8,000		
Veterans nursing home care (service-connected) (H.R. 2768)	+1,500			+1,500		
Additional district judges (S. 952)		+1,473			+1,473	
Additional clerks for House Members (H. Res. 357)	+3,600		+3,600	+3,600		+3,600
J.F.K. Center (H.R. 11249)	+5,000	* +5,000		+5,000	* +5,000	
Appalachian highways (H.R. 4018)	+20,000					
Food for needy children (H.R. 11651)				+100,000		
Veterans education assistance (H.R. 11959)	+206,500			+206,500		
Subtotal, legislative bills	+267,332	+7,835	+4,962	+294,922	-44,575	+7,552
Total, fiscal year 1970	+525,203	+648,552	+4,962	+522,622	+398,825	-67,448
Fiscal year 1969:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the budget):						
2d supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400)	-580,794	-357,496	-461,948	-464,000	-254,600	-325,000

¹ Reflects floor action increasing milk funds by \$120,000,000, but does not reflect effect of \$20,000 limitation on subsidy payments adopted by House. The Appropriations Committee assumed a reduction in Public Law 480 spending which if not realized will result in higher spending than estimated.

² The 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969, carried an overall expenditure limitation for fiscal 1970 which was different in all 3 versions. The House-passed version set the ceiling at the Apr. 15 budget figure of \$192,900,000,000 with provision for increases or decreases depending upon actions or inactions of the Congress affecting the budget. The Senate version made a flat

reduction of \$1,900,000,000 in the overall ceiling but exempted certain items from the ceiling. The enacted version made a flat reduction of \$1,000,000,000, provided for increases or decreases depending upon action or inaction of Congress affecting the budget, and granted up to \$2,000,000,000 of flexibility in the ceiling to the President for certain uncontrollable items.

³ Committee action.

⁴ Estimated savings in first year.

N.A.—Not available.

BUDGET SUMMARY

A SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1970 AND FISCAL YEAR 1969 FEDERAL BUDGETS—REFLECTING CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS AFFECTING THOSE BUDGETS DURING THE 1ST SESS. OF THE 91ST CONG.

[In millions of dollars]

Summary totals	Budget authority (obligational and lending authority)	Budget outlays (expenditures and net lending)	Budget receipts	Budget surplus or deficit
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fiscal year 1970:				
Net total budget estimates as submitted Jan. 15, 1969	210,116	195,272	198,686	+3,414
Net total budget estimates as corrected by the new administration	211,412	196,921	198,686	+1,765
Net total budget estimates as corrected and revised to Apr. 15, 1969	205,901	192,899	198,686	+5,787
Net total budget estimates as revised and amended to date	* 204,201	* 192,885	* 199,337	+6,452
Adjustments for interfund and intragovernmental transactions and applicable receipts	+13,714	+13,714	+13,714	
Total gross budget estimates	217,915	206,599	213,051	+6,452
Budget estimates not requiring further action by Congress (previously enacted or permanent)	80,710	114,894	202,584	
Prior year's budget authority		(85,165)		
Current (1970) budget authority	(80,710)	(29,729)		
Budget estimates requiring action by Congress	137,205	91,705	10,467	
Effect of congressional action on budget estimates (net changes) to Aug. 7, 1969:				
House	+525	+523	-270	-793
Senate	+649	+399		-399
Enacted	+5	* -67		+67
Fiscal year 1969:				
Net total budget estimates as submitted in January	194,620	183,701	186,092	+2,391
Net total budget estimates, as revised	196,030	185,588	186,492	+904
Net total budget estimates, as changed by congressional action	195,568	185,263	186,492	+1,229
Actual net total as enacted by Congress and reported by the Treasury	195,568	184,769	187,843	+3,074

¹ Reflects latest estimates and revised legislative program presented to Ways and Means Committee on May 20, 1969, representing a decrease of \$1,700,000,000 in 1970 budget authority for the previously proposed social security program and a net increase in estimated receipts for 1970 of \$620,000,000 including aviation user charges.

² On July 22, the President issued a statement indicating that estimated expenditures for certain uncontrollable items have increased by approximately \$2,500,000,000 since net expenditures were estimated on Apr. 15, 1969, to be \$192,900,000,000. However, the President also indicated that it was the intent of his administration to hold expenditures to the Apr. 15 estimated level. It is therefore assumed that the official budget estimate is still \$192,900,000,000.

³ Sec. 401 of the 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969, imposes a flexible ceiling on expenditures (outlays) for fiscal year 1970, based upon congressional action or inaction on the various appropriation and legislative requests in the Apr. 15 Nixon administration budget estimates. However, the limitation also requires a \$1,000,000,000 reduction in expenditures either by congressional action or (if not accomplished by Congress) by the President. For current scorekeeping purposes the figure shown reflects the net effect of congressional action to date, as shown in supporting table No. 1.

THE WET FRONTIER

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, The senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) is a member of the recently announced subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs formed to deal with the problems of the Outer Continental Shelf.

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) is a man of action and responded to this appointment by presenting an informative paper to the American Bar Association.

His remarks, entitled "A United States Policy for the Wet Frontier," call for a reassessment of claims to exclusive fishing rights and management of the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

A U.S. POLICY FOR THE WET FRONTIER

(By Senator TED STEVENS to the Section of Natural Resources Law of the American Bar Association, Dallas, Tex., Aug. 12, 1969)

I am here to discuss with you suggestions for modification in United States policy with respect to our interpretation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. In my opinion, a reassessment of claims to exclusive fishing rights and management of

the fish and minerals off our coast would be in the best interests of our future utilization of these resources.

For the sake of consistency, in my discussion I have adopted the following terminology: the term "continental shelf" is understood to be that portion of the continent which is covered by the waters up to the point of declivity of the slope or edge of the shelf. The term "continental slope" refers to the slope from the edge of the shelf to the abyssal. "Continental terrace" is understood to be that part of the submerged land mass that forms both the shelf and the slope.

In appraising our nation's right to control the disposition and development of the natural resources on the continental terrace and its right to the marine life that inhabits the waters above the terrace, it is important to remember that a nation's jurisdiction can be likened to a bundle of sticks. Landward of a baseline, which is low water line or straight-line joining points along an irregular coast line, the coastal nation has exactly the power it has on land, a complete bundle of jurisdictional sticks. Outward from the baseline to the limit of territorial waters, say three miles, as our government insists, or six, or twelve, or more, as other nations claim, the coastal nation has most of the sovereign power it has on land. These extend to all four elements of the marine environment—the seabed, the overlying water, the water surface, and the superjacent air space. This near plenary control over territorial waters is subject under international law to the easement in favor of innocent passage of merchant ships and war ships in peacetime, subject to certain restrictions.

Beyond territorial waters, some sticks begin to fall out of the bundle of sovereign powers. Coastal nations, under international law, have some powers beyond the belt of territorial waters, but these are restricted, extra-territorial powers. For example, with respect to the surface, the Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone provides that a contiguous zone may be established to encompass a belt twelve miles wide, measured from the same baseline from which the territorial waters are measured. In this contiguous zone, the coastal nation may, for example, exercise exclusive control of fisheries. Beyond that, the surface of the ocean is part of the high seas over which the coastal nation has no more power than any other nation of the world.

The potential value of the undersea area adjacent to the coast of the United States in terms of mineral resources and food sources is almost beyond estimate.

For instance, the importance of offshore petroleum and natural gas is reflected in estimates that, within two decades, 30% to 40% of the domestic and world production will come from offshore sources. Currently, 15% of United States production of sulfur comes from offshore, and additional sulfur areas have been identified in the Gulf of Mexico. While the potential for offshore solid minerals is still in the exploratory stage, projections show that U.S. consumption of many commodities will double by 1980. Additionally, the demand for sand, gravel, shells, and other construction materials dredged from near shore waters is increasing significantly in areas where rapid urbanization is simultaneously enlarging the need and excluding land sources of supply. The value of all minerals produced from Federal and state offshore waters in the past decade exceeds \$7.5 billion, including petroleum production valued at about \$6 billion.

Also of some commercial importance are varieties of seaweed to be found off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. California kelp, which is machine harvested as a source of algin, is of greatest importance.

In terms of animal resources in the waters superjacent to the continental terrace, the fishing industries that have flourished in

our coastal states testify to the wealth of this particular food source. However, these same industries testify to the need for wise management and conservation of a continually diminishing supply of commercially harvestable marine animal life. Of particular concern in my State of Alaska is the management of the salmon harvest. The Japanese, operating a mother-ship fleet consisting of nearly 400 salmon vessels, were taking salmon originating in Alaskan river systems during June and July. During this same period, observations by a U.S. fishery patrol unit revealed that catches of salmon—mature sockeye salmon on their way to Bristol Bay—were being made by a small fleet of 6 South Korean vessels. In 1967 a total of nearly 1200 Soviet and Japanese vessels were sighted operating in the Bering Sea and the North Pacific. About 500 of these vessels operated in the Eastern Bering Sea on the Alaskan continental shelf.

For me, these activities raise two distinct problems: (1) to what seaward boundary should the United States assert exclusive American jurisdiction over submarine mineral development, and, (2) to what seaward boundary should the United States assert exclusive American jurisdiction over the management and disposition of the food resources of the sea.

Let us look first to the basis for assertion of exclusive American rights to the mineral development of the continental terrace. From all evidence, there is no reason to assume that the value of potential mineral discoveries will end at the edge of the shelf. In addition, there is no way to clearly delineate, satisfactorily, the limits of the shelf for national claims and take into account all specific situations that arise. There is, however, a clear and easily defined manner in establishing a boundary of the terrace, and we shall briefly discuss this point later. Since 1945, when President Truman proclaimed that "... the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and the seabed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control", it has been the policy of our Government to regard the resources of the continental shelf as within the jurisdictional bundle of sticks that belongs to the United States.

In 1951 the International Law Commission for all intents and purposes gave legitimacy to President Truman's proclamation by recommending that a coastal nation should have control and jurisdiction over the natural resources of a continental shelf, contiguous to the coast but outside the area of its territorial waters "where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil." Neither the International Law Commission nor the Truman proclamation included any reference to depth or defined the term continental shelf.

The first reference to depth or an attempt to define the recommendations of the International Law Commission was made by that body in 1953 when it defined coastal jurisdiction of the shelf lands solely in terms of water depth, using 200 meters as the outside limit. In March of 1956, 20 American nations, which were dissatisfied with the Commission's 1953 recommendations met at Ciudad Trujillo and adopted a resolution that would admit national jurisdiction to a depth of 200 meters, or beyond that limit to a depth of the superjacent waters which would admit the exploitation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil. The International Law Commission met a week after the Ciudad Trujillo American meeting and, in essence, adopted the American position which placed national jurisdiction at any depth that admitted exploitation of the resources of the seabed and subsoil.

In 1958, the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea convened in Geneva. The Convention on the Continental Shelf was one of the end products of this meeting. The language used in the Convention was the same as that recommended by the 20 American nations at Ciudad Trujillo and that of the 1956 International Law Commission recommendations. The Convention was ratified by the United States in 1960 and went into effect on June 10, 1964, when the 22nd nation ratified that agreement.

Essentially then, the rights of the United States in the continental margin are controlled by the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf. This recognizes in the coastal nations exclusive "sovereign rights" to the exploration and exploitation of the natural resources of the "continental shelf". The Convention uses the term continental shelf as shorthand expression which refers to the submarine areas adjacent to the coasts but outside the territorial sea to a depth of 200 meters or, as the Convention asserts in Article I, beyond that limit to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of exploitation of the natural resources of that area. This, of course, extends coastal jurisdiction beyond the continental shelf, and the Convention does this deliberately. In light of the relative ease with which a geo-legal definition of the continental terrace can be made, it would seem in the best interests of the United States to interpret the wording of the Convention to mean the continental terrace to alleviate possible problems of disputes that may arise from some unforeseeable contingencies. Article II of the Convention asserts that these rights are exclusive in the sense that, if the coastal nation does not explore or exploit these resources, then no one may undertake these activities. Again, we can see the desirability of a firmly fixed boundary that is easily definable rather than the fairly fuzzy one of the Convention. Article III of the Convention clearly states that the seabed rights of the coastal state do not affect the status of the superjacent waters as high seas or that of the air space above these waters. There are, however, valuable resources in the overlying water column in the form of food resources which brings us to a discussion of our second question, to what seaward boundary should the United States assert exclusive American jurisdiction over the management of and disposition of the food resources of the sea.

The European Fisheries Convention of 1964, although limiting its effect to the parties of the Convention, represents the first multilateral agreement which recognized that a state is entitled to fix the limits of its territorial sea up to a maximum of 6 nautical miles with a contiguous fishing zone extending not further than 12 nautical miles from the baseline of its territorial sea. The Convention further provides that the fishing vessels of any party, which had made a practice of fishing in the outer 6 miles of a fishing zone, retain these fishing rights for an unlimited period provided that they do not fish for stocks or in any area substantially different from those they have habitually exploited. The United States is not a party to this convention.

Again, as in the case of mineral resources, it is absurd to assert that fish inhabit areas of oceans convenient to the Convention definition of exclusive fishing rights. Indeed, as early as 1938, it was recognized by Anthony Diamond, then Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and others, that the migratory practices of salmon, for instance, carried them far afield from the fishing zone and that the practices of foreign and American fishing vessels outside the fishing zone areas could, in fact do, irreparable harm to that species. Mr. Diamond cited the near destruction of the Siberian fisheries of Siberia in 1937 due to swiftness management and conservation practices. At that time, he was concerned lest the same thing happen to the Alaskan salmon

industry. Today we face the same problem. As I cited earlier, in 1967 about 500 foreign vessels were observed fishing in the Bering Sea over the continental shelf lands adjacent to Alaska. Any fisherman of fresh water lakes that have been over fished can tell you of the disastrous consequences of uncontrolled management of fishing. Salmon are particularly vulnerable to over fishing because of their migratory habits. Yet there is no way we can now control those nations who are not a party to the North Pacific Fishing Treaty from harvesting salmon beyond our territorial waters.

I suggest it would be in the best interests of this nation and every coastal nation to assert exclusive fishery rights in the waters that lie above their continental terrace lands. I would also suggest that this nation take the lead in seeking international recognition of this right. We cannot continue to allow a pillage of the marine resources above the continental terrace.

In summary, I assert that the United States ought to seek to have the definition of exploitability in the Convention on the Continental Shelf modified so that the term embraces the entire continental terrace. Secondly, I assert it is in the best interests of this nation for the United States to claim

exclusively fishery rights in the waters superjacent to the continental terrace and seek international recognition of this claim. Neither of these assertions is inconsistent with the right of innocent passage nor with the basic intent of the Convention on the Continental Shelf.

It is my understanding that the position I have voiced today is in basic agreement with that of the current administration in my home State of Alaska. Today I seek broad federal acceptance of this position and will submit legislation to that effect in the near future.

RESULTS OF POLL

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent out a legislative questionnaire to constituents in the Seventh District, querying them on 10 different issues. I was most impressed by the enthusiastic

response registered in the district to this poll. While the returns were extensive in number, they were also highly enlightening in content. Of equal import was the conversant tone of the comments that many chose to attach to their completed questionnaires.

Revealing as well as reassuring, a sampling such as this offers perhaps the best method of determining the extent of cohesion that exists between Congressman and constituency. In short, it affords the legislator a barometer that can be of continued and real benefit in helping him effectively represent his district.

Most significant, I think, is the fact that over 30,000 constituents chose to return this questionnaire, and thus, to involve themselves in the affairs of our Government; they have chosen to have their voices heard. Achievement begins with action; action of the very sort taken by these constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit for inclusion in the RECORD the results of this poll:

	Percentage results			Percentage results	
	His	Hers		His	Hers
1. Do you think our current draft system should be:			6. Do you feel the proposed ABM system is:		
(a) Retained as is.....	26.3	28.7	(a) Necessary.....	61.5	66.4
(b) Abolished.....	9.7	12.4	(b) Unnecessary.....	23.7	24.7
(c) Based on a lottery system as recently called for by President Nixon.....	52.2	54.7	No response.....	14.9	8.9
No response.....	11.9	4.2	7. Do you feel the 7-percent investment tax credit should be:		
2. Do you think we should settle the Vietnam War by:			(a) Repealed.....	33.2	32.4
(a) All-out military escalation.....	28.2	25.5	(b) Retained.....	40.7	36.2
(b) Seeking a settlement through negotiation as proposed by President Nixon.....	41.7	47.2	(c) No opinion.....	14.6	26.7
(c) Unilateral withdrawal of all our Armed Forces.....	18.2	23.6	No response.....	11.5	4.7
No response.....	11.9	3.8	8. Do you think the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance should be:		
3. Do you favor a Government-guaranteed annual wage as a means of attacking poverty?			(a) Retained.....	53.8	53.2
(a) Yes.....	6.4	7.0	(b) Lowered.....	18.1	16.2
(b) No.....	78.7	85.0	(c) Eliminated.....	9.3	10.2
(c) Undecided.....	4.7	6.4	(d) No opinion.....	8.1	17.1
No response.....	10.2	1.6	No response.....	10.6	3.3
4. Do you favor legislation to limit the number of mandatory questions in the 1970 census?			9. Which course of action do you favor in dealing with campus unrest:		
(a) Yes.....	61.9	66.7	(a) More Federal laws.....	1.9	2.3
(b) No.....	16.5	16.9	(b) More use of local law enforcement by university administrators.....	48.4	47.8
(c) Undecided.....	10.0	13.1	(c) A combination of (a) and (b).....	35.9	44.2
No response.....	11.7	3.3	(d) No action.....	3.2	3.5
5. With regard to current tax reform legislation, do you feel that tax-exempt foundations should:			No response.....	10.6	2.1
(a) Be permitted to keep their tax-exempt status.....	5.5	5.4	10. Do you favor a mandatory retirement age of 70 for members of the legislative and judicial branches?		
(b) Be taxed on profits.....	33.1	36.3	(a) Yes.....	67.9	73.4
(c) Receive no exemptions at all.....	14.2	14.4	(b) No.....	13.6	15.3
(d) Be better defined by the Congress and more closely watched by the Internal Revenue Service.....	36.3	41.1	(c) Favor no change.....	7.9	9.0
No response.....	10.9	2.9	No response.....	10.6	2.2

VETERANS OF REMAGEN BRIDGE

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of our colleague, the Honorable KEN HECHLER of West Virginia, I recently announced in my congressional district that he was interested in obtaining the names of World War II veterans of the first crossing of the Rhine River over the famed Remagen Bridge.

I have since received a number of letters from such veterans or their relatives, and copies of such letters were forwarded to Congressman HECHLER. As you know, our colleague is the author of a best-selling book "The Bridge at Remagen," which has been made into a

movie by United Artists and will shortly be released for public showing throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, the capture of the Remagen Bridge and the first crossing of the Rhine River at that point took place on March 7, 1945. The crossing of the bridge by the U.S. 9th Armored Division was one of the most heroic episodes in modern American military history, and later proved to be a turning point in the war in Europe.

I believe that all those who were instrumental in capturing, crossing, and holding this bridge on this historic occasion during World War II deserve to be honored. I do not know what plans Congressman HECHLER has in mind by way of paying tribute to them, but I want to take this opportunity to honor them by placing their names in the RECORD. The names of the following men from Eastern Connecticut have been for-

warded to me as veterans of the Remagen Bridge:

Raymond W. Aucoin, RFD #1, Wauregan Rd., Danielson, Conn.

Gregory Curtis, Oak Terrace, Durham, Conn.

Nicholas DeGange, 842 Montauk Ave., New London, Conn.

L. J. Francesconi, 2004 Shepard Ave., Hamden, Conn.

Saverio R. La Terra, 107 Park Ave. Ext., Uncasville, Conn.

William E. Michaud, Thompson Ave., Putnam, Conn.

James S. Nihill, Seaside Ave., Westbrook, Conn.

Hirschel Rabinow, 64 Mason Drive, New Britain, Conn.

Howard L. Traeger, RFD #3, Norwich, Conn.

Irving W. Wessman, 37 Diane Lane, Bristol, Conn.

Joseph F. Wilkos, 61 Bay View Rd., Niantic, Conn.

Rader Wilson, 32 Great Plains Rd., Norwich, Conn.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC'S REDWOOD
GIFT REVEALS NEW FACES OF
TIMBER BARONS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Herbert Lundy, editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, Portland, who is a noted conservationist, has written a most interesting and excellent article concerning the Georgia-Pacific Corp. and its contribution to recreation and conservation. All who are genuinely interested in these areas should have an opportunity to read Mr. Lundy's article which I am pleased to share with my colleagues:

GEORGIA-PACIFIC'S REDWOODS GIFT REVEALS
NEW FACE OF TIMBER BARONS

(By Herbert Lundy)

The timber industry took a fearful beating from outdoor conservation spokesmen in their commendable and successful efforts to set aside large areas of redwoods in California as a national park. To whip up public support, lumbermen were pictured as the beasts of the forest out to lay low every tree and leave the giant redwoods only a memory.

But now comes the Georgia-Pacific Corporation, one of the largest forest products companies, with a gift of two redwood groves totaling 390 acres on the Van Duzen River in northern California. The groves contain an estimated \$6 million worth of timber, including 206 acres of old growth up to 800 years in age and 15-feet in diameter.

With the national goal established by Congress being 26 million new homes by 1978—an average of 2.6 million a year compared with the present construction rate of 1.5 million—some eyebrows may be raised by Georgia-

Pacific's donation to the public. After all, the prime redwood in this gift package would provide houses for a million people.

But the national interest also demands preservation of large stands of these magnificent trees, not as "wilderness" but as protected areas to be visited by millions of Americans and visitors from afar. The deed was given to The Nature Conservancy, a privately organized, national, nonprofit organization formed to acquire and protect outstanding natural areas. The California Park System will administer the tract 12 miles from Fortuna, Calif.

Georgia-Pacific is only one of the many large wood products firms which recognize responsibility to communities and the public generally. But in Oregon alone, Portland-based Georgia-Pacific provides 500,000 acres of deer hunting territory and maintains several parks for public recreation.

It is a pleasure to report G-P's interest in recreation and conservation because, as almost everyone in Oregon knows, Georgia-Pacific's intentions were viewed with much suspicion when it entered Washington and Oregon after World War II and started buying vast timber acreages and operating companies.

Robert B. Pamplin, president, made no bones of this the other day in addressing a luncheon of Oregon business leaders on behalf of his board of directors at the Portland Hilton.

"Most of you can remember then that the 'common gossip' among a lot of people around town was that we would be broke within a few years and that we were 'cutting out and getting out,'" he said. Then he gave some statistics:

Georgia-Pacific's sales in 1954 were \$65 million, profit that year was \$1,794,000 and net worth was \$22 million.

"It is with pleasure that I can state today our sales last year were over \$1 billion and our profits were \$76 million—or, in other words, our profits last year were more than our sales in 1954. From this you can see we

are quite a long way from being broke! Furthermore, instead of cutting out and getting out, we now have in Oregon an investment of over \$300 million, and over 5,500 employees whose annual payroll last year topped \$47 million."

Georgia-Pacific, on the basis of this phenomenal growth, evidently could afford the redwoods gift to the nation. Still, the company didn't have to do it. There ought to be a big public hand for the enlightened management and public conscience of this group of "timber barons."

CONSTITUENT POLL OF THE SEVENTH OHIO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during each of the past 3 years I have surveyed the citizens of the Seventh Ohio Congressional District for a reflection of their viewpoints on current and anticipated issues regarding legislation. I have found the results of these polls very valuable in helping to assess the opinions of my constituents. The high ratio of returns of questionnaires during past years also indicates that the public considers its views necessary for the proper functioning of their Government.

With the 1968 survey of the Seventh Ohio District now going out to my constituents, I ask that the questions be printed in the RECORD. When the responses have been tabulated, I will also share the results with my colleagues.

SURVEY OF THE 7TH OHIO DISTRICT, BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN

[If you have no opinion, please do not answer]

	His	Hers
WAR AND MILITARY		
1. If there are no meaningful developments in the Vietnamese peace talks in Paris soon, which course should the United States follow? (Check one)		
(a) Apply all-out military pressure to win the war.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Continue fighting and negotiating for neutral supervision of elections and mutual troop withdrawals, with South Vietnam taking over the fighting when and where possible.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Withdraw U.S. forces regardless of progress in the Paris peace talks.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you favor the proposed limited antiballistic missile defense system (ABM), with installations around strategic ICBM sites?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
POVERTY AND WELFARE		
3. Do you favor a 2-year extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) as an agency to study and initiate new programs to aid in the fight against poverty?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Should private industry be granted tax incentives to:		
(a) Engage in job-training programs?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Aid black capitalism projects?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you favor automatic cost-of-living adjustments in social security benefits?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Should Congress enact national welfare benefit standards to replace the present system of State standards?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Should welfare recipients be required to work, if physically able, as a condition of receiving welfare benefits?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
TAXES AND INFLATION		
8. Which of the following proposed tax reforms do you favor? (Mark as many as appropriate):		
(a) Enactment of a minimum Federal income tax for citizens with substantial incomes by limiting their use of deductions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exempt families with less than \$3,000 annual income from paying any Federal income taxes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Tax earnings of investments and businesses owned by foundations, social and fraternal organizations and churches.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Allow parents and/or students to deduct the full cost of college or vocational education expenses from their Federal income taxes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Eliminate or reduce the oil depletion allowance.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Repeal the 7 percent investment tax credit allowed to industry for capital expenditures for new equipment and facilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Repeal the tax exempt status of State and municipal bonds.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) Permit individuals to claim a Federal tax deduction for a total contribution of up to \$100 to political candidates or parties (including non-partisan contests) to encourage more participation in our election process.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Permit industries to deduct from their Federal income-tax payments investments made to control air and water pollution.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SURVEY OF THE 7TH OHIO DISTRICT, BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN—Continued

[If you have no opinion, please do not answer]

	His	Hers
TAXES AND INFLATION—Continued		
9. Which measures do you favor being taken to halt inflation? (Mark as many as appropriate)		
(a) Extension of the Federal income tax surcharge.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Reduced Federal spending.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Wage and price controls.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Higher interest rates.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. If Federal spending must be reduced, list the order in which you think such cuts should be made (Number the first area you would cut as "1," the next as "2," etc.).		
Poverty.....	His	Hers
Education.....	His	Hers
Health.....	His	Hers
Agriculture.....	His	Hers
Highways.....	His	Hers
Welfare.....	His	Hers
Foreign aid.....	His	Hers
Crime control.....	His	Hers
Space exploration.....	His	Hers
Air and water pollution control.....	His	Hers
Military research and hardware.....	His	Hers
Public works (dams, post offices, etc.).....	His	Hers
11. Do you favor a Federal tax-sharing program which would give State and local governments a share of Federal tax revenues to spend as they see fit (within broad Federal guidelines)?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
12. Would you be willing to pay increased State and local income taxes to finance the Nation's needs if Federal income taxes were reduced?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS		
13. Do you favor removal of the Post Office Department from the Cabinet and the formation of a nonprofit Government corporation to run the postal service?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
14. Should the Congress enact legislation prohibiting strikes by public employees?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
15. Should public employees be allowed to join labor unions?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
16. Which approach do you favor in national agricultural policies? (Choose one):		
(a) Continuation of the present farm program.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Direct controls on farm commodity production.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Expansion of consumption of farm products through free or low-cost distribution to the poor of surplus commodities purchased by the Federal Government to maintain farm prices.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Termination of production controls and price support programs so as to rely on free markets (supply and demand) to set prices and production levels.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Retire 10,000,000 acres of farmland per year through the use of Government funds (on a bid basis).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Are you a farmer?.....	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
CAMPUS DISORDERS		
17. Should Federal aid be denied to students who engage in disruptive campus demonstrations?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
18. Should Federal aid be denied to institutions which fail to set up procedures for controlling campus disorders?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
ELECTORAL REFORM		
19. Which system of electing the President do you favor? (Choose one):		
(a) Direct popular election, with a runoff if none of the candidates receives a majority of the popular vote.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Selection of presidential electors from each of the States' congressional districts, with the election settled by Congress if none of the candidates receives a majority of the electoral votes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Provide for a proportional division of each State's electoral votes according to the share of popular votes each candidate received in the State, with the election going to the Congress if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) No change in the present system.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Should the voting age be lowered nationally from 21 years?	Yes.....	Yes.....
	No.....	No.....
EVALUATING YOUR PUBLIC SERVANTS		
21. Please assess the jobs being done by the following public officials:		
President Richard Nixon:	Excellent	Good
His.....	Excellent	Good
Hers.....	Average	Average
Senator Stephen Young:	Below average	Poor
His.....	Excellent	Good
Hers.....	Excellent	Good
Senator William Saxbe:	Average	Below average
His.....	Excellent	Good
Hers.....	Excellent	Good
Congressman Clarence J. Brown:	Below average	Poor
His.....	Excellent	Good
Hers.....	Excellent	Good
RESPONDENT INFORMATION		
22. Please indicate your annual family income bracket: less than \$3,000 <input type="checkbox"/> ; \$3,000 to \$7,500 <input type="checkbox"/> ; \$7,500 to \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> ; \$10,000 to \$15,000 <input type="checkbox"/> ; \$15,000 to \$25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> ; more than \$25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> .		
23. What is your political preference? Republican <input type="checkbox"/> Independent <input type="checkbox"/> Democrat <input type="checkbox"/> Your wife's? Republican <input type="checkbox"/> Independent <input type="checkbox"/> Democrat <input type="checkbox"/>		
24. What is your age? _____ Your wife's? _____		
How can I be of better service to you as your Congressman?		

MELWOOD AGRICULTURAL TRAINING CENTER: AN EXAMPLE FOR THE NATION

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the primary obstacles in providing the mentally retarded with a fruitful, useful life has been the difficulty in finding meaningful employment for them. Without special training these people are not equipped to perform in an unsheltered, competitive environment.

Yet proper job training for the retarded is usually not available. One encouraging exception to this is the Mel-

wood Agricultural Training Center in Upper Marlboro, Prince Georges County, Md. The center provides special training in elementary horticultural skills and is a glowing example of what can be done for retarded young adults, given guidance by skilled, concerned teachers, and backed by active community support.

We in Maryland are very proud of the Melwood Agricultural Training Center and I personally feel it should serve as a model for similar centers across the country.

What makes Melwood so unique, and so successful, is the stress the center places on developing a sense of self-reliance on the part of its trainees. The basic agricultural skills are taught but the emphasis is on providing the understanding, experience, and ability required

to work under normal conditions. When the trainee is judged to have all these, the center finds him suitable employment. Both the individual and society at large gain.

Another reason for Melwood's success, and a most encouraging sign, is the involvement and participation of the Upper Marlboro and Prince Georges community. Such local support is vital if a project of this type is to succeed.

In an August 3, 1969, New York Times article entitled "Where Skills Are a Harvest," Barbara Dubivsky writes about the Melwood Agricultural Training Center and describes its programs and benefits. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE SKILLS ARE A HARVEST

(By Barbara Dubivsky)

WASHINGTON.—The trees, shrubs and plants at the Melwood Agricultural Training Center in upper Marlboro, Md. are carefully cultivated, but the harvests that really count are self reliance and skills learned by the trainees.

Established under the auspices of the Prince George's County Association For Retarded Children, Inc., as a non-profit organization, Melwood uses an intensified form of garden therapy to achieve employability for young adults previously considered untrainable for positions in the work-a-day world.

Because of the special problems involved in training the mentally retarded, there is no specific time frame for entering or leaving the facility. Boys are accepted whenever openings exist and leave as soon as they achieve competence in elementary horticultural skills and are judged to have developed satisfactory job responsibility. The average stay is twelve months.

The center, which started in a tent six years ago and grew into a complex of buildings through the efforts of local Lions clubs and other interested community groups, can presently accommodate 20 boys. Trainees are referred through the division of vocational rehabilitation of the Board of Education of Prince George's County, which pays for their pre-entry medical and psychological examinations and underwrites the tuition costs of just under seven dollars per day per boy.

Few of the boys know a coldframe from a potting shed when they first report to the seven acre center just outside Washington and most of them couldn't care less. What motivates them is the chance to get a job, like everyone else. The interest in greenery comes later as they experience the satisfaction of watching things they have tended grow and flourish.

The wide range in intelligence quotients and the special emotional problems of the mentally disadvantaged dictate a curriculum that is necessarily flexible with a heavy emphasis on the personal approaches.

"We try to keep the newer boys near the center until they get to know the plants and learn some self-sufficiency," explains Earl Copus, Jr., Melwood's dedicated young director. "They're always keen, though, to go out on the truck with the older boys who work out in the field during the spring and fall on some of our maintenance contracts."

During the first two or three weeks, the boys are closely supervised as they receive individualized instruction in how and when to water plants, how to identify and use such basic agricultural tools as rakes, hoes and shovels, and some simple aspects of greenhouse work. When they have achieved a certain stability within their new environment, the boys are assigned to small work crews where they learn to adjust to regular job conditions.

While there is no fixed course of study, certain goals are kept in mind. To the level of his ability, each boy is taught to transplant and fertilize various species of plants as well as the use and maintenance of cultivators, grinders, sprayers, etc. He is encouraged to acquire basic painting and carpentry skills in the center's workshops.

Occasionally in the early stages of adjustment, some boys experience frustrations which necessitate special counselling by instructors and the trainee's big brother who serves as a reassuring link.

A garden shop on the premises serves as something of an instant therapy facility. Here the boys can mix a little bit of sand, water, cement, and gravel, pour it into a mold and something that looks good and people pay money for what comes out. Basically a winter project, the mold produces attractive bird baths and an assortment

of decorative outdoor planters and urns, all of which are established sellers.

The public may also purchase such landscaping plants as flowering cherry, crab apple, pin oak, maple, yew, juniper and dwarf holly at the center.

To help the boys develop a better understanding of job routine, the center hours, 8 A.M. to 4:30 P.M., are modeled on those of commercial establishments. The boys, who live at home, are picked up and returned to designated spots by school buses.

Ninety per cent of the boys have never worked before. Now and then the parents of a beginning trainee will complain their son arrives home too tired to eat. Because of misguided, over-protectiveness, many of them have led extremely sedentary lives, and tire quickly until their muscles are sufficiently exercised.

What the boys call "pay" is really non-competitive incentive compensation based on attendance and individual ability to progress. The boys can take home anywhere from \$2 to \$20 each week, depending on the effort they put out.

As there are no graduations at Melwood, Richard Barnard, the job placement officer is constantly looking for openings, preferably ones that offer the boys a future. The boys biggest need is security. They can't jump from job to job without risking serious setbacks.

Government is a popular and enthusiastic employer. Several boys have been placed at the Department of Agriculture's research center in nearby Beltsville. Among them is a mongoloid with an IQ of 49 who earns \$2.80 an hour. Two boys are at the National Arboretum and a fair number work on the grounds of the Goodard Space Center.

The center has a good job follow-up program with frequent consultations during the first few months. Instructors work closely with the boys' employers, briefing them on which areas the boys are strongest in, what their weak points are and how to get the best out of each.

Concern for the welfare of marginal students who can do a lot but will never quite be able to compete outside a sheltered environment, has led to the formation of plans for an open company to be operated by the center. "We'd concentrate on the small yard jobs", Barnard says, "the kind even the smallest commercial firms wouldn't consider worth the time and effort, pulling weeds, cutting grass, etc." Foundation money is being sought for the project.

Sometime early this fall, Melwood will go coed. Ten girls, already selected, will help transform a borrowed corner of the greenhouse into a demonstration flower shop where they will be taught to make flower arrangements, prepare planters, box and wrap cut-flowers, pot plants, ring up sales, etc. The embryonic program, believed to be the first of its kind in the country for mental retardees, has enlisted the cooperation of florists in surrounding communities who have agreed to accept the girls as apprentice assistants. If a grant applied for by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should be approved, a much needed separate training facility will be built.

POPULATION EXPLOSION—AN APPALLING THREAT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of August 10 contained an editorial entitled "Population Explosion—An Appalling Threat," which superbly describes

the view in Government circles today of the population problem.

As chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, I would like to recommend that every Member of this body review this editorial carefully. There can be no question of the seriousness of the problems increasing populations will present to this country and the world. In the United States we are already experiencing some of them. In the underdeveloped nations of the world the problems are even more acute.

In our task force hearings on population we have been trying to ascertain the degree of sensitivity to voluntary family planning. The responses have been varied, highly informative, and substantially in agreement on the point that people do want family planning and that in this they are out in front of their elected officials. I hope that every Member of the House will read this editorial—it may change some of your ideas:

POPULATION EXPLOSION—AN APPALLING THREAT

By an interesting coincidence, President Nixon's recent warning that the human race is disastrously overpopulating the earth was issued at almost precisely the moment that man's foot first touched the alien soil of the moon. It is too bad that the latter event does not offer some direct solution to the problem.

But as a practical matter it doesn't. Neither space travel nor the ultimate possibilities of extraterrestrial colonization has the slightest immediate relevance to man's apparent determination to turn his home planet into a human ant hill.

Yet, there are important elements of similarity in these two events. Human life is proliferating at a rate so fantastic, and with such terrifying ramifications that the phenomenon, no less than space travel, almost smacks of science-fiction. It is clear, furthermore, that the population challenge requires a fiscal, political and technological commitment no less than that which put Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin on the moon. And it is accordingly hopeful, at least, that most of the world has become aware by now of the capabilities of such vast commitments.

If there is awareness, however, there is as yet no evidence of such a commitment—despite the compelling threat of statistics which bear repeating over and over again.

When Christ walked the earth, the world population totaled about one-quarter billion people, and civilization required more than 1,600 years to add another quarter-billion. By 1830 there were only 1 billion people, and a full century passed before there were 2 billion.

But by 1960—only 30 years later this time—the third billion had appeared on the scene. And the fourth billion, expected by 1975, will have required only 15 years to materialize. At this rate the earth's population will exceed 7 billion by the turn of the century—a doubling of today's numbers, in other words, within a mere three decades. After that, President Nixon asserted, the eighth billion "would be added in only five years—and each additional billion in an even shorter period."

Indeed, it becomes absurd to project these rates beyond the year 2000. At that stage, says former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, now head of the World Bank Group, the projection "becomes so demanding on the imagination as to make the statistics almost incomprehensible." It is no great task, however, to see what lies ahead—immediately ahead—in purely human terms.

To the affluent nations, which is to say

ours and most of Western Europe, a continuation of the current growth level will impose social and physical complications whose dimensions we can only guess. In terms of housing alone, for example, if this rate prevails, the United States would have to build the equivalent of a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. This is to say nothing, of course, of the need for additional school rooms, hospitals or transportation facilities.

And these problems would be nothing, in fact, in comparison to the plight of the poorer areas of earth. In these regions, where growth is fastest (10 times the growth rate of a century ago in some nations), the result would be at best a total stagnation of development, and, at worst, scourges of famine, disease and political chaos on a scale undreamed of before in history.

None of this knowledge is really new. Yet, the incredible fact is that President Nixon's July 18 message to Congress was the first time that an American president had ever deigned to give the subject such major attention! Nor, of course, can the reason for this unconscionable neglect, and for the token nature of federal programs on the subject, be written off as oversight. McNamara, addressing, significantly, the University of Notre Dame, faced the subject squarely in saying that the issue of birth control is "so hypersensitive—giving rise to such diverse opinion—that there is an understandable tendency simply to avoid argument . . . and hope that the problem will somehow disappear."

President Nixon has not, at least, succumbed to that temptation. His legislative proposal would create a high-caliber Commission on Population Growth to formulate long-range goals, step up research and direct birth-control grants. It would also give the subject more attention in foreign aid and—as a "national goal"—seek to provide "adequate family planning services" to all Americans who desire them within the next five years. This is surely a step forward, and the best measure of its significance, perhaps, is the fact that Dr. Alan Guttmacher, the president of Planned Parenthood, has hailed it as the "magnificent culmination" of a federal government policy which has been several years in the making.

Yet, by any realistic assessment of what needs to be accomplished, this surely remains a small first step—with very little time in which to take the needed longer strides. Of \$2.6 billion in economic and military aid requests now pending, for example, only \$50 million is allocated for population-family planning work. Of a total National Institutes of Health budget of \$1 billion this year, less than \$10 million is being spent in the area of birth control. There are growing signs of a more realistic, and courageous, congressional attitude toward the subject. Some 23 senators, nearly a fourth of the Senate, for example, are co-sponsoring a bill similar in some respects to the Nixon approach. But even so, the deliberate tenor of the political approach seems much better attuned to some far-distant problem than to a world crisis which resembles, more than anything else, a bomb about to explode.

The British novelist-scientist, C. P. Snow, thinks the time fuse is already so short, and the efforts ahead likely to be so feeble, that "many millions of people in the poor countries are going to starve to death before our eyes."

"We shall see them doing so," Lord Snow says, "upon our television sets." He predicts that local famines within the next decade will go into "major catastrophes" before the end of the century in which the rich countries "will be surrounded by a sea of famine, involving hundreds of millions of human beings."

Few experts share Lord Snow's despair, assuming that all-out efforts are made within the time frame remaining before such disasters occur. McNamara's experts at the World Bank cite, for example, the "revolution" in agricultural technology now under way involving new high-yield grain seeds, hybrid strains and fertilizers. If this revolution is spread through adequate and properly administered technical and economic assistance, McNamara believes, it may be "that for the next two decades the world's food supply will grow at a faster rate than its population."

But even such efforts as these require positive, aggressive and successful curtailments in birth rates if the poorer regions, despite all else that may be done, are to move beyond minimal levels of existence. For this reason, a great deal more emphasis—indeed perhaps the focal point of emphasis—should be the development of easier, cheaper, more acceptable and more effective methods of birth control than those now available.

It is not a new thought that the population problem inevitably will be solved, in one way or another. Allowed to proceed unchecked, the rate of growth will lead to a point at which famine, disease or the other acts of human desperation envisioned by Lord Snow will inevitably apply the counterweights. The alternative solution is a method of rational, humane, voluntary control—and seeking out that solution ranks second in importance, we suspect, only to the prevention of a holocaust of nuclear war.

DR. VYTAUTAS DAMBRAVA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 11, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the news media of Latin America and the United States does not always report in glowing terms on United States-Latin American relations or the personnel who represent the United States in Latin America, it is heartwarming to learn of the tribute paid to the devotion and skill of a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.

Vytautas Dambava, who has just completed his tour of service as press attaché of the U.S. Embassy in Bolivia, has been awarded the highest decoration of that country, the Order of the Condor of the Andes in the grade of gentleman. The award was personally presented by President Siles of Bolivia and received extensive press coverage.

Dr. Dambava was born in Russia in 1920. His studies at the University of Vilnius in Lithuania, the University of Innsbruck, Austria, the Academy of Music at Salzburg, Austria, and Columbia University in New York, provided him with a wide background in the humanities, the arts, and economics. While in Salzburg he also was editor of various Lithuanian periodicals.

In 1951, Dr. Dambava began his career in the U.S. Government as a translator-announcer for the State Department, subsequently transferring to the U.S. Information Agency and serving in Munich, Washington, and Saigon. Dr. Dambava's performance within the Agency earned him the Meritorious Honor Award in 1962 and in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the following communication concerning Dr. Dambava, received by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency from the Office of the Presidency of Bolivia, to the attention of the Members of the House:

[Translation]

PRESIDENCY OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA,

La Paz, July 4, 1969.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I have the high honor of informing your Agency that on the Fourth of July (Day of Independence of the United States), His Excellency, the Constitutional President of Bolivia, Dr. Luis Adolfo Siles Salinas, received in private audience Dr. Vytautas A. Dambava, Press Attache of the United States Embassy in Bolivia, to express to him good wishes and congratulations on the completion of his tour in this country.

The sentiments of His Excellency, and of the Bolivian people, have been duly represented by the conferring upon Dr. Dambava for his services in Bolivia of the highest decoration of this country, the Order of the Condor of the Andes in the grade of Gentleman.

As evidence of the sentiments reflected also by the press of this country, I am enclosing press clippings which point up the qualities of this American official who has strengthened the bonds of sincere friendship felt by both countries.

I cannot do less than mention that the Dambava family has participated actively in the cultural life of this country, extending familiarity with the culture and art of the United States. We are proud of this family, and we admire the Agency which has sent to Bolivia a man of such outstanding qualities.

I take advantage of this opportunity, Mr. Director, to offer you my sincerest regards.

AUGUSTO MONTECINOS S.

Chief of Public Relations of the Presidency of Bolivia.

FACTS ABOUT THE NEW "AMERICA"

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1851, was to see a significant event in the annals of yachting history, for on that day the *America*, our Nation's entry into the Royal Yacht Squadron Race in England won the coveted 100 Guinea Cup. The importance of this day cannot be overestimated, for any American boating enthusiast will proudly tell you this triumph was the foundation of the supremacy of the United States in international yachting competition. In honor of the *America* the trophy which she won was renamed the "America's Cup." This has since become the most renowned symbol of this exciting sport.

The *America* was a New York ship, but New Englanders had a love for her as they had for all ships. For ships are part of the sea and of American history, and both of these are basic to New England. It is not strange that New Englanders combine a real appreciation of history with a deep pride in America's naval tradition. We live in the place where our Nation had its beginnings and being so close to where so much of American his-

history was made, we value reminders of our country's achievements. We also live by the sea. To people whose existence has been tied to the sea by the strongest bonds; who have taken from it their livelihood; who have lost to it their sons—these men and women have gained inspiration from the sea. They have taken to it in time of war to defend their country—and in time of peace to compete for their country's glory. To these people, the sea is much more than water or tides. To them it is a primeval symbol of life and of the courage which life necessitates. They have won life and success with and often against the sea. This is more than success, this is victory.

The triumph of the *America* was such a victory. It was more than just a race. It was the culmination of an effort by many men who knew the sea and loved it; who knew ships and loved them. Their effort has been commemorated by a man who like them, loves the sea and ships, and who like the men of New England, values history. This man is Rudolph J. Schaefer, who in 1966 conceived the idea of building an exact replica of the *America* as a project to observe the 125th anniversary of the F. M. Schaefer Brewing Co. In doing so, Mr. Schaefer brought to life for all Americans the beginnings of a glorious era in our Nation's sporting history.

On August 8 I enjoyed an extremely pleasurable cruise around Boston Harbor on this very elegant schooner. She is indeed a beautiful boat and a joy to behold. Her majestic lines, slender good looks and graceful movements are an eloquent tribute to her creators. My delight on this occasion was doubly increased by my knowledge of her magnificent heritage. For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to include at this point a description of the *America*:

Plans and specifications for the original boat were discovered recently and were made available by Howard Chapelle of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. The lines had been taken off the "America" by the British Admiralty when she was hauled out in England in 1851, already an international phenomenon. As a rule, shipbuilders of the 19th century did not write down their plans, but worked from carved models and the practiced eye of builder and designer.

The new "America" was designed to the original lines and the details and specifications were developed by the well-known architectural firm of Sparkman and Stephens of New York. Builders were the Goudy and Stevens Shipyard in East Boothbay, Maine. Construction of the boat for the most part was done by hand. The lines and dimensions of the original "America" were reproduced faithfully in virtually all details, although some modern modifications have been incorporated, notably, auxiliary power and modern service facilities below decks.

Sails for the replica were cut by Ratsey and Laphorn of City Island, N.Y. Colin Ratsey, president of the firm, is a sixth generation descendant of George Ratsey, who cut a jib topsail for the first "America" when she was in England. George Ratsey later forfeited payment for his work in a wager against the "America."

The principal statistics of the new "America" are:

Length (overall) 104'10".
Length (waterline): 90'8".
Extreme Beam: 22'10".
Draft: 12'.

The new "America" was launched May 3, 1967, in East Boothbay, Maine, where the event was witnessed by an assembly of yachting authorities and enthusiasts. The launching took place exactly 116 years to the day after the launching of the original "America" at Brown's shipyard, at the foot of 12th Street and the East River in Manhattan, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Shaefer for the wonderful experience he afforded me and to commend him as a generous boating enthusiast who is sharing his love of the sea with people all over the world.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, my beautiful State of Michigan has for years been known as the water wonderland, and aptly so. Surrounded on three sides by the Great Lakes, the Nation's largest system of inland waterways, and dotted with thousands of small lakes and reservoirs, much of Michigan's economy and life is concentrated on its waterways. Throughout the years they have served to supply power, as a conduit for interstate and international commerce, as a magnificent vacation and recreation source, as the supplier of water for tremendous cities and for an enormous concentration of the Nation's industrial strength.

Surrounded as we Michiganders are with constant reminders of the importance of water resources, it is little wonder that we have become intensely conscious of the dangers of pollution and spoilage of those water resources. Lake Erie, once a beautiful clean body of water has now deteriorated until some scientists claim that it is already dead from "eutrophication"—or the growth of plant and small animal life along the bottom of the lake. The larger and deeper Lake Michigan has taken longer to deteriorate but is now at a critical stage. Even the magnificent Lake Superior is beginning to feel the effects of manmade waste.

Our lakes, our rivers and streams, our reservoirs simply can no longer continue to absorb the great amount of trash and junk which we humans dump into them every year. The concern about water pollution is no longer something which can be talked about—but no action taken about. Time is running out and it is absolutely urgent that we take action and take it immediately.

Cleaning up our water resources will not be cheap—we must now pay the price for years of neglect. The Water Resources Council estimates that a minimum of \$8 billion will be required in the next 3 years for the construction of municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor sewers. An additional \$6.2 billion will be required to construct sanitary collection sewers in communities where such facilities are not now in existence. This total of \$14.2 billion by 1973 would not entirely

ly solve the problem, however, since this would just meet minimum acceptable standards and does not allow for the tremendous growth our cities and towns are undergoing. Every year another 1,000 communities outgrow their treatment facilities and every year it will be necessary to expand and improve those facilities. By 1975, an estimated \$20 billion will be required to simply catch up on the backlog of needs so that annual growth needs can be met.

The enormity of cleaning up municipal waste is staggering, but it cannot be delayed. The people of Michigan recognized their responsibility to take prompt action and last year by a large margin they approved a clean water bonding program of \$446 million. Six other States have followed in our footsteps and in a vote of the people have authorized major pollution control bond issues. By an overwhelming margin of 66 percent of all the people voting, these issues have carried. Of the 17,625,254 citizens who have been asked to express their concern about pollution in the ballot box, 11,725,444 have voted yea.

This commitment on the part of the people of Michigan and so many other States has been made mostly on the basis of the Federal promise, contained in the Clean Water Restoration Act, of 50 percent Federal funding of water and sewage treatment plants designed to clean up the rivers and streams. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has not even come close to fulfilling that promise.

By the end of fiscal 1970, the Federal expenditure of water pollution control funds will have fallen more than a billion and a half dollars short of the Federal promise. Under the Federal promise, Michigan should be eligible for \$42 million in Federal funds next year to control pollution. The inadequate funds contained in the 1970 budget, however, will yield only \$8 billion—only one fifth the Federal pledge.

There are 39 Michigan projects already underway which would require an additional \$11,227,634 from the Federal Government to meet the 50-percent funding which has been pledged by the law. There are an additional 54 water pollution abatement projects in Michigan which have been approved and which are eligible for \$66,589,612 in Federal funds under the 50-percent Federal participation commitment.

This situation is not confined to Michigan. State-approved applications for matching grant funds totaling \$2½ billion from States and local governments are now on file with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The proposed appropriations of \$214 million meets less than one-tenth of the need in already approved projects—not to mention the thousands which are now being prepared.

Mr. Speaker, the disgraceful failure of the Federal Government to meet its promises in this vital area is scandalous. This is a breach of faith with the American people and with America's future. The Federal Government is in a poor position to require high standards of water quality from the States and local governments unless it begins to do its share.

The Government is in a poor position to require the installation of expensive cleanup equipment for industry unless it first takes action against its own pollutants.

I call upon this Congress to fulfill its commitments and appropriate the full \$1 billion which has been authorized for the control of water pollution this year. To do any less would be to sacrifice the future for temporary fiscal advantage.

The quality of our environment should be one of the most serious concerns of the Government and it should be placed very highly in our Federal priorities for the expenditure of funds.

But the Federal responsibility cannot stop merely with the appropriation and expenditure of funds. Water pollution is not confined by political boundaries. The pollution in one State inevitably transferred through other States as the rivers and lakes cross boundaries. Although there have been new efforts on the parts of these political subdivisions to cooperate, there has been very little coordination on a national level. Clearly the Federal Government could serve as a useful coordinating agency. It must set up regional conferences and use its vast research resources to determine the nationwide action which can be taken.

Throughout the Second District of Michigan there has been a great deal of attention and action to control pollution. The coordination between local communities, county government, the State agencies and the Federal Government should serve as a model for the rest of the Nation as to what can be done if a spirit of cooperation can be established. The examples of successful water pollution control programs which have been started in the Second District are widespread and include: the Berlin Township system for the disposal of hard waste, the Monroe Water Purification and Environmental Control Facility, the Rollin-Woodstock planning advance for water and sewer facilities in Lenawee County, and the public works planning grant for French Town-Stony Point. Study is underway for major water pollution facilities in Livingston County and in Ypsilanti. A coordinated regional effort is being undertaken by the Huron River Watershed Council which is a working model for similar programs elsewhere in the country.

Water pollution control is primarily a technical problem and it is one that is open to technical solutions. Space and defense industries have been able to solve even more complex technical problems through the use of systems analysis—making use of the computer to determine the effect of every part of the problem on every other part of the problem. Employment of this systems analysis technique, as recommended in my bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, might well go a long way toward making our pollution control programs more effective and more efficient.

There are no "bogey-men" in the field of water pollution. We cannot point to only one factor and say "The other guy is primarily at fault." In fact, we are all at fault. Industry is at fault. Municipali-

ties are at fault. Water and recreational vessels are at fault. Farm runoff is at fault. What we need is not to place the blame but to coordinate solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I view the question of water pollution control as one of the most important that this Congress will consider and I urge my colleagues to join with me in attempting to find immediate solutions. Our responsibility to the future of the Nation demands our attention.

UPDATING SOCIAL SECURITY DESERVES HIGH PRIORITY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, although I have pointed out already that the Ways and Means Committee still has work to be done on tax reform, there also is the urgent necessity for updating of our Social Security program.

Our senior citizens really are feeling the pinch of the increased cost of living and there remain various inequities in the handling of social security benefits. The committee has a heavy schedule and a still heavier responsibility, which I am the first to acknowledge.

But the necessity for further tax reform and for an updating of the social security system demands and deserves high priority.

An editorial in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News of July 30 makes the point very well, as follows:

UPDATE SOCIAL SECURITY

Although Congress is unlikely to increase again this year the benefits paid to millions of retired Americans, there are reasons beyond the obvious for a searching new look at the social security system.

Nobody needs to be reminded that the inflation that robs the purchasing power of us all does special damage to the fixed incomes of most retired people. And a recent Senate report clearly documents this.

But this report also illuminates a number of less visible social changes that further undermine the financial stability of the retired. For one thing, people tend to retire earlier now than in the past, and to live longer. For another medical costs, which hit the elderly hard, have recently risen faster even than the general level of prices.

Congress could ease such burdens for many by allowing a widow as full a payment as a widower and by installing an escalator clause to raise social security benefits automatically whenever the cost of living goes up.

But these are not the sole, or even the central, needs. Of particular importance is for the federal government to examine a series of relationships that now seem somewhat out of kilter. We believe social security should continue to be a wage-related, rather than a welfare-related, system: those who pay most into the system should get most out of it. But it may well be, in view of the increasingly heavy payroll deductions for social security, that general tax funds should be used to supplement medicare costs. Moreover, if social security is to be only a floor for retirement income and not the major portion of it for millions of people, then Congress might well examine how to promote and safeguard private pension funds as a carefully related supplement to that income.

DAVE OBEY: AN ASSET TO THE CONGRESS

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege for me to have met and come to know DAVE OBEY, our young Congressman from Wisconsin. Since DAVE's election in April, he has shown us all a refreshing mind, unlimited energy, a zest for delving into difficult and often sensitive problems, and a deep conviction in the strength of our democratic process. He is a stimulating addition to the Congress, and an asset to his constituents.

Congressman OBEY's assignment to the Public Works Committee has proved fortunate indeed for our committee. During his short time on the committee he has shown keen interest in its business, and through hard work has contributed significantly to the success of the legislation which we have handled—and I know he will grow even more valuable as his natural ability is developed further through experience.

A recent article in the Minneapolis Tribune puts in sharp focus DAVE's characteristic clear thinking approach to the great national issues of our times:

HE'S FRUSTRATED, BUT DAVE OBEY STILL LOVES WASHINGTON

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Three months after being elected the nation's youngest Congressman, Dave Obey is frustrated and impatient—but loves it here.

Obey—more formally David R., but his calling card makes it "Dave"—is the 30-year-old former Wausau Assemblyman chosen in an April special election as the first Democrat to represent Wisconsin's Seventh District. He replaced Melvin Laird, the Nixon Administration's defense secretary.

By now Obey—well past the period when capitol elevator operators would try to bar his way with a supercilious "Members only, please"—has made some judgments about the national legislature.

He's impatient because he feels congressional accomplishment since April has been "a big zero."

"Nixon doesn't send anything and when committees try to do something on their own people say, 'Let's wait and see what the administration sends down,'" Obey said last week in an interview.

He's frustrated because—while he considers congressmen overworked and understaffed—on his frequent trips back to Wisconsin, he senses a constituent's-eye view of Congress that is "not very high."

"People are absolutely fed up," Obey reported. "They feel we've got our priorities turned around—not that they want to spend more money, but they feel we're spending it in the wrong places."

Obey registered his agreement with that view earlier this month in voting against a \$3.9 billion space budget that topped by more than \$200 million the requests of both present and former administrations.

"When the House can pass a bill for nine or 10 more trips to the moon, it's pouring money into shiny programs that people can see on TV and not the programs that determine whether we have a quality society or not."

"I think the space budget ought to be No. 1 priority for cutting," Obey said.

He can be expected to register another protest Monday, when the extension of the 10 percent income surtax comes up. It's not just that he wants tax reform—as do most ther protesting liberal Democrats—but Obey also believes the surtax should not be continued without full funding of the elementary and secondary education and anti-water-pollution programs.

These clearly are his top priority concerns. Nothing takes more time of his six-member Washington staff, he reports, than processing requests for water pollution control grants from communities in his 15-county dairy-farming district.

"Funny thing: the people believed Congress when it said it would spend \$1 billion on water pollution control," Obey said. "Then Nixon followed former President Johnson's last request for just \$215 million."

In his committee assignment, public works, Obey hopes to work for better federal financing of clean-water facilities that should, he believes, command no less federal support than the 9-to-1 financing of interstate freeways.

Turning to his other main concern, education, Obey made a strong plea against campus violence (while recognizing that universities can be "unresponsive and bumbling.") But he also considers inadequate education a form of violence—"something society does to a kid."

"It's more subtle—But just as devastating as when someone picks up a brick or blocks a classroom door, and we've got to oppose it just as much," he said.

If fat space budgets and a search for unattainable "absolute security" through new missile systems spell topsyturvy priorities to Obey, he blames Congress, not the "military-industrial complex."

"Those are witch-words that people run against, as liberals used to run against 'communism,'" he said. "You expect the military to ask for new weapons systems: that's their job—but you'd expect Congress to look at their request as it does anybody else's—and we don't."

Military and space budgets ought to be looked at "as deeply and skeptically as the Wisconsin Legislature dug into the University of Wisconsin budget this year," Obey declared.

Looking back over the three months since he, his wife Joan, and son, Craig, 5, moved to Washington, Obey has no regrets.

"I love it here," he said, despite his long list of frustrations. "If somebody is going to attack these problems, this is where it's going to be done—and if that's the case, this is where I want to be."

ARAB TERRORISM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent series of border clashes between the Arabs and Israel are but another chapter in the long standing determination of the Arab States to wear down Israel's military strength and wipe Israel off the map. The Arab Governments' support of terrorist groups carrying out raids against Israeli property and civilians is also calculated to chip away at Israel's defenses in preparation for yet another all-out assault on the State of Israel.

The Arabs claim that these terrorist groups, including El Fatah, seek to achieve self-determination for the Arabs of Palestine. The fallacious interpretation

of "self-determination" by these terrorist groups has been pointed out by several observers, however.

I am inserting in the RECORD today an article by Abraham C. Weinfeld, which appeared in the June issue of the American Zionist, which discusses with especial clarity the concept of self-determination in relation to the Palestinian Arabs. I commend Mr. Weinfeld's article to my colleagues and urge that they give it their closest attention.

The article follows:

ARAB SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Abraham C. Weinfeld)

Though Arab Governments entered into cease-fire agreements with Israel after the war of June 1967, they publicly approve and fully support actions of Arab terrorists which continue the war against Israel in an effort to wipe Israel off the map. The terrorists claim to act in behalf of "Palestinians" or "the Arabs of Palestine." In a recently published article,¹ Ambassador George Tomeh, the Syrian representative to the United Nations, after stating that Palestine is "the southern part of Syria," continued that "the United Nations in 1947 took a step in the wrong direction. Now, as then, the Arabs of Palestine, a real and historical entity that should be recognized by international law, have been deliberately disregarded." He also stated that "the only people in the world that were denied the right to self-determination was the Arab people of Palestine," and further that, "The Arab struggle for Palestine is basically a struggle of a people for liberation, a people who are asking for nothing more than the right of self-determination. . . ."

In a memorandum submitted to a meeting of foreign ministers of the Arab League in Cairo which ended on March 12, 1969, the Palestine Liberation Organization, representing almost all of the guerrilla groups, urged the Arab states to reject the November 1967 resolution of the U.N. Security Council which called for peace in the Middle East. According to the memorandum, acceptance of the resolution was "an infringement by the Arab states of the right of the Palestinian people to all of Palestine, presently occupied by the state of Israel."

In view of the sympathy which Arab terrorists have evoked among some Americans, and the approval of the terrorists by Arab states, it seems important to analyze the concept of self-determination and its applicability here.

"During the first World War it was generally believed by public opinion in the Western democracies that there was a right of national independence which the Central Powers had overthrown, and that the primary object of the Allies was the reinstatement of this right. The democratic conception of government being added to it, the combined ideal obtained widespread recognition as the principle of self-determination."²

The principle of national self-determination was designed to meet the needs of peoples. President Wilson demanded in his Fourteen Points that "the peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development"; that "the Turkish portions of the present Ottoman

empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development." He demanded an independent Polish state. The Atlantic Charter required respect of "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," and Article 1(2) of the Charter of the United Nations states as one of the purposes of the organization, "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. . . ."

The evil which the principle of self-determination was designed to cure was that of a people—that is, a separate cultural entity, molded by factors like centuries of common history, traditions, language, territory, religion—having no government of its own and therefore deprived of the opportunity to develop its life as a group, feel its needs in its own way, and fashion its own remedies to meet those needs. This was the situation of the Poles, the Czechs, and many other European and Asiatic peoples before the First World War.

The Arab people, numbering about 100 million and occupying about four million square miles from the Atlantic Ocean to Iran, is not deprived of an opportunity to govern itself. In this vast area, the Arab people has 14 independent governments. There are about two and a half million Jews living in Israel out of about 14 million Jews living all over the world, and Israel contains about 8,000 square miles. Under these circumstances, for the Arab people to take the position that the Jewish people is not entitled to one independent government is monstrous from the standpoint of international morality. It is true that by the creation of the state of Israel, the Arabs who lived there at the time or who live there as citizens now, have been deprived of an opportunity to practice national self-determination. They became a national minority. Whatever their number was at that time or is now, they were and are a drop in the Arab sea. Becoming a national minority is, under some circumstances, a part of the hazard of living. There are hundreds of national minorities all over the world. There is no doubt in my mind that the Israeli government has fully protected and will continue fully to protect the status and rights of its Arab citizens.

The denial of the Jewish right to an independent state is not only a grave moral injustice; it also violates a legal principle, one that is analogous to eminent domain. According to the law of eminent domain, an owner of property may be forced by a government or semi-governmental authority to part with that property if it is needed by such authority for the public good, for instance, for a school or a hospital, against compensation. There are also many judicial decisions as well as statutory and constitutional provisions which force an owner to part with his property in favor of another individual for the latter's private benefit, under certain circumstances involving the public good. Such circumstances may be the need of the other individual for a necessary private road or right of way to his property; for irrigation; for the use of water primarily for household and stockraising purposes; for flowage of lands for mill purposes and to create water power; for mining; or for production of electric power for use in aid of farming.³ The Jewish need of an independent

¹ George Tomeh, *Palestine—The Arab Point of View*, Viewpoints (a magazine published by the Boston Chapter of the Organization of Arab Students), March 1968, p. 25. The article is part of a statement Mr. Tomeh made on October 13, 1965, at the 20th Session of the U.N. General Assembly.

² Alfred Cobban, *National Self-Determination* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 1.

³ The legal authorities above referred to are listed and a further discussion of this viewpoint is contained in Abraham C. Weinfeld, *Eminent Domain Among Peoples—A Jewish State in Palestine and Arab Self-Determination*, 21 Temple Law Quarterly 223, 225-232 (1948).

state after wandering over the face of the earth for 2000 years is just as great as is the need of any individual for the property and services above-mentioned, and by way of analogy a principle similar to eminent domain may be applied in this situation.

The decision of the United Nations to recognize the state of Israel as a member of the United Nations may be considered similar to a judgment of a governmental or semi-governmental body that certain property is to be taken from an individual and used for a public good, that is, for the good of the United Nations. Further, the Arab claim to self-determination should be held to yield to the Jewish right to statehood by analogy with those many situations where one individual's right was held to yield to another individual's right for the latter's private benefit, as previously referred to. As to compensation, I have not come across any precedent for it in this kind of situation, that is, any record of payment to a group to compensate for ceasing to be a majority and instead becoming a minority, or payment to a person for experiencing a change from a member of a majority to a member of a minority. The general rule as to compensation is that it is to be adequate, prompt, and effective, but there have been cases of partial compensation and of no compensation.⁴ In addition, in this Arab-Jewish dispute, one cannot overlook the property and cash which Jews had to relinquish in many Arab states when forced to leave those states prior to their migration to Israel.

Lately, the claim for national self-determination in opposition to Israel began to be made, not in the name of the Arabs or the Arab people or the Arab nation, but with increasing frequency in behalf of "the Arabs of Palestine" or "the Palestinians." But "the Arabs of Palestine" are not the kind of cultural entity for whose benefit the principle of national self-determination was established. They never had a government of their own, they never had a literary language separate from that of other Arabs, a separate religion, or a separate political history. When Jordan annexed the West Bank or when Egypt seized Gaza, the Arabs of Palestine did not protest, as any people would if some other people occupied its land. The only thing that distinguished Arabs of Palestine from other Arabs was that they resided in a certain territory. Even as to that, Mr. Tomeh still considers Palestine to be "the southern part of Syria," as previously stated. If mere living in a certain territory qualifies the residents for national self-determination, the residents of Amman or of Nablus could also be qualified and declare these cities to be independent states, infringing on others' rights.

President Wilson, who was devoted to the principle of self-determination of peoples as much as any other person, supported a Jewish state in Palestine. He said: "I am . . . persuaded that the allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."⁵

In the United Nations, the main objective for which the principle of self-determination was used was the liquidation of traditional colonialism. Discussions involved the question of whether the principle was part of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and whether permanent sovereignty over national wealth and resources was a constituent of the right of peoples to self-determination. The Jewish-Arab problem is not one of traditional colonialism or of

sovereignty over natural wealth and resources, and application to it of the provisions of the charter should certainly not lead to a destruction of a member-state. The Jewish-Arab problem is one of the original type, going back to the Wilsonian era, and involves enabling each people to have a state of its own in which to continue to develop as a cultural entity.

The viewpoint here presented does not derogate from, but furnishes additional support to, the Jewish position based on the historical connection between the Jewish people and Palestine and on the membership of Israel in the United Nations.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION: DDT THREATENS YOU

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last week my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I introduced a bill which would ban the distribution and use of DDT throughout the United States.

The fact is that evidence continues to mount every day illustrating the deleterious effects of these pesticides. The evidence is not ambiguous. DDT is a poison; it is a threat to man and his environment and especially to all forms of wildlife.

The most recent issue of National Wildlife has a particularly lucid article by Ed Chaney, director of information services for the National Wildlife Federation, on the awesome threat that DDT poses to life forms in Lake Michigan. As Mr. Chaney suggests, more research is needed to develop new substitutes that will not jeopardize our environment and wildlife.

This is a matter that demands immediate attention by Congressman and citizen alike.

The article referred to follows:

OUR POINT OF VIEW: DDT THREATENS YOU!
(By Ed Chaney)

Thousands of tons of DDT have been laded onto lands surrounding Lake Michigan over the past 20 years to combat real, and sometimes imaginary threats from a variety of creepy crawlies.

This perennial application contains poison that moves freely from place to place and retains its toxicity for a guestimated half century or more. Yet it has become an accepted method for dealing with pests. And over the years—via wind, water and soil—DDT has washed into Lake Michigan from farms, orchards, mosquito swamps, elm-lined streets, flower beds and even from mothproofing by dry cleaners.

Occasionally, someone would wonder at the scarcity of robins after the community elms were doused with DDT to fight Dutch elm disease. Once in while a few unexplainably dead fish would appear in a nearby creek. And sometimes an article claiming DDT was eating the livers out of eagles and ospreys would turn up on the back page of our paper.

"Silent Spring" silenced. But compared to the commotion over the surtax, the ABM and getting Johnny ready for graduation, these isolated incidents seemed of little concern to most people. Dr. George Mehren, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, summed up the tenor the times in a statement to a congressional committee in 1968, ". . . the

hysteria associated with 'Silent Spring' has effectively subsided."

But then it happened! The Food and Drug Administration put the grabs on more than 10 tons of Lake Michigan coho salmon en route to family dinner tables. The salmon contained up to 19 parts per million DDT—almost three times the maximum allowed in beef sold for human consumption. Suddenly, the fundamental relationship of DDT to man's position at the top of the natural food chain became an exciting topic of conversation for folks living in the Great Lakes area.

The coho seizures added fuel to the smoldering coals of Rachel Carson's best seller which had already been furiously fanned by a group of citizens and scientists banded together in the "Environmental Defense Fund." Attempting to ban DDT as a water pollutant in the state of Wisconsin, EDF paraded an impressive array of scientists through the national press damning DDT as a heinous uncontrollable global pollutant.

Reaction to the contaminated coho impoundment was quick. Lacking an established tolerance level for DDT in fish, Secretary Robert Finch of Health, Education and Welfare, quickly set a temporary standard of five parts per million. He also established a commission to study the situation and present recommendations within six months.

Hot coho. State and Federal fishery biologists predicted DDT levels in this year's crop of Lake Michigan coho would reach that five parts per million by mid-summer and several times that concentration by fall. Because growing fish concentrate DDT in their tissues, biologists hold out little hope that millions of pounds of valuable fish will be safe for consumption by the end of summer. The United States Bureau of Commercial Fisheries also warned that DDT levels in the lake are so high that reproduction of lake trout, salmon and other species may be in real danger.

Visions of DDT scuttling the \$200 million Lake Michigan coho salmon fishing industry brought prompt reaction from the governors of the states surrounding Lake Michigan.

They met and declared there was no immediate DDT health hazard in Lake Michigan. Then they set up several committees to study the problem to see if a tolerance level of 20 parts per million DDT would be safe for humans. (Nobody knows what a really safe limit is. Whether it is 1, 5, 20 or 100 parts per million is an arbitrary judgment.)

Illinois Governor Richard B. Ogilvie announced his intention to continue drinking Lake Michigan water and eating coho salmon.

The Michigan Department of Agriculture "banned" DDT in April. This "ban" was analogous to slamming the barn door behind a horse thief and giving him several years to get out of town since it allows unlimited quantities of DDT to be sold and used in Michigan if the chemical was in transit from the manufacturer by June 27. Consequently, new, home-grown DDT will continue to pollute the air, water, soil, wildlife and people of Michigan for a long time.

It is a disturbing, spooky fact that no one really knows what effects, if any, DDT has on humans. Some eminent scientists maintain it may be difficult, even impossible, to find out until incalculable damage has occurred and it is too late to do anything about it.

Twelve parts per person. We do know the average American carries around approximately 12 parts per million DDT in his body. Man gets an estimated 90 percent of his DDT from food. We also know it is passed on to the human fetus via the mother's placenta and a nursing mother's milk generally contains more DDT than is allowed in milk you buy at the store.

Laboratory experiments with various animals have shown DDT attacks the central nervous system, upsets body chemistry, dis-

⁴ Abraham C. Weinfeld, *The Mexican Oil Expropriation*, National Lawyers Guild Quarterly 367, 393 (1938).

⁵ New York Times, March 3, 1919, p. 1, col. 2.

torts cells, accelerates gene mutations, reduces drug effectiveness and affects calcium absorption by the bones.

Hungarian experiments with mice emphasized DDT's cancer-producing potential, and that country recently banned its use. These carcinogenic properties were confirmed by a recent controversial six-year study by the National Cancer Institute which found DDT in mice did cause tumors, most of which "... had malignant potential."

A pharmacologist with a leading drug firm says DDT has a deleterious effect on rats' sex hormones, which are essentially the same as man's. Further, the amount of DDT necessary to produce that effect "... is well within the range of DDT found in human fat."

All this growing, damning evidence does not *absolutely prove* DDT is having or might have the same effects on the human animal. But Dr. Wayland Hayes, past chief of the Public Health Service toxicology section, has said, "In considering the safety of workers who formulate DDT, we must depend largely on animal experiments."

Unfortunately, the evidence damning DDT as a potential threat to mankind, all the laboratory experiments, state and Federal study groups, commissions and exploding public concern, may have little impact.

It's big business. The manufacture of DDT is a \$20 million a year business, and pesticide manufacturers also fear the fight over DDT will carry over onto its persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon relatives, heptachlor, lindane, aldrin, endrin, dieldrin, and chlordane which constitute a big part of the industry's \$1 billion annual sales.

The pesticide lobby is powerful, experienced and at the slightest disparaging word aimed at DDT, industry spokesmen trot out an impressive array of truths extolling its virtues in fighting disease organisms and agricultural pests throughout the world. No one contests these truths.

But there are substitutes for DDT in the form of safe non-persistent insecticides. Insect sterilization offers much hope for counteracting certain pests, and research has been stepped up on insect predators.

But DDT's apologists continue their campaign that DDT is indispensable to the welfare of mankind and get away with it. They know from past experience that the public's memory is short and the people who make the laws and buy the products don't read history books. The decisions will be made behind the scenes.

Agriculture committees in state and Federal government are almost universally dominated by farm and pesticide-oriented legislators. These committees are commonly considered rubber stamps for all but the most offensive industry pleas and graveyards for regulatory bills.

DDT's proponents seem willing to write off the growing list of threatened wildlife including the bald eagle, osprey, peregrine falcon, elder duck, bermuda petrel, brown pelican and even the sportsman-revered mallard duck. During the EDF hearing in Madison, spokesmen for the National Agricultural Manufacturers Association said, "... the damage is not as severe as conservationists claim." One of their arguments is that "DDT inhibits the reproduction of birds ... but these are primarily birds of prey, and very small numbers are involved." And, "A person whose thing is studying the peregrine falcon is concerned only about every little thing that might happen to his bird."

Can't prove human effects. When the question of DDT's possible effects on humans is raised, their answers boil down to "prove it." Despite the overwhelming, growing scientific evidence that portends frightening effects on man, DDT's fans are willing to gamble. And they have graciously volunteered the rest of the world.

The already dangerous and climbing levels

of DDT in the food fish of Lake Michigan may be a grim hint of what is to come. Even if not another ounce of DDT were applied anywhere in the world, beginning today, some experts guess it would be at least 25 years before the concentrations in the environment begin to level off. However, researchers have revealed a great deal of variability in the chemical's persistence depending upon local conditions.

Our exploding technology now keeps some men alive with artificial hearts and puts others on the moon. What unknown secrets will we discover about the 12 parts per million DDT we all carry in our bodies? At this level, the FDA would rule the average American unfit for human consumption.

John Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, said, "What is happening in Lake Michigan is an indication of what to expect elsewhere. There will be a day, and it may not be until the year 2000, when we are the coho salmon."

The widespread use of DDT should be halted immediately unless its safety can be proven.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's proposal to provide fiscal relief to the States and local communities through a revenue sharing plan is an attempt to head off the fiscal disaster that looms over most of the State and municipal governments of our Nation. It is important that revenue sharing be widely discussed and understood.

The Treasury Department has prepared a series of questions and answers to explain the President's revenue sharing proposal. I hope it will be helpful to my colleagues:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S REVENUE SHARING PROPOSAL

Q. What is the purpose of this proposed legislation?

A. 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; and

To achieve a better allocation of total public resources.

In short, our purpose is to build a streamlined federal system with a return to the States, cities, and communities of the decisionmaking power rightfully theirs.

Q. How much money is to be shared?

A. 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. To provide for an orderly phase-in of this program, the FY 1971 percentage will be one-sixth of one percent, or about \$500 million; with subsequent fiscal year percentages being increased annually up to a permanent one percent for FY 1976 and thereafter. On this basis, we estimate an appropriation for fiscal 1976 of about \$5 billion.

Q. Can the States and localities depend on this flow of funds to be regularly appropriated?

A. In order to provide for the assured flow of federal funds, a permanent and indefinite appropriation will be authorized and established for the Treasury Department, from which will be automatically disbursed each fiscal year an amount corresponding to the stipulated percentage.

Q. How will the funds be distributed?

A. The funds will be distributed from the federal Treasury to the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Each state will receive an amount based on its 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. Revenue effort is defined as the ratio of total general revenues collected by state and local governments in a given fiscal year to the total personal income of that state. A simple adjustment along these lines would provide a state whose revenue effort is 10 percent above the national average with a 10 percent bonus above its basic per capita portion of revenue sharing.

Q. Will the States be required to share some of this distribution with their local governments?

A. The allocation of a state's share among its general units of local government will be established by prescribed formula. First, there will be determined a total amount which a state will share with all its local governments. This amount will be that percentage of its national share which total local general revenues bear to the sum of state and total local general revenues. Second, there will be determined the distribution of this local share among the various units of local government within the state. The amount which an individual unit of general local government will receive is that percentage of the total local share that its own revenues bear to the total of all local government revenues in the state.

Q. Why are these particular distribution formulas used?

A. Distribution based on revenues raised have several important advantages: they make allowance for state-by-state variations;

They tend to be neutral with respect to the current relative fiscal importance of state and local governments in each state; and

They provide a method for allocating among government units with overlapping jurisdictions.

Q. Does a state have any opportunity to use some other distribution procedures than those just outlined?

A. Yes. In order to provide local flexibility, each state—working with its local governments—is authorized to develop an alternative distribution plan.

Q. What restrictions or qualifications will be imposed on the use of these funds?

A. There will be no program or project restrictions on the use of these funds. One purpose of revenue sharing is to permit local authorities the programming flexibility to make their own budget allocation decisions.

Each state will be required to meet minimum reporting and accounting requirements.

Q. How do the various state, county, city, and other local officials view this revenue-sharing proposal?

A. We have had numerous discussions with governors, mayors and county officials about the essentials of this proposal. There has developed a remarkable degree of consensus approval on its key measures. At our July 8 White House conference on revenue sharing, for example, the various representatives of state and local governments reached broad agreement on all the program's major features.

Q. How much of a new administrative apparatus will be required to administer revenue sharing?

A. None. The plan has been designed to operate almost automatically, avoiding any requirement for the establishment of any new Federal bureau or agency. The whole purpose is to avoid Federal controls and to increase the fiscal discretion available to state and local governments.

CUMBERLAND CHAPTER 377, SAFE-TEEN, INC.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. Speaker, I am happy this morning to pay tribute to an excellent group of young people from Cumberland in Western Maryland. The organization is the Cumberland Chapter 377, Safe-Teen, Inc. This group was founded on July 2, 1959, largely through the efforts of Lynn Walker and a charter was granted by the national organization at the same time.

These young men and women are dedicated to the improvement of their community and since their beginning have been involved in programs which have contributed substantially to bettering life in Cumberland.

In March 1960 the chapter voted to adopt the national vehicle safety check program as a community service program for annual presentation in the city of Cumberland.

Their first program was presented in June 1960 and received the circle of safety award. This is the national award for placing second in the quality of the program presented and the community co-operation achieved.

In each successive year since 1960 the chapter has received the circle of safety award, with the exception of 1965 when they received the national grand award for teenage participation. This is the top honor given by the national board of judges.

In the 1969 program the chapter has just been notified they have again been selected to receive the national grand award.

The chapter has undertaken many other projects in the community including: the collection and shipment of books to our servicemen in Vietnam and veterans hospitals; playtown, a pedestrian and bicycle safety program for primary grade school pupils; and radio and newspaper publicity programs of traffic safety during holiday seasons.

At present they are actively participating in the drive to secure funds for the Greater Cumberland Youth Center.

The chapter has 20 active members at present representing the three high schools in the city of Cumberland. Listed below are the officers and members comprising the chapter which we are proud to salute today:

Advisers: Lynn Walker, Administrator, 229 Pear Street, Cumberland. Willys Wilson, RD No. 2, Box 288, Cumberland. Lloyd Harrison, 640 N. Centre St., Cumberland. Sgt. Oliver Cook, City Police Headquarters, Cumberland.

President: Phil Young, Winchester Rd., RD No. 5, Cumberland.

Vice-President: Rosemary Lehman, 817 Shriver Ave., Cumberland.

Secretary-Treasurer: Mary Wilson, 245 N. Mechanic St., Cumberland.

Members: Diane Collins, Shortest Day Road, LaVale; Tim Farrell, 815 Shriver Ave., Cumberland; Cindy Hanks, 701 Arundel St., Cumberland; Nancy Hanks, 701 Arundel St., Cumberland; Sandy Hanks, 701 Arundel St., Cumberland; Kathy Harrison, 640 N. Centre St., Cumberland; Dale Kimble, 611 Greene St., Cumberland; Pat McDermott, 312 Franklin St., Cumberland; Sue Patterson, 712 Louisiana Ave., Cumberland; Sue Ransom, 1002 Holland St., Cumberland; Sue Shriely, McGill Dr., BelAir, Cumberland; Maris Smith, 135 E. Elder St., Cumberland; Donna Van-Buskirk, 128 N. BelAir Dr., BelAir, Cumberland; Carol Weakley, RD No. 6 Brant Road, Cresaptown; Cindy Worgetz, 61 C Stoneybrook Lane, LaVale; and Ruth Young, Winchester Rd., RD No. 5, Cumberland.

HAILED AS HEROES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker—

If ever men deserved to be hailed as heroes, they are Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins.

So says the New York Times today. So say we all, especially on this day when the great cities of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, representing America as a whole, will welcome the moon travelers and indeed hail them as heroes. The Times editorial follows:

REPORT FROM THE MOON-WALKERS

What came through most clearly in yesterday's enthralling first-hand report by the Apollo astronauts was the infinitesimal margin by which Eagle escaped either catastrophe or a decision to abort the moon landing. Either of the two major problems that emerged in those nerve-wracking moments before touchdown—the overburdened computer and the near-exhaustion of their fuel supply before Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin found a suitable landing spot—might have forced a very different ending to the historic mission. That all turned out perfectly is a tribute to the astronauts' skill, courage and poise as well as to the ability of the back-up personnel at Mission Control in Houston.

In their news conference, the moon visitors compared themselves to five-year-old children in a candy store. There were so many fascinating delights and intriguing opportunities all around them, and so little chance to do all they wanted to do. Had they been less tactful, the astronauts might have noted that their precious two-and-a-half hours on the lunar surface could have been even more productive for science if they had been less burdened with ceremonial and public relations obligations.

The astronauts' emphasis on the mysteries and puzzles they found on the moon points up how much remains to be done there. In effect, the scientists of this planet have been given an entire new world to explore. Even the whole Apollo program as now projected for the next few years will only begin to scratch the surface of the vast body of new knowledge available from earth's nearest celestial neighbor. The many goodies in the lunar candy shop, to use the astronauts' simile, deserve to be digested before the major

emphasis of the space program turns to the much more controversial and expensive project of putting men on Mars.

The astronauts' joint appearance served to remind the world how attractive and modest as well as brave all three of these Columboes of space are. If ever men deserved to be hailed as heroes, they are Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins. Today the millions of this great city will have the opportunity to exhibit their admirations for these first envoys of mankind to another world. We join with all New York in expressing our delight that the Apollo 11 team will be here, even if only for a few hours, on this happy day.

STARS AND STRIPES

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, these days patriotism is doubted on every hand and flag waving is considered old hat. For me, patriotism is a living, growing thing and the sight of the Stars and Stripes warms my heart, sharpens my mind and gives me courage to do the things I must for my country.

It is that belief which came to mind as I read an article in the May 23, 1969, edition of the Poughkeepsie, N.Y., Journal, titled "Area Pupil Wins Statewide Essay Contest." In this instance, a 13-year-old Chinese girl attending a junior high school in New York, spoke of what the American flag meant to her when she first set foot on American soil. She described a quality missing to many of us native born or who have been here so long that we have let the love for our country and what it stands for become faded and jaded and slide into disuse.

Let me share that article with you:

Hsiao-lien Chin, 13, a student at Arlington Junior High School, has been named winner of the New York State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution Flag Essay Contest.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Tsung Chin, Watson House, Vassar College, her essay was judged among 172 winners from DAR chapters across the State.

She was sponsored by the local Mahawenawashigh Chapter. Hsiao-lien came to this country with her parents from Taiwan about 3½ years ago and she was not able to speak English.

This is her winning essay:

"I stepped out of the plane and looked out at the new and strange land. Seven days ago I was still in Taiwan, the Republic of China.

"But now I am in a completely different place. I looked up and there up on the top of the roof of the airport building, was a flag. It was strange to me for it was different from my country's flag. The wind was blowing hard and the flag waved endlessly in the wind as if saying, 'Hello there! Welcome to the United States of America.'

"I smiled and suddenly a strange feeling of loneliness came creeping into my heart. All my friends are at the other end of the world. Perhaps I shall never see them again and perhaps they'll forget that they ever had a friend named Hsiao-lien. Tears came, and slowly I raised my head and looked at the flag through my tear-filled eyes.

"The flag seemed to say to me, 'My country is different from yours, that I know and

understand. But there is no reason for you to cry. You'll make new friends, but before you do, you must face the responsibilities that lie ahead of you. You must meet it half way and you must have courage and determination."

"I dropped my head in confusion and shame, then I shrugged my shoulders and forced myself to look at the flag again. This time, there were no tears in my eyes, instead, a look of courage. I said, 'I'm not afraid now. I'll do what you said and I'm grateful of it. You gave me the courage which I never knew had existed. From now on, I'll start a new life and the words you said will never be forgotten.'

"I walked across the air field and before I went into the airport building, I turned and waved at the new friend for the last time. The flag fluttered for a second, then slowly settled into a calm position as if satisfied.

"I smiled, then whispered, 'Thank you so very much.'

Hsiao-lien's father is assistant professor in the Chinese Division of the Linguistic School at Georgetown University. Her mother is assistant professor of Chinese at Vassar College.

Hsiao-lien will be honored at an assembly program next Wednesday morning at which time a state DAR representative will present her with a \$50 U.S. Savings Bond.

Mrs. Bernard J. O'Connell was chairman of the local contest.

The essays were written on "What the American Flag Means to Me."

DANGEROUS GAME

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the August 10, 1969, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune warning against the dangers of the adoption of the so-called Dirksen amendment.

The text of the editorial follows:

DANGEROUS GAME

There may have been a few moments in American history when the times were less propitious than now for a constitutional convention, but there surely haven't been very many.

Yet this country stands at the brink of its first constitutional convention since the one that met in Philadelphia in the hot summer of 1787 and drafted the nation's basic legal document.

Ostensibly, the new convention would confine itself to considering an amendment to the U.S. Constitution allowing one house of a bicameral state legislature to apportion itself on bases other than population.

But it might be difficult to control the activities of constitutional convention, even if Congress passes bills designed to put reins on what a convention could do. A time of drastic social upheaval hardly seems an ideal time to indulge in wholesale tampering with the Constitution.

Much of the push behind the convention movement comes from Sen. Everett M. Dirksen. Stymied in putting an apportionment amendment through the familiar channels of congressional approval and state ratification, Mr. Dirksen has been trying to take advantage of a clause in the Constitution that empowers the legislatures themselves to call a constitutional convention into being.

Thirty-four states must issue such a call. So far, 33 are on record favoring a conven-

tion. If one more state acts, Congress will have to decide whether and how to respond.

It is a shabby fact that of the 33 state resolutions seeking a convention, only five emerged from assemblies which met court standards for proper apportionment. (Indiana was one of the five although federal judges have subsequently found a flaw in our legislative districts.)

What it boils down to is a batch of state legislatures, poorly representative of the voters, scrambling to perpetuate inequalities which the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional. It is a dismal standard for the senior senator from Illinois to be flying.

One hope for avoiding a constitutional convention is a spate of state resolutions rescinding convention calls. So far, though, no rescinding resolution has passed both houses of any state legislature.

"Little federalism"—the patterning of state legislatures on the federal model, with one house having fixed membership and the other representative membership—is a myth without foundation. The federal system was created among other reasons, as a check on centralized government. There is no reason why states should copy it.

The Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling was just and deserves to be left alone. Sen. Dirksen is playing a dangerous game to save a personal pique.

NIXON PROPOSALS ON WELFARE VIEWED

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, two of the newspapers in my part of the country, the New Orleans Times-Picayune and the Louisiana Weekly have recently published several editorials and articles on the subject of welfare and on the proposals made by President Nixon last Friday night.

Because I consider these articles well written and informative and because of the timely and important nature of the subject, I am inserting them in the RECORD and calling them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 10, 1969]

NIXON PROPOSALS VIEWED WITH CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM—LOUISIANA OPINIONS CENTER ON PROBLEM OF CONGRESS

(By Brent Manley)

Cautious optimism was the prevailing sentiment Saturday as reactions to President Nixon's domestic proposals—particularly welfare reform—were gathered throughout Louisiana.

In his Friday night telecast, Nixon included broad reforms in existing welfare programs. The heart of his proposals was the federal guaranteed annual income of \$1,600 a year to a family of four with supplements until earnings reach \$3,920, provided the breadwinner is willing to work.

Typical of the reactions was that of Arthur J. Chapital Sr., urban programs director of the New Orleans branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"It sounds good generally, but knowing the politics of the situation, you have to keep your fingers crossed."

CONGRESS LAG FEARED

Most of those who commented on the proposed reforms expressed concern that the

President's suggestions may bog down in Congress.

And most agreed that the existing welfare system is grossly inadequate in its effort to meet the needs of the poor.

"One basic thing I agree with is that the welfare program now is not meeting the needs of the people," said Emmitt Douglas, president of the Louisiana branch of the NAACP.

"The basic concept is good, I just hope it can be implemented," Douglass said.

State Rep. Ernest N. "Dutch" Morial said he feels President Nixon took a step in the right direction, but not far enough.

"Hopefully, Congress will see fit to enlarge on what the President has suggested to the extent that the programs will be adequate to give the poor the dignity they should have," Morial said.

He added, however, that Nixon still has "said nothing about other programs, such as aid to the aged and blind and disabled. The federal government should take over all welfare-related programs."

LA. WELFARE ASSAILED

Mixed in with the guarded optimism was a sour note: an appraisal of Louisiana's current welfare crisis, which cannot be affected immediately by any of the President's proposals.

John Pecoul, executive director of the city's Human Relations Committee, said he feels the federal minimum income concept is definitely a "positive step."

He said, however, New Orleans and the rest of the state are still faced with the problem of financing the welfare system as it exists.

Even if President Nixon's proposals moved quickly through Congress, the earliest possible date for federal funds for Louisiana would be July of 1970—possibly January of 1971.

Thus, Louisiana's welfare crisis cannot be relieved by federal funds for about a year and a half, Pecoul said.

"The existing system is the problem," he remarked, "and it's still here. We're not out of the woods at the local level."

State Sen. Michael H. O'Keefe's reaction was in accord with Rep. Morial's.

O'Keefe lauded the President's departure from the existing welfare structure, but added that "he has not taken the best of the minimum income alternatives."

FAVORS DEMO PLAN

He said the minimum income proposal authored by Democrats is far better than the one President Nixon has proposed.

The state senator said the Democratic minimum income proposal is a flat payment to those persons earning less than the established standard.

This method of guaranteed income eliminates welfare programs altogether and thereby eliminates the red tape welfare applicants are forced to go through to receive financial assistance.

O'Keefe said he feels Nixon's basic proposals may be revamped in Congress to resemble programs more closely allied to Democrats' concepts.

"President Nixon's departure from the existing system is commendable," O'Keefe added. "He (Nixon) has taken a courageous step toward the Democratic position which will endanger him with members of his own party."

NEED UPDATING

Mayoral candidate David Gertler also lauded President Nixon's departure from welfare systems now in use.

"I feel that all our programs certainly need a proper updating. Outmoded programs are the cause of many problems in the city and State today," Gertler said.

Gertler said he is not in accord with every phase of the President's proposal but that

any effort to evaluate and update antiquated programs is "a step in the right direction."

Ellis Hull, president of the United Voters' League, said he is skeptical of the feasibility of the entire program.

"Some of the programs might work, but others—such as day care centers for working mothers—just can't work. You can't depend on people for voluntary work."

Chapital commented further that any programs for the rehabilitation of the poor must include their education as well as job training, which President Nixon outlined as one of the objectives of his domestic proposals.

"Many of these poor people are functional illiterates, so they must receive education along with their training," Chapital said.

The poor will remain poor without education and training for meaningful jobs, he added.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune,
July 29, 1969]

WELFARE SWITCH IN PERSPECTIVE

The confusing complaints and commentary over abolition of the Welfare Department's Aid to Dependent Children dollar maximums in favor of a new hypothetical standard system—to which a 42 per cent ratable cut was applied—need to be brought into focus.

Generally speaking, large ADC families now receive more; smaller ones are due about the same or are experiencing a reduction. (In the Crescent City three out of 10 recipients are getting increases.) Two appropriate instances: One leading protester is having payments cut \$5 from the erstwhile maximum \$163; another garners \$67 a month more under the new system.

In some cases, benefit losses will be partially compensated by the food stamp program—fewer dollars will be needed to buy about the same amount of grocery-multipier stamps. For example, a household of five whose monthly allotment may drop from \$133 to \$120 will pay \$48 (instead of \$52) for \$80 (instead of \$82) worth of food stamps. Thus this family's "net income" really becomes \$152; about \$2.66 a day for food and an aggregate \$72 left over for rent, utilities, clothing, household supplies and transportation.

The dilemma for many welfare families, however, is that they say they do not—and cannot afford to—spend 40 per cent of their meager income for food. That's what \$48 of \$120 is, and, in fact, the rules demand a take-it-or-leave-it \$48 stamp purchase for such a family even if its income were as low as \$110 a month. (The average American family, by contrast, devotes about 17 per cent of its income for food.)

While \$80 or so a month—with proper food budget management—is a respectable sum for a family of five to "chew" on, those welfare families whose rent, utilities, etc., aggregate well over \$75 a month may indeed be "skimping" on their food budget by allocating less than the daily \$1.60 which, in this instance, United States Department of Agriculture says should be spent for food—or stamps.

By contrast, again, a similar-sized non-welfare family with take-home pay of \$400 a month, when fed and housed at like expense, has about \$245 or more remaining for other needs. But the welfare family may have \$12 to \$15 "to spare." The economics of the total family budget, then, may press these "worse off" households NOT to opt for the food stamp program.

There has been some talk in Washington of liberalizing the rules—requiring a lesser slice of a family's income to go toward food. A reasonable goal, we believe would be to work toward requiring "poverty-level" families to pay no higher percentage of their total income for a "basic subsistence" quantity of food stamps than the percentage that

the average American family spends, albeit, for somewhat classier menus.

In the meantime, however, a readily implementable rules change might be to allow prospective food-stamp applicants the option to purchase with fewer dollars a lesser amount of monthly stamps, if their circumstances seem to justify it. While this may do violence to the program's presumed ideal, common sense would seem to dictate that this buy-fewer-stamps provision would be the lesser of two evils.

If a mother says she can't—and doesn't—spend \$35 a month for food, is it logical to exclude her from the program? Rather, if prevention of gross malnutrition is the goal, would it not be better to allow her a prorated \$60 of stamps in exchange for what she does spend for food? Though not fully adequate, her family's fare, with good management, would greatly improve.

The USDA-LSU Extension Service program initiated here this past year on good health and nutrition habits for homemakers should be continued and expanded to educate low-income families on the best use of their food dollars.

But what's the welfare-switch rhubarb all about? Under the scuttled ADC program the hypothetical ceiling was \$199—really only funded to a maximum \$163. The new system has a \$233 ceiling—but the new scales give some families, especially large ones, \$200 a month or more, while smaller ones, in some cases, are allotted less than they used to get.

We haven't heard a full explanation why this had to be—only that \$13 million more was needed to implement the new system fully, and available new funds this year, mostly federal, came to about \$2¼ million.

Besides normal caseload increases, welfare recipient head counts swelled by the thousands because of the U.S. Supreme Court's "man in the house" ruling. And, like Old Man River, the welfare rolls roll on.

[From the Louisiana Weekly, Aug. 9, 1969]

WELFARE PROBLEMS ARE NATIONAL

Developments of the past few weeks have made New Orleans a "welfare disaster area."

But what is happening here is typical of conditions in other parts of the nation.

Recently a series of articles entitled "Welfare: A Bankrupt System," written by John T. Dauner, was published in the Kansas City Times and Star.

A few excerpts from this series are offered The Louisiana Weekly readers for comparison with the local situation:

"Awash in a sea of red tape, intellectually bankrupt, and threatening the financial ruin of state and local government, the public welfare system is rapidly becoming a national issue as heated and divisive as the urban crisis, Vietnam and black nationalism.

"It can, in fact, hardly be called a system. It is a morass of 50 state laws, all different, thousands of pages of federal and state regulations and local traditions and interpretations that attempt to implement and administer the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

"The welfare system is supposed to provide an ultimate guarantee against poverty and social privation. But it breeds poverty and continuing dependency rather than independence . . ."

During the past week here in New Orleans, Mayor Victor H. Schiro indicated he was not pleased by an action of the City Council which provided \$20,000 for the purchase of medicine for needy welfare recipients. He said, in fact, that he did not think the city should go into the welfare business.

Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York told President Richard M. Nixon recently:

" . . . The welfare system is bankrupting our cities and must be scrapped and replaced. . . . We in the cities have reached our limit. We cannot ante up more every

year at the expense of other essential services."

The article by John T. Dauner continued: "State and local responsibility for administering and, originally, for financing public assistance is deeply rooted in the American tradition. But in 1935, the federal government through the Social Security Act, began helping the states finance their welfare programs. Since then, five programs—old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to families with dependent children, and Medicaid—have been set up, each with state and federal responsibility requirements.

"The federal government will pay 50 to 80 percent of the costs, depending on the program and the state's ability to pay.

"States are free to participate in the programs only to the extent they wish, controlling that participation by the amount of money they are willing to make available. Both the states and the federal government put a maximum on the amount they will contribute to any one individual, and some states put a ceiling on the amount a family can receive.

"It is the federal-state partnership that the problem lies in this period of rapidly expanding rolls and increasing costs. . . ."

Governor John J. McKeithen of Louisiana was quoted as urging full federal responsibility for the entire welfare program last week.

Dauner's article says:

"The federal government's revenues respond to the economy, to inflation and to the gross national product. State revenues have not kept pace, and the local revenues, based mainly on property taxes, have hardly increased at all. While potential of the federal government to pay and its willingness to pay have increased, that of the states has not. . . ."

"A federal takeover is being seriously studied," Dauner wrote, "and may be proposed by President Nixon as part of a move to a guaranteed annual income system . . ."

POLAND MISSION FATAL TO BISHOP GROCHOWSKI

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform you and my colleagues of the death of Prime Bishop Leon Grochowski, the spiritual leader of the Polish National Catholic Church in the United States and Canada. His death occurred when he was stricken in a hotel while visiting Warsaw in the beloved land of his birth.

It would be difficult to summarize all of the activities in the life of Bishop Grochowski from his ordination on September 10, 1910, to his death on July 17, 1969. During those years, he not only served as a pastor and then as the spiritual leader of his church, but also founded a weekly diocesan newspaper, conducted weekly Sunday religious programs on the radio, and established a special fund to aid sick or disabled priests in the Diocese.

I am sure that all of us will join the members of the Polish National Catholic Church in mourning his passing.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append here two articles which appeared in the Scranton Tribune and the

Scranton Times which tell of the life of this religious leader:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune]

POLAND MISSION FATAL TO BISHOP GROCHOWSKI—HEADED POLISH NATIONAL CATHOLIC CHURCH

Prime Bishop Leon Grochowski, head of the Polish National Catholic Church in the United States and Canada and pastor of St. Stanislaus Church, South Scranton, died Thursday in Poland. He was 82.

Bishop John Miaslaszek of Cleveland, a member of the primate's party, said the church leader died in the downtown Warsaw hotel where he was staying.

The bishop's wife, Bernice, was informed at about 1:30 p.m. by telephone from Poland.

Bishop Miaslaszek said Bishop Grochowski had been hospitalized in past years for heart trouble. Lately, he said, the bishop had not been feeling well, and added the present heat wave in Poland may have been a contributing factor.

Bishop Grochowski was in Warsaw leading a delegation of 25 Polish National bishops and lay leaders at the invitation of the Polish National Catholic Church. The group was scheduled to return to this country Aug. 1.

Born in Poland, he completed his early education in Siedce and pursued academic studies in Warsaw, Poland, where he distinguished himself as an upperclassman in the Warsaw Polytechnic.

Following studies in Poland, he came to the United States and entered the Savonarola Seminary, Scranton. Ordained on Sept. 10, 1910 by the late Bishop Francis Hodur, he was consecrated as a bishop into the Polish National Catholic Church Aug. 17, 1924.

On Sept. 30, 1925 Bishop Grochowski became head of the Western Diocese of the church and was transferred to its headquarters in Chicago. He served in Chicago for 30 years before returning to Scranton.

Prior to taking on his duties as Western head of the church, he served as pastor of SS. Peter and Paul Church, Passaic, N.J., and St. Adalbert's in Dickson City.

Following the death of Prime Bishop Hodur, Bishop Grochowski was elected his successor by the General Synod. He officially assumed the post as highest authority of the church in 1953 and was installed May 15, 1955 at ceremonies in St. Stanislaus Church.

In 1952 he was awarded a doctorate degree by the board of trustees, Nashotah House, Wisconsin, and again received a doctorate in 1957 by the Virginia Seminary, Alexandria, Va., singling him out as a scholar and outstanding leader of the Old Catholic Church.

Born on Oct. 11, 1886, he was the youngest son of Albert and Victoria Pienkowski Grochowski, the latest trip to Poland was his 17th missionary trip to that country. In 1964, he made a trip to England, Poland and Holland.

In 1959, Bishop Grochowski consecrated Rev. Maksimilian Rode as bishop of the Polish National Catholic Church in Poland. The ceremonies took place in St. Gertrude's Cathedral, Utrecht, Holland.

In October of 1960, Bishop Grochowski observed his 50th anniversary of ordination with ceremonies and religious rites in St. Stanislaus Cathedral, followed by a program at the Masonic Temple.

Bishop Grochowski is survived by his wife and a son, Mitchell, who is in the U.S. Army.

The body will be taken to Scranton for burial in St. Stanislaus Cemetery. Other arrangements are incomplete.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times]

PRIME BISHOP GROCHOWSKI TO BE BURIED IN SCRANTON

The body of Prime Bishop Leon Grochowski, spiritual leader of the Polish National Catholic Church in the United States and

Canada, who died Thursday in Poland, will be flown to Scranton for burial, a family spokesman said today.

The date of arrival of the body and funeral arrangements have not been determined.

Bishop Grochowski, pastor of St. Stanislaus Polish National Catholic Cathedral, South Scranton, had been in Poland since early this month leading a delegation of Polish National Catholic bishops and lay leaders. The group was scheduled to return to this country Aug. 1.

Bishop John Miaslaszek of Cleveland, a member of the delegation, said the 82-year-old bishop was stricken and died in a downtown Warsaw hotel where he had been staying.

Bishop Grochowski's wife, Bernice, was informed by telephone of his death about 1:30 p.m. Thursday.

According to Bishop Miaslaszek, the prelate had been in failing health the past several years and a current heat wave in Poland may have been a contributing factor in his death.

Besides his widow, Bishop Grochowski is survived by a son, Mitchell, who is in the U.S. Army.

Burial will take place in St. Stanislaus Cemetery following Mass in the cathedral at a time to be announced.

The latest trip to Poland was his 17th missionary journey to that country. In 1964 he journeyed to England, Poland and Holland.

In October, 1960, Bishop Grochowski observed the 50th anniversary of his ordination with ceremonies and religious rites in St. Stanislaus Cathedral, followed by a program at Masonic Temple.

Bishop Grochowski died in the land in which he was born. He was born in Skupica, Poland, and came to this country in 1905 at age 19.

In 1910 he was ordained a priest in the Polish National Catholic Church at Savonarola Theological Seminary in Scranton by the late Prime Bishop Francis Hodur.

On Aug. 17, 1924 he was consecrated to the episcopate.

In 1925 Bishop Grochowski was appointed bishop ordinary of the Western Diocese of the Polish National Church, with Episcopal residence in Chicago, Ill. He remained there 30 years, during which time the two parishes in Chicago and 21 in the Western Diocese grew to nine in Chicago and 55 parishes and missions in the diocese.

Among his accomplishments in the Chicago area were: Founding of a weekly diocesan newspaper, "The Awakening," personally conducted weekly Sunday radio hour for 18 years; organization of United Women's Societies; construction of a new cathedral church in Chicago; organization of the United Choirs in the Western Diocese and expansion of the Polish National Spojnia.

He also organized a Clergy Fund for sick and disabled priests of the diocese. During World War II he organized the Polish Platoon of Samaritans, which sent more than 7,000 gift packages and tons of food, clothing and medical supplies to needy Polish people. The Samaritans also financed an ambulance fully equipped for the Polish Army in England.

In 1949 the General Synod elected him Prime Bishop and he became head of the Polish National Church upon the death of Bishop Hodur on Feb. 18, 1953.

Bishop Grochowski's first pastorate was at SS. Peter and Paul Church, Passaic, N.J., where he served four years. He was pastor of St. Adalbert's Church, Dickson City, for nine years before leaving for Chicago.

On July 4, 1966, Bishop Grochowski commemorated the 100th anniversary of the birth of Bishop Hodur by laying the cornerstone of a new church in Zarski, Poland, birthplace of the founder of the Polish National Church.

Organizer of the Aid to Poland Commission, Bishop Grochowski sponsored the entry

of 1,500 displaced persons into the U.S. He was editor of the church organ, "Rola Boza" (God's Field), and served as representative to ecumenical meetings of the World Council of Churches.

VETERANS BENEFITS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, over the years we have passed many bills providing benefits to our veterans and their families. H.R. 11959 will increase the educational allowance to veterans, widows, and orphans attending school under programs administered by the Veterans' Administration. The proposed increase for those attending school under the GI bill will be approximately 27 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE. Under his able leadership, and that of our subcommittee chairman, GEORGE BROWN, the committee reported a bill designed to make the educational benefits programs more meaningful. The bill provides for increased benefits to offset the rising cost of living and the ever increasing cost of education.

The Congress has recognized the value of providing the means for an education to those who have fought in past wars. In 1943, Congress enacted into law a program providing for vocational rehabilitation to veterans with service-connected disabilities. On June 22, 1944, the first GI bill passed the Congress without a dissenting vote. On July 16, 1952, during the Korean conflict, we passed another GI bill. Both of these bills were tremendously successful. Then on March 3, 1966, Congress passed the third generation GI educational bill. These are all major bills—all designed to provide millions of veterans, widows, and orphans an education and an earning capacity far greater than the average individual.

Mr. Speaker, during a visit to Vietnam in January 1966, I met with General Westmoreland. I talked with many servicemen from General Westmoreland to privates in the ranks serving in all branches of our military. Every place I visited—Danang, Pleiku, Saigon, Nha Trang, and others—the question was always asked whether Congress was going to pass a GI education bill. When I returned from my visit there, I cosponsored the cold war GI education bill, providing assistance for those who served since January 1955. The passage of that bill was a tremendous boost to the morale of our servicemen. It will benefit millions in years to come. It has been estimated that it cost the Federal Government approximately \$19 billion for the World War II GI bill; at the same time, estimates are that the tax return to the U.S. Treasury will double that amount due to the increased earning capacity of those who continued their education.

This bill will affect more than 750,000 persons. Each month over 70,000 veterans are discharged from active service. All

of them will be eligible for these increased educational benefits. This bill will raise the allowance for a single veteran going to school full time from \$130 to \$165 per month; from \$155 to \$197 monthly for a veteran with one dependent, and from \$175 to \$222 for a veteran with two dependents.

ABM AND THE CHANCES FOR PEACE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the narrow margin with which the Senate approved the Safeguard ABM system increases our responsibility for thorough study of that measure.

In my investigation of this matter, I have discovered a cogent treatise by Mr. Bill Wickersham, founder and president of the Missouri Peace Study Institute. I met him when he joined 25 other concerned citizens to form the Peace Act Advisory Council last May.

The purpose of this council is to promote public education and support for the Peace Act bill—H.R. 6501—which I introduced last February with over 60 cosponsors.

In order to share Mr. Wickersham's views with other Members, I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

HYDROGEN BOMBS IN MID-MISSOURI (By Bill Wickersham)

In recent months much publicity has been directed toward the proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system and the very critical issue of whether to scrap it, delay it, or deploy it. It is probably one of the most crucial decisions in history, in that it could be the technological straw which breaks the world's back. The acceptance of ABM by the Congress could very easily be the turning point in the escalation and development of super weaponry systems which will bring an end to civilization as we know it.

We in Mid-Missouri are much more involved with nuclear weapons than many people seem to realize, and we will definitely be affected by ABM, since a portion of the Safeguard system will be located in the area of Sedalia, Missouri, home of Whiteman Air Force Base and home of the 351st Strategic Missile Wing.

The U.S. now has enough nuclear weapons to easily kill 120 million Russians in a day's time. A sizeable portion of those weapons (Minuteman Missiles) are located near Columbia, and are dispersed in underground silos throughout 14 counties of Missouri.

According to the Official Manual of the State of Missouri (1967-68): "Whiteman Air Force Base itself covers 3,384 acres with the entire missile complex spanning 15,678 square miles in 14 west central Missouri counties: Saline, Lafayette, Cooper, Moniteau, Pettis, Henry, Bates, St. Clair, Cedar, Vernon, Johnson, Cass, Morgan, and Benton.

Each of the missiles which is located near a cornfield or other relatively open area, houses a one megaton hydrogen war-head which contains fifty times the potential destructive power of the A-bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

From the top side, the missile sites, which resemble small parking lots enclosed by low level cyclone fences, appear to be quite harmless. The truth is that within 25 miles of Jesse Hall, in a silo near Boonville, Missouri, is a weapon which is designed to reach a

target in Russia or some other country within one half hour. When it reaches its target, it will kill thousands of innocent men, women, and children.

The moral and ethical question which the people of Columbia, Sedalia, Clinton, Marshall, Higginsville, California, Versailles, Warsaw, Butler, Nevada, and many other Missouri towns have to ask is: Are there any conditions under which we are willing to sanction the deaths of 120 million people on a given day?

This is a question which all the religious groups in the above named towns should be asking themselves. The various Christian denominations should ask themselves what they think Jesus would have said about their approval of such obscenities.

If one is not willing to answer yes to the deaths of 120 million people under any conditions, then he (as the writer does) should disavow our "threat capability" and intention to use the Minuteman strategic weapons.

If one answers the question "only if the Russians use them on us first, then he simply wants revenge. A Mid-Missourian won't be around to be aware of his revenge if the Russians strike first because we live in a "prime target area" and will be the first to die if there is a nuclear war. And if we should deploy Safeguard ABMs and do prevent incoming Russian missiles from destroying our "second strike" Minuteman missiles, then the chances are that the radioactive fallout emitted by our own ABM will rain down upon the towns of Missouri, leaving our soil and water unfit for agricultural production.

If one answers yes to the deaths of 120 million people in a day's time, then he can hardly consider himself either a humanist or a truly religious person, since such excessive killing and suicide far outstrip the criteria put forth by even the most hawkish of the "moral war" and "just war" theologians.

When the ABM hearings were held in Boston, Chicago, and other cities, many of the urbanites who opposed ABM were extremely concerned about the possibility of having a two megaton H-bomb in their backyards. Missourians cannot really offer that point in argument against ABMs because we already have enough nuclear energy in our backyards to blow up a big chunk of mankind.

Our main argument against putting an ABM in Sedalia is that the "Safeguard," which most people in the independent (non-governmental) scientific community say is unworkable, is just one more manifestation of insane technical barbarism which will seriously disturb the so-called nuclear balance of terror, increase the upward spiral of the world's weaponry race, and simultaneously feather the nests of the arms merchants.

People who raise questions about nuclear weapons and their disastrous potential are sometimes said to be afflicted with the disease known as nucleomitaphobia (the irrational fear of death by nuclear weapons). Nucleomitaphobia should come easy for any Mid-Missourian.

It should be remembered that man has seldom had machines which didn't eventually make mistakes, and there is no reason to believe that our present weaponry systems will not make mistakes. In three separate tests of Montana based Minuteman missiles, the missiles failed to operate properly.

Dr. Kurt Hohenemser, Professor of Aero-Space Engineering at Washington University, St. Louis, estimates that 20 to 30 per cent of our Missouri missiles will not function properly. Dr. Hohenemser does not predict the nature of the failure, but it is not difficult to imagine Minutemen misfiring, going off target, exploding, or failing to launch.

Most of the weapons experts assure us signers have worked hard to insure that our

that our system is virtually fool-proof. De-weapons control devices are as effective as humanly possible, and as Dr. Donald Inglis says, "they must be good, for the record is excellent. It happens to be perfect." Dr. Inglis, senior physicist at Argonne National Laboratory, also points out that: "We don't hear much about near accidents, but in the case of one H-bomb dropped accidentally in North Carolina in 1961, it was reported that five of the six safety devices had failed. There were six, and the bomb was 'un-armed' so there was no detonation."

Another basis for rational fear of nuclear weapons is that man has always used his major inventions. Yet this writer, through a series of interviews with Mid-Missourians, has found that many people feel that no one would ever really use nuclear weapons.

In the October 16, 1968, Columbia Missourian, James Kilpatrick quoted General Curtis Le May, former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as saying: "If I found it necessary I would use anything that we could dream up, including nuclear weapons—if it was necessary. . . . My desire is not to use any weapons. But once the time comes that you have to fight, I would use any weapon that we have in the arsenal that is necessary."

In the same article Mr. Kilpatrick went on to say: "If the United States is not prepared to use nuclear weapons, as a last resort, in a fight for survival itself, why do we have a fleet of 40 Polaris submarines patrolling the ocean floor? Why do we have a stockpile of hydrogen bombs and nuclear weapons? Why does research continue on fantastic new techniques for delivering multiple warheads? Is the whole thing a multi-billion dollar bluff, having no national will behind it?"

Mr. Kilpatrick agrees with General LeMay that if nuclear weapons are never to be used under any circumstances, then "we might as well bury them under Ft. Knox with the gold." Kilpatrick also feels that Americans have developed a phobia on the subject of nuclear weapons and "resolutely refuse to think upon such things."

This writer agrees that many, in fact most, Americans refuse to give much thought to the weaponry problem. The sad fact is that many active conservatives, liberals and radicals who are very alert on other pressing social problems refuse to consider the nuclear symptoms of the largest of all problems—war. If a solution to war is not found, the solutions to the other problems will not have a chance to materialize.

Any student, educator, scientist, businessman, or other citizen who fails to comprehend the obscenity of a world without law which is loaded to the teeth with suicidal weapons, will make no contribution to his own or the world's survival.

Any academic institution which fails to direct major attention and substantial resources for research, teaching, and extension efforts aimed at war elimination is guilty of irrelevance and lacks a sound educational philosophy.

As Norman Cousins says: "The biggest lesson to be learned about contemporary civilization is that nothing anyone is doing today makes any sense unless it is connected to the making of a genuine peace."

HOUSE PUTS OFFICE OF EDUCATION ON ALERT

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as one who vigorously supported the Whitten amendment to the

HEW appropriations bill, I think it is appropriate to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following column of James J. Kilpatrick entitled "House Puts Office of Education on Alert," which appeared in the Evening Star, Tuesday, August 12, 1969. I also hope the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Commissioner of Education read this column and take it to heart.

The column follows:

HOUSE PUTS OFFICE OF EDUCATION ON ALERT
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House of Representatives put in a good day's work a couple of weeks ago, when members insisted upon retaining the "Whitten amendments" dealing with federal aid to education. The Senate may nullify the gesture, as it did a year ago, but the gesture is worth making anyhow.

The two sections inserted in the bill by Mississippi's Jamie Whitten are not phrased with pure felicity, but their meaning is tolerably clear: "No part of the funds contained in this act may be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent."

When this identical language was inserted in the aid-to-education appropriation bill of 1968, the Senate watered it down by adding "in order to overcome racial imbalance." The Commissioner of Education said his office could live with that, since—*heh, heh*—their object wasn't to overcome racial imbalance, but to achieve desegregation, and these were two different things.

Doubtless an effort will be made in the Senate to repeat the process this time. Some of us who have followed the Office of Education over the years will hope that the effort fails. It would be a salutary thing to see the language preserved intact.

After all, what's so wrong with the Whitten restrictions? Opponents charged in floor debate that Whitten's provisions were dangerous, disastrous, obnoxious, and iniquitous—calculated to crush civil rights, rape the Constitution, violate the Bill of Rights, and trample upon the conscience and dignity of man. It was freely predicted that if the language were accepted, the South would return to segregation, degradation and slavery through the device of "freedom of choice," and opponents appealed to heaven to forfend so cruel a betrayal.

This was mostly hot air. Nothing in the Whitten amendment would prevent federal courts from interpreting the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as they please. Nothing would prevent school boards from voluntarily adopting desegregation plans that might include the busing of children, the abandonment of schools, or the transfer of students with parental consent.

What the Whitten amendment might accomplish, however, is this: It might put the Office of Education on notice, through its new commissioner, James E. Allen, Jr., that the Congress and the country are fed to the teeth with the doctrinaire methods that have been employed to achieve racial integration as the be-all and end-all of federal aid to education.

Dr. Allen ought to understand this growing resentment and concern. In the days before he came on the scene, agents of the commissioner's office were roaming the South in the fashion of Reconstruction proconsuls. Many of them were quite young and utterly inexperienced. They often were arrogant beyond belief. They had packed their carpetbags with guidelines, theories, and threats to cut off the federal money. "Do as

we say!" they demanded; and flew grandly back to Washington.

In their furious orders to shift pupils here, combine schools there, assign black teachers to these classrooms and white teachers to those, no place remained for compassion or for common sense. The children became faceless ciphers. Integrate! That was the overriding goal, and if the quality of education suffered, so what?

Whitten's amendments may not survive; but Dr. Allen would have to have a heart of stone not to be touched by last week's appeal from Negro parents in Charlotte, N.C. Their 4,200 children are about to be bused like cattle out to the suburbs. Seven old and well-loved schools are to be closed altogether. They foresee total disruption of their lives—and for what? For artificial integration, imposed by court decree pursuant to federal guidelines. It is this brutal management of people's lives that Whitten seeks to prevent. He ought to be encouraged.

THE COMING BATTLE FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there is ample and well-documented evidence from the basic medical care indexes like infant mortality, maternal mortality, and life expectancy, that the United States is not delivering good medical care to many citizens. Compared to other developed countries which are not nearly as wealthy, our country has so far failed to build an effective delivery system for the superb medical knowledge we possess.

An equally disturbing message comes from an analysis of medical care costs. Doctors' fees and hospitalization have been inflated by Federal medical programs like Medicare and Medicaid. The limited Federal involvement in these problems has, so far, had a negative effect. Further, Americans spend more—as a percentage of our gross national product—and get poorer medical care in return, than comparable developed countries.

This fiscal comparison, and many other aspects of our serious medical care problem, are examined in Bert Seidman's excellent article "The Coming Battle for National Health Insurance" in the June 1969 issue of Social Service Outlook.

Mr. Seidman's excellent credentials as an experienced observer of national medical problems make this an authoritative article. His present position as director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security gives him good insights in the growing concern of middle-income wage earners that something better must be done for medical care. His article follows:

THE COMING BATTLE FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Bert Seidman)

Renewed interest in a universal and comprehensive health insurance program has been gathering momentum in the last few years as the rapid rise in medical costs has made it increasingly difficult for people to pay their health bills.

There is increasing evidence also that special programs for the poor, including Medicaid and the neighborhood health centers of the Office of Economic Opportunity, are not meeting the need. And although federal and state governments are literally "pouring" billions of dollars into many different health programs, there is no appreciable impact on the efficiency with which health services are delivered.

Since 1938, both the AFL and the CIO repeatedly endorsed a national health insurance program for all the American people. The 1955 merger convention, in its resolution on health programs, called upon Congress to enact:

"A national health insurance system which would make complete prepaid health protection available to all Americans, with contributions geared to income; assure high quality medical services, facilities and personnel in expanding quantity and quality; and at the same time provide free choice of doctors and patients, with control of medical decisions in the hands of the medical profession."

In 1957, the AFL-CIO reaffirmed the 1955 convention action as the continuing position of the federation. At its February 1967 meeting, the AFL-CIO Executive Council again called on Congress to enact a program of national health insurance embodying the principles of universal coverage; comprehensive benefits; adequate financing; and assurance of high quality services. This action was underscored by a comprehensive resolution adopted at the AFL-CIO convention in December 1967.

Support for national health insurance has waxed and waned in this country, but at least three times since World War I it was strong enough so that its establishment was under active consideration.

A universal compulsory system of medical care insurance was first advocated in the United States before World War I. This early movement covered the years 1910 to 1920. Significantly, this initiative had the support of the American Medical Association. Professional opposition soon developed, however, and at the annual meeting of the AMA in New Orleans in 1920, the House of Delegates established a basic policy which has not been revised to the present day. This is what the AMA said nearly 50 years ago:

"The American Medical Association declares its opposition to the institution of any plan embodying the system of compulsory insurance against illness, or other plan of compulsory insurance which provides for medical service to be rendered contributors or their dependents, provided, controlled or regulated by any state or federal government."

In 1925 and 1926, a number of conferences were held which were called to formulate plans for a study of the structure of medical services in the United States. As a result of those conferences, the Committee on Costs of Medical Care (CCMC) was established, financed by six foundations. The final report of the Committee was published in 1932. Battle lines were quickly drawn. The majority of the members of the Committee were of the opinion that "medical service, both preventive and therapeutic should be furnished largely by organized groups of physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists and other associated personnel" and that "the costs of medical care be placed on a group payment basis" through the use of insurance, taxation or both. The minority report, which was supported by the AMA, objected to the proposal for group practice and the adoption of insurance plans unless sponsored and controlled by organized medicine.

Following the report of the CCMC, a serious movement began for enactment of a national health insurance program. Originally, it was to have been part of the Social Security Act which was passed in

1935. Apparently for tactical reasons, it was left out. Later, Senator Wagner introduced his first National Health Insurance bill in 1939 with the Roosevelt Administration's blessing. The first Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was introduced in 1943 and subsequently reintroduced in 1945, 1947 and 1949. Despite considerable interest and support, the bill never passed either house of Congress.

MEDICARE EVOLVED

We all know what happened then. Despairing of the likelihood that universal national health insurance could be enacted in the foreseeable future, organized labor and other supporters made a tactical retreat. It was then that the long, successful fight began for Medicare which now provides health insurance for 20 million elderly Americans. I hope that the Congress will extend Medicare to the disabled and eventually to other social security beneficiaries. In this way, health insurance under federal auspices may gradually cover more and more of the population.

But there is an easier way of doing it and that is to recognize that America needs now a national health insurance system with universal coverage.

What would be the main features of a national health insurance program for the 1970's? First, let me clear up one possible misconception right away. By national health insurance, we do not propose a government-operated health system as, for example in Great Britain. Rather, it would be a financial mechanism to pay for the costs of medical care for all people much like the present Medicare program for the elderly. A national health insurance program would not "interfere" with the clinical practice of medicine. Benefits under the program would be broad and should cover hospitalization, physician services in the office, home and hospital care, extended care as well as custodial care in nursing homes, home health services, outpatient and inpatient psychiatric services, eye examinations and prescriptions. Preventive health services such as physical examinations would be covered for members of comprehensive group practice prepayment plans or in community multi-phasic diagnostic centers for those beneficiaries who prefer to receive benefits from a physician on a fee-for-service basis.

We would propose universal coverage, including not only the working population and their families but also the unemployed, students in school and those on public assistance. Rather than a separate program for the poor such as Medicaid, all citizens would be covered on an equal basis, thereby implementing the concept of health as a basic human right.

THREE-WAY FINANCING PROPOSED

Coverage of those on public assistance and the unemployed naturally implies federal participation from general revenues. We, therefore, feel the program should be financed on a tripartite basis under social security, probably with the employer paying one-third, the employee paying one-third and the Federal Government participating by paying one-third from general revenues.

Physicians would be given a choice of practicing fulltime under the system or combining care of patients paid for by the system with care of those who prefer to pay for their care privately or of continuing to practice fulltime outside the system. But since most people would get their care under the system, care of patients under national health insurance would constitute the bulk of most physicians' practice. Whether caring for prepaid patients or for others, physicians would be free, as they are now, to practice alone or as members of a group. Physicians would also be free to choose to be paid by fee-for-service or by capitation, that is, periodic payments for each individual or family covering total health care. Capitation

payments would be payable for physician services or for entire health delivery systems, such as Kaiser or other group health plans which undertake a total responsibility for delivering comprehensive care.

Patients should have not just free choice of physicians but also free choice of health delivery systems. The government should not "freeze in" either the fee-for-service system or a capitation system. Rather, the national health insurance program should allow maximum flexibility in methods of paying for services so that innovations and experiments designed to develop new ways of delivering health care would be encouraged.

Since the trade union movement believes in competition, we think the interests of the American people would best be served by stimulating competition between health delivery systems. We also think that fee-for-service entrepreneurial medicine cannot, by its very nature, ever be efficient and would in time lose out to an organized system.

No one should get the idea that the AFL-CIO would favor a completely laissez-faire system under national health insurance. Frankly, we would not. Some of the trials and tribulations we have experienced under Medicare and some of the mistakes other countries have made under their national health insurance programs could be and should be avoided under a national health insurance program. We would not tolerate sky's-the-limit doctor fees and we would insist on both controls and incentives for moderating hospital charges. We would also want to institute some type of negotiation of physician fee schedules and hospital charges instead of present arrangements which largely permit providers to determine their own compensation. Moreover, we would do everything possible to provide appropriate incentives to improve quality, enhance efficiency and reduce the cost of medical care.

These are the bare bones of a national health insurance program for the American people. There remain a number of questions: How much such a program would cost? Can we afford it? Are there enough hospital beds? Enough physicians? Enough health manpower? These are indeed legitimate questions.

First, there is no doubt that if the unregulated fee-for-service, entrepreneurial system of delivering health care is to remain sacrosanct, then we may as well resign ourselves to inefficient, costly, fragmented and ineffective health care of inferior quality. But national health insurance, by providing financing for across-the-board health care, will help to move us away from predominant reliance on fee-for-service.

Total U.S. health expenditures in 1968 were over \$50 billion, 6.3 percent of the Gross National Product. This is more, not just in dollars but as a proportion of the total economy, than for any other country in the world. Great Britain, with its National Health Service which provides a scope of health services as broad as proposed in this article, spends less than 5 percent. Most other western countries have national health programs covering substantially all of their citizens. Yet they all spend less than we do as a percentage of their Gross National Product. On the basis of what we are now spending, the United States has ample resources to underwrite a national health insurance system covering the benefits outlined with the proviso that something will be done to begin to rationalize the health delivery system in this country.

ENOUGH HOSPITAL BEDS?

Next, let us examine the question of hospital beds. We have 3.9 hospital beds per 1,000 population. However, about one-third of these should be modernized to conform to minimum federal standards. The Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates an additional 75,000 beds are

needed under our unorganized system of delivering hospital services.

But it is conceivable that, with a more rational medical care system, we might now have too many beds! The fact that the group practice prepayment plans have but one-half the rate of hospital bed utilization as under conventional fee-for-service has been well documented. For both federal employees and for employees of the State of California, the number of hospital days per thousand enrolled under the group practice prepayment plans, as compared to those enrolled under Blue Cross and under commercial indemnity insurance for federal employees, was as follows for the contract year ending December 31, 1965: Blue Cross, 990; Commercial Insurance, 1,006; Group Practice Plans, 475.

The group practice prepayment plans used to use as a rule of thumb that two beds were required for every 1,000 subscribers. Now, as a result of experience they are planning on the basis of 1.7 to 1.8 beds per 1,000. This is less than half our present ratio. The backlog need for modernization of hospitals under the present "non-system" is estimated to be \$20 billion. Under an organized system of health care, most of these obsolete hospitals could be simply torn down.

PHYSICIANS ENOUGH NOW?

Now, just one more jolt. Under a rational system of health care, we might even now have enough physicians!

Prepaid group practice plans also make physicians' services more efficient so that fewer of them are needed in relation to the patient population. Kaiser Portland has one physician for every 1,500 subscribers. Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound has one physician for every 1,200 subscribers. The East Nassau clinic of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York has one physician for every 1,100 subscribers. Kaiser of Northern and Southern California likewise have one physician per 1,100 subscribers.

These ratios are for plans which have a fulltime medical staff. Let us be conservative. Let us assume that one physician per 1,000 population is needed. With about 200 million population, we would need 200,000 physicians. We have slightly over 300,000 doctors but, of course, many of them are in government, in fulltime teaching and research in our medical schools and some are retired.

It is estimated that there are 233,000 "patient seeing" physicians in the United States—more than we would need if health services were rationalized in this country!

With regard to nurses, dentists, psychiatrists and many categories of allied health personnel, we do need more health manpower but, except for psychiatrists, the training period is not as long as for physicians.

In order to implement a national health insurance program in the United States, we would propose a double attack. We realize, of course, that group practice prepayment plans will not become the predominant form of medical practice for many years to come—perhaps never. To solve our facility and manpower problems, we should support federal programs to meet these needs under our present "non-system" while at the same time federal funds should be provided to encourage large-scale development of new group practice prepayment plans in order to reduce our future requirements. At some time in the future, our increased supply of facility and manpower resources will converge with a gradually decreasing need for such resources as the health delivery system becomes more rational.

THE COST?

Now, let's talk about money. Can we afford national health insurance? For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, total expenditures for personal health services in the United States totaled \$41.5 billion or 5.4 percent of the Gross National Product. This

excludes expenditures for health facility constructions, medical research and other items not associated with personal health care. While a national health insurance program would certainly result in an increase in personal health services, assuming we can make some headway in rationalizing our delivery system I believe we could finance such a program providing more comprehensive and higher quality health services to the American people for no more and perhaps less than we are now spending for personal health services.

Moreover, a national health insurance plan as broad as the one outlined would not have cost \$41.5 billion in fiscal 1967 because there are some items of personal health expenditures included in the total figures that would not be covered, such as over-the-counter non-prescription drugs.

The more comprehensive group practice prepayment plans cover about 75 to 80 percent of the personal health expenditures of the subscribers and their benefits are roughly comparable to those outlined. Granted that such a comparison is rough, it would seem that an 80 percent coverage factor for a comprehensive national health insurance program should be reasonable. Eighty percent of \$41.5 billion is approximately \$33 billion.

With tripartite financing, this comes to an annual contribution of about \$11 billion each by employees, employers and from general revenues. Now, in fiscal 1967, total public expenditures—federal, state and local—for personal health services came to \$12.6 billion, of which \$7.8 billion were federal. If the appropriate adjustments are made to take account of the fact that public expenditures included Medicare payments partly financed by employer-employee contributions, federal expenditures out of general revenue combined with state and local expenditures for personal health services approximated \$11 billion. So the one-third government contribution for national health insurance would be less than what government is now paying for inadequate health care.

Labor is particularly interested in what the financial impact of national health insurance would be on workers. Health plans negotiated by unions under collective bargaining seldom meet more than 50 percent of the health expenditures of workers and their families. In addition, workers pay on the average one-seventh of the cost of their private health insurance. This means that workers today are paying for nearly two-thirds of their total health care costs. Under national health insurance, they would pay one-third in contributions plus 20 percent out-of-pocket or a total of 53 percent. But this would be for comprehensive across-the-board health care instead of the fragmented partial services they can afford today.

NO TAX INCREASE SEEN

From these facts, we conclude that a national health insurance program could now, or in the near future, be financed without increasing taxes and with most workers paying less for health care than they do today.

The time is now ripe to again make a determined effort to enact national health insurance. This is why the last AFL-CIO convention unanimously reaffirmed organized labor's longstanding support for national health insurance. And we resolved that organized labor should take the initiative to unite with other progressively minded groups in the nation in devising and promoting a medically advanced and economically sound program of national health insurance.

With the health services national health insurance would make possible, America could have the best medical care in the world. This is a goal worth striving for. It is time to bring the wonders of modern medicine to all the American people. It is time for national health insurance.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN THE UNIVERSITY

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. F. V. Pohle, professor of mathematics and chairman, department of mathematics, Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y., recently furnished me a copy of his paper entitled "Current Problems in the University." Professor Pohle is among those faculty members who object bitterly to the trends now in existence on many of our campuses and are trying to do something about them. Since the Members of the House have a strong interest in campus problems, I feel that they may wish to know about faculty viewpoints which, though they exist, have not been given too much publicity.

Obviously, no person would agree with each and every conclusion and recommendation of Professor Pohle, but in balance, I believe, his paper is one of the most accurate analysis of campus problems I have had the opportunity to review. I agree most strongly with his conclusion that universities should be run by competent and expert educators who are working with the Nation's most important resources—its youth. I insert Professor Pohle's paper in full in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN THE UNIVERSITY INTRODUCTION

You may wonder why I, a mathematician, have sought out every opportunity to address off-campus groups about problems in the university. My answer is that it is no longer possible to solve the problems of the university through discussions and acts on the campuses alone. The universities are virtually unable to govern themselves, as the events of the spring of 1969 have demonstrated over and over again. It is my conviction that the university can only be rescued by informed parents and the public at large, acting through their legislators.

The universities have been damaged and are threatened with greater damage in the near future. To avoid this calamity it will be necessary for the public to be much better informed than it has been on the nature of the problems the universities face. In addition to outlining some of the problems, I have suggested some possible remedies, so that constructive discussions can take place before new legislation is enacted.

For years university faculties and students have judged society and have found it wanting. Such criticisms, from whatever source, must be freely expressed.

But it is also time now for society to judge the university, its morality, its acts, and its shortcomings. That judgment, in my opinion, will be a harsh one.

I have taught full-time for 6 years at New York University (at the College of Liberal Arts, and in the College of Engineering), 10 years at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, and am in my 9th year at Adelphi University. I served in the U.S. Navy for 3 years during the second world war.

During my university work I have served on faculty senates, personnel committees,

¹ F. V. Pohle, Professor of Mathematics and Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Adelphi University, Garden City, New York.

curriculum committees, accreditation committees, and also served for more than a year recently on a screening committee for the selection of a president of Adelphi.

In addition to this experience I have close colleagues and former students at Cornell, Queens College, City College in New York, Berkeley, Stanford, Columbia, MIT, Harvard, and New York University. As a result of this experience it is my conviction that newspaper accounts have been grossly inaccurate and misleading as to the actual nature of the problems of the university today and that many spokesmen for the universities have been not less misleading.

These spokesmen have tried to divert the attention of the public so that donors, faculty and students will not be offended and that, in effect, the campus can continue "business as usual". They have made ringing statements (Perkins, Cornell) on Monday in defense of academic freedom and on Wednesday are smilingly photographed on the front page of the New York Times next to the gun-carrying hoodlum and the local SDS leader. And they have made strong statements (Hessburgh, Notre Dame) on Monday on campus disruptions and on Wednesday have issued statements that we should thank God for our rebellious students. But they have not been candid in explaining to the public what could be done to restore sanity to the campus—other than to do nothing.

The faculty, along with a fanatically indoctrinated minority of the students, must take the greatest share of the blame. Among all components which can be involved with the university (president, faculty, students, administration, trustees, alumni, parents, courts, newspapers, police) it is likely that when future studies are made of these agonizing days, they will show that there was one group with the least to be criticized for: the police.

The faculty have either been indifferent or have not rallied to the side of rationality in time for effective countermeasures to be taken. Some faculty have protested and have tried to restore sanity but it must be noted too that a number of fanatical faculty members (usually but not always concentrated in the departments of sociology, anthropology, political science, social work, and some of the humanities) have been busy urging the students to greater and greater demands.

These groups know that they have now evolved a working formula for success and they will continue to use it until they have brought the university to its knees on their terms. A minority of students have agreed with this program.

The administration has been all but powerless as a result of its own ineptness combined with faculty opposition to them. The trustees have gone along with the president, who all too often is essentially powerless without the backing of the faculty; the alumni have not taken a stand in time and parents have been perplexed, neutral, or enraged, all without effect. The courts have often been lenient or have even condoned too many acts even though there is some hope that the courts will now take a firmer stand. The newspapers have been hunting headlines for the most part and have not given a coherent account of the situation.

Finally, the police have been made into the main villains in a drama carefully rehearsed on many campuses: the refrain is always the same that the police are the enemy, that the campus is above the law, and that an administration which calls upon the police is without morality.

SOME MORAL JUDGMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Just as the war in Viet-Nam, and domestic issues, are viewed in uncompromising terms on the campuses, so let us apply the same standards to the university on the first issue and on some related issue. The argument which could be made might run as follows.

The opposition to the Viet-Nam war has

been carried out with such fanaticism as to undermine the will of the nation, and hence to prolong the war and to kill additional thousands on both sides and desperately compromise the ability of the United States to function in foreign or domestic affairs. Somehow moral judgments against Hanoi always seem to be totally lacking. The fanatics consider the withdrawal of Johnson from the presidential race last year as their supreme triumph, and the sign of even more power to come.

Therefore the university dissidents can justifiably be charged with the deliberate prolongation of the war and in making a reasonable peace all but impossible. I merely state this argument as a possible one to make against the university. It is entirely possible for the university to be accused, in the future, of a "stab in the back" to the nation. Society, in a state of crisis, could easily make such charges and they would have a great deal of validity. That matters would assuredly not be that simple may turn out to be irrelevant; the universities, having entered politics, cannot be expected to be immune from counter-attack.

Life on the campus is a good area for moral judgments to be made. Many of my colleagues would merely sneer at this and try to shame the listener into feeling that "more important" issues should be discussed instead. Yet I am sure that parents and the general public cannot and will not take such a casual attitude on questions of morality and the quality of life on or near the campus.

I refer to the issues of drugs, sex, and obscenity.

In the case of drugs, their use has either been condoned or ignored, and little effort has been made to make clear to our students that the campus is not a drug center or a rehabilitation center and will not become either one. Administrators have too often either turned away from the issues or have informed the students of impending police actions. Thus some faculty members and administrators have become accomplices to illegal and degrading acts. In addition, some faculty have openly advocated the use of drugs.

In the matter of sex, the tendency has been to run away from any and all moral judgments. The result has been the predictable one of setting up academic red-light districts which go under the name of co-ed dorms. Again, this is done under the wholly incorrect assumption that students can now set up their own life-style, and brutalize those who do not wish their privacy destroyed. We are expected to accept this as the highest revelation of inspired morality, but it amounts to the demand for society to subsidize its own destruction and to become a partner to something which it has never accepted. The faculty need not accept, on its own campuses, such arrangements, yet they have accepted this in a terrified state, always unable to hold out any guidance to any student.

Verbal and psychological assaults continue in lectures, and there is a pattern of dehumanization which the faculty has either tolerated, ignored, or at times initiated. If some immature faculty have this freedom, society can demand open disclosure too, and this is just what I intend to do at every opportunity. Why should society pay many thousands of dollars for an education which includes the enforced brutalization of a generation.

We will soon have, not the most moral generation, but the most brain-washed generation in our history, and a maimed one at that. Some professors may believe that the essence of present-day education is the introduction of material on oral-genital stimulation into their talks, but if parents now object and insist upon removal of their children with full re-payment of all tuition, I for one would support their complaint.

The issue of obscenity is no dream on the part of the public: too many campus publications could not, for their filth, perversion and obscenity, be allowed in the library or the home. The morally fanatic reply is that *something else* is the real obscenity, and how could a word, anyway, hurt anyone? However, we know from the Nazi experience how words can not only corrupt the language but also the spirit of a nation as well. Many college newspapers are deliberately brutalizing in their language, knowing full well that such dehumanization is needed for later violent actions. The faculty response to this has too often been silent agreement, abdication, toleration, indifference, or down-right encouragement—all in the name that, somehow or other, this is not evil, but the rest of the world is evil.

The list could be extended. It would show that the universities have not only criticized external evils but are guilty of a long list of self-created internal ones.

The obscenity and the degradation have been exported from the campus, and not (by and large) imported into it. It is therefore time for society to hold the university accountable for its acts, and to expose its moral shortcomings—and to impose some restraints. Specifically it is time for society to insist that

- (1) Co-ed dormitories be banned.
- (2) The faculty and administration acknowledge the seriousness of the drug problem and that the campus is not a rehabilitation center. Expulsions of both faculty and students are called for. The human destruction can no longer be stopped and the administration can no longer ignore the needs of society and must stop all cooperation with the students against the police. The faculty is *not* above the law, and the university is *not* a privileged sanctuary, with a self-created higher morality of its own.
- (3) Student publications, if found to be obscene, will have to be suspended by the faculty. It is not necessary for the faculty to tolerate this state of affairs and it will not do for the faculty to insist that, after all, obscenity cannot be defined to the satisfaction of everyone.

PARALLELS WITH NAZISM

The similarities between the actions in the German universities 35 years ago and present situations in the United States have often been commented upon. If the circumstances are not entirely analogous (and they are not) they are at least similar or parallel.

The young post World War I German generation under Hitler was indoctrinated as few generations have ever been indoctrinated. Over and over again they were told that:

"You are not the miserably immoral and corrupt generation which lost the great war! You did not stab this nation in the back! You are the first moral generation that the Fatherland has produced and with your moral courage and energy we will, together, build a New Order and a new nation to last 1000 years! Your absolute moral judgment will tell you what laws to obey in this rotten and corrupt society, a society which must first be destroyed before the New Order can take over!"

Now this is precisely what is preached to our young students, in modern terminology, in countless classes throughout the country, day in and day out, without adequate discussion, and to the point where many students are now acting upon the indoctrination they have received—justifying all acts on the basis of a moral fanaticism which is their weapon and their defense to all counterarguments. It is this type of immorality which has now been presented to us as the greatest morality of all. Ultimately, of course, the young Nazis also acted on the basis of their beliefs. If the situation in the United States is not yet the German one, it still has far too many similarities for any of us to expect the campuses to solve the problems with their present organization.

GOVERNANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The universities, nation-wide, must be subject to a uniform code of governance. The screams, too, will be nation-wide, but as the sequel will show, all this will demand of the faculty is that they assume the obligations society has the right to expect of them.

We note two facts: (1) the universities are subject to law and society can impose such codes of governance through legislation, boards of regents, accreditation agencies, and so on; (2) In the past many organizations (specifically and by way of example, the railroads, Wall Street, the banks) have mistakenly felt that their self-interest was either identical with that of the nation or even superior to it. They were wrong. Society *did* impose restraints upon their activities and wrote laws for their proper governance—and for the benefit of their activities and of society too.

The universities, in their supreme arrogance, must also learn the same lesson. Since their role in our life is so vital, society cannot accept the destruction of the university, either by internal fanatics or by uninformed and misguided outsiders. Although the present threat to academic freedom comes primarily from student fanatics and their faculty allies (and is internal), we must also see to it that this threat is treated just as seriously as an external one would be treated.

How? This is a question of governance: that is, the power to run and direct the university. It is this aspect which must be clarified and it must be based upon some clearly stated principles.

The first principle is that the students *cannot* run the university and that the favorite words "meaningful participation" cannot mean voting as equals with the faculty in the running of the university. Student opinions and suggestions must indeed—and always have been—sought by responsive faculty members and administrators. But this does not imply a voting voice for the following reasons:

(1) *The students do not have the competence of the faculty members and the university cannot be run except by equally competent people.* If the country is now willing to pay \$15,000 and often much more per year for senior faculty, we also must expect such faculty to do their important work and not assume that a vastly less qualified (and unpaid) student member is now his equal.

(2) *The Students have no professional responsibility for their acts. I do.* As a mathematician and also as a chairman of a department I have responsibilities to my university at times of accreditation, and at other times, when the state asks me for information and for evidence of complying with existing laws. Also there is no continuity in the student membership and each year another equally unqualified member would have to get on-the-job training to do what he never came to the university to do.

(3) *There is a direct conflict of interest in having voting students on standing committees, Boards of Trustees, and so on.* We see this most acutely on discipline committees where students can in effect judge themselves. Even if such students would take a harsh stand against the disrupters, the fact is that the students cannot be the judges of their own actions and this is of course well known by the activists and has made it all but impossible to enforce discipline on the campuses. There are enough weak-willed faculty members on such committees without adding students to it to make the work virtually impossible.

The remarks just made also point to some rational acts to take to restore proper governance to the university:

(1) *All standing committees of the faculty must have a majority (say 60%) of tenured (senior) faculty and no voting students or members present other than committee mem-*

bers when the final deliberations take place. Consultation with students should not be taken to mean direct voting participation or the presence of students in the committee room, since in that case the usual coercive emotional atmosphere can be generated to make rational actions impossible.

(2) *No members of the Board of Trustees should be appointed who have not had at least 10 years of experience after the granting of the BA degree:* they need this time to gain the minimum amount of maturity to make suggestions about the proper running of the university.

The recent appointment of a recent graduate (class of '69) to the Board of Trustees of Princeton University is a prime example of appeasement; the new member has no experience whatever for the post and could not be presumed to speak for anyone but himself, and has no subsequent experience to guide him. This appointment is nothing more than an attempt to buy off the opposition and to cool off what is considered to be a hot issue.

After all, when a dean or a chairman appears before the Board and is questioned on any matter where he must take into account the opinions and beliefs of others (say his faculty) he will make certain that he does speak for them. There is no comparable information available to the new graduate, intent upon starting a career or attending graduate school, and it is a disgrace to the cause of education that Princeton has seen fit to do this. Far from being a forward looking action it is precisely an illustration of how not to run a university. Whether coercively made or not, the addition will not strengthen the Board in making its difficult decisions.

(3) *Discipline is to be placed in the hands of the faculty and the administration alone, and ultimately with the President and the Board of Trustees.* Knowing all the facts, they are in the position to run the university, and not the students.

TEACHING LOADS; FINANCIAL SUPPORT; OTHER SUGGESTIONS

Although the matter of proper governance is at the heart of the problems before the university today, these are not the only ones. Among others we could mention, for example, the matter of lowering the voting age to 18. Not only is this entirely uncalled for, on the basis of maturity and insight, but it would encourage the politicization of the campus to a marked degree since now opportunists could also court the student vote and make further promises in the name of the students. While not all of this need be bad, it would intensify a situation which needs quieting down, and not heating up.

An investigation (or fact-finding) committee could do this nation a lasting service if the matter of teaching loads were thoroughly studied. Indeed my personal expectation is that this study would result in a national scandal. If we keep in mind that the productivity per man hour of a professor cannot change too much in the course of time (and cannot be remotely compared with a production worker in industry who bases his demand for more money upon the fact that he is able to produce more per hour) we see that society must make some adjustments for this fact, the faculties do (indirectly) produce wealth for the nation. However, society can in turn also make some demands: at least let the faculties teach and not turn over vast amounts of their proper work to teaching assistant. What many faculty currently want is an economic impossibility: more pay (7% or more per year in increases) for less work, and at constant unit productivity.

If any group in this nation suddenly and entirely on its own, reduced its work week by 25% and wanted more money at the same time, it would be headlined in every news-

paper and discussed on every editorial page. Over the past 15 years the teaching loads have been reduced by much more than 25%. Now, the faculty will at once insist that the work week is distinct from the teaching load, and that the amount of work has not been reduced, more research work is being done, more students are advised, and so on—and on. This is part of the truth, but it is only a part and a rather small one at that.

That teaching loads were too high 15-20 years ago is true enough, but some data on current teaching loads would do little credit to many faculty members, the more so when we look at the consequences: when the faculty do not teach many classes (or teach to huge classes numbered in the hundreds), the remaining classes are routinely turned over to teaching assistants, young students often with only the MA, little or no formal training in teaching, often with little interest in their work, underpaid, and with their minds on other matters (doctoral studies, family responsibilities).

If each university in the country were to list the amount of teaching actually done by the full-time faculty, part-time (or adjunct) faculty, teaching assistants, and so on, the nation could also judge matters more accurately. What has been done, of course, is to balance the financial books by having the assistants earn the money to allow the senior professors their large salaries and exceedingly comfortable working conditions. That many faculty members need such time off for scholarship and research is clear, but this does not mean that such arrangements have to be done at the expense of sound teaching. Society will have to recognize that the universities have been driven to this arrangement in self-defense, and not because they wished to ignore their students. If good teaching is essential (and it is) then it will have to be honorably rewarded on its own terms and not squeezed to help other activities.

The general matter of university financing is also approaching the state of scandal. It is often assumed that government or foundation support is a great boon to the university. This is, sad to say, a half-truth.

In the first place the university must put up money of its own, or have done so in the past, in order to obtain the money. Also the grant never pays for itself and indirect costs are but partly paid; office spaces, library holdings, and so on, are not paid for. Instead there is a selective exploitation of the university by outside (and well meaning) agencies. It also means that outside forces can control many internal changes of the universities and too many universities are at the mercy of such forces. As a result many excellent departments languish, since they are not currently visible or popular; yet they too are part of the university.

Some illustrations are in order: if we consider a university with a \$10,000,000 budget then it is certain that most of this sum is already spoken for and that little of it is free or "seed" money—perhaps not 3% of it, or \$300,000. Now the outside agency enters with its grant, say for an expanded program in a professional field; if the agency has \$250,000 for this purpose it could amount to the entire sum that the university has for such innovations. Therefore the universities accept the bait, enlarge the program, and after 5 years or so have to continue it on their own. That some good comes of these programs is of course true; but it also carries with it the fact that the university has lost control of its own future, and is in fact now at the mercy of outside forces. The results are a steady impoverishment of its situation, despite the outside money. And if the university refuses the money, then it will suffer through the loss of energetic staff members who, as true migratory workers, will gravitate to the newest center of affluence (temporarily at least). At the same time the other activi-

ties of the university, of little interest to the foundation, must be supported by the university and often must get by with sub-standard budgets.

Many of the acute problems of the university can be traced to this source of funding and it is time that this were also recognized and changed, since so many other problems depend upon its solution. The university is perhaps the only organization that uniformly sells its services at a loss!

ADDITIONAL MEASURES

Although investigation is clearly called for in the areas of teaching loads and in financing, in other areas quite different actions are called for. Just as the granting agencies hold out the carrot, so society should also hold out a stick. Tough as this sounds, I believe that society has a right to demand, for example, that the universities be kept open, or that if they are closed, there should be some consequences for the faculty and the administration of a financial kind.

In particular if a school is closed due to disruptions, or indeed even to avoid them, then twice the amount of tuition should be refunded to the parents (in private schools) or, in the public schools, twice the state aid should be forfeited. In addition, all faculty salaries should be forfeited during the time the university is closed. Thus if a faculty member earns \$15,000 for the 9-month academic year (39 weeks, or \$385/week, that is \$77/day) he should have his salary reduced \$77 for each day that the university is closed. This would provide him and others in the administration with some incentive to keep the university open for its prime mission in our culture. Too often the schools have been allowed to drift into this situation, or to use it without fear of the consequences. Society should not stand idly by during these closings and calmly accept the loss of education, the severe disruptions, and still pay all the bills.

Although changes are slowly taking place, the universities will have to take a more realistic stand on expulsions (with no right of re-admittance to the same university) not only with respect to the students, but also with respect to the faculty, if either group insists upon disruptive practices such as the seizure of buildings, refusal to teach classes entirely on their own moral judgment, and defying the laws on the campuses, still expecting amnesty for all their acts. Court decisions in many cases would seem to indicate that laws would also have to be re-written to clarify the obligations of students and faculty to conform to the law.

A related matter of importance, but one which cannot be fully discussed here, is the problem of establishing new and more suitable schools and colleges: we have too many students underqualified to be in the traditional college, and alternatives must be made available for those with different aptitudes and interests in life. At present far too many students are indirectly coerced into attending the traditional college, and cannot benefit from the work there.

The individual outside of the university can in any case do a great deal to change matters for the better. As a parent he should be in close touch with the university and be ready to exert his influence at every turn. As a taxpayer he should be alert to the needs and to the problems of all universities, especially the state-supported ones. Above all, he can remain in close touch with those members—presently far too few—on campuses who are trying to preserve the integrity of the university in our society. (Such groups are currently being organized on campuses throughout the country by S. Hook and S. I. Hayakawa.)

SOME PREDICTIONS

If present trends continue it is fairly easy to make some predictions:

(1) *Acceptance of pass/fail systems (or ungraded systems in the final analysis):*

though put forward to minimize competition (and therefore humanize learning) this will surely tend to downgrade learning everywhere.

(2) *Abolition of the tenure system*, on the ground that students, to get good teaching, must not only select those professors whom they want, but also those whom they do not want. Again this is put forth in absolutist moral tones but the practical consequences will be at best a popularity poll to select and retain professors, or at worst the setting up of political tests to throw out the opponents. The latter, of course, is one of the practical intentions of the activist students and junior (untenured) faculty.

(3) *Unless alternatives are offered in the form of new schools, more and more under-qualified students will be forced into the universities.* This will also have the practical effect (intended at least in part by the activists) of excluding able students. Inevitably there will be pressure for racial criteria for admission and indirect ones for the exclusion of other races or religions. We have indeed seen some of these forces at work at the City College of New York, during the late spring of 1969. It was in this college that the deadly issue of negotiating away admissions standards was allowed to become a matter of negotiation between the administration and some dissident students.

(4) *Able faculty will leave as soon as possible for other schools where the problems either do not exist or are still in a manageable form.*

(5) *Steady erosion of academic freedom and the setting up of restraints to open discussion on the campus, by insiders, not by outsiders.*

(6) *Serious scholarly work will become less and less possible.*

(7) *The "life-style" on the campus (and near it) will become more and more destructively oriented, both with respect to moral conduct, and to the use of drugs. This may be dismissed by all too many faculty members and students, but the society at large will ignore these developments at its peril.*

CONCLUSIONS

Society, through its legislators, must now face the issues of university governance and the additional issues that have been outlined (financing, teaching loads in particular) and to take appropriate actions.

Indeed the main hope in giving this talk was to suggest some specific solutions and tasks so that we can move from the endless discussions of campus difficulties to their realistic solution.

The time still remaining to avert permanent damage to the university is short, and outside forces must now come to the aid of the university so that—once more—we can restore its integrity and instill a sense of purpose to university life.

YOUTH BRIDGES THE GENERATION GAP

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable young constituent of mine, Susan Heller, had the honor of delivering the valedictorian address at the Sands Point Academy and Country Day School this past June.

Susan's message to her classmates is an extremely perceptive and most appropriate statement of youth's concern with the problems of today. Indeed, it reaches out beyond the generation gap, speak-

ing to parents and Susan's elders—reflecting vividly the awareness and sensitivity of today's youth.

I was greatly impressed by it, and feel that its message merits the attention of all of my colleagues.

The address follows:

SUSAN HELLER'S VALEDICTORIAN ADDRESS, SANDS POINT ACADEMY AND COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, AT GRADUATION EXERCISES ON JUNE 13, 1969

This is our last day of school at Sands Point Academy and Country Day School. When I first came here, we didn't even have a senior class, and now I'm proud to be valedictorian at our fourth graduation.

Next fall, we will be entering various colleges and universities across the country, the culmination of our years at Sands Point. When we arrive, and become assimilated into the college community, we will begin to apply the knowledge we have acquired at Sands Point towards gaining an understanding of the changing world around us, from which we have been largely insulated. We seem to be at a turning point in history. Man first underwent an agricultural revolution, and then, in the nineteenth century, the beginnings of the industrial revolution. Today one side of the world knows instantaneously what is happening on the other side, and the world has become truly small. This revolution has created new problems, many of which may not be solved by using past methods.

Another effect of this revolution is the growing dependence of people on mass media and other mass forms of communication. This gives the media tremendous power, which it may misuse in an effort to entertain instead of inform. The media tends to emphasize the more exciting aspects of an event, publicizing those details which will make "good copy". By this method of overamplification, certain feedbacks will develop in the system, as witnessed in the recent furor over campus rebellion.

On campuses today, there are some students who feel that America has not quite fulfilled the goals of freedom and democracy that its founders proposed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution. There are certain aspects of modern society that they feel should be changed. Tremendous emphasis has been placed by the media on those who feel that the channels provided by our government are not doing the job they should be doing.

This militant minority has been using violent means to achieve their ends, means which include interfering with the other students' right to attend classes. Because of this a backlash forms, and polarization occurs. This polarization has resulted in the increased closed-mindedness of both generations. We cannot allow this trend to continue, for without open minds, communication becomes impossible, and without communication, man is just another animal.

One of the difficulties in trying to reconcile the militants to the administration's way of thinking is the greatly enlarged size of the campuses. Most of the colleges and universities which we are going to attend have grown tremendously in the past few years. This makes personal communication between students, faculty, and administration proportionately harder.

One of the unique attributes of Sands Point is its small size, which enables the student to get individual attention. Unfortunately, this cannot hold true for a "megaversity" of forty thousand in which the student is reduced to a number instead of being treated as a person.

The growth of the university is largely due to the change in its role, from an educational institution to a training school. Since a college degree is necessary for a professional job, and since these jobs are more

in demand than they used to be, the college has had to grow in order to accommodate the enlarged number of applicants.

Today, college enrollments mainly consist of students from middle and lower class homes who need an education in order to get a good job rather than a wealthy few who go to college simply because it is nice to have some higher education. The university must consider its changed roles in society, and the ramifications of this.

In these ways, the technological revolution will affect us in college. It seems that whether we like it or not, as college students we will be objects of national interest. How we react to this depends upon our individual personalities and beliefs. If we, in the future, look back upon our Sands Point experience objectively, and remember to keep an open mind, it will help us to make the judgments that will be essential to us in this most recent revolution.

Thank you for listening.

THE TIDE OF TAX REFORM

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the past month has been a momentous one for the House of Representatives. We have passed two truly significant pieces of legislation: the 10-percent surtax bill and, most importantly, the Tax Reform Act of 1969. The latter is the most comprehensive tax reform bill ever to be passed by this body.

The Washington Post published an editorial on this subject last Saturday, August 9, and I am taking this opportunity to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of those Members who may not have seen it.

The editorial follows:

THE TIDE OF TAX REFORM

Nothing is more powerful, as the old saying goes, than an idea whose time has come. That is the chief explanation for the remarkable 394-30 vote in the House of Representatives for the tax-reform bill. Congress is well aware of a strong national demand for more equitable distribution of the tax burden and for tax relief, and this lusty vote in the House is a virtual guarantee that a tax-reform bill will be enacted before the present session adjourns.

In the light of this vote the great mystery is why some legislators insisted over a long period that tax reform be tied to extension of the surtax. The surtax bill, which itself had been sweetened with some important reforms, barely squeaked through the House after a number of votes had been changed to save it from failure. Yet some responsible legislators, including the Majority Leader of the Senate, held up the essential extension of the surtax bill for weeks on the flimsy argument that some linkage between the two measures was necessary to the achievement of the tax reform.

Actually, the roaring success of the reform measure has carried with it the 1970 portion of the surtax extension, which might otherwise have been in trouble. In our opinion, there has been no solid ground at any time since the first of the year for the assumption that Congress might balk at the showdown on tax reform if it stood alone. An enormous amount of time and energy was wasted fighting a chimera.

Our feeling has been from the beginning of the controversy that both renewal of the surcharge for a year and far-ranging tax reform were essential. We still think so. For-

fortunately, there appears to be no basic disagreement on either point between the administration and Congress, despite the differences in regard to timing and some details. It is a relief that the futile wrangling over the timing of the respective bills has now been resolved. All that remains is for the Senate to perform as well as the House has done on the reform front. There are many provisions in the House bill which call for scrutiny on the Senate side, but the general dimensions of the bill are likely to stand. The Ways and Means Committee and the House are entitled to generous credit for the outcome in the face of very persistent skepticism.

QUOTA INTERNATIONAL

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts is honored to have as resident the international president of a very distinguished service organization, Quota International. When Miss Edwina Gies of Wellesley, Mass., was installed in this office on July 12, 1969, at the Washington Hilton Hotel, she delivered an outstanding statement of acceptance before a convention membership of 800 Quotarians. I should like to share the text of Miss Gies' remarks with my colleagues. No one can dispute the importance of the theme proposed by Miss Gies for her year's term of office. Quota International's remarkable public service in several lands is in many respects a direct result of wide commitment to Miss Gies' challenge, "Aim high—seek new horizons." Her statement follows:

REMARKS OF EDWINA GIES

We have just completed the first half of Quota's first century and are embarking on the second part of this momentous era. In accepting the office of President, I am deeply privileged and honored and, with God's help, will carry out the responsibilities you have entrusted to me. It is an inspiring challenge to continue the work that has been so well done by those officers who have preceded me.

My Quota associations span the really short period of fifteen years, but in that time I have come to realize the importance of our cause and to cherish all that Quota has already given to me in good friendship and in the satisfaction that comes from helping others. I am grateful for the opportunity to serve Quota and I know that the Board of Directors elected at this Convention will do everything possible to further the objects of our organization.

Ten years ago we "Set our Sights for the Sixties"—planning for a decade of progress. Ten years ago our membership totalled 11,000. Today our membership stands at 12,169. Ten years ago our clubs numbered 365. Today we are 399 clubs. So the sixties have been years of progress.

Now some of our members will immediately say this progress has been far too slow—we are travelling at a snail's pace. They will say that Service Clubs have outlived their usefulness and have no place in this modern world where governments seem to be assuming all responsibility for the needs of the people. They will say that, if we are to continue, we must change our thinking and simply become a part of the government structure for social welfare.

I do not subscribe to these theories. I believe that the need for service clubs is just as great now as it was fifty years ago. Unselfish involvement in worthy causes by individuals and groups will continue to exist as long as people are free to act voluntarily.

If Quota has failed to grow as rapidly as it should have done, the fault lies in our failure to reach out in a positive approach because of the negative attitude of some members.

The basic areas of Service of Quota do not need to be changed. But perhaps we do need to revise our approach to these programs of service. It is not enough to do the same things year after year. We must have new ideas coordinated to the dynamic years in which we live.

Service to Girls—Is your club satisfied to furnish a new dress to a high school graduate because you have always done this?

Service to the Hearing and Speech Handicapped—Is your club satisfied to have a hearing aid repaired because you have always done this?

Community Service—Is your club satisfied to give Thanksgiving Food Baskets to the needy because you have always done this?

International Relations—Is your club satisfied to have one program a year on the United Nations because you have always done this?

Now there is nothing basically wrong with a new dress for the Senior Prom, or with repairing a Hearing Aid, or with giving Food Baskets, or with having one United Nations program. All of these things may still be needed in your community.

The point I wish to emphasize is that this type of service alone, be it done by a large club or a small club, is not enough. We must approach service with open minds and not be satisfied with the same programs we have always had.

We live in an exciting, changing world, and we must be ready for change when it is needed.

Our graduating girl could probably have acquired that new dress herself, if a Quota Club had helped her organize her time and had showed her how to help herself.

The hearing aid may not be needed, if the youngster has the opportunity of attending a good school for the Hearing Handicapped, staffed with trained teachers whose education was financed by a Quota Club.

Perhaps the food baskets would not be necessary, if we directed our energies to helping the less fortunate to help themselves.

We might truly be furthering the cause of International good will and understanding, if we supported the Exchange Student Programs—people living together truly can understand one another.

We will do what needs to be done, if we have the vision to see the opportunity and the courage to accept the challenge.

I lived in this city of Washington during World War II and to me it is visual evidence of what can be done. The magnificent capitol building was started in 1793, just ten years after the treaty which established the independence of the States. A tremendous undertaking for a new, little country: The men who planned this city had courage. They made no little plans. They aimed high. I never return to Washington and view it on the flight in without a feeling of excitement and gratitude for those who accepted the challenge to Aim High for the future.

I know our Canadian Quotarians must feel the same about the magnificent city of Ottawa, and certainly Australians are proud of their new capitol at Canberra.

Within a few days we shall be sending our astronauts on that long journey to the moon. This program is the culmination of planning, of courage, and of aiming high.

Throughout the history of mankind successes have been achieved by those who said we will do it—not by those who said it cannot be done.

Quota will continue to expand, and to expand more rapidly, if every member will say it can be done—if every member will be willing to accept changes that are inevitable because of the tremendous changes we are seeing in the social structure of the world today.

An open-minded and forward look in our Service programs will result in an increase in membership. Only a meaningful service program will create the opportunity for unselfish involvement in worthy causes.

We need new clubs and these we shall have, provided we have persons willing to do organizational work. I believe we have an untapped reservoir of these people in the affiliate members of Quota. Many members in this classification are energetic, alert women with great knowledge of Quota, and I call upon them to offer their services to Quota International for organizational work.

We need growth in our present clubs. Your International Presidents for the past several years have given you a challenge in membership growth. Some clubs have accepted the challenge and have met the goals. Too many clubs have taken the negative approach of "we cannot get new members" and have failed to meet the goals.

The financial budget which has been prepared for the coming year has been based on a membership of 13,000. To achieve this number, I ask each of our 399 clubs to give us a net increase of two members. This can be done if we all take a positive approach.

There is nothing to be gained if we do not try. There is a whole new, exciting, enlarged Quota world, if we only reach out for it.

If we have the vision to see the opportunity and the courage to accept the challenge, we will make the second half of our first century an era never to be forgotten. For the year ahead, I propose to you just one theme: "Aim high—seek new horizons."

HOW BRIDGE HELPED TO SHORTEN A BIG WAR

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Record the following article entitled, "How Bridge Helped To Shorten A Big War." This article appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, July 30, 1969, and is about a book, "Bridge at Remagen" written by one of our esteemed colleagues, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, Fourth District of West Virginia. The movie based on this book is currently showing in the Washington area.

The article follows:

HOW BRIDGE HELPED TO SHORTEN A BIG WAR (By David Jones)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes it's the things that don't happen that count in a war.

The Germans didn't blow up one iron bridge.

Sixty-one days later Hitler's survivors surrendered.

The Ludendorff bridge that crossed the Rhine River at the resort town of Remagen didn't make the difference between winning the war. By that time Germany, despite its new rockets and its jet planes, had already lost.

But it did shorten the war by weeks, perhaps months.

It saved perhaps thousands of lives on both sides that would have been lost had

Hitler's fanatical attempt to stem the Allied tide been stretched out.

The Allies hadn't even given serious thought to taking a bridge across the Rhine intact. Eisenhower had dreamed a little, but not much. The Germans would surely destroy them all.

There had been two attempts to capture a Rhine bridge. Both failed.

Thus it was with enormous surprise that an advance American unit, looking down at the town of Remagen Mar. 7, 1945, saw the Ludendorff Bridge standing.

Rep. Ken Hechler (D-W. Va.) has lived with that bridge for 24 years. He attributes his seat in Congress to it. He covered the bridge, first as a war historian, then as a writer telling the story, and finally as a technical adviser for the new movie, "The Bridge at Remagen."

His life with the bridge began when the Allied troops poured across the bridge and the Germans, incredibly, failed to blow it up.

TWISTING A KEY

From the safety of a tunnel, a German officer twisted a key that was supposed to send the entire structure soaring into the sky. A few minutes before, when he checked the wiring while the last Germans sought safety by dashing across the bridge, everything had seemed perfect.

But now it failed to work. Frantically, as the Americans charged toward the eastern shore, he turned the key again and again.

Just why the charges failed has never been explained. Some forced laborers, Poles and Russians, claimed they had sabotaged the wiring, but it was encased in a cast iron pipe.

Two German soldiers ran frantically to the bridge to light a fuse leading to an emergency charge. The attempt was successful but in the confusion of the falling Reich the defenders, who had asked for 600 pounds of high-grade explosives, had received only 300 pounds of inferior industrial explosives.

The charge went off, the bridge seemed to lift into the air and then, agonizingly, slowly resettle intact.

A LUCKY BLAST?

Hechler's own theory is that a lucky blast by American tanks trying to protect the advancing troops broke the pipe carrying the charge wires.

Ten days later the structure, weakened by the explosion, would collapse, but on that late March afternoon it was still crossable—a bridge into the German heartland.

Hechler was then an Army captain, a former history professor, who was charged with writing the history of the major battles as quickly after they occurred as possible. He happened to be near Remagen and was sent in to gather data even as the Germans were launching a desperate counter-attack.

For the next few days the Nazis threw troops, jet planes, artillery, V-2 bombs, and even demolition swimmers into the battle. Nothing apparently worked, but 10 days after the bridge was captured the structure suddenly, and without warning, fell, killing 28 engineers who were trying to strengthen and repair it.

By the time it went down, however, the Americans had constructed two pontoon bridges across the Rhine and pushed troops out into Germany. The Rhine had been irrevocably leaped.

Hechler duly wrote his official history and returned to civilian life. Then, as he tells in "The Bridge at Remagen," "during Christmas vacation in 1953, I was cleaning out some old files when I came across the wartime notes and interviews concerning Remagen Bridge, decided they had rested long enough, and set out to complete the story."

ABOUT 500 VETERANS OF ACTION

Thus began Hechler's second personal battle of Remagen. Through the Army he was able to contact about 500 veterans of the

action, and in the summer of 1954 he returned to the town to talk to the Germans who had seen and participated in the action. He found the bridge stripped to its piers and towers. It has never been rebuilt.

He had to battle for an accurate history through the thousand frustrations that beset an author. Honest men remember the same incident differently, or try to distinguish themselves or try to ease guilt when talking to a historian.

The publisher didn't want so many personal touches but more military detail—what unit was where when. This can be fine for an official history but distracting to a narrative.

"I fought to keep my opening chapter in (in which the mother of the lieutenant who led the charge was informed of her son's heroism—a particularly poignant passage because the mother was a German war bride of World War I who had relatives fighting for the Nazis) but I had to trim quite a few things I wanted to keep," Hechler says.

The book gave Hechler the satisfaction of doing something he felt had to be done. But it had an unexpected side benefit—a seat in the U.S. Congress.

A TOUCH OF BRANDEIS

"I had been teaching at Princeton University when I came under the influence of Justice (Louis) Brandeis. He urged the greatness in smallness, how much better it was to be an integral part of a small unit than lost in a large one. So I took a job at Marshall University in Huntington, W. Va.

"The students and I began discussing various theories of government and, almost as a lark, they asked me why I didn't run for Congress so I could put my theories into practice.

"It started as a kind of a joke. Then I filed for the Democratic nomination and things got serious. Dr. Will E. Neal, a Republican, was the incumbent. To meet him I had to get by a Democratic primary with a tough machine opponent.

"I was unknown, having been in the state only a year, but the students worked hard, and then the book came out in paperback.

"The publisher had 15,000 special editions with my campaign platform printed as a foreword rushed to me. I became locally known."

OPTION TO SCHULBERG

It was 1958, 13 years after the fall of Germany and five after he found the notes in his attic. But the events had made Ken Hechler a congressman.

After publication came movie offers. Hechler sold an option to Budd ("What Makes Sammy Run") Schulberg. For several years Schulberg picked up the options faithfully, and then Sherman Gruenberg bought options for a few years. Then they ran out.

Along came David Wolper, TV documentary producer par excellence ("The Making of the President," "Escape to Freedom") who is now branching into movies ("The Devil's Brigade," "If It's Tuesday, This Must Be Belgium").

Wolper started checking out locations. The site at Remagen was out—lucrative commercial traffic down the Rhine wouldn't stop long enough to shoot the picture and besides, the area had changed too much since 1945. The expense of rebuilding the bridge was prohibitive.

No place in the United States would substitute for Remagen.

Finally a bridge was found at Davle, Czechoslovakia, some 15 kilometers south of Prague. Davle looked enough like Remagen to be a double and the Czechs agreed to halt bridge and water traffic on the Vitava River for a minimum of five months. Wolper drilled a phony railroad tunnel part way into a nearby hill.

The agreement was made with the conservative Communist government of Antonin Novotny.

BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Because the movie was being made behind the Iron Curtain the Defense Department wouldn't lend Wolper the assistance it usually gives when Hollywood makes a war movie. That didn't stop Wolper. He simply leased from the Austrian government the military equipment they had received from the U.S. years ago.

By this time the liberal regime of Alexander Dubcek had replaced Novotny and the conservative Communist propaganda mills outside the Czech border began heating up.

This was no simple movie crew, charged the East German "Berliner Zeitung." These were, "busloads of American troops arriving in Prague disguised as tourists, actors and film technicians," to support the Dubcek regime.

The World War II tanks and weapons, claimed the Germans, constituted a "grave and serious threat to the security of the Communist bloc."

The Czech government largely ignored the tirades and work proceeded peacefully enough on the movie. Then came August, 1968, and the Russians attacked.

Rep. Hechler, had left the production site on a flight to London just hours before the invasion, but for all his staff knew he was a prisoner. It took 48 hours to get the mess straightened out.

FLEEING INVASION

The movie company, including actors George Segal, Ben Gazzara, and Robert Vaughn had to flee Prague by motorcade, finally crossing the Czech border into Austria. The military props and equipment were left behind. The Russians finally gave them back to the Austrians.

With the original set denied him Wolper had to search desperately for a new site. He found it at Castel Gandolfo, Italy, right under the summer home of one of the world's better known citizens.

Had he felt like it Pope Paul could have thrown rocks off his terrace at the advancing troops.

To save money Wolper only constructed a short section of the bridge.

"They did a remarkable job in matching the sets and locale scenes," says Hechler. "I defy you to tell me which ones were shot in Italy and which were shot in Czechoslovakia."

Another tunnel was built in Hamburg, Germany, where the final interior scenes were finished.

The movie "Bridge at Remagen" is not entirely like the book "Bridge at Remagen." Where the book dealt with the real heroes by name the movie has a fictional platoon.

This, says Hechler, gave the film makers freedom with some story lines and personality traits, although readers of the book should have little trouble figuring out who is who.

How does Hechler, the author, look at the movie?

"The 'feel' is very close to the original action. Oh, there are some details I could carp over, but they've done a fine job of tightening the suspense by showing both sides with the bridge as the focal point."

LONELY GI AND LOVELY GIRL

The still photographs of the movie give one pause. We have the old Hollywood standby of the lovely girl and the lonely GI (with the new morality she offers favors to him in exchange for a pack of cigarettes).

Then there is the scene where the lieutenant gives an order his men don't want to obey so he holds a rifle on the hero and again orders him across the bridge.

Old hat? Indeed! But the director is John Guillermin, who took some clichés wrapped up in a literate script and turned out a first-rate drama in "The Blue Max." His "Guns of Batasi" also won high praise.

"Remagen" has a cast of some of the best young actors in the industry and Hechler thinks George Segal should win an Academy Award for his performance.

(For the record, Hechler sold the screen rights for a fixed sum, so whether the movie does well or poorly is, at least financially, a matter of no concern to him.)

Presumably, after the actual event, the book and the movie Hechler's working connecting with the Remagen bridge would seem to be over. "Don't count on it," he says.

"This incident has been such a part of my life, and has had such an effect on my career, that I wouldn't be surprised if it continued to have some influence."

Even if it doesn't it has been a dramatic connection.

"It's hard to believe," blares one movie ad, "That after the Rape of Poland, the Fall of France, the Blitz of London and the Siege of Leningrad, one of the final blows of World War II came at a little iron bridge."

For once Hollywood doesn't overstate the case.

LIBERTY BELL

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a very fine poem written by a constituent of mine, Marie S. Bordner, of New Hope, Pa. "Liberty Bell" has been accepted by the U.S. Park Service to hang permanently in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, and I recommend it highly to my colleagues and to all who read the RECORD.

LIBERTY BELL

(NOTE.—From "A Goodly Heritage": Poems of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Poetry Society, Inc., Copyright 1968).

It rang in answer to the ancient cry,
Let us be free! The mighty sound surged on
To fill the universe, rose to the sky
To reach the stars men set their hopes upon.
The creed divine that steeled the arms and
thrilled

The hearts of those who fought at Lexington
Rings down the ages! It will not be stilled
Till every war for freedom shall be won.
Could they but know, those fervent, stalwart
men,

It still reverberates . . . as when a hand
Casts one small pebble into water . . . then
Can never stop the rippling to the land.

For Liberty shall widen more and more,
Stir every heart and touch on every shore.

It rang again for all the world to hear
The deeper tones. They had been amplified
By what had gone before; and far and near
They intonate the earth where men have died
Who kept the faith . . . to where the poppy
grows

In far-off France, though once it drooped in
grief;

To where the English Hawthorne and the rose
Pay homage to their dust with bud and leaf;
To farthest jungles where with eerie light
The moon seeks out the places where they
fell,

Marks them with beauty through the lonely
night,

Mourns with the palms their only sentinel.

These are the ones who gave it strength and
power,

Who died to hasten our victorious hour!

Listen, America! It rings today!
Discord shall never drown it out! The force
It roused no power but God alone can stay.
For righteousness and peace it sets our
course.

The homeless hear it and take heart again;
The hungry falter in their cry for bread;
Deeper than agony to those in pain,
It answers them, and they are comforted.

For us the bell will always ring most clear.
That clarion call declares majestically,
"The strong go on! The brave, the just will
hear

Who disregard their safety to be free!"

Oh, never cease to listen; count no cost;
Let not one single note of it be lost!

MARIE S. BORDNER.

INDUSTRIAL LEADERS AND WORKERS BOTH APPRECIATED REPRESENTATIVE BATES

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated here before, I was privileged to serve for years with the late Congressman Bill Bates, my distinguished colleague from my home State of Massachusetts, as cochairman of the informal House Footwear Committee. Together we sponsored many bipartisan efforts to aid our beleaguered shoe industry. I am continuing to carry on the fight we launched together; and I feel it was a tribute to Bill Bates that more than 300 Members of this House joined in signing our petition to President Nixon, which we hope may lead to needed voluntary controls on the devastating flood of foreign shoe imports.

In my close association with this fine man who has been wrested from our midst, I learned that he and his public service were appreciated by labor and management in many other areas besides the footwear industry. I would, therefore, like to quote some of the reactions to Bill Bates' passing.

Maxwell Field, executive vice president of both the National Footwear Manufacturers Association and the New England Footwear Association, in a letter to Mrs. Bates said:

Representative William Bates was a loyal friend and stalwart supporter of the shoe industry during all the years he served in Congress. He was always the first to come to the aid of any shoe manufacturer or tanner, or their workers, if they had any serious problems, such as the current one on foreign footwear imports. In every respect he was much like his famous father, George.

John E. Mara, president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, wired Congressman Bates' office:

40,000 members of the Boot and Shoe Workers Union saddened by the tragic death of Bill Bates who fought their greatest battle in sickness and health and lost his own. Deep sympathy to his family and colleagues.

Angelo Georgian, general secretary-treasurer of the United Shoe Workers of America—AFL-CIO—in a telegram to Mrs. Bates:

The general officers and members of the United Shoe Workers of America AFL-CIO extend their sincere and heartfelt sympathy and condolences. We were shocked to learn of the Congressman's death, and his loss will be keenly felt by all of us. May God bless you and keep you and yours in your hour of sorrow.

Robert A. Chadbourne, executive vice president of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, sent this telegram to Congressman Bates' Washington office:

All of us are deeply saddened by the death of Congressman William H. Bates. Massachusetts has lost an outstanding national leader and devoted citizen, and Massachusetts industry has lost a great friend. On behalf of the officers, members and staff of A.I.M. please accept and convey to Mrs. Bates our heartfelt sympathy.

H. N. Snook, general manager, Merimack Valley Works, Western Electric Co., North Andover, Mass., wrote to Bill Bates' widow:

It is with the deepest personal grief that I write to express to you my sincere sympathy on the death of your husband. To me, Bill was not only a dedicated, conscientious man, devoted to the service of the people, he was also a kind, gentle person whose friendship provided inspiration to all of us who knew him.

Bill served his country in time of war and time of peace with a strength of duty that was unswerving in its determination that the cause of humanitarianism should be forever at the forefront in the wishes and deeds of man.

I would like you to know that my thoughts—and those of his many friends at Western Electric—are with you at this time.

Daniel S. Lisberger, general manager, investment department, General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass., wrote to Mrs. Bates:

I was deeply shocked and very saddened to learn the news of your great loss. Like so many others, I was very fond of your husband and looked forward to the occasions when we had a chance to be together.

He was not only a fine man, but a truly wonderful public servant. We will miss him very much.

HONORS FROM FISHERMEN

"The Gloucester Fishermen" was the way the card was signed, advising Jean Bates that a generous contribution had been made to the American Cancer Society in her husband's memory. Through Salvatore J. Favazza, executive secretary of the city of Gloucester Fisheries Commission, Mrs. Bates learned that many fishermen had donated to this token in honor of the man who, year in and year out, had worked for ways and means of assisting the fishing industry.

Nothing could better illustrate how highly the fishermen and others concerned with the American fishing industry regard Congressman Bates than this editorial which appeared in the Gloucester Daily Times:

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Daily Times
July 29, 1969]

A WAY TO REMEMBER BILL BATES

Congressman William H. Bates worked diligently for his constituency on Cape Ann during a dedicated political career which spanned more than 20 years.

This diligence and dedication should not go unremembered.

Bill Bates should be remembered as the man who worked so well to have Gloucester recognized as an economically depressed area, thereby opening many of the federal funding doors our present city administration is now utilizing.

Bill Bates should be remembered as the man who helped greatly to bring the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries North Atlantic Regional headquarters and other establishments with resulting federal commitment to the fish industry.

And Bill Bates should be remembered as the man principally responsible for construction of the \$650,000 Marine Products Development irradiator in the BCF Technological Laboratory on Emerson Avenue, Gloucester.

Bill Bates should be remembered.

But will he be?

What would be more fitting than to memorialize Bill Bates, as he should be memorialized by officially giving his name to the irradiator? After all, he caused it to be.

This facility is already informally known as the Bates irradiator due to the late Congressman's enthusiastic support of the project from its first vague inception back in 1960.

Let's make the designation official. Let's demonstrate our appreciation of his life's work in a way most meaningful. Let's remember a man who represented value among men. What better way to remember Bill Bates?

In Washington Bill Bates will be remembered as the Congressman who carried irradiated fish in his pocket, prepared at any moment to show the Gloucester product to any interested person. It was a standing joke on Capitol Hill and widely applauded. He used his fish as a gimmick to gain support for the irradiator whenever its federal funds were threatened by cost conscious administrators. And his gimmick usually worked.

Just prior to his death Bates once again expressed his dedication to the irradiator (and to Gloucester) by appealing from his hospital bed at the Bethesda Naval Center, for the continued Atomic Energy Commission funding of a key project now underway at the Gloucester Lab.

Though hospitalized with what then was known to be a terminal illness, Bill Bates fought to have AEC funds recommitted to the irradiator and to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries animal feeding studies, designed to prove that irradiated food is safe for human consumption.

Bill Bates knew the value of these feeding studies. He knew that now, especially now, they must be continued lest all of the previous experimental work at the irradiator go to waste for lack of empirical evidence. Bill Bates was that committed.

Fittingly, one of Bill Bates' last official acts as the U.S. Congressman from the Sixth District was to fight (and win) to have the AEC restore \$750,000 for food irradiation studies in the 1970 fiscal budget.

We think this sort of commitment deserves recognition, a fitting memorial to work well done. We do not doubt that he will be otherwise remembered, for the leather workers in Peabody will surely remember him, together with Gloucester fishermen, as long as they survive.

He will also no doubt be remembered by many of those who returned him to Washington for 20 consecutive years.

But sometimes memory needs a mnemonic, an aid to prompt recollection more readily. To remember we believe is to value.

Even recognizing the sometimes puerile fetish we Americans have for naming things in memory of persons, the practice we feel remains to be one of the best means we have to remember an individual's contribution to the common good.

When the United States follows the

example of Germany and the Soviet Union and begins to allow the sale of irradiated food for human consumption, let's remember the role Bill Bates played in the early history of this exciting process of the future.

It is with the future in mind that we propose that he be memorialized by the official designation of the Gloucester Marine Products Development irradiator as "The William H. Bates Irradiator."

And who is to say, perhaps we also memorialize ourselves by doing so.

H. E. Crowther, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, addressed this message to Congressman Bates' widow:

On behalf of the entire staff of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, may I express our deep sympathy to you on the loss of your husband.

Over the years, we maintained a close working relationship with Bill. He was very dedicated to the welfare of the American fisherman and will be long remembered for his deep and sincere interest in improving the economic status of the fishing industry.

His passing is a loss, not only to those of us who had the benefit of knowing and working with him, but to our entire country as well. Our thoughts and prayers are with you in your sorrow.

NAVY YARD TRIBUTES

In accordance with the family's suggestion that donations might be made in Bill Bates' memory to the Cancer Society, numerous such contributions were made. Among them was one from the Boston Naval Shipyard Metal Trades Council—AFL-CIO. In a letter advising Mrs. Bates of this action, Council President Gustaf Lindberg stated:

Congressman William H. Bates was one of our hardest workers for the Boston Naval Shipyard. He always welcomed us when we went to Washington. The Council members really thought a great deal of him as one of our representatives.

D. D. Glatthorn, secretary-treasurer of the Superintendent's Association, Boston Naval Shipyard:

The members of the Association deeply appreciate the past help and interest of Congressman Bates and sincerely mourn the loss of a fine friend and benefactor.

Not only was Bill Bates credited with a major share of responsibility in the continuance and planned modernization of Boston Naval Shipyard, but he was a constant leader in the efforts to have the 1974 closure order reversed for Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. In fact, his distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. LEGGETT of California, has proposed that the closure be canceled as a tribute to this example of Congressman Bates' dedicated concern for the Nation's defense and economic security.

Timothy D. Flynn, president of local No. 4, American Federation of Technical Engineers, at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, wrote to Mrs. Bates about her husband:

He was a great man and I met him many times during the crisis here at the Shipyard. He also was a considerate and well informed friend. I am enclosing the feeling of the people of our area.

The enclosure was the following editorial from the Portsmouth Herald:

[From Portsmouth (N.H.) Herald, June 24, 1969]

THE SHIPYARD HAS LOST A GOOD FRIEND WITH THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BATES

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has lost a good friend—U.S. Rep. William H. Bates of Massachusetts.

That dreaded killer—cancer—felled the representative Sunday with all too few of us aware that he was making his last fight.

Throughout his nearly 20 years in the House, Rep. Bates displayed a keen interest in the welfare of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. True, the cynic can point out that many of his constituents from the Newburyport-Amesbury area are employed there and it was to his political advantage to promote the yard.

However, in all honesty, their numbers aren't so great that Rep. Bates would have lost re-election without their support.

The man was sincerely a promoter of the shipyard because he believed it had a vital role to play in national defense.

We can only hope his successor will manifest the same interest; Portsmouth needs all the friends it can get.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART III

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that one of the byproducts of the President's visit to India and Pakistan has been an increase in pressure to supply both countries with more armaments.

What bothers me is that recent reports make it appear that our Government has not supplied arms to the two countries since the end of the Pakistan-India war of 1965. This is not true.

Let me illustrate what has happened.

In the autumn of 1965, the Pakistanis and Indians went to war over Kashmir. Pakistanis in American Patton tanks fought Indians in American Sherman tanks, and Pakistanis were transported to the front in American C-130B Hercules to fight Indians who had been transported to the front in American C-119's and C-47's.

Within a month after the cease-fire of September 22, an Iranian arms-buying delegation went to West Germany to purchase military jet aircraft. One member of the Iranian delegation was an armaments expert of the Pakistani Army, a Colonel Zaidi. Apparently his presence raised no eyebrows in Bonn.

The Iranians agreed to purchase 90 surplus F-86 Sabrejets from the Luftwaffe and, since the planes were American in origin, Washington's consent to the deal was obtained. The 90 planes were transferred to Iran—reportedly by Luftwaffe pilots in civilian clothes—between March and November 1966, and almost immediately thereafter were secretly transferred to Pakistan, ostensibly to be "repaired."

The Indian press complained loudly that this was a violation of the U.S. embargo, and a diplomatic scramble began between Washington, Bonn, Teheran, and New Delhi. A crisis was averted when Washington announced that the "planes were returned to Iran," although

to this day the U.S. Government refuses to state categorically that all of them in fact have been returned.

Here is an instance where the U.S. Government knowingly broke its own embargo. I charge that our Government knew from the beginning that those 90 planes were destined for Pakistan.

According to the prestigious Institute for Strategic Studies of London, the entire Iranian Air Force in 1956-66 numbered no more than 110 combat planes of all types. For the U.S. Government to encourage a nation like Iran virtually to double its combat air strength over a 9-month period would indicate that those who make arms sales decisions in Washington were lacking in elementary commonsense. Air forces are just not doubled in 9 months as it takes at least 2 years to train pilots and mechanics, and build additional hangars, barracks, runways, and support areas. Doubling an air force in 9 months also is a seriously destabilizing factor which is not an act the United States would likely approve.

On the other hand, Pakistan lost an estimated 70 jet aircraft in the 1965 war which suggests that there was a void in the area which needed to be filled.

Furthermore, Iran in 1965 and 1966 was in the process of negotiating with the United States for F-4 Phantoms to replace some of its own aging F-86's. The Shah eventually received at least one squadron of F-4's. I submit that no country trying to upgrade its air force is going to overload itself with the same type of jet it is trying to get rid of.

Under the circumstances it seems reasonable to assume that someone in our Government knew from the beginning that the 90 jets were meant for Pakistan. It was common knowledge among arms dealers where the jets were meant to go but the U.S. Government refused to admit it.

In addition to this abortive attempt to rearm Pakistan secretly in contravention of its own embargo, there are other instances where the U.S. Government armed both sides following the 1965 war that should be mentioned.

In the spring of 1967, the United States announced that it would resume the sale of "nonlethal" arms to both Pakistan and India. As everyone knows, nonlethal items such as tires, gasoline, spare engines, and radios are used to activate the lethal items—guns, bombs, tanks, missiles, and jets. Selling such spares is, in reality, a subterfuge to calm public opinion; but when the dust has settled these nonlethal items are still just as much an integral part of arms sales as the items that actually shoot and explode. Why we bother to make this distinction is baffling since it fools no one.

One year later, in March 1968, the U.S. Government quietly approved the resumption of "lethal" arms sales to Pakistan. Typically, the move was made in a manner designed to calm the fears of arms sales critics. The arrangement called for several Italian firms to provide Pakistan with 100 refurbished Sherman tanks that had previously seen service in the West German Bundeswehr.

Whether these tanks have in fact been delivered yet has not been announced by

the U.S. Government. But what is clear is that our arms embargo against the two nations was completely abandoned 17 months ago. Yet we are telling the world that the embargo is still in force, and that we are considering "breaking" it by selling additional equipment to the Pakistanis.

I think it might be of interest to my colleagues to show how bloated Pakistan's and India's military establishments are by listing the major equipment owned by each. The fact that Pakistan maintains a relatively smaller military establishment should not necessarily be interpreted as weakness, any more than the ability of Israel's 315,000 soldiers can necessarily be compared unfavorably to the larger combined forces of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan.

My figures come from "The Military Balance 1968-69," published by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London. In order to put them in perspective, it should be noted that Pakistan's army is roughly the same size as West Germany's and that India's combat air force is larger than either that of France or Italy.

The figures referred to, follow:

INDIA

General

Population: 520,000,000. 7.5 rupees=\$1.
Voluntary military service.
Estimated GNP 1967: \$41 billion.
Total armed forces: 1,033,000 (regular armed forces excluding police, border guards, and other para-military units).
Defense expenditure 1968-69: 10,825 million rupees (\$1,452,000,000).*

Army

Total strength: 950,000.
1 armoured division.
2 independent armoured brigades.
13 infantry divisions.
10 mountain divisions.
6 independent infantry brigades.
2 parachute brigades.
220 Centurion 5/7, 250 M4A3 Sherman, and 50 Vijayanta medium tanks (with 105mm guns).
100 PT-76, 90 AMX-13, and 50 M3A1 Stuart light tanks.

Some 400 T-34 and T-54 medium tanks have been delivered from Eastern Europe, but are believed to be not yet operational.

About 3,000 artillery pieces, mostly British 25-pounders, but including some 350 100mm and 140 130mm guns from the USSR.

About 12 anti-aircraft artillery regiments. Trained reservists number about 100,000, including a Territorial Army of 42,000.

Navy

Total strength: 25,000.
1 16,000-ton aircraft carrier.
1 submarine (ex-Soviet F-class).
2 cruisers.
6 destroyer/destroyer escorts (including 1 ex-Soviet Petya-class).
3 anti-aircraft frigates.
5 anti-submarine frigates.
2 other escort vessels.
4 coastal minesweepers.
4 survey ships.
2 inshore minesweepers.
1 landing ship.
3 landing craft.
2 patrol craft.
3 seaward defense boats.
5 other ships.

The naval air force includes 30 *Sea Hawk* attack aircraft, 12 *Alizé* maritime patrolers, and some *Alouette 3* helicopters. 10 *Sea*

* Including some categories not included in the Defense Ministry budget.

Hawks, four *Alizés*, and two *Alouettes* can be carried on the aircraft carrier at any one time.

Air Force

Total strength (regular, including all ground personnel): 58,000; 500 combat aircraft.

45 *Canberra* B(1) light bombers.
8 *Canberra* PR-57 reconnaissance aircraft.
80 MiG-21 interceptors.
150 *Hunter* F-56 fighter/ground-attack aircraft.
150 *Gnat* Mark I interceptors.
60 *Mystère IV* fighter/fighter-bombers.
7 *Convair* B-24 maritime reconnaissance aircraft.
About 50 *Vampire* and *Ouragan* fighter-bombers (in reserve).
50 C-47, 9 *Super Constellation*, 60 C-119, 22 I-14, 35 An-12, 30 *Otter*, 20 HS-748, and 18 *Caribou* medium transport aircraft.
90 Mi-4, 50 *Alouette 3*, 4 Bell-47, and 6 S-55 helicopters.

About 60 *Auster* and *Krishak* observation aircraft.

About 50 *Guideline* 2 surface-to-air missile launchers.

There is an Auxiliary Air Force of 7 squadrons, flying chiefly *Harvard* and *Vampire* trainers.

6 Su-7B *Fitter* fighter-bombers have been delivered by the Soviet Union, but are believed not yet to be in operational service.

Paramilitary forces

A Border Security Force of about 100,000.

PAKISTAN

General

Population: 110,000,000. 4.8 rupees=\$1.
Voluntary military service.
Estimated GNP 1967: \$13.1 billion.
Total armed forces: 324,000.
Defense estimates 1968-69: 2,457 million rupees (\$514,000,000).

Army

Total strength: 300,000 (including 25,000 Azad Kashmir troops).

4 armoured brigades with M-4 *Sherman*, M-47 *Patton*, M-48 *Patton*, and Chinese T-59 tanks.

12 infantry divisions (based on 32 brigades).

Some of the infantry divisions have reconnaissance regiments with M-24 *Chaffee* and M-41 *Bulldog* light tanks.

About 90 25-pounders, 125mm and 155mm howitzers.

Cobra anti-tank missiles.

An air defense brigade with anti-aircraft guns.

Navy

Total strength: 9,000.
1 submarine.
2 large destroyers.
3 destroyer escorts.
2 ASW frigates.
8 coastal minesweepers.
4 fast patrol boats.
2 small patrol boats (less than 100 tons).
8 support ships.
There is a coast guard force of 1,500 men.
Naval aircraft include *Albatross* and some UH-19 helicopters for air-sea rescue.

Air Force

Total strength: 15,000; 250 combat aircraft.

4 I-28 light jet bombers.
20 B-57B light jet bombers.
140 F-86 jet interceptor/fighter-bombers.
40 MiG-19 jet interceptors.
14 *Mirage IIIIE* jet interceptor/fighter-bombers.

12 F-104A jet interceptors.
20 RT-33A, RB-57, and *Mirage IIIR* reconnaissance aircraft.

8 C-47, 6 Bristol Mark 31, and 8 C-130B transport aircraft.

About 75 T-6, T-33, T-37B, and *Mirage IIIIE* trainers.

25 Bell-47, Kaman-43B, and Alouette 3 helicopters.

Air Force reservists number 2,000.

Paramilitary forces

Total strength: 200,000.

This total includes the frontier corps, lightly-armed tribal levies and local defense units.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps a basic tenet of arms aid policy is that every nation should be armed only to the extent necessary to defend itself. More extensive armament escalates the risk of war, yet in many parts of the world we are actively selling those extra arms.

I do not believe it is in anyone's interest to supply additional arms to either Pakistan or India. Both countries already have more than enough military equipment for the purpose of defending themselves from any external threat save a great power invasion.

It seems to me that the U.S. Government should do two things to dampen the threat of war in this area: First, it should resist the temptation to supply more arms and, second, it should request that a limitation on arms sales to these two countries by all suppliers be placed on the agenda of the upcoming disarmament talks in Geneva.

A GREAT KINDNESS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a retarded woman learning assembly work; 3,500 youth canvassing over 25 Nassau County communities in a fund drive; a retarded man operating light machinery; a vivacious and dedicated woman originating and directing a vitally significant project.

Despite the contrast, these persons have a great deal in common. It is the personification of the fact that the cloak of ignorance and embarrassment which surrounds mental retardation does not smother the efforts of all persons. It is also the fact that community action coupled with vocational training centers has shown the world that retardates are capable of and should have every chance to "learn, work and earn."

The Association for the Help of Retarded Children located in Brookville, N.Y., a part of the Third Congressional District which I represent, is the source of these vast achievements. Recently, the AHRC's teen drive, originated and directed by the organization's tireless vice-president, Mrs. H. E. Schueler, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for several years, added to the accomplishments of this exceptional center.

More than 3,500 youths offered their time and efforts to raise \$40,000 for a proposed \$2 million vocational training center to be built by 1970 in Freeport, N.Y. Designed to serve over 500 retardates, the proposed center, to be built with matching Federal and State aid, will provide facilities comparable to those found at the highly successful William and Esther Kaufman Center in Hempstead, N.Y.

This center, I might add, offers more than 200 retardates, ranging from 17 to 60, the opportunity to gain dignity, self-respect, and independence through vocational training.

Certainly, each one of the 3,500 young canvassers deserved recognition for helping this goal become a reality. And subsequently, they did receive a delightful "thank you" from the AHRC. On June 1, they were guests at a party which I had the good fortune of attending. Among those cited at this gala were the 45 most outstanding volunteers, including a young lady voted "All County Top Teen" for her extraordinary work, Miss Nancy Denker of Plainview, N.Y., also a Third Congressional resident I am pleased to say.

Mr. Speaker, Cervantes once said, "Great persons are able to do great kindnesses." Although I am unable to include the 3,500 persons who showed such "great kindnesses" in the RECORD, I would like to include the top 45 teenagers cited at this occasion. I believe that they are invaluable expressions of American youth's willingness to undertake worthwhile endeavors.

The list cited follows:

Mrs. H. E. Schueler, Chairman; Mrs. Karl Ganin, Mrs. Stuart Larick, Co-Chairman; All County Top Teen—Nancy Denker.

(City, Top Teens, and chairman)

Baldwin, Susan Weinberg, Mrs. George De Annuntis.

Bellmores-Merrick, Marcia Amsterdam and Cheryl Gaynor, Mrs. H. Donald Fisher, Jr., and Mrs. Arthur Luhmann.

Farmingdale, Susan Klos, Mrs. John Cottone.

Floral Park, Diane Peterson and Phyllis Cuttita (Elmont), Mrs. Paul S. Devan, and Mrs. John L. McDonald.

Freeport, Candy Licence, Mrs. Walter E. Johnson.

Glenwood, Janet Koloski, Mrs. Donald Whyte.

Great Neck, Bart Weiss and Donna Laub, Mrs. Gary R. Ozaroff, Mrs. Stuart H. Larick, and Mrs. Louis H. Emmanuel.

Levittown, Hickville, Wantagh, Marjorie Gilcher (Wantagh), Susan Cardone (Levittown), and Gerry Russell (Hickville). Runners-up: John Graham (Wantagh), Kathleen Beach (Levittown), and Virginia Santini (Hickville), Mrs. John Hansen, Mrs. Elmer B. King, Jr., and Mrs. Edward Ramsteck.

Long Beach, Richard Bartholomew, Mrs. Arthur Fisher.

Manhasset, Theresa Habeile, Mrs. Cyril Draddy, and Mrs. Richard Sexaue.

Massapequa, Steven Liposki, Mrs. Warren E. Poling.

New Hyde Park, Randy Mason, Mrs. Robert L. Pellegrino, Mrs. George W. Kilminster, and Mrs. Otto N. Schaefer.

Oyster Bay, E. Norwich, Lorraine Cimino, Paula Ryan, and Helen Lazarus. Runners-up, Anita Petrella, Janice McCue, Matthew Eerbig, and Jan Connors, Mrs. Fred Cimino, and Eleanor Monson.

Port Washington, Kathy Wynkoop, and Carol Mathews, Mrs. Sara Ann Fatizzi, Miss Sandra Bondy, and Mrs. Frank Bergen, Jr.

Roslyn, Maxine Sobel and Karen Berko, Mrs. Leo Vogel.

Tri-Town (Jericho Syosset, Plainview), Charles Cyge, Geoffrey Grable, David Schulamn, and Demi Zodda. Runners-up, Melanie Stopeck, and Lauren Baker.

Uniondale, East Meadow, Frances Messina and Gary Schwartz, Mrs. Richard F. Erb.

Valley Stream, Harvey Katz, Mrs. Abraham Vernikoff, Runners-up, Maida Oringer and Linda Haas, Mrs. Herbert Schleifer.

Westbury, Donna Valentine, Mary McCormack, and Linda Silvers, Mrs. George Ploska, Mrs. Joseph R. Molina, and Mrs. Martin Schindler.

REV. LEROY PATRICK

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, many claim that organized religion has shunned its logical role in helping America in its myriad social problems.

Although this claim holds some general truth, there are numerous cases of individual churchmen who have fought long and hard for civil and equal rights for all Americans.

Every American city has its vocal and dynamic religious leader. In Pittsburgh, we are fortunate enough to have several. One of these is the Reverend LeRoy Patrick, a giant of a man to his parishioners and to all Pittsburghers.

Reverend Patrick, whose son, Steve, is an intern in my office this summer, recently expressed his concern about cutbacks in money headed for low-income neighborhoods.

I now would like to introduce these comments, which appeared in an article in the Pittsburgh Press, for the perusal of my colleagues:

CHURCH MUST MEET NEEDS OF WHOLE MAN—
HOMWOOD PASTOR CONCERNED THAT FUNDS
WON'T MATCH FAITH—ANY OEO CUTS DANGEROUS, REV. LEROY PATRICK SAYS

(By Ralph Miller)

"If there are no serious cutbacks in funding special programs in potentially troubled areas, things can be reasonably peaceful. . . ."

That's the opinion of the Rev. LeRoy Patrick, pastor of the Bethesda United Presbyterian Church of Homewood. Now in his 19th year of serving the people there, Dr. Patrick knows "what he's talking about."

In addition to the traditional church program, the Bethesda pastor says Federal anti-poverty money and other funding will be needed to maintain several special projects of the church.

He cites the church's Community Center and the Youth House as examples.

"The Youth House is a fairly new idea designed to help troubled youth who seek help for a variety of reasons," Dr. Patrick says.

The Youth House is located at 6812 Simon-ton St., and the young men range between 17 and 23 years of age.

Through the church's Community Center, persons from nursery school age through senior citizens' age are provided programs to meet their interests and needs.

Dr. Patrick, 53, believes "it is a little too early to say how much actual success some of these programs have . . . but it's an effort to do something in a positive way to help others."

RELIGIOUS MOTIVATION STRONG

Asked to comment on the priority values, Dr. Patrick said, "It is the religious motivation which gives substance and strength to the social endeavors."

He said the church is not interested in running settlement house programs just for the sake of doing good for goodness sake. He emphasized that his church is "interested rather in doing good for others for God's sake . . . there's a big difference."

Generally, he opined, the church—the total church—"must look at the community

and the people therein and see what unmet needs it can meet."

At the same time, he continued, "the church must look at the world to see what new things must be done to make the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ a relevant force for the healing of the hurts of mankind."

Dr. Patrick warned that "the absence of violence doesn't mean there is a greater degree of justice in troubled areas."

BASIC PROBLEMS STILL EXIST

He cautioned that the "basic problems of prejudice and inequality and inhumanity still exist in our society and they must be solved."

Until they are solved, he pointed out, "we can expect disruptions of varying degrees."

Dr. Patrick, an eloquent and earnest man in expressing his views, is soft-spoken, but his thoughts are those of good, hard common sense.

He believes in facing the problems of the day, but he retains a strong faith in what he considers to be the "primary goal of the church today—to let men know that God has come to him in Jesus Christ to meet the needs of the whole man."

Busy "in such an intense way," he says he has no particular hobbies.

"I suppose," he responded, rubbing a long hand over a deep forehead, "my hobby would be staying away from hobbies."

In 1943 he married Norma Brandon in New York City. Mrs. Patrick is a professional social worker in her own right and is now the training supervisor of case workers for the Travelers Aid Society in Pittsburgh.

TWO SONS STUDENTS

Dr. and Mrs. Patrick have two sons. Stephen LeRoy, 19, a junior at Lincoln University, works during the summer months as an aide to Congressman William S. Moorhead.

Gregory, a sophomore at Haverford College, is attending summer school sessions at the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Patrick received his education at Lincoln University and at Union Theological Seminary. In 1964 he was awarded his Doctor of Divinity degree from Lincoln University.

The Patrick family live at the church manse, 233 Mayflower St., East Liberty.

"Just like Pilgrims on the Mayflower," he quipped, concluding the interview.

The Pilgrims needed funds to match their faith, too.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.N. STANDBY MILITARY FORCE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the success of our two most spectacular space shots during the last 3 or 4 weeks, man has come to realize how alone he really is in his own world here on Earth. After the astronauts had walked upon the sterile Moon, and Mariners 6 and 7 had swept past a lifeless Mars, I suddenly felt how alone and unique the Earth really is. Man has reached out to touch his nearest neighbors in space only to find a void. For the first time in history, man cannot look over the mountain to greener pastures. He must take a good look at the space vehicle upon which he was born and realize that this is where life

began and it is here on Earth where life may possibly end. It is up to man to develop institutions that will allow his race to survive.

For many years now, I have supported measures which would strengthen the United Nations and other regional organizations as a means of maintaining and strengthening the peace. Today, in a letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, my colleagues and I are expressing our conviction that some way must be found which permits a larger number of countries to share more fully the responsibility for international peacekeeping. One such way has been suggested by the National Policy Panel of the United Nations Association. The mechanism which their report recommends, and which deserves close scrutiny and consideration, is the establishment of an effective, adequately funded U.N. standby force. Where a military force is required, it should clearly consist of a multilateral effort on behalf of all mankind.

In this connection, I have very recently introduced, with 90 cosponsors, House Concurrent Resolution 283, the Atlantic Union Resolution, which provides for the appointment of a U.S. delegation to explore with similar delegations of other nations the possibilities of federation as a means of solving supranational problems. In my view, this suggests another means of answering this important question: How do we get a larger number of countries to share more fully the responsibility for international peacekeeping?

It was estimated by former President Eisenhower that the sharing of defense costs among the Atlantic States could save the United States 50 percent on its defense budget. Today's proposal offers a similar opportunity to save on certain defense costs. International sharing of the responsibility of maintaining a U.N. standby force would mean that our proportionate share of that cost would be substantially less than if we decided to maintain such a force ourselves. The \$30 billion-a-year cost of carrying on the Vietnam war should give adequate evidence of the value of a multilateral effort.

Far more important, though, than the possibility of saving badly needed tax dollars is the very real contribution a U.N. standby force would make to peace and stability. Among the numerous handicaps under which our men fight in Vietnam is the fact that they have never received meaningful support from the vast majority of our allies. The failure of other nations to participate in the struggle against the Vietcong and North Vietnamese has deprived our military effort of the legitimizing support of world opinion. As a consequence, we fight virtually alone in Vietnam, often viewed more as the oppressor than the standard bearer of the oppressed.

A U.N. standby force, adequately funded, will provide for political stability threatened by local insurgent groups backed by Hanoi, Peking, Cuba, or the U.S.S.R. When fighting actually breaks out, the intervention of the standby force, rather than the armed force of a

single country, will help to secure the public support for and success of the military mission.

The cost of the Vietnam war to our own country, and to the world, has been so great that it should be clear to all that the United States will never again become embroiled in another similar conflict on these terms. President Nixon said as much when he visited Laos on his recent Asian tour. Today's proposal for a U.N. standby force is a commonsense alternative to international lawlessness among nations in the future.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO 11

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, among the millions of words of praise and hope generated by the flight of Apollo 11 in recent weeks, there has been a small but persistent minority view critical of the cost of the program. There are many ways to reply to this kind of shortsightedness. One of the best answers I have seen was delivered in the form of an editorial on television station WJBK-TV 2 in Detroit last week by the station's vice president and general manager, Mr. Lawrence M. Carino. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the other body and to my colleagues here in the House:

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO 11

Soaring enthusiasm over the journey of Apollo 11 has been tempered somewhat by sincere critics concerned with ample unfinished business here at home. Their reservations, however, give the impression that the \$24-billion spent on Apollo is lost forever, shot into the vacuum of outer space.

Well, as a viewer reminds us, there were two things which Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins didn't take with them to the moon—weapons . . . and money. The billions which launched their fantastic journey remain right here on earth—a good share of the expenditure in the most impoverished areas of the American South.

It went, as salaries, into the pockets of the 400,000 people directly employed by the program at its peak. In areas of Alabama, Louisiana, Texas and Florida—places lacking both skilled and unskilled jobs—the space program put to work not just scientists and astronauts, but construction workers, truck drivers, waitresses and countless others.

Furthermore, as it developed jobs and taught new skills, Apollo represented the most constructive kind of spending—especially when compared to the untold billions we have poured into a complex of social programs of doubtful or limited value.

Critics of Apollo 11 should also consider its many spin-off contributions to industry, medicine, communications, and nearly every major field working to create a better life for all Americans.

Perhaps most important, we now have the thrilling example of Apollo to demonstrate the incredible heights we can reach as a nation with our will and resources focused on a single massive goal.

The goal can be mastery of human needs as well as of space. TV2 has sufficient faith in this nation to believe it can be both.

LUNNEY "OVERWHELMED" BY BIG WELCOME, PARADE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of July it is estimated that more than one-half billion people all over the world watched the beginning of the flight of Apollo 11, which was destined to land mankind on the moon.

It was not only the fulfillment of 8 long years of planning since Apollo first was conceived, but it was the fulfillment of the dream of mankind to stand upon another celestial body to look across the universe at the earth.

The Apollo space vehicle must, indeed, be considered a wonder of our age. I am sure that my colleagues are aware that this was not the first flight of the Apollo. It was tested thoroughly for every phase of this mission. I am proud to say that the flight director of the first Apollo mission was a fine gentleman from my congressional district, Mr. Glynn Lunney.

Here is a man who is dedicated and intelligent, typical of the splendid men and women at NASA who started with a dream and brought that dream to its fulfillment in what might be described as the most historic event in the history of mankind on earth.

Mr. Lunney and his family have been honored in my congressional district, and the honor is certainly deserving. I am sure that all my colleagues join me in offering our warmest congratulations to Glynn and to his splendid colleagues in NASA for the part each one played in giving this Nation such distinction in the eyes of the world.

Many years ago, upon the death of Sir Isaac Newton, the Poet Alexander Pope wrote Newton's epitaph:

Nature and nature's laws lay hid in night.
God said: "Let Newton be!" and all was light.

It would take another Alexander Pope to find the words to describe the excellence of these splendid men. All we can do is to behold and to admire.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append herewith two articles in the Scranton Tribune and in the Scranton Times concerning Mr. Lunney. I know everyone will be delighted to read about this fine man:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, Aug. 9, 1969]

APOLLO FLIGHT DIRECTOR GREETED BY THOUSANDS AT OLD FORGE—LUNNEY "OVERWHELMED" BY BIG WELCOME PARADE

(By Bob McCarthy)

"It was overwhelming!"

This was the reaction of Glynn Lunney, a flight director for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the hero's welcome he received upon his return to his home town of Old Forge Friday.

"I had been told there was to be some kind of reception," he said, "but I didn't expect the parade, the speeches, and all those people. I can't tell you what it felt like to see all the American flags flying."

The gala reception for the man who played a key role in the Apollo 11 moon mission be-

gan when a large delegation met Lunney at the Dupont exit of the Pennsylvania Turnpike at 4 p.m. after he and his wife, Marilyn, had landed at the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport after a flight from Cleveland where Mrs. Lunney's family resides.

The Lunneys were escorted amid cheers through Dupont, Avoca, Duryea and Moosic to Old Forge, where the group met a large parade which Lunney described as "quite a surprise."

The parade, organized by parade marshals Thomas Gaylets and John Laurenzi, made its way to Old Forge Borough Stadium, where the mayors of more than a dozen communities and a crowd of several thousand proud residents were on hand to greet Lunney.

Old Forge Mayor Edmund Wascavage presented Glynn with a proclamation making Friday, August 8, "Glynn Lunney Day" in Old Forge.

Also on hand with plaudits, keys to their cities and proclamations were mayors: James Walsh, Scranton; John Morris, Wilkes-Barre; Martin Monahan, Dunmore; John O'Malley, Moosic; Al Costello, Dupont; Joseph Hannon, Avoca; John Salek, Duryea; Edmund Kalley, Throop; Nicholas Duchnik, Dickson City; John Chichilla, Olyphant; Joseph Jay, Mayfield, and John Derenick, Taylor.

It was well into Friday night before Lunney was able to join his family and friends at the home of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Lunney, 303 River St., Old Forge. At home Friday night, Glynn's mother commented, "the whole thing seems unbelievable."

While preparations were under way last week for the grand homecoming, Mrs. Lunney told a reporter "we're really not prepared for all of this, you know; we've always led a quiet kind of life—it scares you a little."

Lunney and his wife plan to remain in Old Forge for about a week before they drive back to Cleveland and then fly to Texas. The celebrated flight director, if he can find the time, will spend the next few days visiting friends. "It seems like we never get to see our friends any more," he said.

During the historic Apollo 11 mission, Lunney worked eight-hour shifts, rotating with five other directors. The six men shared an awesome responsibility, empowered to alter or even cancel the mission if such measures became necessary.

Apollo 11 Commander Neil Armstrong and his fellow astronauts, Mike Collins and Edwin Aldrin, were directly answerable to Lunney while he was on duty. Reflecting on the mission, Lunney told The Tribune "there was a great deal of courage shown on the part of everyone involved in the mission—in letting certain decisions and responsibilities rest in someone else's hands."

"We (flight directors) were responsible for making decisions that had to be made in a hurry. When there was time, we made it a point of advising our bosses of a problem and discussing the alternatives—it was a good working relationship."

Lunney says he was "reasonably confident" of the success of the moon landing mission. "Everything possible had been done," he said, "The worst that crossed my mind was that we might have to call the astronauts back to earth. But we never came close to a decision like that."

Commenting on the current popular joke to the effect that the entire mission was a hoax—a simulation filmed in a New York studio—Lunney said "I can tell you from experience that simulations don't go that well."

Lunney, a veteran of Apollo missions 1, 4 and 7, was at the controls when Apollo 11's lunar module "Eagle," made the crucial ascent from the moon's surface to rendezvous with the command module "Columbia."

While the excitement for man's greatest adventure is past, Lunney has no fears about being bored when he returns to Houston and

expresses great optimism about the future of the manned space program.

"There is no slowdown in between missions," he reported, "and when I return there'll be plenty to do. We have a mission to review, new hardware to examine. There are plans for orbiting space stations and solar telescopes."

"The space program has really come along—it's all part of the flight business—from Kitty Hawk to the moon landing. It can't do anything but grow. I feel that despite talks of cutbacks in the program, etc., we can't go anywhere but ahead."

The father of four children, Lunney is married to the former Marilyn Kurtz of Cleveland. The family resides in Friendwood, Tex., a suburb of Houston.

A 1953 graduate of Scranton Preparatory School, Lunney received his BS degree in aeronautical engineering at the University of Scranton in 1958.

He was with the NASA program at its inception and participated in the Mercury, Gemini and now Apollo programs. Four years ago, as he sat at the controls in Houston for the Gemini 10 flight at age 29, he was the youngest man ever to serve as a flight director for a manned space mission.

Before Lunney leaves Old Forge, he will be honored at a testimonial dinner Sunday, Aug. 17, in St. Nicholas Hall, Old Forge. Officials of the Old Forge Lions Club, which is sponsoring the fete, said former Gov. William Scranton and Congressmen Daniel Flood are planning to attend, along with many other dignitaries.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Aug. 9, 1969]

TRIBUTES PAID AT OLD FORGE

(By Daniel Cusick)

Glynn Lunney came home to Old Forge on Friday and found the town had turned out for a tumultuous welcome.

Lunney, 33, native of the borough and flight director for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency's Manned Space Flight Center in Houston, Tex., arrived at the Dupont exit of the Pennsylvania Turnpike at 4:10 p.m. On hand to greet him there were: A contingent of state police; squad cars and motorcycles from various area police departments; officials of civic and social organizations; mayors from 10 communities including his own, and the Old Forge Borough council.

"This is just overwhelming," he said as he climbed from his car, in which he and his family drove from Cleveland, Ohio, where he had been visiting his wife's family. "I knew a few days ago that there had been something planned, but nothing like this."

"This" included the reception, a caravan of 25 cars which took Lunney through Dupont, Avoca, Duryea, and Moosic; a full-scale parade in Old Forge and a public welcome at Veterans Memorial Stadium in Old Forge where he was asked to send a model rocket aloft.

Many posters along the parade route declared "Welcome Home Glynn" and "We're Moonstruck by Glynn Lunney."

At the Old Forge Stadium, Lunney heard proclamations read from his hometown mayor, Edmund Wascavage, and from the mayors of Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, Dunmore, Moosic, Dupont, Avoca, Throop, Dickson City, Olyphant, Mayfield and Taylor, all declaring Friday as "Glynn Lunney Day" in their communities. Many of the mayors presented keys to their cities and boroughs to the flight director.

Cyril Bosak, general chairman for the celebration, told the crowd at the stadium, "This is indeed a proud day for all of us and a day that will be marked indelibly in the history of Old Forge and the area."

Lunney, whose major responsibility on the Apollo 11 moon voyage was directing the lift-off of the lunar module from the Moon's sur-

face and its rendezvous with the command module following the moonwalk by two American astronauts, then told the audience, "I'm overwhelmed by all of this, but what you are really doing today is honoring my parents."

Lunney said he is looking forward to seeing many of his friends in the area during his vacation, but he will be in Los Angeles on Wednesday and Thursday, at the invitation of President Nixon, for a special dinner honoring the astronauts and the space team.

A testimonial dinner will be held in Lunney's honor, Aug. 17, in St. Nicholas Hall, Old Forge. Many dignitaries are expected to attend, including Gov. William Scranton and Rep. Daniel Flood.

TAX REFORM IN 1969—A PUBLIC DEMAND

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the American public has become highly educated during the recent years on fabulous tax loopholes which have been secured by high-powered lobbies for certain of our industries and other high-powered organizations. The following editorial from the Gary Post Tribune of August 11 physically warns the other body that the country is aroused and that loopholes must be not only greatly reduced but in most cases outright repealed as demanded. The Senate should heed the warning.

The one-sided vote of almost 12 to 1 on final passage of the tax reform bill should serve notice that the American people are demanding tax reform and demanding it this year.

The editorial follows:

BUT DON'T BANK IT YET

It would be unwise to start banking all your federal tax savings yet, but congressional weathervanes point increasingly in that direction.

The bill the House has now passed would give most all individuals up to the \$100,000 income brackets a minimum saving of 5 percent, totaling some \$9 billion. The measure is devised to offset \$7 billion of that loss in revenue through closing of loopholes on foundations, on tax exempt bonds, limitation of benefits now realized by the oil industry and some others, and through attempts to close other loopholes.

But all of that faces review in the Senate and that's why counting your savings now may be premature.

True, the Democratic Senate leadership has insisted on just this kind of tax reform as the price for the already approved six-month extension of the 10 percent income tax surcharge and for consideration of a further six-month extension at 5 per cent. However, the reaction of a number of individual senators or senatorial blocs could still spell rough going ahead.

Unless realistic cuts can be made in federal spending there still could be an effort on the part of administration senators to offset that \$2 billion difference between individual tax cuts and the added revenue from reform.

Further, the oil state senators and others whose industries might be affected will probably make more of a fight over the oil depletion allowance and other reforms than was evident in the House where the door

was closed on amendments to the bill as it came out of the Ways and Means Committee.

The fact remains, however, that the one-sided vote in the House accurately reflects the public clamor for tax reform and the Senate knows it. That relief isn't coming, of course, until the tax bills you pay in 1972 and spending requirements could change. As of now, though, it would appear the tax weary public finally has made its voice heard.

SIR JONATHAN AND THE ELECTRONIC DRAGONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the sending out of unwanted, unsolicited credit cards continues apace.

A number of newspapers around the country have criticized the practice and have commented favorably on my bill, H.R. 8920, which would prohibit it. An example is the following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser, April 28, 1969, which has just come to my attention:

SIR JONATHAN AND THE ELECTRONIC DRAGONS

Many citizens have lost battles with computers over small matters of personal finance.

Rep. Jonathan Bingham of New York is one of them. He found not recently that being a congressman didn't impress an argumentative computer, but the computer didn't reckon with Bingham's trump card. He is in the enviable position of being able to introduce legislation to abolish the practice that offended him.

Bingham's troubles began when he received an unsolicited credit card through the mail. He sent it back, with an angry note demanding that his name be taken off the approved charge list. No answer. Bingham thought that was the end of the matter.

Several months later, his wife ordered some goodies from an imported food shop in Boston, enclosing a check for the correct amount of the purchase. Somehow, the check was not credited. Bingham received a computer-printed bill for \$10.79, the purchase amount and the amount of the check. The bill was charged against the credit card Bingham had previously returned.

A second protest letter, this time on congressional stationery, was ignored. A week later, Bingham got a past due notice with a late charge tacked on.

At that point, Bingham gave up arguing with the computer. He introduced legislation in Congress to prohibit the issuance of unsolicited credit cards. Chances of passage are reportedly 50-50.

Bingham's bill may solve his particular problem, but it does nothing to resolve the matter of computers which refuse to acknowledge their mail. To most citizens, that is a larger, more serious problem. The method we've adopted is simple: If a computer won't answer your letter, don't answer its.

Other editorials include the following:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 21, 1969]

SOLON'S TARGET: FREE-WHEELING CREDIT CARDS

WASHINGTON.—The free-wheeling, free-mailing credit card people have gone too far.

Now they've got a congressman mad at them—so, mad, in fact, that he has introduced a bill that would prohibit the issuing of credit cards except on request.

The way Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham,

D-N.Y., wants it, any person who really wants a credit card can ask for it. Otherwise, nothing doing!

As Bingham sees it, "the chutzpah of the banks, the imperviousness of the computer and the threat of a bad credit rating have combined to create a nightmare for the consumer."

The New Yorker has criticized the practice of some companies of sending out unsolicited credit cards, telling the "unwary recipient" he has a shiny new line of credit up to \$300.

Now, says Bingham, he finds the situation is even worse. Once a person gets a card he is stuck and cannot get rid "of the darned thing. Protesting letters go unanswered and notifications tumble in showing unidentifiable entries issued by a Frankenstein like computer who will not listen to reason."

"I feel like a character in a Kafka novel," says Bingham, and the only reason he thinks he may get somewhere is that he is a congressman. If he were not, then it would really be tough.

Bingham has joined the ranks of those who received credit cards they didn't ask for and wound up with charges they should never have received.

This is his self-confessed "sad tale":

The State Street Bank & Trust Co. of Boston sent the congressman a "BankAmericard." The card misspelled the congressman's name—"slightly"—and was sent to his home, rather than his office.

Bingham says he promptly returned the card with "an angry note saying I did not want it."

Next he received a computer-issued statement showing a balance due under the credit card account. The charge was \$10.79 for a purchase from a well-known oldline Boston firm specializing in canned goods and tobacco, among other items.

The purchase had been made, all right, by Mrs. Bingham. Mrs. Bingham, however, had already paid for it, by check.

"O woe, that such a fine old firm should lend itself to these monstrous practices," wailed the congressman.

So Bingham returned the statement with a second angry note. This time he made sure the note was written on congressional stationery.

"That ought to make them sit up and take notice," he thought.

No such luck, says Bingham, "what naïvete. The computer was wholly unimpressed."

Instead, Bingham received a second statement telling him that \$10 of the \$10.79 charge was past due. It added a 16-cent interest charge to the balance, making a new total of \$10.95.

Following that, Bingham received "two increasingly sharp reminders" that his account was overdue.

At least Bingham is not alone, either in or out of Congress. A companion bill has been introduced by Sen. William E. Proxmire, D-Wis.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch]

UNWANTED CREDIT CARDS

Convinced that they constitute a national nuisance and possibly a national economic threat, Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.) has introduced legislation to check the flow of unsolicited credit cards.

His efforts appear to be making him something of a national hero. Letters from across the nation have praised him and have condemned the practice, followed by some businesses, of sending credit cards to people who have not sought them.

Such a practice is a nuisance because, at the least, it inconveniences recipients. Those uninterested in keeping the cards they receive must either return or destroy them to make certain they don't fall into the hands of dishonest persons who would fraudulently use them at the recipient's possible expense.

And even destroying the card may not prevent trouble, since the name and number of the recipient is inside a computer somewhere and may be spewed out to erroneously charge that person with having made purchases. Or, at least, Rep. Bingham says this is what happened in his case. He has spent weeks trying to convince the computer that he never used the card.

Some critics also contend that wide, indiscriminate distribution of credit cards encourages consumer extravagance, leads some people dangerously deep in debt and contributes to inflation.

There is much to what Bingham and his supporters say. Wisely used, the credit card is a useful economic tool that facilitates transactions. Credit card users may find it unnecessary to carry large sums of money or to submit to a credit investigation every time they trade where they are not known. Still, it seems unfair to thrust a credit card upon a man and force him either to send it back or tear it up. Credit cards should go only to those who have requested them.

Recently New York State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz urged the New York State Legislature to pass legislation to curb unsolicited credit cards, and I am delighted that he has done so, but Federal legislation is needed also. The following is a New York Times editorial, dated August 13, on the subject:

THOSE UNWANTED CREDIT CARDS

The phenomenal growth in popularity of credit cards has inevitably produced some abuses. One of the most exasperating is the growing commercial practice of sending out unsolicited credit cards to people who do not want them. It is indulged in even by some of our leading banks, which should know better.

Only recently the Brooklyn District Attorney, Eugene Gold, asserted that the major distributors of such cards were guilty of "helter-skelter distribution that encourages crime."

Representative Jonathan B. Bingham received and sent back an unwanted card recently, but nevertheless as a result of a computer mix-up found himself the recipient of a bill from its sender. It infuriated him so that he now has a bill pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee to forbid the practice.

Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz has announced he will ask the State Legislature for similar legislation at the next session. It is badly needed. Many unsophisticated people do not realize that if an unsolicited card bearing their names is stolen and used fraudulently they are not responsible for the debt. And, even if they are aware of their rights, they may have to pay a big court bill to defend them.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I mailed to every postal patron in the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I have the great honor to represent in the U.S. Congress, my annual legislative questionnaire. The generous and thoughtful response of my constituents

to this inquiry was most gratifying. More than 24,000 persons took the time to consider my questions and register their preferences in these matters of national concern. It is only through cooperation like this on the part of informed citizens that Members of Congress can effectively represent the people who elect them to office.

For purposes of tabulation and because of space limitations, the questions were necessarily simplified and the optional choices abbreviated. Such brevity can be frustrating both for the constituent and Representative in a day when the issues are so complex. Thus, I found the many additional comments and letters written by a number of my constituents to expand and clarify their views most interesting. A recurring theme of these comments was inflation and the difficulties encountered by persons living on fixed incomes. The need for increases in social security payments was stressed, just as it has been in the conversations I have had over the past months with thousands of senior citizens of the 10th Congressional District.

The Vietnamese conflict remains uppermost in the minds of residents of the 10th Congressional District. There is a significant difference in opinion reflected in this year's poll as compared with the results in 1968, when no more than one-quarter of the respondents could be included in the group favoring withdrawal. This year approximately 70 percent of the answers indicate the feeling that American forces should be withdrawn from Vietnam—either immediately or on the basis of a gradual phaseout. As opposed to the 21 percent figure in my 1968 questionnaire, this year 13.3 percent favored the pursuit of complete victory in Vietnam.

In evaluating the questionnaire results, I was interested to see that the number of men and women answering my poll differed by less than 200. In question 4, both men and women ranked Federal spending priorities in the same exact order, with the exception that the order of space and welfare programs was reversed. Slightly more men in the 10th Congressional District appear to feel more strongly than women about the importance of space expenditures, and several hundred women seem to believe that welfare expenditures are more important than space programs. It should also be noted that many persons added to this list of categories health care and medical research, conservation, air and water pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the results of my legislative poll be entered into the RECORD so that my colleagues and other students of this journal may benefit from the thoughtful views of the residents of Massachusetts' 10th District. Although it is said that there are regional differences in these United States, I am confident that this poll represents a wide cross section of the American people, and should be of value to Congressmen from every section of the country. The tabulation of the results of my 1969 legislative questionnaire follows:

[Answers in percent]

1. Concerning the war in Vietnam, which one approach do you favor:

Pursuit of complete victory	13.3
Paris peace talks and limited military action	13.9
Peace talks with phased withdrawal of U.S. troops	48.4
Immediate withdrawal	19.9
No answer to question	4.5

2. Concerning the antiballistic missile, which do you think is the best system:

Construct a "thick" system	7.3
Adopt the President's limited program	31.4
Delay construction pending study of alternatives but continue research and development	30.3
Stop all ABM deployment, applying the billions of dollars to domestic needs	27.5
No answer to question	3.5

3. Check any of the following you would favor:

A ban on cigarette advertising on radio and TV	56.1
Establishment of an all-volunteer army	38.3
Tighter gun control laws	64.8

4. In which three of these categories is Federal spending most important: (Preferences ranked as follows, with education and crime prevention and control the primary selections of the overwhelming majority)

1. Education.	
2. Crime prevention and control.	
3. Antipoverty programs.	
4. Housing.	
5. Military expenditures.	
6. Transportation—ground and air.	
7. Space program.	
8. Welfare.	
9. Foreign aid.	
5. Regarding student disorders, which course do you think Congress should take:	
No Federal intervention, thus allowing school administrations full authority on campus	25.2
Cut off Federal aid to individual students who, in school administrators' judgment, caused serious campus disruptions	46.2
Stop all Federal funds to schools whose administrations fail to curb student disorders	26.7
Create a Federal Higher Education Mediation and Conciliation Service to help settle disputes between students, faculty and administrations	12.8

LIBERAL PARTY OPPOSES DEPLOYMENT OF MIRV

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding forces for progressive change in my State, the Liberal Party, has added its voice to the rising tide of public indignation over the threat posed to world stability by deployment of MIRV—the multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicles.

It is my belief that we should defer further MIRV testing until every effort is made to achieve a mutual moratorium

with the Soviet Union on MIRV development.

In view of the Senate's recent vote to deploy the Safeguard ABM, the great danger of nuclear arms escalation increases as long as we give the administration the go ahead on MIRV.

Because of the immediacy of the question of testing and deployment of MIRV, I would like to commend this resolution of the Liberal Party to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE AGAINST THE TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OF MIRV

The testing of Multiple Independent Targetable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRV) by the United States government represents not only a further dangerous and meaningless escalation of the arms race, but is also a direct threat to the success of impending U.S.-Soviet nuclear arms talks.

Many scientists, deeply concerned about U.S. security, believe that the MIRV program will do more to hurt the U.S. than to help it. As we increase weapons, we increase the chance of mistake leading to their use.

A balance of terror exists. What is gained by making it more terrible? Even without MIRV it is clear that the United States can destroy Soviet cities several times over. Another clear result of MIRV testing and deployment is that America's cities will continue to decay due to lack of urgently needed resources.

The Liberal Party of New York State strongly opposes testing and deployment of the MIRV program and urges:

1. That the United States government cease all testing of the MIRV, regardless of the program under which this testing takes place.
2. That President Nixon begin immediate nuclear nonproliferation talks with the Soviet Union making the MIRV program a top priority for discussion and agreement.
3. By concentrating on arms limitation and pressing social needs as its outstanding concerns, the United States would indicate clearly what are its priorities. The Liberal Party strongly supports such a change.

WELFARE WORKERS HAPPY WITH NIXON'S PROPOSAL

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress is interested in the early public response to the proposals to reform the welfare system the President outlined in his television speech of August 8.

One of the important constituencies affected by the President's proposals are the welfare workers. I was pleased to see that one of the enterprising newspapers in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, the Paper of Oshkosh, interviewed county welfare managers in three counties for their reactions to the President's proposals. I was particularly interested to learn that the welfare workers in my district are favorable and optimistic about the program.

What follows is the text of a story in the Paper, Oshkosh, Wis., for August 9, 1969:

WELFARE WORKERS HAPPY WITH NIXON'S PROPOSAL

"It would appear that this is really an excellent kind of change because it puts everybody on an equal basis," Outagamie County's welfare director commented Friday after President Nixon's proposal to revamp the welfare system.

Alfred Eggert said that subsidizing families would prompt welfare recipients to think "if I want more I have to work. We have to try to motivate people towards this. This ought to bring about pay checks instead of welfare checks. Get the people to work."

"I favor this. I think all people in welfare work would favor this," Eggert added.

The President wants the present Aid to Families with Dependent Children program absorbed into a new system that would subsidize poor families regardless of whether the household head has a job.

Winnebago County welfare director, Norman Whitford could not be reached Friday, but Ray Toner, chairman of the county social services board, said the proposal seemed worthwhile.

"It looks to me like there is sense in what he says," Toner commented.

Toner said that \$1,600 would hardly be sufficient to sustain a family. "You know that \$1,600 won't go very far with food prices today," said the chairman. "At least they would buy bread and butter. If these young kids are hungry, how do they live? They won't have the ability or desire to concentrate on learning."

The President called also for a \$1 billion start on sharing federal tax revenues with states, a dramatic shift of manpower programs from Washington to state and local control, and reorganization of the anti-poverty agency for almost total emphasis on experimentation.

Joseph W. Jukniulis, Fond du Lac County welfare director, particularly favored the work incentive programs proposed by Nixon.

The President proposed that all able-bodied welfare recipients "accept work or training provided suitable jobs are available either locally or at some distance if transportation is provided."

"The state (Wisconsin) for the last couple of years has had the Work Incentive Program (WIN)," Jukniulis said. "Fond du Lac County has recently been accepted for the WIN program."

"They (the proposed welfare changes) have been a long time in coming," Fond du Lac County's director continued. "Wisconsin will be less affected by this than some of the southern states."

"We're moving in the right direction."

As a political observation, Jukniulis said: "You know that people have always said that it's been the Democrats largely that have been spending the money and broadening the welfare programs. But it's good to see the Republicans picking up some of these programs."

PRESIDENT NIXON'S JOURNEY

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my words of congratulations to President Nixon on his recent worldwide trip, which I believe has helped to bring the peoples of the earth closer together. Coming as it did so soon after the moon

landing of Apollo 11, the trip certainly emphasized the need for all men to live together in peace.

History alone will judge the ultimate benefits of this journey, but the most promising development at this point seems to be the evolution of a new foreign policy for the United States. America has neither the manpower nor the moneypower to be the world's policeman, but America does have a moral obligation to help maintain international peace that makes isolationism unacceptable. The key question is how to achieve the proper balance in moving from the overcommitted posture of the present to a realistic posture in the future.

Few people believe this Nation should retreat into a shell, like a turtle. As a principal power, we must play a major role in assuring peace and freedom among nations. In initiating his new policy, Mr. Nixon stated that while we indeed plan to do our share in keeping the peace in the Far East, the nations of that region should not in the future depend upon American combat troops for defense, but must rely primarily on the efforts of their own people.

I believe the same message should be made clear to other regions of the free world. In Western Europe, for example, the democracies must not expect the indefinite presence of a substantial number of American foot soldiers as part of the NATO defense. The time is coming when our contribution should be primarily air and sea power. The Western European nations, as well as Japan in the Far East, must therefore begin to assume a larger responsibility for the defense of their own regions.

This policy shift cannot and should not be carried out overnight. We must move positively, but we must move patiently and carefully to avoid either skepticism about the value of our international treaties from friendly nations or further aggression by Communist countries: As we approach the first anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Russians, for example, it is painfully obvious that Communist aggression continues to be a threat. Therefore, in evolving what I feel should be our new policy of primary reliance on air and sea power, we must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we shall honor our commitment to help maintain international peace, as we must also make it clear that the free nations of the world must assume greater responsibility in providing for their own defense.

I congratulate the President for his espousal of a new foreign policy. I believe 1969 will be marked as the turning point in our attitude toward our worldwide commitments as we move toward helping other regions take the necessary steps to become self-supporting and protective of their own rights. Truly effective reallocation of our military power will enable us simultaneously to meet our moral obligations around the world and to refocus our human and financial resources on building a strong and free Nation here at home.

OWEN B. AUGSPURGER

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Buffalo and western New York Saturday lost one of its most valuable citizens and distinguished community leaders. He was Owen B. Augspurger, 56, the spark who ignited innumerable worthwhile—and indeed some historic—civic causes. He was a selfless and completely dedicated person who gave of himself in countless ways.

I was privileged to work with him during the 1950's when a group of Buffalonians including Melvin H. Baker, Elmer F. Lux, George F. Rand, Jr., Richard Lang Miller, and others, organized the Buffalo Redevelopment Foundation. This group later became the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation which spearheaded the multimillion dollar renewal of Buffalo's inner city and launched other far-reaching programs of community betterment.

Owen was a personal friend of Mrs. McCarthy and myself and while his untimely passing is a major loss to our area it is also a deep personal loss to us. We convey our deepest sympathy to his widow, Paula, and to his children.

Mr. Speaker, I include the obituaries from the Buffalo Courier-Express and the Buffalo Evening News following my remarks:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News
Aug. 11, 1969]

OWEN B. AUGSPURGER IS DEAD—AN OUTSTANDING CIVIC LEADER—LAWYER WAS INSTRUMENTAL IN FORMING MAIN PLACE MALL AND UNITED FUND

Owen B. Augspurger, 56, of 115 Lexington Ave., a lawyer, former city councilman and civic leader who worked diligently and often behind the scenes to improve Buffalo, died Saturday (Aug. 9, 1969) in a Bozeman, Mont., hospital.

Mr. Augspurger, a partner in Jeckle, Fleischmann, Kelly, Swart & Augspurger, one of the most prominent law firms in the state, injured his neck Wednesday in a fall from a horse.

He had been vacationing on a dude ranch in Montana with his family.

Mr. Augspurger was so modest and unassuming that his great contributions to Buffalo often went unnoticed.

"He liked to work that way," an associate said today, "he was a nice guy, quite and nice."

FORMED MAIN PLACE

In 1963, Mr. Augspurger, with Lee R. Norton, a banker, and R. J. (Chris) Schutz of Kleinhans Inc., did the long, detailed background work that brought about the construction of Main Place, Buffalo's first, private downtown redevelopment project.

Earlier, Mr. Augspurger was the prime mover in negotiations that brought about joint fund-raising efforts by the Buffalo Red Cross Chapter and the Community Chest of Buffalo & Erie County, now the United Fund.

Always interested in history, especially military history, Mr. Augspurger was president of the Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society in 1964 when the first steps were taken to acquire the Ansley Wilcox mansion in Delaware Ave., where President Theodore Roosevelt took the presidential oath of office, as an historical shrine.

OUTSTANDING CITIZEN AWARDS

The Buffalo Evening News considered Mr. Augspurger's civic achievements so important that he was twice-honored in 1963 and 1964, by The News as one of Buffalo's outstanding citizens.

A Republican, he served in 1950 and 1951 as Delaware District councilman.

A Buffalo native, Mr. Augspurger was a graduate of Nichols School, Princeton University and the University of Buffalo Law School. He was admitted to the bar in 1937.

Mr. Augspurger was a private in the National Guard in 1940 and his outfit was called into active service as the 102d Anti-Aircraft Battalion.

Soon after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the battalion went to the Pacific Theatre and he served overseas nearly 45 months.

BATTALION COMMANDER

When he left active service in 1945, Mr. Augspurger was a lieutenant colonel and the battalion commander. He had fought in Australia, the East Indies, New Guinea and the Philippines.

In Australia, Mr. Augspurger met his future wife, Paula Norris, who was then in the Australian Women's Army Service. They were married in 1944.

Mr. Augspurger is a former member of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce and in 1948 received the Chamber's Gold Key Award as "Buffalo's outstanding young man."

Active as a lawyer and busy in community projects, Mr. Augspurger maintained his military connections and in 1960 was made a brigadier general in the New York Guard.

ADDED TO CANADIAN RELATIONS

Leader of the Guards 55th Area Command, Mr. Augspurger's group was the first in the state to conduct a summer field training program, the first to organize a radiological school for officers, and the first to develop an effective liaison with civil defense units.

Mr. Augspurger, as a member and officer of the Historical Society and through his military connections, contributed enormously to Canadian-U.S. relations.

He worked tirelessly on the 100th anniversary of peace celebration between the two nations and attended countless Canadian military functions as a U.S. representative.

The Buffalo Men's & Boys' Wear Guild named Mr. Augspurger a man of the year in 1965 for his work in the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation and Backers Realty, the group within the Foundation, that helped develop Main Place.

RED CROSS OFFICIAL

A former chairman of the Buffalo Red Cross Chapter, Mr. Augspurger was vice chairman of the American Red Cross national convention in Cincinnati, O. in 1961. He also is a past president of the Main St. Association Inc.

Mr. Augspurger helped develop Red Cross disaster services in the Buffalo area and served in 1949 as the first chairman of the Red Cross regional blood program.

He also was active in United Fund appeals and in many other philanthropic fund campaigns.

Mr. Augspurger, as The News noted in the 1963 outstanding citizen citation, "spearheaded Buffalo's effective program of off-street parking."

The citation also noted that "experience he obtained in practical politics as a city councilman has been valuable in the intricate maneuvering that involves the meshing of public and private enterprise in civic betterment programs."

HONORED BY UB

In 1960, Mr. Augspurger won the Samuel P. Capen Award for meritorious service to UB.

He was a past director of the Erie County Bar Association and a member of the New York State and American Bar Associations.

He was a past president of the Lincoln Law Club and Phi Delta Phi, a legal fraternity.

He served as a deacon of Westminster Presbyterian Church and was a member of the Buffalo Athletic Club.

Survivors, with his wife, are three children, John N., Robert B., and Susan M., and a brother, Charles H. Augspurger.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express,
Aug. 11, 1969]

**FALL OFF HORSE PROVES FATAL TO
OWEN B. AUGSPURGER, 56**

BOZEMAN, MONT.—Owen B. Augspurger, 56, of 115 Lexington Ave., Buffalo, a prominent lawyer and civic leader, died here in Deaconess Hospital Saturday evening of injuries suffered Wednesday when thrown from a horse while vacationing with his family here.

Mr. Augspurger suffered a fractured neck vertebra.

Mr. Augspurger was a partner in the law firm of Jeckle, Fleischmann, Kelly, Swart & Augspurger.

He was admitted to the bar in December 1937 and for nearly three years, before entering the armed service, he was associated with the law firm of Falk, Phillips, Twelvetrees & Falk.

SERVED IN PACIFIC

Mr. Augspurger was a private in the National Guard in 1940 and his outfit became the 102nd Anti-Aircraft Battalion. In February, 1942, the battalion went to the Pacific and before he left the group late in 1945, he was a lieutenant colonel and battalion commander.

He was honored with numerous service medal awards and six battle stars and two arrowheads from the Pacific campaign.

In March, 1946, he was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in the New York Guard. In August, 1954, he was appointed commander of the Fifth Zone Service Command of the New York Guard and was promoted to colonel in October of that year. In 1960 he was promoted to brigadier general.

UB LAW GRADUATE

A native of Buffalo, Mr. Augspurger was graduated from Nichols School and Princeton University, where he earned his bachelor of arts degree, and the University of Buffalo Law School.

Active in university and community affairs, he was general chairman of the Greater University of Buffalo Development Program of 1952. In 1960 he received the Samuel P. Capen Award for notable and meritorious service to the University of Buffalo.

Mr. Augspurger was president of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1938; president of New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1939; and recipient of the 1947 Golf Key Award of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce as Buffalo's Outstanding Young Man.

RED CROSS WORKER

A devoted worker for the American Red Cross on both a national and regional level, he served as chairman of the ARC Disaster Service; first chairman in 1949 of the Buffalo Regional Red Cross Blood Program; chapter chairman of the Buffalo Chapter of the ARC from 1953-55; first chairman in 1956-59 of the United Community Chest-Red Cross Campaign Advisory Committee; and member of the ARC board of directors and the executive committee.

CHURCH DEACON

He was also a past president of the Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society; past director of the Erie County Bar Assn., and a member of the New York State and American Bar Assns.; also a member of the New York State Bar Assn. Committee on the Unauthorized Practice of Law; former president of the Lincoln Law Club and a member of Phi Delta Phi Legal Fraternity.

He was a worker in the Community Chest, March of Dimes, Cancer Fund, Sister Kenny, and Nichols School fund drives. A member of Westminster Presbyterian Church, he served as deacon of the church.

He was a member of the Buffalo Athletic Club. Interested in sports, he served as manager of the Princeton track team for one year and was a member of the Olympic Sports Committee of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Augspurger is survived by his wife, the former Paula Norris, of Brisbane, Australia, three children, John N., Robert B., and Susan M., and one brother, Charles H., all of Buffalo.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM—A REPORT FROM SCIENTIFIC AMERICA

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the Malthusian specter of population increasing at a geometric progression rate while the world's supply of food only increases arithmetically is one that haunts many people today.

A short- and medium-range solution to this problem may lie beneath the ground. We now have the technical capability to make food from petroleum; that is, grow protein-rich micro-organisms on a diet of oil.

The threat of a protein deficient diet is already more of a threat to the masses of the planet that is actual starvation. However, protein deficiency can be just as pernicious in its effects. Already, too many people are living on mere subsistence diets—diets with calories enough to sustain life, but without the nourishment necessary to insure good health.

But man, in another one of his noble efforts, has devised a method which offers hope of growing edible life-sustaining micro-organisms on petroleum. Indeed, laboratories have already operated on a sizable scale and their protein products are being tested. There are difficulties yet being encountered; nonetheless, I believe the process to be one that offers a great amount of hope.

In order to elucidate my colleagues on the possibilities and problems of the process I would like to enter the following article in the RECORD:

[From *Advancement of Science* magazine, December 1968]

ANIMAL PROTEIN FROM UNUSUAL SUBSTRATES INCLUDING PETROLEUM AND METHANE

(Dr. J. R. Norris)

[Tables and illustrations not printed in RECORD]

Nitrogen is an essential element in the composition of proteins and other materials of which living matter is composed, and it follows, therefore, that all forms of life require a supply of nitrogen as a major part of their nutrient intake. Man and the larger animals require nitrogen in complex form as protein or, at least, as the amino acids of which protein is composed. Much of the nitrogen available in the world exists as gaseous nitrogen in the atmosphere or as simple inorganic forms of nitrogen, such as ammonium salts, in the soil and water bodies.

One of the important aims of conventional agriculture is the upgrading of this inorganic nitrogen to produce the complex organic nitrogen compounds required by man.

Figure 1 summarizes the cyclic changes which nitrogen undergoes in nature, and emphasizes the key part played by the green plant. The dashed line represents the border between the organic and inorganic states of nitrogen and, whilst the proteins and amino acids of the bodies of plants and animals and the waste products of animal metabolism are readily broken down to the simpler forms of nitrogen by microbial action, there is only one route upwards from the simple to the complex; protein synthesis by the growing green plant. This nitrogen upgrading requires energy, and the green plant, by photosynthesis, is able to trap and use the energy of the sun for this purpose. That is essentially our problem; protein synthesis by agricultural crop plants is notoriously slow and inefficient in terms of protein synthesized per unit of area cropped. Conventional agriculture is correspondingly limited in its ability to supply man's protein requirements.

Of course, this cycle alone cannot support regular agricultural cropping. As nitrogen is removed in the form of plant or animal produce, it must be replaced as inorganic nitrogenous fertilizer, and we need only look at figures reflecting the world use of fertilizer nitrogen over the past half century to see how the demand for inorganic nitrogen is escalating (Table 1). Today, approximately one-sixth of the world population (say 500,000,000) is dependent on artificial nitrogen for its survival. We can safely assume that the world's soils, via nitrogenous residues, can hardly be expected to take care of more than half of the 3,000,000,000 extra people expected to be alive in the year 2000. This would imply that we shall need no less than 50,000,000 tons of inorganic nitrogen per year by the end of the century. This scale of operation alone creates problems—for instance an annual transport load enormous by present day standards would result—but this is not the aspect of the problem which concerns me here. Assuming that inorganic nitrogen can be produced and distributed on the scale required, it is quite clear that conventional agricultural practice, including all the extensions in area and increase in efficiency considered at present to be reasonable, could never manage to upgrade that volume of nitrogen to a level where it would become available to man and animals. Of course we can hope that the increase in population will be less than can be predicted by extrapolation from today's trends, and we can argue that maximum priority must be given to programmes aimed at limiting the population explosion. This is perfectly correct, but we must also remember that today about half of the world's population is already undernourished. At the present time world food production per head is declining and if we are to feed adequate amounts of protein to the population of the world during the remaining part of this century, we must search for new sources of edible protein and we must look for more efficient methods of producing protein from inorganic nitrogen. It is with the latter aspect of the problem that I am concerned here.

Fortunately, although the nitrogen cycle as outlined in Fig. 1 appears in the majority of agricultural text-books, it is incomplete in one very important respect (Fig. 2). The green plant is not the only organism capable of upgrading nitrogen. Most micro-organisms, the bacteria, yeasts and moulds, are capable of utilizing simple forms of nitrogen (in some cases including nitrogen gas) as a starting point for the synthesis of their own cell proteins. They obtain the energy for the process not from sunlight but by the degradation of energy-rich materials of many different types. Many of these energy-rich substrates—carbohydrates for example such as

starch and cellulose, and hydro-carbons—were originally synthesized by plants during photosynthesis, and the micro-organism growing today is often using energy derived from the sun years, and in some cases millions of years, ago.

Granted that microbial synthesis offers us a possible route to protein, we are faced with three important questions—Can protein be synthesized by this route efficiently on a large scale? Can the protein produced be fed to man or animals? Can the whole process be operated economically? Let us look first at the question of efficiency.

A young pig or chicken may double its weight in a month, but a yeast cell will do this in about two hours. A yeast factory with ten large size fermentors could produce ten tons of yeast per day, roughly half of which would be protein. To provide the same amount of protein in the form of pork, it would be necessary to kill 80 pigs a day—30,000 pigs per year. To go back one stage in the food chain, it would require over 8000 acres of wheat to produce the same amount of protein in a year. The yeast factory might occupy an area of half an acre. Micro-organisms grow rapidly, and the equipment needed, although complex, occupies a relatively small area. Furthermore, the efficiency with which the energy of the substrate material is utilized is very much greater than the efficiency of utilization of solar energy by normal agricultural crops. In terms of production efficiency and capacity, microbial methods of protein synthesis are several orders of magnitude better than conventional agricultural practice. If we think in terms of direct feeding of microbial protein to man, a relatively modest plant of 50 tons daily capacity could furnish a protein supplement of a few grams per day for some 10,000,000 people. In practice, the immediate outlet for microbial—or as it is often called today, single cell protein—is likely to be as a protein-rich supplement in animal feed stuffs, but already some yeast is used as a human food supplement, and there is no basic reason why direct feeding to man should not become an important route for the utilization of single cell protein in the future.

Much of the high growth rate of micro-organisms stems from the microscopic size of the individual cells. Only a small proportion of the surface of a large animal or plant is available for uptake of nutrients and complex systems for the distribution of materials are needed within the body of the organisms. The microbial cell, however, is able to take in nutrients over its entire surface area which is high in proportion to the mass of the cell. What energy sources are available for the growth of such micro-organisms?

Ideally, we might perhaps hope to utilize a fast growing micro-organism that was able to obtain its energy from sunlight by photosynthesis, and we would turn to the microscope algae which have these characteristics. Indeed, this idea is by no means a new one. In the remote Sahara near Lake Chad, one of the staple human foods is a rich soup prepared from cages of algal material scooped as a green slime from brackish waters and dried in the sun. The apparent low cost of the process in which 'free sunlight plus free carbon dioxide equals valuable protein' has attracted a great deal of attention and stimulated considerable work on the production of algal protein. Unfortunately, things are not quite as simple as the equation would have us believe. The low cost of the raw materials is offset by other factors. In particular, the layer of nutrient medium in which the cells grow must be thin if sunlight is to penetrate to all the cells. This leads to high water losses by evaporation; a situation which is intolerable in many areas where production would be contemplated. Cell yields often tend to be low so that recovery may be expensive. Both on account of sunlight and temperature algal growth on a

large scale would only be possible between certain latitudes and under restricted climate conditions. The possibility of growing algae on sewage has attracted attention in recent years and several plants have been built for this purpose in areas where there are sewage purification problems, and where water shortages necessitate the efficient use and recovery of available water supplies.

One field in which algal culture might become important is in space flight programmes. Astronauts confined for long periods of time in a space vehicle must be provided not only with food but also with oxygen; and carbon dioxide must be removed from their atmosphere. The idea of using a photosynthesizing alga to achieve all three objectives is an obvious one, and it has been calculated that production of 600 g of alga per day per man would not only be nutritionally adequate as regards protein and vitamins but would also supply sufficient oxygen. Equally, it would remove adequate amounts of carbon dioxide and act as an efficient 'photosynthetic gas exchanger'.

On the 'earthbound' level, algal culture is certainly possible but is uneconomic at the present time. Important problems concern the elimination of bacterial contamination of the cultures, and the provision of nitrogen for growing cells. Nevertheless, considerable research and development effort goes into the problem of algal culture, particularly in Japan and in Czechoslovakia. A photosynthetic micro-organism which is today attracting attention is the blue-green alga, *Spirulina maxima*, a coil-shaped organism, the cells of which mat together so facilitating harvesting.

Space flight requirements have led to the development of interest in the microbial use of another unusual growth substrate, hydrogen. A curious group of bacteria called *Hydrogenomonas* have the ability to utilize hydrogen directly as electron donor in their energy yielding growth processes. Electrolysis of water could be used to produce oxygen (for respiration) and hydrogen as growth substrate for protein synthesizing bacteria. Carbon for growth comes from carbon dioxide and urea, from the astronaut's urine, could be used as nitrogen source. Preliminary estimates suggest that both power and space requirements are much less than for algal culture. From the equations presented in Fig. 3, it is clear that for every equivalent of carbon dioxide used, one equivalent of oxygen becomes available for the astronaut's respiration. Cultures of high cell density (7 g per l.) can be obtained, and it is estimated that a 20-litre culture would be adequate to support one man for an extended period in a closed system such as a space vehicle. Research today concerns the development of efficient production equipment suitable for use in space vehicles and the handling of the biomass produced to provide an acceptable and non-toxic food material. Hydrogen would be an expensive growth substrate for large scale use on earth and we must seek cheaper, more readily available carbon-energy sources.

The most conventional, and certainly the most extensively studied, carbon-energy source is carbohydrate material of which, since it comes almost entirely from vegetable matter, there is theoretically an inexhaustible supply. Actually, however, since a large proportion of the carbohydrate available in nature is in the form of large polymers such as cellulose, and the direct use of such material by bacteria and fungi has not yet proved realistic on a large scale, preliminary hydrolysis to fermentable material would be necessary. Much agriculturally produced vegetable material is valuable as food or feed stuff, and we are left to consider waste products with a high inherent fermentable carbohydrate content. The conventional ones are sucrose rich wastes from the sugar industry, sulphite waste liquor from paper manufacture and potato starch wastes. In recent

years, we have also seen the development of yeast and algal cultivation on the organic growth substrates present in raw sewage.

There is a tendency to think of single cell protein as a new development still in its infancy. This is quite wrong. The idea of producing yeast for food dates at least from 1910 and there are many records of attempts to use yeasts such as *Candida utilis* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for this purpose. *Candida* is capable of using both pentoses and hexoses whereas *Saccharomyces* uses only hexoses for growth; an important point in relation to growth on sulphite liquors which contain both types of carbohydrate and, in North America alone, yield some 50,000 tons of yeast each year. Global yeast production from carbohydrate substrates today exceeds 4000 tons per week and already single cell protein from this source, used as a supplement in animal feed stuffs, is making a significant contribution to man's protein supplies. Incorporation of yeast at a level of 3 per cent in a protein enriched maize flour results in a valuable human food stuff called Incaparina which has been introduced in recent years in various parts of Central and South America to combat protein deficiency. It is hoped that careful introduction and imaginative marketing will lead to the general acceptance of Incaparina and point the way for the introduction of similar novel foodstuffs to under-nourished populations.

If yeast production from fermentable waste carbohydrate is as well developed as this, why should we still be looking for new growth substrates and why is it that much of the present intense interest in this subject stems from the demonstration that hydrocarbons can be utilized as carbon-energy sources by a wide range of micro-organisms including both yeasts and bacteria? The immediate answer that comes to mind is that hydrocarbons are among the cheapest of all carbon-energy sources and that low cost is their main attraction as potential growth substrates. This is not, I believe, the case and in order to explain why I think this I must describe the process of fermentation in a little more detail.

Microbial cells grow only when bathed in water containing their essential nutrients, and this in practice, on the commercial scale, means that a growing culture consists of microbial cells suspended in an aqueous solution containing substantial quantities of carbon-energy, and nitrogen sources, a range of inorganic salts and, possibly, other essential metabolites such as vitamins and growth factors in smaller amounts. In the fermentations we are considering, oxygen is required and carbon dioxide is produced and our culture must be aerated vigorously by sparging air into the liquid and stirring at a high speed. Both the growth of the cells and the input of mechanical energy causes the temperature to rise, but micro-organisms grow optimally only within certain closely defined temperature limits and large volumes of cooling water may be required to dissipate the heat produced. The provision of adequate cooling can be a most expensive item in a fermentation project. On the commercial scale, the process would be operated continuously and a flow sheet for such a process would look something like that outlined in Fig. 4. In addition, it may be necessary to exclude contaminating organisms rigorously from the fermentation by heat sterilizing the fermentor and the growth medium and filtering the air supply. It is obvious, I think, that fermentation is not a simple process and that capital and operating costs are going to be high. The carbon-energy source is going to be a relatively small, though not by any means insignificant, part of the cost of production.

Hydrocarbons contain no oxygen whereas carbohydrates do contain oxygen. This fact has two important effects when we compare

hydrocarbon and carbohydrate fermentations. Cell material has a carbon-hydrogen-oxygen composition roughly comparable with that of carbohydrate and since quite a lot of the substrate carbon is lost as carbon dioxide during energy yielding growth processes, yields of biomass from sugars are often only of the order of 50 to 60 per cent on a weight for weight basis. Hydrocarbons, on the other hand, since they take up relatively more oxygen during conversion to cell material give higher weight for weight yields—but need much more oxygen to do it. For example, 200 kg of sugar plus 70 kg of oxygen will yield 100 kg of cells, whereas 100 kg of cells will be obtained from 100 kg of hydrocarbon, but its production will need no less than 200 kg of oxygen. Furthermore, the heat produced by the hydrocarbon oxidation is double or triple that for the equivalent weight of carbohydrate grown cells.

Increased oxygen demand means increased stirring rate with a greater requirement for mechanical energy, and increased heat production means more cooling water—possibly even refrigeration. The expense of these items can be expected largely to offset the cost advantage of using a cheap hydrocarbon substrate. At current American prices, the cost of various carbon-energy sources per kg of cell mass produced is roughly 44 cents for sucrose, 8.8 cents for molasses and 2.9 cents for hydrocarbon in light distillate oil. Thus the apparent initial advantage of the hydrocarbon over molasses is only about 6 cents per kg of cells produced. The cost of increased aeration with the hydrocarbon would be perhaps 1.3 cents per kg and the cost of heat dispersal could well be of the order of 4 cents per kg. The cost advantage of the cheap substrate has disappeared.

There is an additional problem; hydrocarbons, especially the liquid hydrocarbons used by yeasts as growth substrates are not very soluble in water. They must be emulsified in the fermentation liquid in order to provide sufficient substrate concentrations. The straight chain hydrocarbons used by growing yeast can be extracted from crude oil and introduced into a fermentor in a relatively pure form, in which case the substrate is completely used and clean yeast is produced. More usually, however, a gas-oil—that is a mixture of straight chain hydrocarbons, cyclic hydrocarbons and other compounds produced by distillation from crude oil—is used as the fermentation substrate. In this case, straight chain hydrocarbons are used by the growing yeast which finishes up highly contaminated with residues from the gas-oil. The subsequent cleaning operation is expensive and the final manufacturing cost of hydrocarbon grown yeast is not likely to differ much from that of a yeast grown on more conventional carbon sources.

The main advantage of using hydrocarbons as substrates for single cell protein is not their low cost but the fact that they are available in large quantities as non-agricultural products. Their production is independent of climatic conditions or seasonal fluctuations, there is no problem of reorganization of agricultural practice to increase supplies, prices are relatively stable, and the amount of hydrocarbon actually needed for single cell protein production would be so small as to have little impact on the overall hydrocarbon supply situation. There is another point which is worth noting. Figure 5, presents a picture of the geography of hunger; the dark areas show where deficiency of food supply is a permanent feature of the economy. Superimposed are the major oil and gas producing areas of the world. The conclusion is a striking one—hydrocarbons are often available in, or close to, areas where protein deficiency is most pronounced. In the case of natural gas, the hydrocarbon (methane) is often unusable at the production site and uneconomic to transport. The carbon-hydrogen bond is highly resistant to chemical attack and possibilities for the eco-

nomic utilization of methane, other than by burning as fuel, are few. Natural gas is therefore often a waste by-product of oil production; the flares of burning waste gas are the most prominent feature of many of the world's oil fields, yet some bacteria exist which have the ability to break the carbon-hydrogen bond under normal fermentation conditions and use methane as their sole source of carbon and energy. Such bacteria yield a protein-rich product which, since methane is introduced to the fermentor as a gas, is free from residual chemical contamination. The prospect of developing production plants converting liquid hydrocarbons or natural gas to valuable protein in areas of the world where protein is most needed, and where the substrates are readily available, is a stimulating one, which attracts today the research and development effort of most of the world's major oil interests.

Of course, the process does not end with the production of yeast or bacterial cells. The protein content of the biomass produced is roughly 50 per cent of the whole—somewhat higher in bacteria than in yeasts—but what of the other components of the cells. What is the nutritional value of the fats, carbohydrates and vitamins of the cells? Can we feed the intact biomass to animals (or indeed to man) without causing toxic effects? Is the protein satisfactory and readily available for digestion? Are there objectionable odours, textures or tastes which make the material unacceptable? Can the product be blended with other foods? How is it best dried, packed, stored and transported?

Protein foods are of different kinds and their nutritional values vary considerably depending on their actual content of protein, the amino acid composition of the protein and the availability of the protein for utilization. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of some conventional protein foods and includes for comparison data for a hydrocarbon grown yeast and a methane grown bacterium. At the bottom is the recommended essential amino acid content for an ideal protein for human consumption as defined by the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization. The single cell proteins compare well with other dietary proteins and, provided that the biomass is correctly treated to render the protein available, this view is confirmed by direct feeding assessments of their nutritional value. In one series of trials recorded recently, a hydrocarbon grown yeast was incorporated at levels up to 20 per cent in feed for hens and pigs and showed excellent digestibility and conversion rates with no detectable toxic effects or interference with egg-laying capacity of the hens. Only minor toxic symptoms—probably attributable to the massive protein intake—developed in a pig receiving 60 per cent of the hydrocarbon yeast and ham from this animal showed no evidence of taint when examined by a taste panel.

The nitrogen content of bacterial cells is often somewhat higher than that of yeast but some of the bacterial nitrogen is bound up in cell wall material which may not be readily available for digestion and utilization by animals, but since some of the amino acids of the bacterial cell wall are present in the form of the unnatural D-isomer, which is certainly valueless and can even be harmful to animals, the fact that it is not readily available for digestion could prove to be a blessing in disguise.

Microbial cells contain relatively large amounts of nucleic acid the purines of which are broken down on digestion to uric acid which could accumulate in the blood system to dangerously high levels leading to kidney damage. This is a subject which has attracted a great deal of research. Indications are that normal tolerance of purines is such as to allow yeast to be used as a valuable protein supplement even in a human diet, but de-

tailed toxicological testing, often extending over several years, is required before any new single cell protein product can be considered safe for incorporation into human food or animal feed stuffs. There is another factor which is highly relevant; the microbiologist, by strain selection, and by careful control of fermentation conditions, is able to exercise considerable control over the composition of the biomass he is producing, not only with respect to nucleic acid content but also regarding the protein, carbohydrate, fat and vitamin content. The selective breeding of microbial "livestock" is an important aspect of work aimed at increasing the potential of single cell protein as a food material.

This brief discussion of some of the problems associated with the production and utilization of single cell protein serves to emphasize the enormous amount of research and development effort that must go into the development of these novel protein sources. Such research involves many types of scientists, economists, nutrition and marketing experts and is by its very nature expensive. Obviously the problem is not simply one of microbiology, biochemistry and technology. 71 per cent of the world population lives in the economically less developed regions of the world. They produce some 42 per cent of the world's food but earn only 21 per cent of the world's income. Their requirement is not simply for more food, it is for low cost protein of the right kind. To provide this will require the combined efforts of workers in many different disciplines.

We are sometimes asked whether, in view of the other pressing needs of mankind, we can afford to carry out this expensive kind of research. Figure 6 shows trends in food production over the last decade. Taking a figure of 100 for food production per head of population in 1952-56, the index has risen in developed countries of the west and the Soviet Union and ranged in 1966 from 120 to 140 in those areas. In less developed countries, output per head increased until 1963 and has since declined. The 1965 figure for India was 97, for Indonesia 89, for Cuba 80. In many of the most densely populated and hungry parts of the world, very considerable increases in output have been more than swallowed up by increases in population. These are the areas in which the rate of increase of the population is today highest.

Increased protein production is not, of course, the only answer to the problem of the world's increasing population. Indeed there are good arguments in favor of considering that it is not even the most important. But the world is already short of protein and, although we can certainly hope that we shall be able to control our numbers more effectively in the future than at present, the protein position is unlikely to improve in the immediate future. It seems to me that the world cannot afford not to carry out research and development work of the kind described here—and indeed that the subject merits more attention than it receives at present.

SMUT MAIL

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see Nebraskans use grass-root opposition in combating smut mail. We must work together to halt this degrading literature which is an embarrassment to the American public.

The following letter to my constituents contains pertinent information and in-

structions on how to best protect themselves and their children from smut mailings under current laws:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: Smut peddlers are simply wolves operating in sheep's clothing with the sanction of an apathetic American public and apathetic legislative bodies and courts. The time has come for drastic, severe legislation couched in legalistic language which is enforceable. Only then will we protect our children and prevent these intrusions into our homes.

You have an important role in combating this smut mail. I need your support in backing pertinent legislation.

"Make it a federal crime to use the mail to deliver any offensive sex material to children under 18 years old."—President Nixon.

"Enable citizens to file their objection to receiving smut mail, even before any has been received, with any postal authorities."—President Nixon.

"Fine offenders \$50,000 or give them a 5-year sentence for using interstate facilities including the mails for the transportation of smut advertising."—Denney (HR 12843)

Many of your neighbors have been writing to me expressing their views on smut mail. This is how they feel—

From Wymore: "We have minors in our house, and I dread the day they get to the mail first."

From Scribner: "Enclosed is 'trash mail' which was opened by my office secretary without noticing the fine print in the corner. This sort of thing is repulsive and certainly merits action."

From Fremont: "Lewd, Crude and Nude. I'm sick of it all."

From Lincoln: "Although we need sex education for our young people, this is not the best method."

You can do something now. Until Congress takes stringent action, you have one recourse. Lodge a formal complaint with the Post Office about any advertising material you receive which you deem "erotically arousing or sexually provocative." The proper form is on the back of my newsletter. Cut out this form or copy it. Fill in the blanks (be sure to give the proper name of the maller of the offensive material) and send the completed form along with the offensive material to the Postmaster, 401 North Market Street, Wichita, Kansas, 67225. Once this form is filed, the Post Office will notify the sender that a repetition will make him subject to fines and imprisonment.

This action will help you to be effective at the community and state level in combating the distribution and display of pornography. I want to represent you effectively, but I need your help.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. DENNEY,
Member of Congress.

UNIQUE EDITORIAL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial in support of Senator KENNEDY appeared in the July 30 issue of the Waterbury-Wolcott, Conn., News.

For the information of a wider public and at the request of my friend, Edward M. Ryan, the publisher of this newspaper, I include this encouraging editorial herewith:

STAY IN THERE TED

Special—United States Senator Edward M. Kennedy is getting wide public support after his explanation of a traffic accident in which a young woman died. Kennedy will decide to remain in the United States Senate.

Thousands of telegrams and hundreds of telephone calls have poured into the Senator's summer home and into his office in response to his nationally televised appeal Friday night to the people of Massachusetts to help him decide whether to remain in office. He asked, "advise and opinion" but said that the final decision would have to be made "on my own."

What happened to Senator Kennedy could have happened to any American. It was an accident and his enemies can make no more than that out of it. The United States needs Kennedy. The people of his state need him.

We say "Keep up the good fight Ted and stay in there."

MORE FUNDS FOR THE EEOC

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an editorial which appeared in the Voice, the largest home-delivered weekly in the New York metropolitan area. The editorial condemns the recommendation of a House appropriation subcommittee that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission be granted \$10.1 million for fiscal 1970. While this is about \$1 million more than the appropriation for fiscal 1969, both it and the \$11.5 million ultimately passed by the House fall considerably short of the \$15.9 million requested by the Commission.

I am alarmed that while we can allocate \$30 billion each year to carry on a wasteful war in Vietnam we cannot meet our minimum responsibilities toward this country's minority groups. The number of complaints directed to the Commission has been growing astronomically, up to 30 percent from 1967 to 1968 alone. This caseload represents only a minute percentage of the incidents of employment discrimination which exist and with which the Commission should be encouraged to deal. Additional funds must be forthcoming if meaningful inroads into discriminatory hiring are to be made.

Congress might also consider giving the EEOC the power to issue cease-and-desist orders. At present, it takes the EEOC 18 months to 2 years to dispose of the average case, during which time the individual who has been unfairly treated has had to find another job. Even then, the Commission can merely investigate and mediate. It cannot order the illegal practices stopped.

The EEOC appropriations bill is now before the Senate. The time has come for the United States to turn its eyes from civil wars in Asia and a landing on Mars and direct them toward the flagrant abuses of human rights here at home. The editorial from the Voice follows:

EEOC: STARVATION WAGES

Soon after the Nixon Administration was sworn in, there were strong indications that it was trying to undercut the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) by forcing the resignation of Clifford Alexander, who had been fulfilling his functions as Chairman in a particularly vigorous way, much to the dismay of certain business interest.

The President tried to redeem himself by appointing another Black, William Brown III, who so far has been doing excellent work in trying to ferret out and prevent cases of discrimination in job hiring and promotion.

There are, however, other subtler ways of sabotaging the operation of an agency. Foremost among them is the simple refusal to appropriate enough funds to enable the unit to function properly.

This time the onslaught is coming from Congress. A House Appropriations Subcommittee has recommended an outlay for the EEOC of only \$10.1 million for fiscal '70, while the EEOC, having already cut down its request to the bone, submitted a budget of \$15.9 million, or 50% more than is being offered. This meager amount arrived at by the Subcommittee, which is headed by John Rooney, Democrat of Brooklyn, was reported to the floor of the House this week.

We strongly urge the Congress, and, in particular, congressmen from this area, which so badly needs an effective equal opportunity agency in Washington, to attempt to restore the slashed funds. We also hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee, now considering the bill, will realize the folly of handcuffing in this manner the work of the EEOC, and will take the necessary steps to remedy the situation.

\$15.9 million for an entire year is little enough for an agency which is the only body on a nation-wide basis devoted to rooting out unfair practices in employment, one of the most deep-rooted and pernicious problems in the country.

The Nixon Administration has given far too little attention to the necessity of upgrading the EEOC by seeing that it is properly financed and by urging it be given the "cease and desist" powers it so desperately needs. (These powers would permit the agency to order illegal practices stopped, as other agencies can do, instead of being able only to investigate and mediate cases of discrimination.)

The Congress, of course, holds the purse strings, but without a commitment from the White House, the situation is likely to go from bad to worse.

At present, budgetary problems have caused a gigantic backlog in the work of the Commission. It takes 18 months to 2 years between the time a case is filed and the time relief is obtained for the plaintiff. Such delays are a gross miscarriage of justice, but the EEOC is powerless to do anything about it due to its present understaffing.

The \$10.1 million projected for fiscal '70 is only slightly more than the appropriation for fiscal '69 (the latter \$9.2 million,) whereas the complaints pouring into the Commission are increasing at a tremendous rate. In fiscal '67 there were 8,512 complaints; in fiscal '68 there were 11,172. Figures have not yet been released for fiscal '69, just ended on July 1, but the growth of cases is expected to be even greater.

It is a fallacy to reason that the EEOC, because it is being given almost a million more than last year, should be satisfied. This is equivalent to maintaining that a man who received next to no income last year has no gripe because he is getting starvation wages this year!

The fact is, there are 3000 cases pending at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in Washington, which does not in-

clude all the incidents being reported on a daily basis to each of the thirteen regional offices of the agency.

Since job discrimination has been an area so grievously neglected in the U.S., unlike other matters, for instance, the conquest of space and agricultural overproduction, it is natural that the need for funds should be relatively greater than in other fields.

While the task ahead is overwhelming, progress has been made. Many large corporations have changed their hiring policies since the watchful eye of the EEOC has been upon them, and individuals know they have a channel of complaint when they are refused employment or are underpaid on account of their race, age or sex.

The EEOC budgetary request of \$15.9 million is a small price to pay for tackling this age-old problem. Unless the Congress restores the appropriation to the full amount it, will be proving to the world and to the underprivileged of this nation that it is totally indifferent to the second-class treatment that so many of our citizens are receiving.

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL BRETTON WOODS?

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in July, the Saturday Review noted the 25th anniversary of the Bretton Woods agreements by publishing a guest editorial entitled "Will Success Spoil Bretton Woods?" The guest editor, Prof. Richard N. Gardner of the Columbia Law School, is a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and a U.S. delegate to many international meetings. He is an authority on monetary problems, his latest book on the subject, "Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy: The Origins and the Prospects of Our International Economic Order," having just been published by McGraw-Hill.

Prof. Gardner's proposals for strengthening and expanding the Bretton Woods system are constructive and should receive serious study. Especially interesting is his suggestion that the creation of new monetary reserves, such as the proposed "special drawing rights," be used in part for purposes of international development. The editorial follows:

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL BRETTON WOODS?

It is not an anniversary likely to be celebrated in newspaper headlines or TV specials, but twenty-five years ago this week the charters of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were agreed upon at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire. That event created the international financial system still in operation today.

Everything considered, the negotiators at Bretton Woods did not do too badly. Impressed by the failures of economic diplomacy after World War I, they were determined to avoid another Great Depression, and to lay an adequate economic foundation for world peace. One measure of their success may be seen in the fact that, in the quarter-century since Bretton Woods, there has been an era of economic advance unparalleled in the history of mankind.

To give all the credit for this economic record to the planners at Bretton Woods would be an obvious oversimplification. But

it is clear that they must have done something right. If they had not had the foresight to draft the fund and bank agreements before the war ended, the basis for the post-war growth in trade and production would not have existed.

Yet, the system established at Bretton Woods is now in serious trouble. One of the reasons, paradoxically, is that it has worked so well. The system lacks the resources and the flexibility to cope with the fantastic increase in trade and capital flows that it made possible. The remedy is not another Bretton Woods Conference, as some have urged, but a series of negotiations aimed at reforming the system on a number of key points.

The first and most pressing necessity is to activate the new facility for Special Drawing Rights in the International Monetary Fund, and to create enough of this "paper gold" to sustain a climate of free trade and economic expansion. In concrete terms this means issuing at least \$15 billion of SDRs during the initial five-year period, with perhaps \$5 billion in the first year to compensate for recent reserve losses.

Second, new techniques of international reserve management need to be devised so that countries do not run from dollars, sterling, and other currencies into gold. The best way to do this would be for countries to pool their gold and currency reserves in consolidated accounts with the fund.

Third, new arrangements are needed to improve the balance-of-payments adjustment process. More effective international pressures through the fund and other forums should be brought to bear not only on deficit countries but on surplus countries that drain reserves out of the system. Since governments are reluctant to adjust exchange rates for reasons of prestige and domestic politics, devices such as the "crawling peg" by which parities could move by 1 or 2 per cent each year in response to economic forces should also be explored. Before putting this type of system into effect, of course, a major realignment of existing exchange rates—notably a revaluation of the mark and the devaluation of the franc—is in order so as to compensate for the adjustment failures of the past.

Finally, there is a need for much bolder approaches in aid to less developed countries, whose problems were hardly considered by the draftsmen at Bretton Woods. Adequate amounts of aid on sufficiently liberal terms are unlikely to be provided as long as the necessity exists for annual contributions by Congress and other national legislatures. The rational solution—admittedly a difficult one politically—would be to combine reserve creation with development assistance, allocating substantial amounts of SDRs to multilateral lending agencies for relending to the developing countries.

This is quite an agenda for those who bear the responsibility of running the international financial system. They can cope with it, if they demonstrate the same commitment to economic internationalism and the same qualities of courage and imagination as their predecessors who met at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, twenty-five years ago.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN POW'S

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, of the many tragedies that have grown from our deplorable involvement in Vietnam, none perhaps is more poignant than the situation facing the families of our service-

men missing in action. In many cases, these families have no way of knowing whether their loved one—missing for months and years in some instances—is dead or alive.

As the Members are aware, Mrs. Pat Mearns, a courageous wife of one of our missing servicemen, has organized wives and parents of American prisoners of war who it is believed are currently being held captive by the North Vietnamese or NLF. My distinguished colleague from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) intends to request a special order next month to address the problem. His recent "Dear Colleague" letter concerning the subject was most constructive.

Mrs. Mearns' plea, and the plight of the many in her situation, demand urgent attention not only in the Congress but at the negotiating table. Our POW's in Vietnam must receive our negotiators' top priority in Paris. It is time to demand enforcement of the code of the Geneva convention: free flow of mail, release of the sick and wounded, the simple decency of listing the names of living prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I have over the months risen to decry the cancerous effects of our misguided and ill-advised commitment to what is surely a senseless war. While the tragedy continues, however, our negotiators in Paris must not neglect the fate of our men lost in the fighting.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of "building bridges" to the East and talk of increased trade with Soviet countries, it would do well to remember the two anniversaries of Soviet treachery which fall in this month. More than once the Soviets have suddenly, and under cover of night, slammed the door of freedom closed in the face of a captive people.

Eight years ago, on the morning of August 13, 1961, the world awoke to discover that the "divided" city of Berlin had been further separated by a grim "defensive" wall, not to keep people out, but to keep hostages in. That crude concrete and cinder block construction has been replaced by more sophisticated masonry works, barbed wire, watch towers, search lights and check points, but it has never, with its antitank barricades turned in on the people of East Berlin, been a "defensive" fortification. To date 66 East-ern Germans have given their lives seeking the refuge and freedom of the West over and under the infamous Berlin Wall.

Just last year, during the night of August 20-21, a Soviet-led Warsaw pact invasion of Czechoslovakia attempted to still the feeble stirrings of independence from strict Russian control. In that assault a reported 20 to 70 Czechs died. The new Prague government has yet to release an official

report. The government has been "purged" and brought into line, but the interior ministry is planning heavy guard for government leaders to protect them from any "anti-socialist, anti-party and anti-Soviet" anniversary demonstrations by the people of this captive nation.

PITTSBURGH POSTAL DOCTOR HONORED

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today that casts disrepute on the medical profession. Surely all doctors cannot be held responsible for the jaded ethics of a surly few.

Many thousands of physicians today are dedicated still to the oath they took on becoming doctors.

One such unselfish individual is Dr. Earl S. Simms, Sr., who is the medical officer for the Pittsburgh Post Office. In this position Dr. Simms shoulders the tremendous responsibility for the health of both 7,000 postal employees plus 150 other Federal employees who work in other agencies within the same building. Thanks to his tireless efforts in directing and guiding the nursing staff all ill and injured personnel are now assured uniform treatment at all hours of the day and night.

In a recent issue of the Postmark, Dr. Simms was honored for his truly selfless and effective work by its editor Art Schmidt. It is with great pleasure that I ask that Mr. Schmidt's article be introduced into the Record at this time.

The article follows:

MEDICAL OFFICER HONORED

(By Art Schmidt)

Too often the good a person has done is not revealed until after they have gone. Such was not the case on Thursday, July 10, 1969.

Your editor was privileged to attend a special presentation honoring the outstanding, unselfish performance of duty of Doctor Earl S. Simms Sr., MD. Dr. Simms is the Medical Officer for the Pittsburgh Post Office.

Not only is he responsible for maintaining a comprehensible health program for approximately 7000 postal employees, he also administers medical services to an additional 150 employees of other Federal Agencies which are housed in this building. This is a monumental task and requires a medical person with the highest degree of dedication and qualification. This is the man who was honored at this ceremony.

Since first becoming a part of the Pittsburgh Postal Family in 1967, Dr. Simms has continuously strived to improve the medical services that are provided for the employees of this office. He has provided the Nursing Staff with expert advice, direction and guidance, resulting in a uniform procedure for the treatment of ill and injured personnel on a 24 hour basis.

The Nursing Staff under his direction has reached a degree of efficiency second to none. They too have been infected with the compassion and dedication Dr. Simms is so noted for. You need only refer back to the past Christmas period.

As the epidemic began to reach its peak, the effectiveness of Dr. Simms' prior plan-

ning was clearly visible. Many of our employees were able to remain on duty, or were able to return to work after a very short absence. In truth, Dr. Simms and the Medical Unit Staff averted a near catastrophe and enabled the Mail Processing Sections to maintain a stable working force during the crucial period of Christmas.

It can honestly be stated that Doctor Simms lives and breathes the "Oath of Hippocrates" which each doctor must take. Particularly the line that reads, "With Purity and Holiness I will pass my life and practice my art."

Congratulations Doctor Earl S. Simms, you are indeed an outstanding man.

THAT "SECOND TO NONE" RAILROAD

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of New York has promised flatly that next year the Long Island Railroad would be "second to none" in the Nation. He has also promised that it would be running "smoothly" within 2 months. He is thus far implementing this promise largely by canceling trains.

So that we will really appreciate the miracles to be wrought over the next 2 months it might be useful to have an articulate statement on the present operation of the railroad by a neutral observer. Such is available in the form of an essay forthrightly called a critique in the Washington Post of Friday, August 8, 1969, the very same day the Governor's promises were published. The article, by Myra MacPherson, follows:

TO PATCHOGUE THE HARD WAY

Riding the Long Island Rail Road is like taking a trip into the 19th century.

There are these old cars with fans in the ceilings, like those you used to see in old barrooms and butcher shops. Their paddles twirl uselessly moving masses of hot air from one place to another, and you wouldn't be surprised to see the Indians coming over the horizon with bows and arrows.

Through windows covered with decades of dust, a commuter sees a landscape that looks as if it is bathed in the gloom of rain clouds. Actually it is only that you are looking through the dust. Outside those dirty windows, the sun is, in reality, shining.

It is a summer afternoon, 97 degrees, and I am taking the 1:10 steamboat to Patchogue, hopeful of meeting up with a boat to Fire Island. Passengers approach each other tentatively, in non-air conditioned stupor, easing into seats, looks of apology on their faces for having to sit so close.

You move a leg, and your skirt—straight at the beginning of the trip and now accordion pleated—sticks to the seat.

The car is filled—businessmen with ties at at half-mast, mothers and children with sand buckets, men in twos with their unmistakable hissing sibilants, a young couple cuddling a cat in his cage, a girl with a long swatch of hair which she braids two or three times on the trip, two white-haired tall-cumed ladies in print dresses.

The car seems suitable for a World War I troop train. It was, in fact, built around 1917 and singing "It's a Long Way to Tipperary" seems far more appropriate than reading about Neil and Buzz landing on the

moon, as you plumb the outer regions of Long Island (50 miles from Penn Central Station).

The chugging suddenly stops. We sit somewhere outside New York City, looking at modern America's sculpture—rusted auto junk yards and plastic backyard pools. We sit and we sit. No one tells us why. Perhaps it is to keep up with the rest of the Long Island trains. No one would want to mar that record of the day before—123 trains more than 10 minutes late to their destination. (A report states 92,250 commuters were affected by those delays.)

We finally pull into one of those Indian-named towns—made totally incomprehensible by the conductor's announcement.

We sit and sit and another train pulls up on an adjacent track. All of a sudden, countless people pour off that train, stampeed through the vestibules of our train and out the other side, like clowns in a circus car. Since our train blocked their path, it was the only way they could get across to wherever they were going.

Several sickening lurches and we're off again. Commuters start asking questions. A conductor, who looks like a male Margaret Rutherford, says through wobbling dentures something that sounds like changing at Babylon if you want to get to Patchogue.

A man asks if that is indeed what he said. The conductor, whose face says he's been riding the Long Island Rail Road 80 years and hating every minute of it, shouts, "Look, I tolja once." Then the man approaches a seat where a woman is trying to extricate her leg from a slather of bubble gum, a memento left by the previous rider. She complains and the conductor says, "Lady, that's no problem of mine."

He's now zeroing in on me and my ticket. I ask whether we can make the change in Babylon in time to get to Patchogue to catch the ferry. He snarled, "I don't know nothin' about boats."

Well, we didn't make it on time. We were due at 2:50. We arrived at 3:40. Two hours and forty minutes to go 50 miles—the exact same time it took me on the Metroliner to get from Washington to New York. The ferry? It left at 3:15. The next one? Five p.m.

Several days later: Revived in an air-conditioned office, I read with renewed interest about the plight of the Long Island Rail Road.

Commuters burn their commuter cards in protest. New York Democrats and Republican factions yell at each other about doing something. The New York Times runs front page stories. In a few minutes, during one inevitable wait for a train, zealots collected 5,000 signatures on a petition calling for the ouster of the management of the Long Island Railroad.

A call to the Long Island Railroad uncovers a pleasant masochist who came from American Airlines recently to handle publicity for the company. His name is Hank Boerner and he says actually, it's his wife who is the masochist. He just works for the Long Island Railroad; she rides it.

Boerner says the "immediate problem is the shortage of electric cars. There are 774, and at present, 250 are out of service." He says the reason you have to do such things as change at Babylon is that the electric cars go no farther than that. Diesel takes over from there.

He goes into some long explanations about repairmen and union demands and why it takes so long to get bad cars repaired. He says a quarter of a million people ride the Long Island daily and he says new cars the line bought aren't operating right.

He ends up saying it is "utter chaos." To clean things up, you "need time." The Long Island operated the way it did for 100 and some odd years before the state ever heard of it." (Now run by the Metropolitan Trans-

portation Authority, the state took over the line in 1966 when the line was in bankruptcy.)

Boerner said another problem is that "in many instances, employees just don't give a damn." An understatement, I thought, remembering my conductor.

Although Boerner admits "they don't speak too clearly on Long Island," he says you should have heard them before they took voice lessons. Station announcers were taken to WCBS in New York where a radio announcer drilled them. As a result one woman announcer now says "For change at Jamaica" rather than "change-a-maica." And they don't say Erster Bay for Oyster Bay so much any more.

As a non-New Yorker, it is not always easy to feel sorry for a New Yorker, who has learned young to gouge, kick and batter his way into taxicabs, airplanes, trains. But after one trip to Long Island, I have only pity for the commuter who must include it in his daily life, a trip that leaves grown men mumbling incoherently.

As one secretary said, perhaps better than any of the countless numbers of fed-up, complaining commuters, "Riding the Long Island Railroad is like having a second job."

SUMMER INTERNS: BRIDGING THE GAP

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about the so-called generation gap that exists between our Nation's youth and their elders.

Congress is doing its part to bridge this gap. This summer my colleagues and I have employed several hundred college students as interns in the various congressional offices. These students are not the ones you read about who are burning buildings on campus; rather, they represent a much, much larger group of young people who are concerned with the future of our country and are constructively doing something about it.

These bright, young citizens have come to Capitol Hill to learn the workings of our Government and to witness democracy in action. They bring with them curiosity, energy, and a fresh point of view. I am sure the experience they have gained during the summer will be valuable to them; certainly the experience my colleagues and I have gained in working with them will be valuable to us.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed fortunate to have had six interns working in my office for the summer, and I hope they have profited from our association as much as I have. These fine youth, who have contributed much during their short stay on the Hill, are to be commended for their efforts, and I would like to include their names at this point in the RECORD:

SUMMER INTERNS

Mae Kocis, American University; Patti Meadow, Beaver College; Cynthia Michael, Amherst College; Karen Schultze, Trinity College; Tom Skirbunt, Georgetown University; and Dick Loftin, Harvard Business School.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE STATISTICS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, now that President Nixon has called for an overhaul of the present welfare system, it is to be expected that in the months ahead there will be a wide-ranging debate in this country on poverty and public assistance. I expect that H.R. 586, my Income Maintenance Act, the first bill presented to the Congress to provide for a guaranteed annual income, will be widely discussed.

In matters of such importance it is essential that discussion be based on factual information and the realities of the situation, rather than on conjecture or emotion. In determining the most effective way to assist the poor, preconceptions and stereotypes must be cast aside.

This determination must not be made on the basis of outmoded assumptions, such as the common misconception that the poor are poor because they are lazy, or that welfare recipients will not work unless they are forced to.

In rejecting the present welfare system, we must be aware of exactly what the old system is, how it works—or more accurately, how it does not work—and how much assistance it gives in each State.

Therefore, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information which I feel is worthy of my colleagues' careful consideration. The following tables describe several of the more striking features of the welfare system, as of March 1969.

The first table lists recent changes in public assistance payments, number of recipients, and money payments per recipient.

The second table lists the number of recipients and the payments per recipient in the aid to families with de-

pendent children program in each of the States. In conjunction with this table it is interesting to note that on the national average, the Federal Government pays for 55.3 percent of AFDC costs; while States pay 31.7 percent and localities pay 13.1 percent. In New York State however, the Federal Government assumes only 49.2 percent of the AFDC cost, with 25.6 percent of the cost being assumed by the State and 25.2 percent by the localities. This is doubly significant when we note that New York has the highest expenses of any State for the AFDC program. The monthly cost of the program in New York was \$80,315,000 in March 1969, as compared to California, the State with the next highest costs with \$48,156,000.

These statistics and tables are provided by the National Center for Social Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its monthly report, "Public Assistance Statistics, March 1969."

The tables follow:

TABLE 1.—RECENT CHANGES IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE: RECIPIENTS, PAYMENTS, AND MONEY PAYMENTS PER RECIPIENT, MARCH 1969 COMPARED WITH SELECTED EARLIER MONTH

Program	2 years ago, March 1967	1 year ago, March 1968	Last month, February 1969	This month, March 1969 ¹	Program	2 years ago, March 1967	1 year ago, March 1968	Last month, February 1969	This month, March 1969 ¹
Recipients:					Assistance payments (in thousands)—Continued				
Old-age assistance.....	2,066,000	2,044,000	2,025,000	2,030,000	Payments to intermediate care facilities.....			\$12,478	\$13,283
Aid to the blind.....	83,300	81,700	80,300	80,400	Medical assistance:				
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	597,000	656,000	718,000	728,000	Total.....	\$219,343	\$318,908	383,862	374,027
Aid to families with dependent children:					Medical assistance.....	186,450	295,218	359,860	349,087
Families.....	1,180,000	1,365,000	1,591,000	1,621,000	Medical assistance for aged.....	5,027	5,388	4,315	4,525
Persons.....	4,906,000	5,587,000	6,376,000	6,478,000	Other federally aided.....	22,414	14,163	13,920	14,800
Children.....	3,692,000	4,180,000	4,743,000	4,815,000	General assistance.....	5,452	4,139	5,767	5,615
General assistance:					Money payments per recipient:				
Cases.....	324,000	365,000	402,000	404,000	Old-age assistance.....	68.15	68.65	70.10	70.65
Persons.....	720,000	792,000	828,000	827,000	Aid to the blind.....	89.65	90.25	93.15	94.25
Assistance payments (in thousands):					Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	76.05	80.25	84.30	84.60
Total.....	\$620,274	\$774,529	\$915,892	\$938,609	Aid to families with dependent children:				
Money payments:					Average per family.....	153.05	163.00	171.15	171.35
Total.....	400,931	455,621	519,552	551,299	Average per person.....	36.80	39.80	42.70	42.90
Old-age assistance.....	140,758	140,385	141,990	144,628	General assistance:				
Aid to the blind.....	7,242	7,374	7,478	7,625	Average per case.....	83.20	89.75	92.85	94.45
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	45,433	52,696	60,533	62,339	Average per person.....	37.40	41.35	45.05	46.10
Aid to families with dependent children.....	180,575	222,402	272,214	295,066					
General assistance.....	26,923	32,764	37,337	41,641					

¹ Aggregate amounts for money payments include special grants of \$25 per person issued quarterly in New York City as follows: Total, \$22,807,000; OAA, \$1,193,000; AB, \$49,400; APTD,

\$780,000; AFDC, \$17,258,000; and GA, \$3,528,000. Payments per recipient exclude the special grants.

TABLE 2.—AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN: RECIPIENTS OF MONEY PAYMENTS AND AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS, BY STATE, MARCH 1969¹

[Excludes vendor payments for institutional services in intermediate care facilities and for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Payments to recipients					Percentage change from—			
		Number of recipients		Total amount	Average per—		February 1969 in—		March 1968 in—	
							Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
		Total ²		Total ²	Children		Family	Recipient		
Total ²	1,621,000	6,478,000	4,815,000	\$295,066,000	\$171.35	\$42.90	+1.6	+2.1	+16.0	+24.9
Alabama	25,100	104,000	82,700	1,605,000	64.05	15.45	+8	+1.0	+18.6	+20.7
Alaska	1,900	6,700	5,200	319,000	167.65	47.20	+1.8	+1.2	+25.0	+68.6
Arizona	10,500	44,300	33,800	1,246,000	119.15	28.15	+7	+6	+1.7	+1.2
Arkansas	10,000	40,200	30,500	784,000	78.30	19.50	-1	+1.1	+2.5	+2.1
California ³	262,000	998,000	715,000	48,156,000	183.75	48.25	+3.3	+3.4	+21.1	+27.5
Colorado ³	15,400	57,600	43,600	2,274,000	147.70	39.50	+1.3	+7	+1.5	+5.8
Connecticut ³	19,800	76,000	56,500	4,749,000	239.60	62.50	+1.1	+1.1	+16.6	+33.3
Delaware ³	4,600	18,300	13,800	602,000	131.90	32.90	+8	+1.2	+1	+1.8
District of Columbia	7,200	31,600	25,000	1,310,000	182.60	41.50	+1.7	+2.7	+21.8	+30.9
Florida	44,500	175,000	138,000	3,564,000	80.10	20.40	+1	(9)	+18.3	+59.3
Georgia	39,200	152,000	117,000	3,732,000	95.30	23.50	+2.5	+2.4	+40.4	+36.2
Guam	290	1,400	1,200	50,000	171.30	34.70	+6.1	+4.2	+47.1	+38.5
Hawaii ³	5,200	21,400	15,700	1,018,000	194.30	47.60	-4	+1.1	+3.7	+12.4
Idaho	3,400	12,800	9,200	607,000	176.80	47.35	+2.3	+2.0	+4.6	+6.0
Illinois ³	75,200	332,000	257,000	16,025,000	213.10	48.25	+1.5	+2.7	+14.0	+21.5
Indiana	13,900	57,200	43,100	1,856,000	134.00	32.45	+5	+1.1	+9.5	+9.6
Iowa	14,900	57,500	41,800	2,881,000	193.15	50.10	+1.4	+1.3	14.4	+16.1
Kansas ³	11,400	46,000	35,500	2,150,000	188.35	46.75	+1.3	+1.7	+10.2	+18.7
Kentucky	31,000	120,000	86,500	3,483,000	112.40	29.10	+1.5	+1.8	+12.1	+14.9
Louisiana	38,600	168,000	130,000	3,981,000	103.10	23.70	-9	-8	+27.6	+26.7

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN: RECIPIENTS OF MONEY PAYMENTS AND AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS, BY STATE, MARCH 1969¹—Continued

[Excludes vendor payments for institutional services in intermediate care facilities and for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total ²	Children	Total amount	Average per—		February 1969 in—		March 1968 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total ³	1,621,000	6,478,000	4,815,000	\$295,066,000	\$171.35	\$42.90	+1.6	+2.1	+16.0	+24.
Maine ³	7,600	27,600	20,400	\$830,000	\$109.80	\$30.00	+3.9	+4.2	+23.0	+24.1
Maryland ³	30,100	118,000	90,700	44,703,000	156.40	39.95	+8	+1.7	+5.2	+8.9
Massachusetts ³	48,200	179,000	132,000	11,400,000	236.55	63.80	+1.6	+9	+23.8	+45.6
Michigan ³	51,400	208,000	156,000	10,001,000	194.60	48.05	+1.4	+1.2	+6.3	+15.1
Minnesota ³	18,000	64,700	49,800	3,604,000	199.70	55.70	+8	+1.9	+6.0	+10.0
Mississippi ³	26,100	104,000	86,000	1,012,000	38.75	9.70	+1.0	+3.0	+3.6	+18.5
Missouri ³	30,400	124,000	94,900	3,309,000	108.95	26.75	+1.3	+1.4	+8.3	+16.7
Montana ³	3,100	11,300	8,600	429,000	140.25	37.90	+4.3	+4.7	+15.3	+18.5
Nebraska ³	6,800	26,400	20,300	992,000	146.20	37.60	+7	+1.6	+6.8	+9.4
Nevada ³	2,500	9,300	7,100	286,000	115.40	30.85	+1.8	+1.0	+11.0	+11.8
New Hampshire ³	1,800	7,200	5,300	322,000	180.10	44.80	+1.6	+1.5	+15.6	+20.8
New Jersey ³	51,100	206,000	153,000	13,429,000	263.00	65.30	+1.5	+8.5	+36.0	+53.6
New Mexico ³	11,300	44,800	34,100	1,375,000	121.25	30.65	(9)	—1	+11.2	+11.4
New York ³	259,000	1,012,000	726,000	\$80,315,000	\$243.15	\$62.75	+1.3	+9	+21.0	+22.7
North Carolina ³	28,000	112,000	84,800	3,161,000	112.80	28.15	+1.4	+1.9	+3.4	+13.2
North Dakota ³	2,700	10,400	7,900	506,000	189.20	48.70	+2.3	+2.1	+6.0	+11.5
Ohio ³	61,300	247,000	184,000	9,796,000	159.70	39.60	+6	+8	+5.7	+13.1
Oklahoma ³	23,100	87,600	65,800	2,977,000	128.70	33.95	—8	—8	—3.7	—4.8
Oregon ³	13,700	52,400	36,800	2,173,000	158.20	41.50	+1.9	+3.3	+17.1	+22.3
Pennsylvania ³	88,400	369,000	268,000	17,704,000	200.25	48.05	+2.2	+1.3	+17.6	+47.8
Puerto Rico ³	38,600	192,000	144,000	1,625,000	42.15	8.45	+1.0	—6	+9.9	+73.5
Rhode Island ³	9,100	35,400	25,700	1,787,000	195.35	50.45	+2.3	+3.1	+15.2	+32.1
South Carolina ³	10,100	39,300	31,400	723,000	71.65	18.40	+3.2	+3.4	+32.5	+31.7
South Dakota ³	4,000	14,600	11,000	667,000	168.45	45.55	+2.1	+6.7	+5.9	+16.6
Tennessee ³	28,600	112,000	86,100	2,921,000	102.10	26.15	+1.3	+1.3	+13.3	+13.3
Texas ³	37,800	172,000	132,000	3,245,000	85.85	18.90	+2.4	+2.5	+27.1	+16.2
Utah ³	8,100	31,500	21,700	1,190,000	147.65	37.80	+2.6	+7	+3.8	+11.8
Vermont ³	3,100	11,800	8,400	580,000	185.70	49.10	+1.3	+1.6	+31.1	+41.5
Virgin Islands ³	410	1,600	1,400	46,600	114.40	28.45	+1.9	+7	+3.9	+3.7
Virginia ³	16,500	67,000	51,600	2,427,000	146.85	36.25	+2.5	+14.3	+10.1	+30.5
Washington ³	23,100	85,600	60,400	4,147,000	179.55	48.45	+2.6	+2.0	+12.5	+20.0
West Virginia ³	10,100	89,100	62,000	2,313,000	114.95	26.00	—1.0	—4	—6.4	—5.0
Wisconsin ³	21,300	81,900	61,500	4,490,000	211.10	54.85	+3.2	+2.1	+22.0	+35.6
Wyoming ³	1,400	5,200	3,900	188,000	135.50	36.25	—1.6	—9	+11.6	+5.5

¹ All data subject to revision. Data include nonmedical vendor payments other than those for institutional services in intermediate care facilities.² Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance.³ Includes data on unemployed-parent segment; see table 8.⁴ Amount includes \$17,258,000 representing a special grant of \$25.00 per person issued quarterly in New York City. The average payment and percentage changes exclude this amount. Including this amount the average payments would be: Total, \$182.00 and \$45.55 and New York, \$309.70 and \$79.40, respectively. Including one-third of this amount the average payments would be: Total, \$174.80 and \$43.75 and New York, \$265.70 and \$68.00, respectively.⁵ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.⁶ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

THADDEUS LUBERA

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people in my congressional district were deeply saddened last week when we learned of the sudden death of Thaddeus Lubera, one of truly great educators of our community.

Dr. Lubera was one of those dedicated and determined public servants whose whole life was devoted toward working in education.

There are very few people in my district who in the last 30 years have not had some dealings with Dr. Lubera. He was the assistant principal at the high school from which I graduated and I well recall the many hours we spent together in interesting conversation about education.

For a brief period, Dr. Lubera served as superintendent of the Chicago school system and was most highly admired for his excellent contribution.

Dr. Lubera retired in December 1967.

I am including in the RECORD today a story about his death which appeared in the Chicago Tribune.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending to the widow and his two sons heartfelt sympathy.

The article follows:

EX-SCHOOLS' CHIEF LUBERA DIES AT AGE 66—
FOLLOWED WILLIS AS SUPERINTENDENT

Thaddeus Lubera, 66, of 3105 N. Rutherford av., former associate school superintendent and acting general superintendent of schools after the retirement of Benjamin C. Willis, died yesterday of a heart attack in St. Mary's Hospital.

As an associate superintendent since 1955, he was in charge of instruction at all north side schools and was the oldest associate superintendent in point of service. He served as acting superintendent in 1966. He retired in December, 1967.

DID FARM WORK

As a boy Lubera worked 12 hours a day in the fields picking onions at a few cents a bushel. He was graduated from a Catholic grade school at the age of 12, the old Armour Institute and De Paul University.

In 1935 he became an assistant principal and helped set up the manual training program at Wells High school. Nine years later he was promoted to district superintendent.

While district superintendent he obtained a doctor of philosophy degree at the University of Chicago and lectured nights at De Paul University.

CHALLENGES HAUSER REPORT

In 1964 he challenged the Hauser report that the quality of schools is improved when schools are integrated by saying that "race has nothing to do with teaching and learning. You can't be pro-integration or pro-segregation," he said. "You must be pro-children."

Mass for Mr. Lubera will be said Tuesday morning in St. Ferdinand's Catholic church, 5900 Barry av. He is survived by his widow, Marlene, two sons, Gene and Richard, and four grandchildren.

A FULL LIFE AT 90

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a 90-year-old constituent in Provo, Utah, has just completed his second book, a collection of odd and interesting facts of history. In the course of his long career, Jacob Coleman has been an educator, public official, newspaperman, lawyer, and an insurance counselor, as well as an enthusiastic participant in community endeavors. His active contribution to civic life continues through "Letters to the Editor," and in his lifelong avocation of helping individuals confront and overcome personal difficulties in their lives. This amazing nonagenarian is planning a third book, as mentioned in the article about him by N. L. Christensen which appeared in the July 6 issue of the Daily Herald, Provo, Utah. The article follows: PROVO MAN WRITES NEW BOOK AT AGE 90

(By N. L. Christensen)

If a 90-year-old is supposed to stick with his rocking chair, then Jacob Coleman of 246 N. 100 E. belies the tradition.

At four score and ten years, this energetic Provoan has just written his second book.

That's only part of the story. He's still practicing law occasionally and handled one of his biggest probate cases just before his last birthday Jan. 20.

FLOWER GARDEN

As always, he still rises early, does his own gardening, and takes pride in growing beautiful flowers.

Despite declining eyesight, aggravated by the dazzle of snow in bright sun a year and a half ago, he keeps up on current events, reading large-print versions of the New York Times and Reader's Digest and having the Herald read to him.

His idea of intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship is participation in community affairs. Formerly he took a more active role than now, but occasionally he still pens a letter to the editor when he feels the city or its officials need a prod, suggestion, or commendation.

Mr. Coleman—lawyer, insurance counselor, educator, public official, and newspaperman during a long career remains fairly close to home now because of his sight problem and illness of his wife, Allie Smoot Coleman.

PATRIOTIC-MINDED

His daughter, Mrs. Virgil J. (Aline) Smith of Boise, on an extended visit here, escorted Mr. Coleman to the public memorial service the American Legion held for the late President Eisenhower. But he begged off at the Flag Day program in June because of his wife's illness. "You'll have to accept my garden as proof of my patriotism," he smiled, referring to his neat rows of red, white and blue petunias which were blooming beautifully.

Mr. and Mrs. Coleman celebrated their 59th wedding anniversary June 22. They didn't make a big fuss about it—just family members present.

The Colemans' five children are Mrs. Smith, whose husband is an insurance executive; Dr. James Coleman, Nairobi, Kenya, expert on African affairs and associate director of the Rockefeller Foundation; Dr. Sherman S. Coleman, head of the department of orthopedic surgery at University of Utah Medical Hospital; Mrs. John R. (Genevieve) Walker, Salt Lake City, whose husband is executive director of the Utah Hospitals Association; and Mrs. Fred R. (Martha) Miner, Stockton, Calif., who heads a piano school and whose husband is an insurance executive.

TAUGHT SCHOOL

Mrs. Coleman, prominent in her own right, was a school teacher as a young woman. A native of Provo, she is the daughter of Abraham O. Smoot II, a one-time state senator, and granddaughter of the original A. O. Smoot, pioneer era mayor, stake president, businessman, and chairman of the Brigham Young Academy board of trustees.

The Coleman home is a delight to visit, with its artistic and homey atmosphere. Some outstanding art (including a prize painting by the late O. D. Campbell and copies of works of the great masters) adorns the walls.

The book just published by Mr. Coleman is a collection of "Odd and Interesting Facts" of history which he researched. Much of it he wrote laboriously with use of magnifying glass, relying on his daughter Aline for the typing. He is not putting the small, multi-grapher volume on the bookstands. "I'm just using it for gift purposes," he said. Those fortunate enough to receive copies will find interesting reading.

Mr. Coleman wrote his first book at age 81, a hardback volume entitled, "How To Be Well Liked."

He was born in Nephi. He struggled hard for a high school education in Salt Lake and even harder in college at Stanford University where he studied law and became editor of the literary magazine and president of his class.

NEPHI CAREER

At age 21 he built his parents a six-room home at Nephi. While in Juab County he was a school principal, county clerk-auditor, city judge, and publisher of the weekly newspaper which he purchased.

After his marriage, he sold the newspaper and moved to Provo. Having passed the bar examination he was appointed Provo City Attorney, a post he held 17 years. He was elected vice president of the State Bar Association and president of the Utah County group.

His long civic service included over quarter of a century with the Provo Kiwanis Club which he served as president, in committee posts, and as Utah-Idaho District governor.

He has been a member or officer of the Utah Shade Tree Commission, Timpanogos Knife and Fork Club, Utah County Historical Society, city beautification committee, Chamber of Commerce committees, PTA, etc.

GOOD TURN

A former Boy Scout merit badge examiner, Mr. Coleman tries to emulate the scouts by doing a good turn each day. Along this line he has given free legal aid to poor widows; tried to get divorce-bound couples to drop their complaints and live happily together; helped prospective alcoholics to get on the right road again; and tried to save youthful first offenders from getting a criminal record.

"I've always tried to encourage persons struggling under difficulty," he says. "I believe we can have heaven on earth if we lead the good life and spread good among the people."

What are Mr. Coleman's future plans? He has in mind a third book about presidents of the United States. Whether he gets to the project will depend a lot on health—and particularly his eyesight.

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF GREATER WASHINGTON

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Public Affairs Committee of the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter addressed to me dated July 30, 1969.

The reason for this is to inform all of the Members of Congress of the outstanding job being performed by the Jewish Community Center and the problems that may be involved regarding changes in the tax laws included in the tax reform bill recently passed by the House of Representatives.

The letter, in full, follows:

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER
OF GREATER WASHINGTON,
Rockville, Md., July 30, 1969.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: As you are well aware, the Ways and Means Committee is now preparing a bill to reform the tax structure. Among the tentative provisions of this bill are changes affecting philanthropy. They center on gifts of appreciated property and on the taxation of foundation income.

As a Director of the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington and chairman of its Public Affairs Committee I have been asked to express the concern of our Board and our membership with the effect these changes would have on non-profit, public-service institutions such as ours.

A five percent tax on foundation income would not penalize the foundations. They

would simply have five percent less to distribute to the beneficiaries which depend on them for survival. We urgently request that such a tax either be eliminated from the bill or, in the alternative, that it be levied only against that income which is surplus after the foundation has distributed its grants for the year. This would encourage the foundations to put their income back into circulation as quickly as possible.

Here in the Washington area we have a particular problem. The Jewish Community Foundation was established to raise funds, plan and build an \$8 million complex comprised of a new Jewish Community Center, Hebrew Home and Jewish Social Service Agency. This unique project is being financed entirely with private donations. Not one cent of government money has been used. A tax on the Foundation's income, or one which would limit the donations it receives, could be disastrous.

A major source of funds for organizations such as community centers, for colleges and universities and for other tax-exempt public service groups is the gift of stocks, real estate or other appreciated property. At a time when the President is urging greater private financial participation to help with this country's domestic problems, it seems singularly inappropriate to discourage these urgently needed donations. Again, those who suffer are not the donors, who simply will not liquidate those properties on which they do not want to pay taxes, but rather the worthy recipients.

I hope you will give this matter your closest attention. Because of your position on this all-important committee you have a unique opportunity to help ensure a just solution to these problems.

Sincerely,

LESLEY LOWE ISRAEL,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF
RABBI SELWYN D. RUSLANDER, OF
DAYTON, OHIO; CLERGYMAN,
CITIZEN, PATRIOT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of one of the finest men I have ever been privileged to know, the late Rabbi Selwyn D. Ruslander, of Dayton, Ohio.

Rabbi Ruslander died on July 18 after a long fight against cancer.

He will be greatly missed and long remembered for his many contributions to so many causes. A personal friend, Sel was a person of great intellect and compassion, a man of God who lived and exemplified the Ten Commandments. He was gentle, perceptive, courteous, and so highly regarded by so many in the greater Dayton area that his impact literally was immeasurable.

Rabbi Ruslander was active in social and civil rights programs in our community and was one of the founders of the Dayton Human Relations Council in 1962. He also was a board member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, president of the Dayton Urban League, chairman of the Montgomery County Juvenile Court Advisory Council, and the Health and Welfare Planning Council's Casework Study

Committee, and a member of the Ohio Youth Commission.

To cite one of the many examples of his countless progressive activities, he helped to create a religious dialog between members of the Jewish and Christian faiths.

The Montgomery County Medical Society first recipient of the Dayton-Miami Valciety honored him in 1965 for "his inspired leadership in religious and social welfare programs." In 1962, he was the key AFL-CIO Meritorious Citizen Award. The University of Dayton, a Catholic institution, conferred on him an honorary doctor of humanities degree last year for "long, continuous, and unselfish service to the Dayton community and mankind in general."

Perhaps his own words indicate more clearly the kind of man Rabbi Ruslander was. Several years ago, he commented about the changes being experienced in the second half of the 20th century:

We're living in probably the most radically revolutionary period in the age of man. Understanding, compassion, justice and mercy; justice with mercy and respect for human dignity and the human personality—these are still the moral values . . . which are necessary if there is to be any dialogue in the tension of revolutionary change.

Rabbi Ruslander was born in Pittsburgh. He graduated with honors from the University of Cincinnati in 1930. After completing his studies at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati he graduated and was ordained a rabbi in 1935.

His first congregation was in Port Arthur, Tex. He later became associate director of the Hillel Foundation at the University of Illinois. In 1939 he became director of youth activities for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

During World War II, he served in the U.S. Navy as a chaplain from 1942 to 1946. After serving as an instructor at the Navy Chaplain School at William and Mary College in Williamsburg, Va., he was assigned in 1943 to the U.S. Eighth Fleet in the Mediterranean. With that duty, he became the first Jewish chaplain ever to be assigned to a combat fleet.

After the war he was the acting senior chaplain at the Great Lakes Naval Station in Illinois. He left the service as a lieutenant commander but remained active in the Naval Reserve, attaining the rank of captain and becoming the highest ranking Jewish chaplain.

He became associate spiritual director of the South Shore Temple in Chicago when he left active duty and in 1947, and later that year came to Dayton.

In 1961 Rabbi Ruslander was named chairman of the Central Conference of American Rabbis Chaplaincy Committee. The year before he had been chosen chaplain for the National Jewish War Veterans and was also National Chaplain for the Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity.

He lectured extensively in the area, including the University of Dayton, where he developed the Judaic studies program at Wright State University, and in various Catholic and Protestant religious classes.

Sel was a former president of the Community Welfare Council; vice presi-

dent of the Ohio Valley Association of Reform Rabbis, embracing five States; and a director of the National Federation of Temple Youth. He received the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award last November for his work for Israel and his community activities. He was a incorporator of the Cultural Development Brotherhood of Greater Dayton and he was known to seek college scholarships for needy and deserving students of any religion. It was said that rarely did anyone discover the identity of his advocate.

To his widow, Marguerite, and his three daughters and brother, my wife and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing it is obvious that Rabbi Selwyn Ruslander was no ordinary man. He was many things and above all a clergyman, a citizen, and a patriot, who devoted his life to his fellow man.

May he rest in peace.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, that war is a generally deplorable situation has long been accepted. With this premise, honorable men set about long ago to curb some of the atrocities of war. One of their more notable accomplishments has been the Geneva Convention of 1949. In seeking to make the business of war a more humane thing, the convention has dealt with nearly all aspects of organized conflict, one of the most important of which is the proper treatment of prisoners of war by belligerents.

Gentlemen, I will be brief. It was 5 years ago August 5 that the first American plane was shot down over North Vietnam. As of this week, there are confirmed reports of 348 Americans held captive by Hanoi, and indications are that they hold another 450 men. This raises the total to approximately 800 Americans incarcerated by the Ho Chi Minh regime.

It might seem natural to assume that the North would treat these prisoners according to the provisions of the Geneva Convention, but such is not the case. The Hanoi regime has consistently refused to comply with even the most fundamental of these requests such as release of the sick and wounded, neutral inspection of their POW camps, and the free flow of mail to and from these men. In fact, North Vietnam has steadfastly refused to even publish the names of those Americans held prisoner.

Gentlemen, this behavior is inexcusable and can be tolerated no longer. We ask only that these Americans be granted their basic human rights, but so far the North has ignored these pleas. Now is the time for definitive action. We, the Congress of the United States of America, must follow whatever course is necessary in order to force North Vietnam to comply with the civilized standards of treatment for prisoners of war. We dare not fail to act, to add our voice to the pro-

test, for to do so would be not only to abandon 800 of our fellow Americans, but also the wives and families who depend on them.

WILSHIRE BAR ASSOCIATION COMMEMORATES WOMEN LAWYERS CENTENNIAL

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to share in the recent commemoration by the Wilshire Bar Association of Los Angeles of the Women Lawyers Centennial, by including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of a letter from Adele I. Springer, program chairman of the Wilshire Bar Association, and past president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, together with an article on the Women Lawyers Centennial which appeared in the Wilshire Press, and an address entitled, "Belles, Courts, and Kings" by U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Shirley Hufstедler:

WILSHIRE BAR ASSOCIATION.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROYBAL: You will be interested to know that a significant event was featured in your Congressional District recently, honoring the 14 Women Judges of Los Angeles, in tribute to the "Women Lawyers Centennial", commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first woman's admission to the Bar; and that a very important speech was made on this occasion by Judge Shirley Hufstедler of the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the nation's highest ranking woman Judge, the only woman on any U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, the second woman in history to serve as a federal appellate Judge.

Her address was hailed as one of the best speeches on the subject of minorities' century struggle for equality and justice.

The objective of this centennial celebration by the National Association of Women Lawyers, and the observance of the local Wilshire Bar Association, served more than a merely commemorative purpose. It emphasized, as an example to the present-day generation, that past generations overcame discriminations by peaceful means, through the legislative and judicial process, and not by violence. It is therefore hoped that this event can serve to impress upon others the important role of women, and the importance of law and order in overcoming discriminations.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ADELE I. SPRINGER,
Program Chairman, Wilshire Bar Association.

SALUTE GIVEN 14 WOMEN JUDGES

An unprecedented assemblage of the 14 women judges of Los Angeles, representing a formidable array of judicial womanpower, graced the dais at a luncheon Tuesday in the Windsor Hotel.

Proclaimed by the City Council as "Women Judges Day" in Los Angeles, the event was hosted by the preponderantly male Wilshire Bar Association in tribute to the Women Lawyers Centennial.

The event honoring the distaff side of the judiciary commemorated the 100th anniversary of the first woman's admission to the Bar in 1869. A highlight of the observance

is the progress of the women members of the judiciary in Los Angeles, not only topping all other cities in the number of women on the bench but also outranking others.

The nation's highest ranking woman judge, Shirley Hufstader, the only woman on any U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and the second woman in history to serve on the federal appellate bench, addressed the meeting on the subject of "Belles, Courts and Kings."

"Their Honors," in addition to the federal judge, included: State Appellate Court Justice Mildred Lillie; Superior Court Judges Kathleen Parker and Elisabeth E. Zeigler; and Municipal Court Judges Leila Bulgrin, Noel Cannon, Rosemary M. Dunbar, Joan Dempsey Klein, Bonnie Lee Martin, Mary G. Rogan, Betty Jo Sheldon, Vaino Spencer and Mary E. Waters. Also included in the honorees were retired Municipal Judge May Lahey, the first woman appointed as judge in Los Angeles, who served 50 years on the bench.

"This judge-studded centennial celebration gathering is not merely commemorative," said Wilshire Bar president Kenneth E. Lynch. "The honored guests are living symbols of the theme. When women were excluded from the Law Schools a century ago and were denied the right of a license in the profession, because of sex discrimination, they did not set fire to the school buildings, but achieved 'equality and justice through the legislative and judicial process.'"

He added that by peaceful means women achieved an important role not only in the legal profession but also in the other fields. Other representatives of the "century of progress" invited as special guests included the president of the Los Angeles Women's Medical Society, Dr. Linda K. Morimoto, and the Wilshire Chamber of Commerce's first woman president, Margaret Burk (a sister of Superior Judge James D. Tante).

The Wilshire Bar Association's program chairman, Adele I. Springer, past president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, pointed out:

"It is noteworthy that the Statue of Justice, throughout the ages, has universally been symbolized by a woman."

BELLES, COURTS, AND KINGS

Mourning for the assassinated President had stilled. There was a restlessness in the land and outcroppings of violence. But there was optimism. A bull market surged on Wall Street and factories were chattering 14 hours a day. A group of women went to the polls in South Pass City. A woman was admitted to the bar.

The assassinated President was Abraham Lincoln. The stirring people were freed slaves making their way from shattered plantations toward strange new lives in the cities. They were European immigrants squeezing through Ellis Island and into the ghettos of New York. They were the adventurers, fugitives, miners, and sodbusters migrating to the western frontiers. The stock market was rising toward the shuddering crash of '73. There was violence as trade unionism caught fire in the factories where workers—men, women, and children—labored 14 hours a day. South Pass City was a roaring Wyoming mining town and the ladies who went to the polls were the first American women permitted to cast a vote. Belle A. Mansfield, armed with a judgment from the Iowa Supreme Court, became the first woman lawyer. The year was 1869.

The view from a distance of 100 years is vast, so vast that the individual images merge and blur. We tend now to see the efforts of women to obtain civil rights, to shed the disabilities of coverture, to join trade unions, to get an education, and to seek entrance into the professions as a pallid struggle totally removed from our own day and wholly incomparable to the present battle of black people to win first-class citizen-

ship. That impression is enhanced when we look at the pictures of the women who led the women's rights movement. We see the whalebone rigidity of the figures, the bloomers and the bustles, the cast-iron coiffures and the frozen eyes. And we laugh. They are grotesque. We mirthfully dismiss them and their causes, unable to perceive behind the silent and ludicrous portraits the suffering, the courage, the intelligence, and the toil that was the reality of their lives.

I am going to talk briefly today about some of those women and some of their causes, and I hope thereby to hold a candlepower of light to our own time.

Let us go back a little before the Civil War, when the women's rights cause began stirring. Remember that at that time women were not only disenfranchised, they were locked by custom and law into a system of cultivated inferiority. Education, public or private, was available to the elite, and women were not included in that class.

Female education, beyond grammar school, was almost entirely confined to private seminaries, the curricula of which went little beyond china painting and advanced potato boiling. It was widely assumed that any stronger subject matter would overtax the frail and simple minds of the sex. No university admitted women until 1833, when Oberlin was established and opened its classes to all qualified students. The academic menu at that time consisted of pretty simple fare. No sturdier curricula was anywhere available to women until Vassar was founded almost 30 years later.

The efforts of women factory workers to better their appalling lot by union activity was ruthlessly put down. Wages for women textile workers averaged \$1.50 per week and the hours ran from 12½ to 16 per day. Men earned over twice as much for the same or lesser labor.

The plight of married woman was worse from a legal standpoint than was that of her single sister. Upon marriage, the legal personalities of the husband and wife merged, and the wife's disappeared. She was incapacitated from property ownership, with insignificant exceptions. She could not contract, or sue, or be sued. She had no legal control over her own earnings, or the clothes she wore, even if her husband were profligate or incompetent. White women were privileged, of course, in comparison with black women. At the outbreak of the Civil War there were in this country 4,000,000 slaves of whom at least half were women.

The women's rights movement was in reality a human rights movement. It just happened that the humans were women. The movement was launched on a heady mixture of abolition and booze. The ladies were for the first and against the second.

Women first crossed the silence barrier in the cause of abolition. Until then the dictates of custom and the dicta of St. Paul combined to exclude any women from public speaking. The sole exception was found in the Society of Friends who alone permitted speaking parts to women. The peaceful Quakers can be charged with letting loose upon an unprepared world the fiery Grimké sisters, Sarah and Angelina. The girls were daughters of a South Carolina slaveholding family, and both of them in childhood had developed an abiding loathing of slavery and all its works. After moving to Philadelphia, the girls joined the Quakers. From speaking at Quaker meetings, the Grimkés branched out to ladies' parlor meetings. These soon outgrew the parlors and flowed into churches, where the Grimkés found themselves speaking against slavery to men as well as women. The public notoriety of their unseemly conduct detonated a storm of protest, most particularly including vitriolic denunciations by the Protestant clergy. Angelina collapsed physically under the strain and lapsed into silence for many years. Sarah came out swinging. Her

voice and her pen remained constant in the cause. It was the Grimkés who broke the platform trail for a long list of famous women orators, including Lucy Stone, Lucretia Mott, Sojourner Truth, and Susan Anthony.

Of these women none was more remarkable than Sojourner Truth. She was born a slave in a small town on the Hudson River. Her master forced her into a marriage from which he harvested her crop of 13 children. Sojourner was a lifelong illiterate. When New York freed its slaves, Sojourner went to New York City, first as a domestic worker and then as an abolitionist and a champion of rights for women. She became known as one of the most dynamic and moving speakers of the day. Here is a sample. In 1851 she attended a women's rights convention in Ohio. The women were being heckled and jeered. A clergyman had just delivered a speech ridiculing the notion of extending suffrage to women, emphasizing the weakness and helplessness of the sex. Amidst hissing and stamping, Sojourner moved to the platform, laid her old bonnet at the chairman's feet, and from the pulpit here is what she said:

"The man over there says women need to be helped into carriages and lifted over ditches, and to have the best place anywhere. Nobody ever helps me into carriages or over puddles, or gives me the best place—and ain't I a woman?"

"Look at my arm! I have ploughed and planted and gathered into barns, and no man could head me—and ain't I a woman?"

"I could work as much and eat as much as a man—when I could get it—and bear the lash as well—and ain't I a woman?"

"I have borne thirteen children, and seen most of 'em sold into slavery, and when I cried out with my mother's grief, none but Jesus heard me—and ain't I a woman?"

Sojourner's cry was heard but it was heard only as an indictment of slavery. Many years were to pass before the pangs of conscience could be converted into a real force in the cause of civil rights for Negroes or for women of any color.

Indeed, with the passage of the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery the steam of the women's movement was largely dissipated. The remaining cause to which the women were yoked was temperance. The suffragette leaders made a measured decision to continue in tandem with temperance to pick up the support which the prohibitionists could offer. It was a strategic error of major proportions for the suffragettes. The notion that all those dedicated teetotalers would vote gave the liquor interests severe attacks of the vapors. They rallied their higher proof spirits and large rolls of cash and poured both in quantities into fight after fight successfully defeating suffrage for more than 50 years. Typical was the California experience in the 1896 campaign. Ten days before the election, the Liquor Dealers League met in San Francisco to discuss how the ladies could be kept at bay. They resolved to "take such steps as were necessary to protect their interests." Precisely what steps were taken is not on record. But the result is. The suffrage amendment carried the state handily, except for San Francisco and Alameda counties. Those thirsty citizens cast 27,399 votes against suffrage, which were just enough to kill the amendment.

When we left Bella Mansfield crossing the bar in 1869, we might have assumed that the door she opened yielded more easily to others of her persuasion. The assumption is wrong. While Bella was tucking her judgment into her reticule, Myra Bradwell was studying for the bar in Illinois. Myra passed the bar, but not the bench. Her experience was a repetition of what usually happened to women who transgressed the assumed social order in the name of employment, or suffrage, or civil liberties.

Myra was bright and ambitious. She was also married. She took her cause to the Illinois Supreme Court and presented a good lawyerlike argument for her admission. The court huffed and puffed its way through a rejection of her statutory arguments and then took off in a flight of rhetoric about the wickedness of permitting frail woman-kind to be exposed to the horrors of courtroom combat. Tush! It was enough to make a feller miss the spittoon.

Undaunted, Myra trundled her cause to the United States Supreme Court. Without any overt emotionalism, the majority of the Court dispatched Myra for want of a federal question. Not so Mr. Justice Bradley. Here are some excerpts from his specially concurring opinion:

"It certainly cannot be affirmed, as a historical fact, that . . . [the right of females to pursue any lawful employment for a livelihood] has ever been established as one of the fundamental privileges and immunities of the sex. On the contrary, the civil law, as well as nature herself, has always recognized a wide difference in the respective spheres and destinies of man and woman. Man is, or should be, woman's protector and defender. The natural and proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfits it for many of the occupations of civil life. . . . The harmony, not to say identity, of interests and views which belong, or should belong, to the family institution is repugnant to the idea of a woman adopting a distinct and independent career from that of her husband. . . .

"It is true that many women are unmarried and not affected by any of the duties, complications, and incapacities arising out of the married state, but these are exceptions to the general rule. The paramount destiny and mission of a woman are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother. This is the law of the Creator. And the rules of civil society must be adapted to the general constitution of things, and cannot be based upon exceptional cases."

What impelled Bradley's performance? Could he have been unaware that there were then more than 325,000 women factory hands working under conditions anything but dainty? That thousands of women performed hard physical labor on the farms and in the fields during the Civil War? That frontier women had been and still were working side by side with their husbands under grueling and often perilous circumstances? That women were indeed undertaking courses of study as arduous as his own, albeit in fewer numbers than men?

Impossible. Mr. Justice Bradley was neither ill informed nor ill educated. He knew from his own childhood on an impoverished farm that his mother and his grandmother had not led delicate lives, and he knew from his own law practice the conditions of American workers.

Then why did Mr. Justice Bradley orate about men's hovering protectively around those helpless women?

He wrote that way because he passionately believed that God, not man, had prescribed women's role down to the last comma in the script, that natural law dictated that women were born timid, delicate, and simple minded, and that women who did not behave that way were either biological curiosities or the victims of mankind's inexcusable rebellion against God. According to Mr. Justice Bradley, God's only directive to man was that man should protect and defend woman. Otherwise, man was on his own. It did not strike Mr. Justice Bradley as odd that God had gone to all that trouble for women and had not done as much for man.

Mr. Justice Bradley's problem was that he confused the signs of a culture with the

signs of the Creator, and he mistook man's laws for the laws of nature.

He was caught up in the thralldom of mythology, by which I mean the adoption of a series of assumptions, only partly articulated, which are not objectively true, but which are treated as if they were true. He had lots of company.

Mankind has always clung to its myths with greater tenacity than it has to anything else. And no myths have been more pervasive and enduring than those which assure the dominant members of a society that their positions are secure, and even just, and which tell the servient members why it is not only their destiny, but their duty to remain where they are. Into this category fall the mild and relatively short-lived myth of the divine right of kings and the powerful and persistent myths of sexual and racial superiorities and inferiorities.

The reasons for the strength and longevity of the myths of racial and sexual inferiority are myriad. I shall mention but a few.

Myths of this kind fill emotional needs and accordingly are charged with a great deal of emotional voltage. One of those needs is relief of man's perpetual anxiety about who he is and what he's doing here. Belief in the mythology of superiority and inferiority assuages some of that anxiety by assuring one that his place is somehow ordained and that he need accept no responsibility for his lot. There is in that belief comfort to the powerful, who may need it the least. But there is also some comfort to those who are on the lower rungs of the ladder. For instance, a serf in feudal England needed no tranquilizers to prevent his worrying about whether he made the right career choice.

Really enduring myths are always supported by elements of plausibility. No one would ever have believed that the earth was flat, if it did not appear so to the earth-bound. No one would have believed that women were innately men's intellectual inferiors had women consistently excelled in the intellectual community. Mr. Justice Bradley had history and the view from 1872 on his side when he observed that women were evidently unfit for occupations beyond the most menial. Why bother to ask: How come? He knew that the reason was the inherent frailties of the sex.

What Bradley actually saw was the result of the power of myths to generate their own kind of reality. We know that if one believes that a human being is inferior and, acting on that belief, treats that human being early enough and often enough about his inferiority, he fulfills the belief, regardless of the treasures with which he was born. And if a society implements the same belief by closing off to the same child all resources from which he could sustain intellectual nourishment, his intellectual yield will be as barren as society expected.

For centuries women were told that they were unfit for anything other than menial labor, except the wives of the very rich who were told that they weren't suited for any labor at all. Most women believed what they were told. But for those women who were unconvinced, society mostly saw to it that the escape hatches were not only guarded, but bolted. The surprising thing is not that most women accomplished little beyond the walls of their homes or the looms of the mills, but that any women did more than that.

Justice Bradley and his ilk succeeded in squelching Myra and many of her sisters in law, but the Genils, once released, could not be induced to return to their bottles.

The ladies kept on marching, picketing, and petitioning. Susan Anthony, that indomitable spirit, continued her needlework on Congress. Maude Park Woods and Carrie Chapman Catt spent years organizing suffragettes and training neophytes in the art of assault on the power structure. One of those neo-

phytes was Florence Allen. Florence graduated from Western Reserve University in 1904. After completing graduate studies in Berlin and in Cleveland, she entered the University of Chicago Law School. She finished law school at N.Y.U. During her New York stay, she became active in suffrage. She returned to Ohio as a seasoned suffrage campaigner. She built a major suffrage organization in Ohio, from which flowed a successful suffrage amendment and, as a dividend, an ardent support group for Florence when she ran for Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Florence was elected to that office 10 weeks after the 19th Amendment was ratified. Two years later she successfully ran for the Supreme Court of Ohio, an office in which she served for 10 years at which time Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed her to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Florence served with distinction on that court from 1934 to her retirement, 25 years later.

It is tempting to assume that the old mythology was buried about the time the suffragettes laid down their hatchets. But the assumption would be wrong. So far as white women are concerned, the legal barriers have crumbled, but we still see little vestigial remnants. Why, for example, can a man fully deduct his secretary's salary from his income for tax purposes, but his secretary cannot deduct her child care expenses, without which she couldn't be his secretary—unless she is paid so little that she is a do-it-yourself poverty pocket?

However, mythologies are made of tougher cloth than can be cut by courts and congresses. Proclamations, constitutional amendments and Supreme Court decisions, and 100 years have not been enough to maim the inferiority mythology. It is alive and well and living in the black community.

Do we have another 100 years to answer Sojourner Truth's indictment?

OUR CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as deputy commander of the congressional squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, I am, of course, deeply interested in the annual international air cadet exchange in which the CAP participates. Thus, it is that I wish to call to the Members' attention an address last week by Michael Hudoba, vice president of the National Press Club, to the foreign participants in the IACE at a dinner held here in Washington. Mr. Hudoba's comments are pertinent not only to the Civil Air Patrol, which is active throughout the United States, but also to international cooperation. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include his speech in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS TO THE INTERNATIONAL AIR CADET EXCHANGE, AUGUST 6, 1969

Your excellencies, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the International Cadet Exchange of 1969, it is my privileged honor to welcome such a varied gathering of aerospace minded young people, and particularly, to share in your meeting here in the National Press Club ballroom.

It may interest you to know that virtually every world leader who has visited Washington in contemporary history, has spoken to the Press Corps in this room.

It is international, with its five thousand members representing the press of nearly

*Bradwell v. Illinois, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 130, 139 (1872).

every country in the world. It is also noteworthy that every President of the United States since William Howard Taft has been a member of this club. Many declarations of policies and news have been made by political leaders of the world from this podium.

We had a television broadcast by satellite to Japan when the prime minister appeared here recently. The day after tomorrow the chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany will again speak from this platform. You are indeed in a historic place for the international exchange of news and information.

At this point, I wish to commend our hosts, Mercedes Benz of North America, Incorporated. It is significant that Mercedes Benz, with the pride of achievement in the world of industry recognizes and supports such a dynamic program as the International Air Cadet Exchange.

I have been advised that CAP's national commander, Major General Walter Putnam, is unable to be with us this evening. You should know. That it took the combined force of a team of Air Force surgeons to stop him though. Since General Putnam regrettably cannot be here, I would like to make a few comments about his remarkable career. General Putnam is indeed a dynamic leader, such as one would expect at the head of an organization like the United States Civil Air Patrol. In his role as national commander, he is capping a brilliant 32-year military career.

He began flying in 1937 when he left Oklahoma State University to enter cadet training. Since then he has flown nearly every fighter aircraft from the old P-6 to the F-4-C supersonic jet.

During World War Two, he became known as the "one man air force of Bataan" because he flew two hundred combat missions in the first nine months after Pearl Harbor.

Among his numerous decorations are the Distinguished Service Medal, Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, and the Legion of Merit.

Although he left school for an open cockpit, he went on to earn a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Maryland and a masters degree from George Washington University. They didn't come easy. It took him fourteen years of going to night school and unrelenting study discipline to achieve these degrees. He has proven his interest in education.

Looking over the audience, I know General Putnam would be delighted to see these charming young ladies. Girls, I want to extend a special welcome to you.

In the twenty-two year history of the International Air Cadet Exchange, I understand this is only the second time that young women have participated. Last year, I am informed, the United States and Great Britain exchanged young ladies for the first time. Thus, ending a long tradition of "men only" in the business of preparing their youth for careers in aerospace, as well as preparing them to assume vital roles of leadership in the future. These countries have demonstrated, through the IACE, that young people are *important*, that young people are *individuals*, that young people are the *future*.

Each of you are selected for your special merits, your demonstrated traits of leadership, and potential future value to your respective countries, in this rapidly advancing world of aerospace technology. The twenty-six countries you represent have good reason to be proud of your participation in this year's I-A-C-E program. Through your experiences of the last three weeks you have contributed to international goodwill and have helped expand the range of aerospace interests. Each of your countries has an investment in your future and you have only just begun to repay dividends as future aerospace leaders.

Needless to say, all young people are faced with a challenge to be something special in today's world—a world threatened by an overabundance of bombs, babies, and bedlam—where the need for leaders multiplies even faster. There is no escape from accepting the world's urgent responsibility for the making and keeping of the peace; otherwise, how can mankind ever hope to survive the awesome threats of a nuclear holocaust?

We are looking to *you* to assume roles of leadership—and the responsibility for helping to achieve this urgent need. Many of the crucial decisions about world foreign policy are yet to be made. *You*, and your generation, may have to make them! That's really what I-A-C-E is all about.

This kind of program is a vital link between your adolescent school years and the responsibilities of an adult world. It is a brief but important step into internationalism and better understanding of your neighbors. It is really a short course in international relations and the promotion of peace and friendship through living contact with the peoples of other free countries.

I hope all of you, in going home, will be richer in the friendship, experience, and knowledge of our country.

Back in your homelands you will find further opportunities to test, to compare, and add to what you have learned. You will be able to apply your experiences here to your own cadet programs and share your knowledge with those other cadets who remained behind.

But more importantly to your governments, your homelands, and your peoples is the kindred spirit of international goodwill and understanding to which you have been exposed. You hold a key which can help unlock the unfortunate misunderstandings among the world's nations. In your important role of "junior ambassadors" you can be a potent voice in shaping the world's future.

The I-A-C-E is a *people to people* program, made more significant because of its involvement of the youth of the free world. You are standing on the threshold of the growing aerospace age of tomorrow, facing new frontiers in aerospace opportunities, these frontiers belong to you by virtue of your youth, your interest, and your special capabilities. But the challenge of the aerospace world is constantly changing. Hardly a day passes without some new accomplishment in aviation, in the exploration of space, in scientific breakthrough. Many of the leaders in your various nations grew up with the airplane, but it was not until your present generation that the use of such terms as satellites and space vehicles became words in daily use.

This incredible twentieth century—two-thirds passed into contemporary history—has seen man awaken from a creepingly lethargic pace, now, to ride the flames of rockets, orbiting the earth and the moon, build wings on machines able to jet around the world, accelerate archaic industry into an atomic era, eradicate diseases, perform miraculous surgery. . . . And begin to tap the innermost secrets of life—yet, man continues to flounder with uncertainties and failures of living together in peace on an earth where each and every human being inevitably meets the same moment of truth, that is, to meet the creator of all life on earth. This unsolved mystery is everyone's common challenge. This is the universal bond that makes all mankind equal. Then, why is it, that all humans on earth, born in the same way, from joy and and pain, sharing the same physical limitations in their day-to-day existence, are still unable to live as brothers and sisters?

The problems of this world are man made and man must solve them!

Modern technology has shrunk earth's distances not only through aerospace but the media of communications. Newspapers bring the world to your hand and their pages un-

fold the drama of man's role in the struggle for existence. Magazines and books produce writings in depth on the numerous facets of our daily world. Television transports you instantly onto the scene of current events. You have available fine libraries, art museums, and symphonies.

This world is an enormously exciting place but do not limit yourselves to only one source of information. Do not risk allowing yourselves to become a carbon copy of a single source. There are thinking people whose interest in life can help enrich your own. Unless you listen, read, observe, and think, to savor and digest the innumerable menus of ideas, knowledge, and information, life can become dull and each drab tomorrow become shrouded into increasing darkness. You have available to you today the sum total of all man's combined knowledge.

Knowledge that was undreamed of at the turn of the century. Your special interest, the airplane, was invented by the Wright brothers in 1903, who flew it successfully but so briefly that its time of flight was measured by seconds and the distance in feet. The event was hardly noticed in news coverage of that day. No one then imagined air transportation would become an enormous industry constricting the whole world.

And while Alexander Graham Bell was experimenting with sound, seeking to provide a better aid for teaching the deaf, he invented the telephone. With that crude instrument he could not have imagined the fantastic extent of modern communications. Nor that man-made satellites in orbit—twenty-two thousand miles above the earth—would instantly put everyone in the world within earshot and view of each other.

Could Goddard have predicted that his experiments with rockets in 1928 and 1929 would put telestar communication into orbit, that weather and the world would be monitored by satellites, that astronauts would walk in space and on the moon, or approach the doorstep of Mars?

Television was born in 1934 with only ten thousand sets in use by 1941.

Great inventions do not come to reality as one perfected result. Each of these depends on isolated discoveries.

When the transistor was invented in 1956, it set the stage for a computer industry that has progressed industrial assembly lines toward automation. These mechanical brains will eventually change the whole pattern of man's work world. Without computers air and space travel could not meet the demands of the modern world.

The point I wish to make is that as our world becomes more complex—an incredible number of new professions and new techniques must be developed, each of these open new opportunities for each new generation. There must always be countless teams of individuals to keep the work progressing. An astronaut orbiting the earth must depend on a vast team of skilled and dedicated people to build and to support the flight. And if anyone fails to maintain perfection he risks to destroy a mission and cause the work of scores of thousands to come to failure.

To this point the individual must learn a basic lesson of life. One must learn to discipline themselves, they must strive for perfection, as well as their ideals, they must be sincere and honest so that when each faces the moment of truth—which no human can escape—there will be no need for apologetic fear. We must each be able to look ourselves squarely in the eye each day without flinching.

With all the progress that has been made in science, medicine, invention, industry, business, and government man has lagged far behind in social science. Some men and nations are still unable to live together in peace, to progress brotherhood, to reach for an approach to human utopia.

Although the United Nations is thirty-four

years old—even with its progress—we still live in a world of peril and uncertainty, with some nations distrusting each other, and more than two-thirds of the three billion people are struggling, underprivileged, starving, uneducated, without foreseeable hope of improvement in their status quo.

Here is a challenge to you, to your generation, seek to help make this world progress toward peace and goodwill and to improve the potential of man's existence for a better life and to bring the dream of a utopia nearer reality.

We, in the United States believe firmly in the concept that all people should live together in peace, we warmly welcome you and all others who are dedicated to this same goal.

So, now as you return home please take with you our sincerest and fullest expression of cooperation and goodwill to your countries and to your people.

It has indeed been our honor and privilege to have had you here!

In closing, may I again thank Mercedes Benz for making this evening possible.

ECONOMIC COMMENT BY J. WHITNEY BUNTING, PH. D.

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. J. Whitney Bunting, president of Georgia College in Milledgeville, Ga., has written a thought-provoking article on the rapid increase in the sale and use of mobile homes for family living in the United States.

I think this article will be of interest to all the Members of Congress and in particular, the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

ECONOMIC COMMENT

(By J. Whitney Bunting, Ph. D.)

THE MOBILE HOME STORY

One of the most interesting trends in the area of economics today is the rapid increase in the sale of mobile homes for family living. This nation has gone a long way from the early belief that trailers provided constricted living and were useful primarily for camping trips, tourist devices or retirement living. Today these truly mobile homes are springing up all over the countryside and come "fully equipped" with all the features of basic home design included. When one realizes that this industry has had to overcome consumer prejudice against such type of living, it is necessary that much credit be given to the builders and merchandisers of mobile homes for their efforts to gain consumer acceptance.

It has been estimated that the sale of mobile homes today constitutes about ten to fifteen percent of the new home market. This is no small item in the total economy of the nation. It is further estimated that the sales of these homes should increase to over twenty-five percent of the market in the next decade. So it would appear that this type of structure will be in increasing evidence in the years ahead—particularly in urban or semi-urban environments.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

It is interesting to consider the reasons for the recent public adoption of mobile living, for these facts do tend to show some very important changes in the way of life for

Americans. Although a long list of reasons can be given for this trend, there are about five very important facts that have been most important. They may be listed as follows without any regard to their respective importance:

(1) The rising cost of home construction in the United States making it virtually impossible for the newly formed family on a limited budget to purchase a newly built home on the low income level. The recent, and apparently unceasing, increase in interest rates has just about pushed many potential home buyers out of the market for they do not want to pledge their future earnings to repay home loans with an eight percent rate of interest or better. Consequently, low budget prices for mobile homes with limited interest rates (as far as time is concerned) appear to be a proper solution to the young family.

(2) The mobility of families today is a rather recent phenomenon and indicates a general lack of roots for the population. Only a few decades ago generation after generation tended to stay in one area and had no thought of moving from place to place for economic improvement. Today families follow jobs in order to rise to the stage of economic affluence which they feel is essential to happiness. The mobile home, either as a small investment which can be resold without too much loss, or readily transportable, matches its mobility with the needs of the young family. There is little doubt but that this trend will continue.

(3) The merchandising of the mobile homes has been mentioned earlier but can stand re-emphasis at this point. One no longer buys a "shell" or a mere trailer but rather a fully equipped home that has been expertly designed for good living. Each room, small though it may be, has ample furnishings usually of good quality that make it liveable as soon as it is placed upon a lot. Moreover, the decor is properly designed by a skilled decorator—a service that could not be readily afforded by most low-income families. Producers of this type of home have gone to great expense and effort to ascertain consumer desires in living quarters and have made a real contribution to the needs of society. Certainly the producers of many other durable products could do well to follow suit in the design of their products to meet consumer preferences and desires.

(4) As public approval of this type of housing has increased, so has the interest by banks and lending agencies for financing increased. Since the market for re-sale has been quite good for mobile homes (particularly the more modern ones with fine quality equipment) the element of risk of financial loss is not too great. In fact in some cases there is actual appreciation in value rather than depreciation. So lending facilities are more readily available than in the past. Bank acceptance of mobile homes for financing purposes has given a type of prestige that would be hard to come by otherwise.

(5) At one time in the nation's history the public dream was to be a multi-car family. Today, with a growing trend toward more time for recreation and leisure time activity, there are many families of moderate means that desire two homes—one for normal living and a second on a lakeside, or in the mountains or at the seashore. The mobile home thus becomes an ideal retreat or second home without a heavy outlay of money. A visit to any resort area will bear this out for one can see many uses of a mobile home for gracious leisure time living. And since most living under these conditions is out-of-doors, there is little opportunity for a family to become cramped in too small quarters.

All of these items have contributed to a new and highly valued industry that has taken its place as a good income producer

for the nation. And the future should be greater than the present if current projections are true.

MARKET TRENDS

There apparently is much confusion, even among experts, as to the current price movements on the stock exchanges. Basically the question pertains as to whether or not the market has "bottomed out" at this point or if a further drop can be expected. A review of most other business barometers shows a continued economic strength in the nation and little encouragement for those who feel that even a mild recession might take place. The status of the market for most stocks today is such that most have a good and protected value if purchased at current price levels. Summertime has historically been marked as a period of readjustment for security prices with a general "softening" accompanied by periodic gains. Action this year is not far from this situation.

For those who have doubts about a sustained period of recovery for stock prices toward the end of the year and into 1970, the best answer possible is that economic conditions should hold from "steady" to a gradually improving position. The basic true value of many securities is such that they too should forge upward with a good last quarter of 1969. With no further increase in interest rates and no formal governmental wage-price controls, every indication of economic health is present. Investors for long run growth should have little fears from adverse stock price movements in the foreseeable future.

OUR SECURITY LIES BEYOND WEAPONS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have talked long and loud about the excesses in our military budget. This martial largesse hides a multitude of sins, the least of which is poor procurement practices and "doctored" reports of weapons' systems production.

Millions of words have been written about the problem of holding military spending in check and putting our defense needs more in line with desirable international commitments. This latter fact is based on an accurate analysis of Russian and Chinese intentions in Europe and Asia.

We have bloated our Army and Navy with weapons and men far beyond the limits dictated by our best foreign policy interests.

An excellent article on defense spending, and the implications of what continued congressional scrutiny of the military spending can reap, appears in the August 26 issue of Look magazine.

This extremely literate and precise piece was written by the distinguished statesman, W. Averell Harriman.

Mr. Harriman deftly labels the development and deployment of MIRV, the multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicle, as very crucial to Soviet-American relations.

Harriman states:

Both sides can develop effective MIRV's in a relatively short time. It is vital that agreement be reached before this occurs.

This is a man who has represented the United States in Russia. He knows the Russians and is a very perceptive individual, sensitive to the Soviet mind and the aspirations of the Russian people and their leaders.

I am convinced that the Soviets are as anxious to avoid destruction of their country by nuclear war as we are of ours.

I would like to introduce Mr. Harriman's article in toto for my colleagues. I urge them to read carefully the words of this great American and to give weight to his thoughts when we in Congress are called upon to judge the Defense Department and their weapons systems' demands.

The article follows:

AMERICAN MILITARISM: AN EPILOG—OUR SECURITY LIES BEYOND WEAPONS

(By W. Averell Harriman)

Like many other Americans, I am fearful about the present role of the military in our national life. Military men have as their primary responsibility the defense of the nation, and they are miscast when they are expected to be omniscient on other vital national concerns. It is in some ways unfair to ask them to accept responsibility for decisions on which they are clearly unqualified to give a balanced judgment.

I have worked closely with our military officers during the past three decades and respect them for their competence and dedication to our country. I have held many of them in the highest esteem, among them General Marshall. I vividly recall Marshall explaining to President Roosevelt that his advice was given purely from a military standpoint.

When military men advised extreme action in Vietnam, I am not sure that they fully realized the limited character of our objectives there. We are not there to win a war, but simply to stop the North from taking over the South by force, and to permit the people of the South to decide their own future. I am not sure that all those advising the President fully understand how limited our objectives are. Somehow or other, there is a feeling that we are fighting the international Communist conspiracy—rather than Vietnamese national Communists who do not want to be dominated by either Peking or Moscow. The international Communist situation is quite different today than it was in the early postwar period. During those days, I was always on the side of those wanting more arms for our nation. When South Korea was attacked, we had a military budget of only about \$14 billion, and we suffered greatly from it. But today, we have a military budget of almost \$80 billion, and have so many other requirements in our country that it is time to call a halt to our arms buildup. The war in Vietnam is an unfortunate drain on our resources, and will, I hope, be brought to an early settlement. The money we spend there is urgently needed now to reunite our own divided country.

It is not the military's job to know how that is to be done, and they cannot be expected to weigh the technological requirements of the military against the requirements in our cities. The military today are asking for new weapons that in my judgment are clearly less important than other national needs.

We obviously must maintain nuclear capability giving us a second strike force that would deter the Soviet Union or anyone else from hitting us. But that does not mean we have to be ahead in every aspect of nuclear capability, nor does it mean that we must have many times the power to overkill any enemy.

In 1941, I was in London as President Roosevelt's representative to Prime Minister Churchill and the British Government. Even then, I was struck by the difference in the role of the military in Britain and in the U.S. The British War Cabinet consisted of the political leaders of the country, and the ministers of the armed services were not even members of it. I am not suggesting that the British military leaders were not highly respected or that their views were not given full weight. But they were given weight within the Cabinet in balance with the other problems of the British nation. The military chiefs of staff were advisers to the Cabinet. The military establishment was integrated into the policy-making procedures of the British Government. They had no contact with the Parliament, nor did they give any public expression of their views.

This is altogether different from our present procedures. Not only the Secretary of Defense but also the Chiefs of Staff go to the committees of the Congress and testify on all sorts of matters. As a result, a number of senators and congressmen get an unbalanced view of our nation's needs from military men who are responsible for only one aspect of our national concerns. What I am suggesting is that we have a group of senators and congressmen whose attention is concentrated on military needs. That is why we had one member of the Congress saying a short while back that if we turned over the Vietnam war to the soldiers, they would win it in a month.

Nothing could be more absurd than that statement. But it indicates the mind-set that some members of Congress get after steady bombardment by the views of our military. Their responsibility is the security of the nation, and they must look at the worst of everything. Those who see only the possible military threats would drive us into another world war. That is why isolated military judgments of political situations are not sound. Robert Kennedy wrote that during the Cuban missile crisis, he was struck by how often his brother's military advisers took "positions, which, if wrong, had the advantage that no one would be around at the end to know" how wrong they were.

All of us abhor Soviet repression of freedoms at home and in Czechoslovakia, and their support for Communist subversion in independent countries. But I decry the attempt that is being made today by some in the Defense Department and Congress to scare the American people into believing that the Soviets are scheming to attack us with nuclear weapons. No one knows the intention of the Kremlin, but I can speak from my Russian experience that dates back over forty years. I am convinced that the Soviets are as anxious to avoid destruction of their country by nuclear war as we are of ours.

It is particularly alarming that there appears to be a new policy in the Pentagon, to have the civilian-directed offices of International Security Affairs and Systems Analysis support the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and not question them.

It is reassuring that the Congress is increasingly showing concern over military programs and exercising its independent judgments on decisions.

I believe that negotiations we are now starting with the Soviets to control the nuclear arms race are the most important we have ever undertaken. They can be successful if we act wisely.

From my talks with Mr. Kosygin and other Soviet officials, I am satisfied that they want to stop the nuclear arms race for two reasons. They don't want to divert further expenditures from their pressing internal needs. And they believe the U.S. and the Soviet Union should come to an understanding now to reduce the risk of nuclear war. This is a time

of world opportunity—a split second in history. I have been told by my scientist friends that both sides can develop effective MIRV's (Multiple Independently-targeted Re-entry Vehicles) in a relatively short time. It is vital that agreement be reached before this occurs. We can each tell the number of missile sites the other has but we cannot know the character of warheads fitted to the missiles without detailed on-site inspection. I was very much shocked to hear that the military had gone ahead to order these multiple warheads without telling the Congress or the public that they had done so.

There are advisers in our defense establishment who are on record as opposing an agreement with the Soviet Union on nuclear restraint. They are entitled to their opinions, but it would be inexcusable if actions were taken that committed us to the arms race without the widest possible discussion. I am sure President Nixon believes that an agreement on nuclear restraint is of vital importance to our nation, and most Americans share this judgment.

It is interesting that it took eight years for the Congress and the public to understand what President Dwight Eisenhower was talking about when he warned about the military-industrial complex. It is only recently that we have begun to question the new weapons programs, the wisdom of immediate deployment of the ABM, and testing of the MIRV. Until now, the pressure from the Congress has been to appropriate more money than the Administration requested for new weapons programs. Pressure comes now in the opposite direction. The turnaround is due largely to the unpopularity of the war and the urgency of domestic needs. We are beginning to recognize the dangers of a militaristic attitude on the part of our country. Our security will not come from the number of our weapons. It will come from the strength of our moral force at home and abroad, from our economic and social strength, and from the unity of our people.

THE 52 ASSOCIATION, INC.

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the wonderful work of the "52 Association, Inc." to awaken every citizen of New Jersey to the fact that there are more wounded servicemen from Vietnam than from World War II and the Korean conflict combined.

The newly formed New Jersey Chapter of the 52 Association, Inc., has as its objective the rehabilitation of these wounded servicemen and giving them the training that will restore them to positions of productive citizens and permit them to be a part of the active life in their own community.

The 52 Association has already successfully trained wounded servicemen in the field of computer programming and data processing and these men are now gainfully employed.

To bring into greater focus the work being done by the 52 Association, Gov. Richard J. Hughes has issued a proclamation that the month of November, 1969, be pledged to the work of this organization. He has called upon all the citi-

zens of New Jersey to take an active part in providing for the sorely needed programs to assist these wounded Vietnam servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I include some additional material touching upon this subject:

A HISTORY OF THE "52" ASSOCIATION FROM 1945 TO 1969

The "52" Association began its consistent record of loyalty, devotion and service to our seriously disabled servicemen back in 1945, just as World War II was drawing to a close.

It all started when Arnold Reuben, Sr. (of Reuben's Restaurant, New York), in the interest of patriotism, called together a group of business and professional friends and proposed that each of the men present contribute \$52.00 a year and pledge to serve the Nation's war-wounded 52 weeks a year! The men approved, unanimously echoing agreement, and the "52" Association (a voluntary non-profit philanthropic organization) was formed.

From this meeting came the famed expression: "The wounded shall never be forgotten," a slogan which has now journeyed through three wars. The group of men wasted no time in replacing their pledges with actions and began hosting disabled servicemen to "nights on the town." News about their activities spread rapidly. Soon, hundreds of other patriotic Americans joined the "52" and began hosting disabled servicemen at dinners, shows, sporting events and the like. Newspaper columnists took notice, nicknaming them the "good-time Charlies," and the course of the "52" Association was secure as the membership began to grow steadily to its present figure of 1,500.

When it became apparent that many of the war's disabled could not physically make it to Broadway, the "52" Association brought Broadway to them. The Department of Defense offered their cooperation too, enabling the "52" Association to transport enthusiastic volunteer groups via military vehicles, to all the Military Hospital Installations along the Eastern seaboard. All-star Broadway reviews offering top entertainment, lavish parties where sumptuous meals were served, and distribution of gifts to the men, all were arranged by "52" as segments of their continuing weekly programs for hospitalized servicemen and discharged veterans.

In 1959, the "52" Association expanded still further their sphere of dedication and loyalty to these seriously-disabled servicemen when they purchased the Samuel H. Kress Estate in Ossining, New York. This magnificent 41-acre estate boasting spacious scenic grounds, sporting areas, picnic groves, and a breath-taking, multi-purpose five-acre lake, was adroitly converted into an Indoor-Outdoor Recreation and Rehabilitation Center for the men. All the sporting and recreational facilities were immediately adapted for the exclusive use of the handicapped. "Low" barbecue pits, especially built for the use and attendance by wheel-chair occupants, allowed the men to simultaneously fulfill their husband/father roles while casually enjoying picnics with their families. Games such as wheel-chair basketball, baseball, volleyball, soft ball and badminton became popular sports at the center, and other areas were equipped for wheel-chair fishing and archery.

The former Kress Estate has, over the years, proven itself as a haven for these disabled men, on a multitude of levels. They not only have a remarkably beautiful 'country club' where they can bring their families and enjoy the many year-round programs provided by the "52" Association, but of even more significance, it is a place where they are never embarrassed by their respective handicaps; and all of this in a total setting professionally designed to stimulate morale

building as well as recreational rehabilitation:

Since 1959, more than 30,000 have thrived, enjoyed and benefitted from this beautiful oasis in Ossining, New York. Daily busloads of wounded service men, back from Vietnam, are currently being brought to the Center from the Military hospitals, and introduced to the recreation and rehabilitation facilities.

"Today, straining to uphold their original pledge—"The wounded shall never be forgotten"—to the exceptionally high number of severely disabled young men who have answered our country's call in Vietnam, the '52' Association finds itself busier than ever," explained Alan Weinberg, the Association's Executive Director. "There are more amputees from Vietnam alone than from World War II and Korea combined," Weinberg added!

The struggle of seriously disabled servicemen to triumph over their physical disabilities has been a powerful inspirational factor behind the "52" Association's continuous growth over the last 24 years. In order to respond to the current and unprecedented needs of these men, the Association is now seriously endeavoring to offer them a brand new and unique extension of their services. Plans have already been drawn for a sorely needed Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Center encompassing complete educational, recreational and residential facilities, to be constructed on the grounds of the Ossining Estate. The total cost of this new expansion program is \$2,500,000.

One extremely important division of the larger complex will be an Advanced Technology and Computer Training Center geared to accommodate and train groups of from 50 to 200 severely disabled veterans during continuing courses of 12 to 14 weeks each. The vast field of Electronic Data Processing and Computer Programming was carefully selected by the "52" Association (the result of an exhaustive survey conducted under the guidance and direction of Dr. Morton Thompson, an eminent authority in the field of rehabilitation of the handicapped) as the most appropriate and sensible course of study for these men. It is a field where the seriously disabled can, consistent with the ever-growing needs of the industry, find satisfying, well-paying careers. Not only will this Training Center offer far-reaching benefits to the participating veterans, but to industry as well, for it will help to meet one of industry's greatest needs today—the availability of people trained in electronic data processing. These disabled men can fill many of these positions satisfactorily since the work, devoid of physical strain, affords them the ideal opportunity to fully utilize their minds while they demonstrate their productivity, stamina and stability—regardless of the severity of their physical disabilities.

In January of this year, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense (under its "Project Transition": "A program set up by Presidential directive through the Department of Defense and designed to assist the disabled serviceman prior to his discharge"), the "52" Association inaugurated its first pilot project course in computer programming for hospitalized servicemen at St. Alban's Naval Hospital. In order to qualify, the men need only the ability to comprehend the logical solutions to business problems. The first group of 20 men will graduate this month.

The "52" Association is extremely encouraged by the high caliber of performance demonstrated by the first group under this Pilot Project, and has already scheduled the second class in Computer Programming to begin on May 5, 1969. To date, 100 servicemen have applied!

Graduation Exercises will take place in the Pratt Auditorium of the St. Alban's Naval Hospital on Friday, April 11th at 1:00 P.M.

Sharp. A Commencement Address will be delivered by leading Industrialist Philip B. Hoffmann, Chairman of the Board of Johnson and Johnson, to be followed by a program of entertainment, and a Reception in the E.M. Club at St. Alban's Naval Hospital. Many prominent and outstanding personalities from business, industry, politics, the military and showbusiness will be present at what promises to be a "fitting" testimonial to the graduates.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, July 27, 1969]

CHAPTER FORMED TO AID WOUNDED

(By Richard Bilotti)

A northern New Jersey chapter of the 52 Association, Inc., a group "pledged to serve our nation's wounded 52 weeks a year," has been formed and a drive for members, volunteers and funds is underway.

The chapter was founded when the independent three-year-old Committee to Support American Servicemen (SAS) dissolved and became a part of the National 52. The temporary headquarters is at the home of Jerry Leopoldi of 17 Franklin St., Verona. Leopoldi was founder of the SAS and has been named full-time executive director of the New Jersey 52.

"There are more wounded veterans in the Vietnam conflict than there were in World War II and the Korean War combined, Leopoldi said. "That is one of the reasons we joined with the National 52."

WAR CONTROVERSY

The SAS, although it did a lot of work in veterans hospitals, did not concentrate solely on the wounded veteran. Its work included raising money to help build the USO in Vietnam. Both of the organizations, however, stress helping the veterans without getting involved with whether the war is right or wrong.

"There is a lot of controversy in the country about the Vietnam War," Leopoldi said. "But the politics of war doesn't concern me. The fact is that men, whether they choose to or not, are being sent to fight, and some of them get wounded."

Funds raised by "52" are used to entertain wounded veterans and to make their social life better but the most important aspect of the 52 program is the training of disabled veterans in the fields of computer programming, data processing and advance technology.

GRADUATE VETS

"The New Jersey chapter will make readily accessible to the state's sizable proportion of Vietnam's battle-injured, the extensive facilities of '52's' recreational center situated on the organization's 41-acre estate in Ossining, N.Y., and maintained by '52' for the express use and enjoyment of America's seriously disabled and wounded servicemen and veterans from three wars," according to "52's" national headquarters.

In April, 20 disabled veterans graduated from the first computer program school, which was held with the cooperation of the Defense Department, at St. Alban's Naval Hospital in Queens. Another such program will begin at Philadelphia Naval Hospital and the New Jersey chapter will become the link between national headquarters and that program.

The organization also is raising funds to construct a \$2.5 million vocational, recreational, morale and rehabilitation center at its estate.

The center, which will be capable of enrolling 200 disabled veterans in 12-to-14 week semesters, will guarantee the graduate placements with leading industries.

"52 MONTH"

Among those named to the temporary board of trustees are Spyros P. Skouras, chairman of the Prudential Shipping Co.,

George Franconero, father of the vocalist, Connie Francis; Mrs. Rose Box, secretary of Tande Industries, Newark, and Matthew Stevens, executive secretary of the Essex-West Hudson AFL-CIO Council.

November will be proclaimed "52 Month" by Gov. Hughes, and Leopoldi said a special effort will be made through the retailers in the state to raise funds for the organization.

Other supporters of the chapter are senators Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., and Harrison A. Williams, D-N.J., and Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and entertainers, Pat Boone, Connie Francis, Betsy Palmer, Celeste Holm and Mary Lee Martin.

Among other fund raising events Leopoldi scheduled are a 52 night at a Jersey Jays football game, a tennis match between himself and former Gov. Robert Meyner, a carnival in the shore area and a golf tournament.

PROCLAMATION

The conflict in Vietnam has resulted in more casualties than from World War II and the Korean War combined. While it is true that our government does a great deal in the enormous process of rehabilitating wounded servicemen, it has nevertheless been proven throughout the last 25 years that there is much that can, should and must be done by concerned citizens. The 52 Association, organized 1945, has been actively involved in providing meaningful programs designed to demonstrate that there are American citizens who understand the problems of a wounded serviceman and who are willing to expend every effort in offering him a friendly and most deserving hand of kindness, friendship and meaningful assistance in his efforts to become a useful and productive citizen on his return to our socioeconomic society.

The 52 Association, Inc. has recently granted a charter to a group of concerned citizens of the state of New Jersey entitled, Northern New Jersey Chapter of the 52 Association, having jurisdiction throughout New Jersey. The leadership of this newly formed group is launching a campaign dedicated to the enormous needs of our severely disabled servicemen.

1. Therefore, be it resolved that the month of November, 1969, shall be proclaimed the month for all New Jersey citizens to tangibly demonstrate that they really understand and will meet the enormous needs now being placed on our community by the influx of severely disabled returning from Vietnam by providing the sorely needed programs to satisfy this need.

2. The State of New Jersey honors the 24 years of outstanding service on the part of the 52 Association, Inc. in behalf of America's wounded servicemen.

3. I, therefore, as Governor of the State of New Jersey, hail the formation of the Northern New Jersey Chapter of the 52 Association and urge the citizens of my state to actively participate and support, both personally and financially, in this most vitally needed effort and to do so "52" weeks of each year by pledging that "The Wounded Shall Never Be Forgotten".

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor, State of New Jersey.

PILOT PROJECT IN COMPUTER PROGRAMMING AT ST. ALBAN'S NAVAL HOSPITAL OFFERS LOGICAL SOLUTION TO EMPLOYMENT OF NATION'S DISABLED G.I.'s

The logical solution to a two-fold problem—bridging the dearth of American big business for qualified computer programmers, with the nation's responsibility for providing adequate employment for the high number of G.I.'s returning from Vietnam seriously disabled—became boldly evident upon the successful completion of the first Pilot Project Computer Programming course given

at St. Alban's Naval Hospital to 20 wounded servicemen, under the sponsorship of the "52" Association, Inc.

In an address delivered at the Commencement Exercises on April 11th, 1969, by Philip B. Hofmann, one of America's leading industrialists, and Chairman of the Board of Johnson and Johnson, Mr. Hofmann eloquently stated: "Where does the business community come into this program? Although we have the 'obligation' to utilize the men trained through a program such as this, we also have the 'opportunity' to utilize them. Men such as these, in this graduating class, are men with great fortitude and with great experiences that have made them strong and adept in skills we all find in short supply. We, in business, are always looking for trained, skillful people, people with conviction and dedication. Here we have them."

Clayton E. Wheat, Jr., President of the "52" Association, Inc. further added, in his talk to the assembly attending the Graduation: "We seek to establish a permanent center where disabled servicemen who are discharged from hospitals can be housed in a training school for both elementary and advanced computer programming. It is possible that some of you, who have completed your course in COBOL, may later enroll at our center for in-residence training that will qualify you for the more stratospheric jobs and salaries in computer work. It is possible that, if the nation and its thinking Americans, learns of this project, they will join us in this most worthy of endeavors, and help us build the Center. A council of leading industrialists has already been formed to further the building fund and establish the Center in the near future."

The concept of educating disabled servicemen in the vast and growing field of Electronic Data Processing constitutes a totally new approach, carefully designed by the "52" Association to meet current needs of both the men and big business. Among the many mutual advantages offered by the program, it affords the men an excellent opportunity to utilize their minds and regain their spirit and hope for the future by being able to earn an attractive livelihood in a field which 'needs their abilities.' On the other hand, the program also offers employers their skills plus the additional benefits of their high degree of loyalty, dependability, responsibility, stamina and stability, as well as their willingness to relocate to small towns throughout the United States.

This first class was given at St. Alban's by two full-time professional instructors in the field of Electronic Data Processing, Mr. Michael Moss and Mrs. Ann Moss. Both instructors reported that these disabled men are as capable as those who are trained in any of the other commercial schools in the country, and regardless of the severity of their disabilities, these men will now be able to perform their jobs on a thoroughly equal keel to able-bodied programmers. Mr. Moss further added: "Those men who are blind, quadriplegic or amputees, are still nevertheless perfectly capable of carrying out their responsibilities, with the aid of a tape recorder."

As a result of the complete success of this pilot project, the program is now slated for continuation at St. Alban's Naval Hospital, and a second course will begin on May 5th, 1969. To date, over 150 men have applied. The "52" Association also plans on extending the program in the near future, to include other military hospitals in the United States. Ultimately, upon completion of a \$2,500,000 Vocational and Recreational Rehabilitation Center, to be constructed on the grounds of the "52" Association's Estate in Ossining, N.Y., this program will find its home as part of the curriculum of the School of Advanced Technology where up to 200 disabled men, each semester, will be housed and trained in the technologies of tomorrow, today.

[From Business Management, July 1969]

INERT COMPUTER POWER

As computer power gallops into the 1970's, it faces a hamstringing hurdle: manpower.

Within the last decade, industry has staked a sizable chunk—about \$18 billion—on the computer race, and right now, there's \$7 billion more in the offing. By latest count, 50,000 to 60,000 computers are installed in the United States.

But, Joseph S. Herbets of Continental Computer Associates, Wyncote, Pa., points out: "Installing a piece of computer hardware is one thing. Turning this inert pile of metal, circuits, and associated gadgetry into a swinging, singing, sagacious source of reports, invoices, statements, and bottom line profits is another: It takes a lot of professional warm bodies to do that."

For example, the median number of electronic data processing personnel for one installation is 17. Larger installations involve hundreds. According to Herbets' arithmetic, around 700,000 qualified people—from EDP managers to keypunch operators—are needed to man the hardware now in place. Yet, the best educated guesses put the current supply of EDP talent at less than half that amount. Systems analysts lead the short supply list with programmers running a close second.

Obviously, there's a big capability gap and some experts feel it will get wider before it gets better. William R. Hoover, executive vice president, Computer Sciences Corp., Los Angeles, calculates the U.S. computer software expenditures will exceed \$21 billion by 1975. Where's the manpower—to communicate with both machine and management—going to come from in six short years, to handle this 300% increase in software business?

Although EDP schools are plugging hard and heavy to fill the need, the quality of their graduates leaves a lot to be desired. Despite this, the schools and those universities which now offer EDP degrees, are leading contenders to fill the gap in the near future. But right now, proselytizing remains the prime source of talent.

Two pilot programs are currently making a stab at solving the talent shortage while fulfilling larger sociological goals. One project, conducted by the philanthropic "52" Association under the direction of the Department of Defense, is the training of seriously disabled Vietnam veterans to be programmers. This provides the veterans a career which relies on their mental prowess and is free of strain. Recently, 20 disabled veterans at New York's St. Albans Naval Hospital completed a four-month course. The "52" Association plans to establish an advanced technology and computer training center for other seriously disabled service men in Ossining, New York.

Elsewhere in Ossining, at Sing Sing to be exact, 16 inmates recently completed a pioneering in-prison computer training course conducted by Electronic Computer Programming Institute (ECPI), New York, one of the nation's larger computer programming schools. Admission requirements for the inmate-students were identical to those ECPI requires at its 100 centers. Since the breakthrough at Sing Sing, similar retraining programs have been introduced in California, Ohio and Pennsylvania prisons. According to ECPI, prisons in Iowa, Minnesota, Connecticut and New Jersey are also examining training possibilities.

Yet within two decades this computer-manpower problem might be entirely nonexistent: By 1990, most software will be integrated into computer hardware, for computers which learn from their own experience will exist before 1989.

The forecast is based on the intuitive judgment" of 88 computer experts from 11 countries, who attended an international computer congress in Copenhagen. According to a report of the recent conference, printed

by the management consultant firm, Parson & Williams, Copenhagen, the changes predicted by these experts strongly support an Orwellian society. To cite a few:

By 1975: Computers will control hospital patient treatment.

By the late 1980's: Industry's present labor force will be reduced 50%. Although shorter working hours and new industries will pick up some slack, unemployment is expected to be a serious problem.

By 2000: All major industries will be controlled by computers. Smaller ones will not be heavily automated but very few small industries are expected to survive to 2000.

[From the New York Sunday News, Mar. 2, 1969]

COMPUTERS GIVE DISABLED A CHANCE

(By Sylvia Carter)

Peter Papa, 21, was going back to Astoria to be a policeman, but now he may have a limp.

George DeGraw, 21, of Bellvale, N.Y., wanted to go into the nursery business. He's in a wheelchair now, and when he is able to walk, one leg may be shorter than the other.

John Wolthusen, 22, was making the Marines his career. He taught marksmanship. Now, his hands and legs are paralyzed.

Papa, DeGraw and Wolthusen may all become computer programmers and analysts instead—even if Wolthusen has to dictate his programs to a tape recorder at home.

GOOD POTENTIAL

All three are in St. Albans' Naval Hospital where they are the very first batch of vets to take a computer training program through the good graces of the '52 Association, Inc., a group that has been helping veterans for 23 years.

"This has the most potential of anything ever offered to vets," said Paul Bock, a 23-year-old Army private from Chester, N.Y. "They've had courses for vets in high school English. But this is technical, valuable. A graduate may be able to start at a \$10,000 salary and work up to \$20,000."

For some of the students in the pilot class, the program was a real life saver. Before it, Charlie Doyle, a West Babylon, L. I., tractor trailer driver, would not have known where to turn after a plane crash in the Naval Air Reserves left him unable to do manual work.

And Doyle, 39, is the father of six kids. The tests men must pass to take the computer program virtually assure that they're qualified, and he is no exception.

The cracked vertebrae in his neck didn't affect his vitality nor his quick mind. He is blessed with a sense of humor as well—witnessed by an uncomfortable cast in "gladiator" style instead of standard.

"I might have become some kind of vegetable," Doyle, a stocky, solid man, says. "But with the help of Mike and his missus (the computer teachers) I've got some sense knocked into my head."

"I may not be the best student—but I bet I'm the hardest working. I always heard that life begins at 40, but I didn't think about it until now."

PROUD OF MARINES

Wolthusen painstakingly fashioned a molded ceramic chess set and can grasp the pieces. He, too, is not a person who gives up easily.

Computer work can be done even at home, and he says: "I can do anything I put my mind to. The Marine Corps taught me that. All I have to do is to want it bad enough." Wolthusen has patient brown eyes, a warm grin.

But conducting the computer program at St. Albans has its drawbacks.

CAN'T MANEUVER STAIRS

For instance, Doyle and Wolthusen cannot attend the classes downstairs in the hospital and have to be tutored by Michael Moss, who

volunteers his time. His wife, Ann, teaches the main class of about 20 boys.

That is why the '52 Association is beginning a fundraising drive to get \$2,500,000 to build a center for training the men at their present outdoor recreation center for servicemen in Ossining.

Their eventual goal is to offer the course mainly to amputees and men confined to wheelchairs.

HOPE TO CARE FOR 200

Now, only the severely maimed are allowed at the center there, and an amputee can take off an artificial leg without embarrassment.

It is, the Association says—the only place in the world where the severely disabled can enjoy normal outdoor recreation with their families. There are even specially built barbecue pits.

The computer center will eventually be a residential facility that will accommodate and train as many as 200 severely disabled veterans for a 12 to 14-week course. Plans are already complete.

NO TIME TO WORRY

"It's not like going home at night to worry alone," explains a spokesman for the organization. And '52—which began with 52 men paying \$52 each per year to help—ought to know. The group is an old hand at throwing parties for vets.

"The government pays for school on the GI bill—but they've never offered something like this," says '52 executive director Allan Weinberg. "This is a total program—social and recreational as well as educational."

The association also has received enthusiastic responses from business for the hiring of men who complete the course. One large company has promised to take whole classes of graduates.

It is expected, too, that the course will be accredited and thus qualify for GI payments.

SEEK INTELLIGENT MEN

"We want to get men who have good minds," Weinberg points out. "And the men others have ignored—self-respecting men who want to support their families and don't want to just collect checks or put nuts and bolts together for \$1.50 an hour."

And a spokesman added: "It doesn't matter how you feel about the war. It is how you feel about people, about these boys."

Because of these men and the thousands like them throughout the entire northeastern U.S., 52 a tax-exempt organization, will be "sticking a shovel" into the ground for the center as soon as they get some of the funds.

Private funds have supported '52 until now, but this time they will be waiting for the public to help make sure their slogan, "The wounded shall never be forgotten," is remembered.

The association is located at 147 E. 50th St. in Manhattan.

BROWN QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS ABM DISAPPROVAL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, for the sixth consecutive year I have sent a questionnaire to the residents of the 29th Congressional District, which I represent. Among the points of interest to be noted in an analysis of the results tallied from those constituents responding is strong support for a ban on sales of DDT, a desire to see cigarette adver-

tising removed from television and radio, support for the halting of oil drilling in the coastal waters off California, and more opposition than approval for the Safeguard ABM system that the President has proposed.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD certain news releases which I have issued detailing some of these results, showing selected demographic breakdowns, and a summary of the overall tally of the responses. Approximately 170,000 questionnaires were sent out—to every household in the district—and I have received about 17,000—10 percent—replies.

The results follow:

BROWN QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS ABM DISAPPROVAL

President Nixon's first major defense policy decision, to deploy an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, is not receiving support from a majority of the residents of the 29th Congressional District, according to an analysis of the returns from a questionnaire sent to all households in the District by Congressman George E. Brown, Jr.

According to the results, only 42% indicated approval of the Nixon proposal to spend several billion dollars deploying an ABM system. Half of those responding to the mailed questionnaire indicate they do not approve, while 8% were undecided or did not reply to that question. With the undecided not counted, the result is 46% in favor, and 54% opposed.

Republican respondents, however, are giving a good deal more support to the President than Democrats, Congressman Brown reports. A breakdown of results by political party shows 63% of those who marked that they are Republicans favoring the plan, with 37% opposed. Democrats go almost exactly the opposite way, with 36% in favor and 64% disapproving. Persons who indicated their registration was other than Republican or Democrat gave the least support to the plan, with 26.5% for and 73.5% against.

A third breakdown of responses, by the age of the respondents, showed the greatest opposition amongst persons aged 21 to 35, with 38% approving and 62% disapproving. Those from 36 to 55 split down the middle, with 50% on each side, and persons over 56 gave support 45% of the time with 55% against.

Another group that was split 50-50 was composed of those who indicated that they had not finished 12 years of school. High school graduates showed slightly more approval than college graduates, with 47% of the high school graduates in favor, and 53% opposed. College graduates gave only a 43% 'yes' vote with a 57% against.

BROWN INQUIRY SHOWS SUPPORT FOR BANS ON SMOKING ADS, DDT SALES

Strong support for two proposals that are designed to protect the nation's health was indicated in the returns from Congressman George Brown's recent questionnaire sent to every home in the 29th Congressional District.

The responses showed nearly two to one support for the banning of all cigarette advertising from TV and radio, and showed an overwhelming majority of almost six to one in favor of banning the sale of all DDT until adequate controls concerning its use have been set up.

Brown's questionnaire results show 61% favoring the cigarette advertising prohibition, with 34% against and 5% undecided. Democrats, the young, and the elderly tended to support the ban more heavily.

In the breakdown by political party, 63% of the Democrats said "yes", with 33% opposed, whereas only 57% of the Republicans favored the plan as against 33% saying "no."

Persons over 55, probably displaying more immediate concern about the dangers of cigarette smoking showed 69% for and 31% against. Those from 20 to 35 gave a 64% approval while persons from 36 to 55 indicated 59% saying "yes".

On the question of banning the sale of DDT, Congressman Brown's constituents favored the ban by an 80% to 14% ratio, with 6% undecided. Democrats, again, gave heavier support to Federal action, with 83% in favor, only 10% against, and 7% undecided. Republicans gave almost as heavy a vote for the move, with 75% saying "yes", 19% opposed, and 6% not sure.

Less variations in opinion showed up on this question in the age categories. With the undecided respondents not counted, the results indicated ban approval by 85% of those from 20 to 35, 84% of the 36-55 age group, and a slightly larger 88% of persons over 55 in favor.

COASTAL BAN ON OIL DRILLING FAVORED

Congressman George Brown's recent questionnaire sent to all residents of the 29th Congressional District indicated very strong Democratic support and somewhat milder support from Republicans for a complete and permanent ban on oil drilling in the waters off the California coast.

Total responses to Brown's mailed questionnaire showed 56% favoring the ban, 29% opposed, and 15% undecided. With the undecided not counted, the figures indicate a 65-35% split favoring the ban.

Democrats gave a 61% approval and 23% disapproval to the ban, with 16% undecided. Republicans showed milder support 46% in favor, 36% opposed, and 18% not sure. Without the undecided responses figured in, the results indicated a 72-28% split amongst Democrats and a 56-44% tally for Republicans.

The results were also broken down by the educational background of respondents, Brown reported. Using responses from only those who expressed an opinion, the questionnaire indicated that 77% of persons with less than a high school education favored the oil drilling halt, 69% of the high school graduates approved, and 61% of those with a college education said "yes".

Congressman Brown introduced a proposal calling for a halt to drilling in the Santa Barbara channel in 1968, a year before the disastrous leak early this year which covered Southern California beaches with crude oil. Immediately following that, Brown called for a halt to all offshore drilling until satisfactorily safe procedures to insure the prevention of future accidents of this type had been instituted.

1969 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

[Answers in percent]

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

Yes ----- 36
No ----- 60
Undecided ----- 4

2. Would you favor legislation raising the minimum wage to \$2 per hour?

Yes ----- 61
No ----- 34
Undecided ----- 5

3. Do you feel, in general, that the individual citizen has too little influence in government decisions, and that his opinion is generally disregarded by officials?

Yes ----- 70
No ----- 16
Undecided ----- 14

4. Do you favor a large increase of 50 percent or more in social security benefits?

Yes ----- 49
No ----- 42
Undecided ----- 9

5. Generally speaking, do you approve of the proposal to spend several billion dollars deploying an antiballistic-missile (ABM) system?

Yes ----- 42
No ----- 50
Undecided ----- 8

6. Do you favor continuing our Nation's space program at about the present level of \$4 billion per year?

Yes ----- 46
No ----- 40
Undecided ----- 14

7. Do you feel that pay TV stations would present a serious threat to the quality of regular TV programs?

Yes ----- 37
No ----- 46
Undecided ----- 17

8. Do you favor the banning of all cigarette advertisements from TV and radio?

Yes ----- 61
No ----- 34
Undecided ----- 5

9. Do you favor legislation charging purchasers of automobiles with gasoline (smog producing) engines, a small increase in Federal excise taxes and earmarking this money for new mass rapid transit programs and smog control research to encourage development of other types of engines and to reduce the total automobile population in large cities?

Yes ----- 44
No ----- 40
Undecided ----- 16

10. Considering the reports of DDT concentrations in certain fish, birds, and human bodies, would you favor the banning of the sale of all DDT until adequate controls have been set up?

Yes ----- 80
No ----- 14
Undecided ----- 6

11. Would you favor a complete and permanent ban on drilling for oil in waters off the California coast in order to prevent disasters such as the Santa Barbara oil leak earlier this year?

Yes ----- 56
No ----- 29
Undecided ----- 15

12. Do you approve of admitting Red China to the United Nations?

Yes ----- 38
No ----- 46
Undecided ----- 16

13. Do you believe that we should broaden U.S. relations with Red China to the extent that we seek trade agreements with Red China?

Yes ----- 36
No ----- 48
Undecided ----- 16

14. Do you think that the Nixon administration efforts to negotiate peace in the Vietnam war are any more effective than were the Johnson administration's efforts?

Yes ----- 37
No ----- 47
Undecided ----- 16

TAX CREDIT FOR SCRAP INDUSTRY ASKED

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, our civilization is in serious danger of being physically overwhelmed by the wastes resulting from its various processes.

The problem of disposing or minimizing these wastes has engaged the attention of many concerned people. The House Committee on Ways and Means has recognized the need to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by including rapid amortization of approved pollution control equipment in the just-passed tax reform bill.

It is suggested in a recent article by Thomas Kelley in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of July 27, 1969, that tax credits be provided the waste materials industry to encourage research and development in the reutilization of our resources.

I am pleased to include this article as an extension of my remarks:

TAX CREDIT FOR SCRAP INDUSTRY ASKED

(By Thomas Kelley, Ramsey County auditor)

I believe that there is a justification for giving tax credit to the scrap industry for the contribution it is making in the conservation of expendable natural resources as well as less measurable, but certainly important, contributions being made to the public welfare—such as keeping the countryside clean of old automobiles and other items which eventually wind up being disposed of at public expense.

In a book called "The Waste Makers," Vance Packard has described ours as an affluent society which has achieved temporary success by deliberately squandering its resources. Our industrial resources are directed at producing things with little regard for the environment that will be the setting for these things and for the owners of these things.

Theodore Roosevelt, America's great conservationist, said 60 years ago: "Our position in the world has been attained by the extent and thoroughness of the control we have achieved over nature, but we are more and not less dependent on what she furnishes than at any other previous time in history."

In 1908 when Roosevelt made this statement, he was looking back into the 19th century in which men were unscrupulous in their exploitation of our irreplaceable resources and deliberately ignored any consideration for our future needs in favor of large short-term profits. If he was concerned in 1908, the need for this concern has been magnified geometrically since.

Ten years ago the Materials Policy Commission observed: "The plain fact seems to be that we have skimmed the cream of our resources as we now understand them. Since the skimming is cutting down the milk still further, today Americans are consuming considerably more materials than they produce. The United States must now depend on other lands for most of the strategic and critical materials essential to the nation's defense."

It is one of the great contradictions of our society that, in the face of this warning we should have a tax structure which, through the mineral resources depletion allowances, encourages the utilization of virgin, irreplaceable resources.

Here in Minnesota we amended our Constitution to encourage the production of taconite. It should be pointed out that this taconite is being produced and used by the same companies that have left, as a monument, gaping holes in our wilderness landscape where they have scooped out the "cream" of our resources.

At the same time we are encouraging the expenditure of the virgin resources, which to me is a little like a business dipping into capital for operations, we are, through our local governments, discouraging the scrap industry which seems to be forgotten or abused except in times of national emergency.

The obvious contradiction is that at the same time government policy in one area is encouraging the depletion of natural resources and the creation of waste, government in another area is providing funds for local governments to deal with the problem of solid waste disposal.

The critics of our federal bureaucracy frequently point out the absurdity of spending money on land reclamation at one point and spending money to keep land out of production in the soil bank at another point. It seems to me we have the same sort of contradiction in the government (both federal and state) policy toward metals in which the government, both directly, through rewards for prospectors, and indirectly, through special tax provisions for oil and mining companies, should also be spending money for the disposition of the ultimate product of oil and mining companies, and ironically even going one step further by subsidizing the development of processes for remining and extracting metals which it paid to have buried.

It seems to me we could eliminate the last two steps quite simply by providing economic incentives either in the way of subsidies, grants for research, or special tax allowances for putting metals back into production before they are reburied or re-extracted.

At a conference in Washington, D.C., I heard local government officers pleading for federal help in cleaning up pollution and in disposing of waste materials. It seems to me that this is the same sort of short-sighted thing which led to the problem in the first place. Instead of dealing with the symptoms created by abundance in waste, we should deal with the condition itself and direct our federal resources at preventing the pollution of our air and water and preventing the accumulation of solid waste. We should be making sure that we prevent the further desecration of our environment instead of worrying, after the fact, about how to restore our countryside, our lands and rivers, and our air to their original condition.

We should look upon solid waste, and particularly ferrous metals, not as a problem, but as a resource and direct our efforts toward federal legislation which would make it economical to repossess metals which are now being thrown away.

Very simply stated, we have a number of related problems, including:

An economy based on rapid consumption and disposition of expendable resources.

The pollution of our air, water and landscape with the undesirable byproducts of our consumption of these resources.

An accumulation of worn out products that cannot now be economically disposed of by burning, burying or reuse.

We have become properly alarmed by these problems and have set out programs to treat each as an entity when they are really part of one big problem. For example:

Instead of looking at ways to conserve and reuse and get the maximum utility from our existing mineral resources, we subsidize programs to mine and use more minerals.

Instead of waging all-out war against the sources of pollution, we allow the pollution to occur and then seek ways to clean up the air, water and land after they have been polluted.

Research into the ways in which we can eliminate waste in products which produce pollutants and into the ways in which we can utilize our mineral resources should be undertaken on a national basis. As long as we continue to insist that these are local problems to be dealt with by local units of government, we are de-emphasizing the need for research and development.

I propose that our income tax laws be amended to give the processors of scrap metals the same tax break as is given to those persons or corporations that mine and process virgin metals. Furthermore, I think that all money spent in research and development of machines and methods for processing scrap metals should not only be tax exempt, but supplemented directly or indirectly by the federal government.

I think that in the local government, we might look into the possibility of the same kind of gross earnings tax, in lieu of all other taxes for scrap processors, that we give to other mineral producers such as the iron mining and taconite processing plants.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has drawn up a program designed primarily for establishing the federal role in pollution control. However, within this proposal are some recommendations that can be applied to scrap processors with very little editing. Their proposal, applied to our present problem, would ask that federal government:

Provide tax incentives for pollution abatement or scrap treatment by industry; for example, there should be allowances for rapid amortization of waste treatment equipment and credits for sums spent on research or development.

Support all kinds of research and development of scrap treatment equipment that are conducted for the general benefit and are not likely to benefit individual firms.

Underwrite industrial research and development on scrap treatment devices that may later be widely sold; by creating tax provisions which would make the use of this equipment economically feasible, the government would create a market for the successful developer of this equipment, and the government would then be able to recoup its share of the costs.

Test and demonstrate techniques for conservation of mineral resources in its own operations, particularly in the military departments. It is also hoped that the federal government could underwrite large scale demonstrations of new treatment systems.

Support the training of technicians, engineers, and scientists for work in the field of mineral salvage and reuse.

Inform the public and local units of government about the program and ways they can take part.

Provide "carrots and sticks" for the local government and private institutions by making appropriations for subsidies to private business and state and local governments for the development of scrap utilization facilities, and providing funds for the support of research, technical assistance and training for people in the field.

TANDEM TRUCK ACCIDENTS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, there is currently before the Committee on Public Works a bill which would authorize an increase in the permissible sizes and weights of the trucks on our Nation's highways. Last year, I fought the pas-

sage of a similar bill because I believed that such a bill would force the American people to bear unwarranted financial burdens and at the same time expose them to increased safety hazards.

H.R. 11870 would cost the American people a minimum of \$1.8 billion to remodel and rebuild our Nation's highways and bridges. Yet only 300,000 out of 15 million truckers would profit by this measure. It is unfair to make the American public pay while the few who would prosper from this measure refuse to pay their just share.

One of my strongest objections to this bill is that it would greatly increase the number of accidents on our Nation's highways. H.R. 11870, while supposedly limiting the length of commercial vehicles to 70 feet, in fact contains a "grandfather clause" which would permit six States to maintain lengths greater than 70 feet.

In 1968, representatives of the trucking industry introduced exhibits during hearings before the Committee on Public Works, on which I serve, which indicated that heavy trucks comprised only 1.54 percent of total vehicle registrations and drive only 5.33 percent of the vehicle miles of travel, but were involved in 11.6 percent of total accidents.

Supporters of this bill would have us believe that these large tandem tractor-trailers are perfectly safe. However, a recent survey by the Buffalo Courier-Express dispels that notion. According to this survey, published in the August 2 issue, tandem tractor-trailer accidents on the New York Thruway have increased faster than the mileage logged by commercial vehicles on this vast superhighway. The thruway authority revealed that the number of accidents involving tandem trucks almost tripled between 1964 and 1968. During the same period of time the total number of miles traveled by commercial vehicles on the 559-mile thruway system doubled over this 5-year stretch.

With this information in mind I hope that the Public Works Committee as well as the Congress if need be will, when faced with a choice between assisting the large trucking interests and protecting the safety and expense of the average motorist, choose to safeguard the public welfare.

Therefore, for the information of my colleagues, I am inserting into the RECORD an article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express of August 2 of this year:

THRUWAY TANDEM TRUCK ACCIDENTS INCREASE SHARPLY FROM 1964-68

(By Modesto Argenio)

Tandem tractor-trailer accidents on the Thruway have increased faster than mileage logged by commercial vehicles on the sprawling superhighway, a Courier-Express survey found Friday.

The number of accidents involving tandem trucks almost tripled between 1964 and 1968 according to figures supplied by the Thruway Authority.

The total number of miles traveled by commercial vehicles on the 559-mile Thruway system, however, just doubled over the five-year stretch.

TRIPLE COMBINES TESTED

Double-trailer tandems frequently range the Thruway. Over the last year, the Thru-

way Authority has allowed triple-trailer combines to use the superhighway in test-run operations.

The question of whether larger and heavier trucks should be permitted to roam the highways currently is being debated in Congress where a House public works subcommittee is considering a bill which would liberalize weight and size restrictions on trucks traveling interstate highways.

Opponents of the bill have denounced it as an antisafety measure while supporters, including strong national and local trucking interests, have defended the economic benefits of allowing larger trucks on highways.

AAA OPPOSES PROPOSAL

Opposition to the proposed law is most vocal from the American Automobile Assn. and its state and local affiliates. The New York State Automobile Assn. and the Automobile Club of Buffalo have also criticized the current operation of double and triple tandems on the Thruway.

In New York State, large tandems are free to travel the Thruway without paying for special permits, a Thruway Authority spokesman said. Depending on weight, tandems pay tolls of five cents a mile for each trailer unit.

Large truck travel on other state highways, however, is restricted to special hauling permits usually issued on a trip-by-trip basis, according to the State Dept. of Transportation.

TRUCKING FIRMS INCREASE

Double-tandem trailer trucks usually include a motorized unit linked to two trailing units carrying freight. These "double bottoms" have been allowed on the Thruway since 1959.

The number of trucking firms regularly operating on the Thruway, a Thruway spokesman said, increased from 49 in 1968 to 58 this year.

In 1964, the Thruway recorded 19 accidents involving double tandems. In 1968, the number of tandem accidents nearly tripled to 52.

Nearly 13,400,000 miles of travel were registered by commercial vehicles on the Thruway in 1964. This doubled to about 26,890,000 miles in 1968.

ACCIDENT RATE LISTED

A breakdown of tandem accident figures supplied by the Thruway Authority for the five-year period showed:

1964—19 accidents, of which two involved fatalities, five personal injuries, and 12 property damage.

1965—28 accidents; one fatality, 11 personal injury, and 16 property damage.

1966—27 accidents; no fatalities, 3 personal injury, and 24 property damage.

1967—33 accidents; no fatalities, seven personal injury and 26 property damage.

TRAVEL INCREASE LISTED

1968—52 accidents; one fatality, 12 personal injury and 39 property damage.

Commercial Thruway travel over the five years rose consistently with the largest increase between 1967 and 1968:

1964—13,400,000 miles based on 47,225 trips.

1965—16,501,479 miles and 72,608 trips.

1966—18,312,772 miles and 86,047 trips.

1967—20,397,361 miles and 102,672 trips.

1968—26,890,000 miles and 133,218 trips.

The Thruway spokesman said that tandems are limited to a 55 mile per hour speed limit on the superhighway as compared to a 65 m.p.h. speed limit for passenger vehicles.

CERTIFICATION REQUIRED

"Every element of a tandem is certified and inspected," the Thruway spokesman said.

The tractor, or motorized link in a tandem, is certified by the manufacturer and the company owning the vehicle, he explained.

"We also carry out safety inspections," he added. He said the Thruway regulations cover the braking ability of tandems and insist that the lead trailer in a combine must be reinforced.

Tandems must have a one-mile clear stretch of highway for passing, the spokesman said.

THE CASE OF NLRB AGAINST GISSEL PACKING CO.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the last week of June, I was privileged to join a number of my colleagues in honoring the services of Chief Justice Earl Warren. At that time, I commented at some length on his contributions in the areas of civil rights and civil liberties.

Today, I would like as an "addenda" to pay homage to his statesmanlike leadership in the area of labor-management relations.

One of Chief Justice Warren's last opinions was his brilliant 43-page decision for a unanimous Supreme Court in the case of NLRB against Gissel Packing Co., issued on June 16, 1969. This decision has rich significance for the field of labor-management relations because it confirms the commitment of the Congress and of this society to the principle of free choice for the American worker.

The Gissel decision reviewed and upheld a remedy fashioned by the NLRB under section 8(a)(5) of the Labor Act known as the "Joy Silk" remedy. It takes its name from a 1950 decision of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit which first approved its use under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The "Joy Silk" remedy requires an employer to recognize and bargain with a majority labor union when that employer's own unfair labor practices—threats, coercion, and discrimination—have unlawfully interfered with employee free choice by preventing the conduct of a fair election by the Board. Even after an election which a union has lost, the Board will sometimes provide such a bargaining order as a remedy if the employer's unfair labor practices have illegally tainted the election results, destroyed a union's uncoerced majority, and foreclosed the possibility of conducting a fair election thereafter. When an employer's illegal acts have contaminated the atmosphere of a plant with fear and hostility, a free election cannot be held because employees would be voting out of fear for their jobs and their families' security, rather than expressing their honest, uncoerced choice about whether they wish to be represented by a union.

The "Joy Silk" remedy protects the fundamental statutory right to choose to be represented by a union, for, where an employer's illegal acts of coercion have prevented the conduct of a fair election, the Board turns to other satisfactory evidence of employee choice, such as properly executed "union authorization cards." These cards simply declare

that the signer wants to be represented by a designated union for purposes of collective bargaining with his employer. When a worker signs such an authorization freely and voluntarily, the Board properly respects the choice which he has made to be represented by a union. Some employers and some employer associations often attack these cards as evidence of employee free choice. They have two reasons; first, they cannot believe that any worker would voluntarily choose to be represented by a union when his employer is available to protect his interests; and, second, they do not have sufficient respect for the American worker's intelligence to believe that he can read and understand the meaning of a union authorization card.

The Gissel decision carefully reviewed the relevant statutory terms, the legislative history, the judicial and agency precedents, the articles of labor law scholars, as well as the briefs and arguments of the parties and of amici curiae. Based on this review, and it was an exhaustive one, the Court concluded that the "Joy Silk" remedy is fully consistent with congressional intent. It also concluded that the Board's reliance on union authorization cards as evidence of employee choice—particularly when coupled with the evidentiary safeguards which the Board has developed for testing the authenticity and reliability of these cards—is a sound exercise of administrative judgment to carry out Congress' policies.

I would like to add that in 1961, a subcommittee headed by Congressman Roman C. PUCINSKI spent many days probing this matter and concluded that the "Joy Silk" remedy was necessary, proper, and underutilized.

In 1966, the Special Subcommittee on Labor again looked into the problem, and arrived at the same conclusion.

The "Joy Silk" remedy has in fact been used most sparingly by the Board. Indeed, in the opinion of the two committees mentioned above, the Board has used it too sparingly, reserving it for only the most exceptional and extreme cases. Contrary to the ill-informed assertion of columnist David Lawrence, for example, the Board conducts 49 or 50 secret ballot elections for every "Joy Silk" bargaining order that it enters. The secret ballot NLRB election remains the standard statutory method for registering the worker's choice whether he wishes to be represented for purposes of collective bargaining. Moreover, employers who obey the law and respect their employees' statutory rights do not and need not fear this remedy, for they are never exposed to it. It is usually the deliberate and intentional law violator who brings this remedy on himself when he interferes with his employees' statutory rights through threats and acts of discrimination and intimidation. I think it is significant that the largest and most responsible employers in the country—in the steel and automobile industries, for example—rarely if ever are involved in "Joy Silk" cases.

But while the "Joy Silk" remedy has been sparingly used by the NLRB, there can be little doubt that it has been a "finger-in-the-dike" for American labor relations. If employers were free to intimidate, coerce and threaten their em-

employees before or after an NLRB election without being subject to a bargaining order remedy, there would be simply no meaningful legal protection for the right of employees to select a bargaining agent freely. The Board remedies threats and other acts of coercion with innocuous cease-and-desist orders, and the Board remedies illegal discharges and discrimination with reinstatement orders.

I spent the better part of the summer of 1966 looking into the problem of NLRB remedies. I can assure you these remedies are inadequate, at best, for their intended purposes. They are no remedy at all for an employer's illegal interference with his employees' right to express a free choice in the selection of a bargaining agent. Our investigation of the J. P. Stevens Co. bears this out. In other words, the importance of the "Joy Silk" remedy is not to be measured by the mere handful of cases in which it is applied, but by the countless hundreds of cases in which employers hesitate to coerce and threaten their employees because of the knowledge that this remedy stands as a legal safeguard of employee rights. As the Supreme Court said in its *Gissel* decision:

If the Board could enter only a cease-and-desist order and direct an election or a rerun, it would in effect be rewarding the employer and allowing him "to profit from [his] own wrongful refusal to bargain," . . . while at the same time severely curtailing the employees' right freely to determine whether they desire a representative. The employer could continue to delay or disrupt the election process and put off indefinitely his obligation to bargain; and any election held under these circumstances would not be likely to demonstrate the employees' true, undistorted desires.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court approved the "Joy Silk" remedy. It is obviously right. Every court of appeals in the Nation—except for the fourth circuit in very recent years—had previously approved it. Virtually every responsible labor relations law scholar had also acknowledged its indispensability. We in Congress intended to protect employee free choice as the central element of our national labor policy, and we in Congress did not intend to permit employers to destroy this crucial right of free choice without providing a meaningful remedy for the violation.

I have drawn particular attention to the *Gissel* decision because it shows in clear relief that not one member of the Supreme Court of the United States agrees that the "Joy Silk" remedy indicates that the NLRB is indifferent to congressional intent. The *Gissel* decision shows that the Board has been faithful to the will of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of Congress will find an opportunity to read Chief Justice Warren's decision in the *Gissel* case. In some respects it is a perfect capstone for his long and distinguished judicial career. It reflects his wisdom, his fundamental fairness, his dedication to the honest implementation of congressional intent, and his respect for the integrity of the American worker.

At this point I insert in the RECORD

the Supreme Court's decision in NLRB against *Gissel Packing Co.*:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, Nos. 573, 691, AND 585, OCTOBER TERM, 1968

National Labor Relations Board, Petitioner, v. *Gissel Packing Co., Inc.*, et al.; Food Store Employees Union, Local No. 347, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, Petitioner, v. *Gissel Packing Co., Inc.*, on writs of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit; The Sinclair Company, Petitioner, v. National Labor Relations Board, on writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

[June 16, 1969]

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN delivered the opinion of the Court.

These cases involve the extent of an employer's duty under the National Labor Relations Act to recognize a union that bases its claim to representative status solely on the possession of union authorization cards, and the steps an employer may take, particularly with regard to the scope and content of statements he may make, in legitimately resisting such card-based recognition. The specific questions facing us here are whether the duty to bargain can arise without a Board election under the Act; whether union authorization cards, if obtained from a majority of employees without misrepresentation or coercion, are reliable enough generally to provide a valid, alternate route to majority status; whether a bargaining order is an appropriate and authorized remedy where an employer rejects a card majority while at the same time committing unfair labor practices that tend to undermine the union's majority and make a fair election an unlikely possibility; and whether certain specific statements made by an employer to his employees constituted such an election-voting unfair labor practice and thus fell outside the protection of the First Amendment and § 8 (c) of the Act. For reasons given below, we answer each of these questions in the affirmative.

I

Of the four cases before us, three—*Gissel Packing Co., Heck's Inc.*, and *General Steel Products, Inc.*—were consolidated following separate decisions in the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and brought here by the National Labor Relations Board in No. 573. Food Store Employees Union, Local No. 347, the petitioning Union in *Heck's*, brought that case here in a separate petition in No. 691. All three cases present the same legal issues in similar, uncomplicated factual settings that can be briefly described together. The fourth case, No. 585 (*Sinclair Company*), brought here from the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and argued separately, presents many of the same questions and will thus be disposed of in this opinion; but because the validity of some of the Board's factual findings are under attack on First Amendment grounds, detailed attention must be paid to the factual setting of that case.

Nos. 573 and 691

In each of the cases from the Fourth Circuit, the course of action followed by the Union and the employer and the Board's response were similar. In each case, the union waged an organizational campaign, obtained authorization cards from a majority of employees in the appropriate bargaining unit, and then on the basis of the cards, demanded recognition by the employer. All three employers refused to bargain on the ground that authorization cards were inherently unreliable indicators of employee desires; and they either embarked on, or continued, vigorous antiunion campaigns that gave rise to numerous unfair labor practice charges. In *Gissel*, where the employer's campaign began almost at the outset of the Union's organizational drive, the Union (petitioner in

No. 691), did not seek an election, but instead filed three unfair labor practice charges against the employer, for refusing to bargain in violation of § 8 (a) (5), for coercion and intimidation of employees in violation of § 8 (a) (1), and for discharge of union adherents in violation of § 8 (a) (3).¹ In *Heck's* an election sought by the Union was never held because of nearly identical unfair labor practice charges later filed by the Union as a result of the employer's antiunion campaign, initiated after the Union's recognition demand.² And in *General Steel*, an election petitioned for by the Union and won by the employer was set aside by the Board because of the unfair labor practices committed by the employer in the pre-election period.³

In each case, the Board's primary response was an order to bargain directed at the employees, despite the absence of an election in *Gissel* and *Heck's* and the employer's victory in *General Steel*. More specifically, the Board found in each case that (1) the union had obtained valid authorization cards from a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit and was thus entitled to represent the employees for collective bargaining purposes; and (2) that the employers' refusal to bargain with the unions in violation of § 8(a) (5) was motivated not by a "good faith" doubt of the unions' majority status, but by a desire to gain time to dissipate that status. The Board based its conclusion as to the lack of good faith doubt on the fact that the employers had committed substantial unfair labor practices during their antiunion campaign efforts to resist recognition. Thus, the Board found that all three employers had engaged in restraint and coercion of employees in violation of § 8(a) (1)—in *Gissel*, for coercively interrogating employees about union activities, threatening them with discharge and promising them benefits; in *Heck's*, for coercively interrogating employees, threatening reprisals, creating the appearance of surveillance, and offering benefits for opposing the Union; and in *General Steel*, for coercive interrogation and threats of reprisals, including discharge. In addition, the Board found that the employers in *Gissel* and *Heck's* had wrongfully discharged employees for engaging in union activities in violation of § 8(a) (3). And because the employers had rejected the card-based bargaining demand in bad faith, the Board found that all three had refused to recognize the unions in violation of § 8(a) (5).

Only in *General Steel* was there any objection by an employer to the validity of the cards and the manner in which they had been solicited, and the doubt raised by the evidence was resolved in the following manner. The customary approach of the Board in dealing with allegations of misrepresentation by the union and misunderstanding by the employees of the purpose for which the cards were being solicited has been set out in *Cumberland Shoe Corp.*, 144 N. L. R. B. No. 57, 68 L. R. E. M. 1338 (1968). Under the *Cumberland Shoe* doctrine, if the card itself is unambiguous (*i. e.*, states on its face that the signer authorizes the union to represent the employee for collective bargaining purposes and not to seek an election), it will be counted unless it is proved that the employee was told that the card was to be used solely for the purpose of obtaining an election. In *General Steel*, the trial examiner considered the allegations of misrepresentation at length and, applying the Board's customary analysis, rejected the claims with findings that were adopted by the Board and are reprinted in the margin.

Consequently, the Board ordered the companies to cease and desist from their unfair labor practices, to offer reinstatement and back pay to the employees who had been discriminatorily discharged, to bargain with the Union on request, and to post the appropriate notices.

Footnotes at end of speech.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in *per curiam* opinions in each of the three cases (398 F. 2d 336, 337, 339), sustained the Board's findings as to the §§ 8(a)(1) and (3) violations, but rejected the Board's findings that the employers' refusal to bargain violated § 8(a)(5) and declined to enforce those portions of the Board's orders directing the respondent companies to bargain in good faith. The court based its § 8(a)(5) rulings on its 1967 decisions raising the same fundamental issues. *Crawford Mfg. Co. v. NLRB*, 386 F. 2d 367 (C. A. 4th Cir. 1967), cert. denied, 390 U.S. 1028 (1968); *NLRB v. Logan Packing Co.*, 386 F. 2d 562 (C. A. 4th Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Sehon Stevenson & Co., Inc.*, 386 F. 2d 551 (C. A. 4th Cir. 1967). The court in those cases held that the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments to the Act, which permitted the Board to resolve representation disputes by certification under § 9(c) only by secret ballot election, withdrew from the Board the authority to order an employer to bargain under § 8(a)(5) on the basis of cards, in the absence of NLRB certification, unless the employer knows independently of the cards that there is in fact no representation dispute. The court held that the cards themselves were so inherently unreliable that their use gave an employer virtually an automatic, good faith claim that such a dispute existed, for which a secret election was necessary. Thus, these rulings established that a company could not be ordered to bargain unless (1) there was no question about a union's majority status (either because the employer agreed the cards were valid or had conducted his own poll so indicating), or (2) the employer's §§ 8(a)(1) and (3) unfair labor practices committed during the representation campaign were so extensive and pervasive that a bargaining order was the only available Board remedy irrespective of a card majority.

Thus based on the earlier decisions, the court's reasoning in these cases was brief, as indicated by the representative holding in *Heck's*:

"We have recently discussed the unreliability of the cards, in the usual case, in determining whether or not a union has attained a majority status and have concluded that an employer is justified in entertaining a good faith doubt of the union's claims when confronted with a demand for recognition based solely upon authorization cards. We have also noted that the National Labor Relations Act after the Taft-Hartley amendments provides for an election as the sole basis of a certification and restricts the Board to the use of secret ballots for the resolution of representation questions. This is not one of those extraordinary cases in which a bargaining order might be an appropriate remedy for pervasive violations of § 8(a)(1). It is controlled by our recent decisions and their reasoning. . . . There was not substantial evidence to support the findings of the Board that Heck's, Inc., had no good faith doubt of the unions' claims of majorities." 398 F. 2d, at 338.

No. 585

In No. 585, the factual pattern was quite similar. The petitioner, a producer of mill rolls, wire, and related products at two plants in Holyoke, Massachusetts, was shut down for some three months in 1952 as the result of a strike over contract negotiations with the American Wire Weavers Protective Association (AWWPA), the representative of petitioner's journeymen and apprentice wire weavers from 1933 to 1952. The Company subsequently reopened without a union contract, and its employees remained unrepresented through 1964, when the Company was acquired by an Ohio corporation, with the Company's former president continuing as head of the Holyoke, Massachusetts, division. In July 1965, the International Brotherhood

of Teamsters, Local Union No. 404, began an organizing campaign among petitioner's Holyoke employees and by the end of the summer had obtained authorization cards from 11 of the Company's 14 journeymen wire weavers choosing the Union as their bargaining agent. On September 20, the Union notified petitioner that it represented a majority of its wire weavers, requested that the Company bargain with it, and offered to submit the signed cards to a neutral third party for authentication. After petitioner's president declined the Union's request a week later, claiming, *inter alia*, that he had a good faith doubt of majority status because of the card's inherent unreliability, the Union petitioned, on November 8, for an election that was ultimately set for December 8.

When petitioner's president first learned of the Union's drive in July, he talked with all of his employees in an effort to dissuade them from joining a union. He particularly emphasized the results of the long 1952 strike, which he claimed "almost put our company out of business," and expressed worry that the employees were forgetting the "lessons of the past." He emphasized secondly that the Company was still on "thin ice" financially, that the Union's "only weapon is to strike," and that a strike "could lead to closing the plant," since the parent company had ample manufacturing facilities elsewhere. He noted thirdly that because of their age and the limited usefulness of their skills outside their craft, the employees might not be able to find re-employment if they lost their jobs as a result of a strike. Finally, he warned those who did not believe that the plant could go out of business to "look around Holyoke and see a lot of them out of business." The president sent letters to the same effect to the employees in early November, emphasizing that the parent company had no reason to stay in Massachusetts if profits went down.

During the two or three weeks immediately prior to the election on December 9, the president sent the employees a pamphlet captioned "Do you want another 13-week strike?" stating, *inter alia*, that "We have no doubt that the Teamsters Union can again close the Wire Weaving Department and the entire plant by a strike. We have no hopes that the Teamster Union bosses will not call a strike. . . . The Teamsters Union is a strike happy outfit." Similar communications followed in late November, including one stressing the Teamsters' "hoodlum control." Two days before the election, the Company sent out another pamphlet that was entitled "Let's Look at the Record," and that purported to be an obituary of companies in the Holyoke-Springfield, Massachusetts, area that had allegedly gone out of business because of union demands, eliminating some 3,500 jobs; the first page carried a large cartoon showing the preparation of a grave for the Sinclair Company and other headstones containing the names of other plants allegedly victimized by the unions. Finally, on the day before the election, the president made another personal appeal to his employees to reject the Union. He repeated that the Company's financial condition was precarious; that a possible strike would jeopardize the continued operation of the plant; and that age and lack of education would make re-employment difficult. The Union lost the election 7-6, and then filed both objections to the election and unfair labor practice charges which were consolidated for hearing before the trial examiner.

The Board agreed with the trial examiner that the president's communications with his employees, when considered as a whole, "reasonably tended to convey to the employees the belief or impression that selection of the Union in the forthcoming election could lead [the Company] to close its plant, or to the transfer of the weaving pro-

duction, with the resultant loss of jobs to the wire weavers." Thus, the Board found that under the "totality of the circumstances" petitioner's activities constituted a violation of § 8(a)(1) of the Act. The Board further agreed with the trial examiner that petitioner's activities, because they "also interfered with the exercise of a free and untrammelled choice in the election," and "tended to foreclose the possibility" of holding a fair election, required that the election be set aside. The Board also found that the Union had a valid card majority (the unambiguous cards, see n. 4, *supra*, went unchallenged) when it demanded recognition initially and the the Company declined recognition, not because of a good faith doubt as to the majority status, but, as the § 8(a)(1) violations indicated, in order to gain time to dissipate that status—in violation of § 8(a)(5). Consequently, the Board set the election aside, entered a cease-and-desist order, and ordered the Company to bargain on request.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit sustained the Board's findings and conclusions and enforced its order in full. 397 F. 2d 157. The court rejected the Company's proposition that the inherent unreliability of authorization cards entitled an employer automatically to insist on an election, noting that the representative status of a union may be shown by means other than an election; the court thus reaffirmed its stance among those circuits disavowing the Fourth Circuit's approach to authorization cards.⁹ Because of the conflict among circuits on the card issues and because of the alleged conflict between First Amendment freedoms and the restrictions placed on employer speech by § 8(a)(1) in *Sinclair*, No. 585, we granted certiorari to consider both questions. 393 U.S. 997 (1968). For reasons given below, we reverse the decisions of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and affirm the ruling of the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

II

In urging us to reverse the Fourth Circuit and to affirm the First Circuit, the National Labor Relations Board contends that we should approve its interpretation and administration of the duties and obligations imposed by the Act in authorization card cases. The Board argues (1) that unions have never been limited under § 9(c) of either the Wagner Act or the 1947 amendments to certified elections as the sole route to attaining representative status. Unions may, the Board contends, impose a duty to bargain on the employer under § 8(a)(5) by reliance on other evidence of majority employee support, such as authorization cards. Contrary to the Fourth Circuit's holding, the Board asserts, the 1947 amendments did not eliminate the alternative routes to majority status. The Board contends (2) that the cards themselves, when solicited in accordance with Board standards which adequately insure against union misrepresentation, are sufficiently reliable indicators of employee desires to support a bargaining order against an employer who refuses to recognize a card majority in violation of § 8(a)(5). The Board argues (3) that a bargaining order is the appropriate remedy for the § 8(a)(5) violation, where the employer commits other unfair labor practices that tend to undermine union support and render a fair election improbable.

Relying on these three assertions, the Board asks us to approve its current practice, which is briefly as follows. When confronted by a recognition demand based on possession of cards allegedly signed by a majority of his employees, an employer need not grant recognition immediately, but may, unless he has knowledge independently of the cards that the union has a majority, decline the union's request and insist on an election, either by requesting the union to file an elec-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tion petition or by filing such a petition himself under § 9(c)(1)(B). If, however, the employer commits independent and substantial unfair labor practices disruptive of election conditions, the Board may withhold the election or set it aside, and issue instead a bargaining order as a remedy for the various violations. A bargaining order will not issue, of course, if the union obtained the cards through misrepresentation or coercion or if the employer's unfair labor practices are unrelated generally to the representation campaign. Conversely, the employers in these cases urge us to adopt the views of the Fourth Circuit.

There is more at issue in these cases than the dispute outlined above between the Board and the four employers, however, for the Union, petitioner in No. 691, argues that we should accord a far greater role to cards in the bargaining area than the Board itself seeks in this litigation. In order to understand the differences between the Union and the Board, it is necessary to trace the evolution of the Board's approach to authorization cards from its early practice to the position it takes on oral argument before this Court. Such an analysis requires viewing the Board's treatment of authorization cards in three separate phases: (1) under the *Joy Silk* doctrine, (2) under the rules of the *Aaron Brothers* case, and (3) under the approach announced at oral argument before this Court.

The traditional approach utilized by the Board for many years has been known as the *Joy Silk* doctrine. *Joy Silk Mills, Inc. v. NLRB*, 85 N. L. R. B. 1263 (1949), enforced 87 U. S. App. D. C. 360, 185 F. 2d 732 (C. A. D. C. Cir. 1950). Under that rule, an employer could lawfully refuse to bargain with a union claiming representative status through possession of authorization cards if he had a "good faith doubt" as to the union's majority status; instead of bargaining, he could insist that the union seek an election in order to test out his doubts. The Board, then, could find a lack of good faith doubt and enter a bargaining order in one of two ways. It could find (1) that the employer's independent unfair labor practices were evidence of bad faith, showing that the employer was seeking time to dissipate the union's majority. Or the Board could find (2) that the employer had come forward with no reasons for entertaining any doubt and therefore that he must have rejected the bargaining demand in bad faith. An example of the second category was *Snow & Sons*, 134 N. L. R. B. 709 (1961), enforced 308 F. 2d 687 (C. A. 9th Cir. 1962), where the employer reneged on his agreement to bargain after a third party checked the validity of the card signatures and insisted on an election because he doubted that the employees truly desired representation. The Board entered a bargaining order with very broad language to the effect that an employer could not refuse a bargaining demand and seek an election instead "without valid ground therefor," 134 N. L. R. B. at 710-711. See also *Dixon Ford Shoe Co., Inc.*, 150 N. L. R. B. 861 (1965); *Kellogg Mills*, 147 N. L. R. B. 342, 346 (1964), enforced 347 F. 2d 219 (C. A. 9th Cir. 1965).

The leading case codifying modifications to the *Joy Silk* doctrine was *Aaron Brothers*, 158 N. L. R. B. 1077 (1966). There the Board made it clear that it had shifted the burden to the General Counsel to show bad faith and that an employer "will not be held to have violated his bargaining obligation . . . simply because he refuses to rely on cards, rather than an election, as the method for determining the union majority." 158 N. L. R. B., at 1078. Two significant consequences were emphasized. The Board noted (1) that not every unfair labor practice would automatically result in a finding of bad faith and therefore a bargaining order; the Board implied that it would find bad faith only if

the unfair labor practice was serious enough to have the tendency to dissipate the union's majority. The Board noted (2) that an employer no longer needed to come forward with reasons for rejecting a bargaining demand. The Board pointed out, however, that a bargaining order would issue if it could prove that an employer's "course of conduct" gave indications as to the employer's bad faith. As examples of such a "course of conduct," the Board cited *Snow & Sons*, *supra*; *Dixon Ford Shoe Co., Inc.*, *supra*, and *Kellogg Mills*, *supra*, thereby reaffirming *John P. Serpa, Inc.*, 155 N. L. R. B. No. 12 (1965), where the Board had limited *Snow & Sons* to its facts.

Although the Board's brief before this Court generally followed the approach as set out in *Aaron Brothers*, *supra*, the Board announced at oral argument that it had virtually abandoned the *Joy Silk* doctrine altogether. Under the Board's current practice, an employer's good faith doubt is largely irrelevant, and the key to the issuance of a bargaining order is the commission of serious unfair labor practices that interfere with the election processes and tend to preclude the holding of a fair election. Thus, an employer can insist that a union go to an election, regardless of his subjective motivation, so long as he is not guilty of misconduct; he need give no affirmative reasons for rejecting a recognition request, and he can demand an election with a simple "no comment" to the union. The Board pointed out, however, (1) that an employer could not refuse to bargain if he knew, through a personal poll for instance, that a majority of his employees supported the union, and (2) that an employer could not refuse recognition initially because of questions as to the appropriateness of the unit and then later claim, as an afterthought, that he doubted the union's strength.

The union argues here that an employer's right to insist on an election in the absence of unfair labor practices should be more circumscribed, and a union's right to rely on cards correspondingly more expanded, than the Board would have us rule. The union's contention is that an employer, when confronted with a card-based bargaining demand, can insist on an election only by filing the election petition himself immediately under § 9(c)(1)(B) and not by insisting that the union file the election petition, whereby the election can be subjected to considerable delay. If the employer does not himself petition for an election, the union argues, he must recognize the union regardless of his good or bad faith and regardless of his other unfair labor practices, and should be ordered to bargain if the cards were in fact validly obtained. And if this Court should continue to utilize the good faith doubt rule, the union contends that at the least we should put the burden on the employer to make an affirmative showing of his reasons for entertaining such doubt.

Because the employers' refusal to bargain in each of these cases was accompanied in each instance by independent unfair labor practices which tend to preclude the holding of a fair election, we need not decide whether a bargaining order is ever appropriate in cases where there is no interference with the election processes.

With the union's arguments aside, the points of difference between the employers and the Board will be considered in the following manner. The validity of the cards under the Act, their intrinsic reliability, and the appropriateness of a bargaining order as a response to violations of § 8(a)(5) as well as §§ 8(a)(1) and (3) will be discussed in the next section. The nature of an employer's reaction to an organizational campaign, and particularly the Board's conclusion that the employer's statements in No. 585 contained threats of reprisal and thus constituted restraint and coercion in violation of § 8(a)(1)

and not protected speech, will be covered in the final section.

III

The first issue facing us is whether a union can establish a bargaining obligation by means other than a Board election and whether the validity of alternate routes to majority status, such as cards, was affected by the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments. The most commonly traveled route for a union to obtain recognition as the exclusive bargaining representative of an unorganized group of employees is through the Board's election and certification procedures under § 9(c) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 159(c) (1964 ed.)); it is also, from the Board's point of view, the preferred route.⁸ A union is not limited to a Board election, however, for, in addition to § 9, the present Act provides in § (a)(5) (29 U.S.C. § 158(a)(5) (1964 ed.)), as did the Wagner Act in § 8(5), that "it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer . . . to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9(a)." Since § 9(a), in both the Wagner Act and the present Act, refers to the representative as the one "designated or selected" by a majority of the employees without specifying precisely how that representative is to be chosen, it was early recognized that an employer had a duty to bargain whenever the union representative presented "convincing evidence of majority support."⁹ Almost from the inception of the Act, then, it was recognized that a union did not have to be certified as the winner of a Board election to invoke a bargaining obligation; it could establish majority status by other means under the unfair labor practice provision of § 8(a)(5)—by showing convincing support, for instance, by a union-called strike or strike vote,¹⁰ or, as here, by possession of cards signed by a majority of the employees authorizing the union to represent them for collective bargaining purposes.¹¹

We have consistently accepted this interpretation of the Wagner Act and the present Act, particularly as to the use of authorization cards. See, e.g., *NLRB v. Bradford Dyeing Assn.*, 310 U.S. 318, 339-340 (1940); *Franks Bros. Co. v. NLRB*, 321 U.S. 702 (1943); *United Mine Workers v. Arkansas Flooring Co.*, 351 U.S. 62 (1956). Thus, in *United Mine Workers*, *supra*, we noted that a "Board election is not the only method by which an employer may satisfy itself as to the union's majority status." 351 U.S., at 72, n. 8, since § 9(a), "which deals expressly with employee representation, says nothing as to how the employees' representative shall be chosen." 351 U.S., at 71. We therefore pointed out in that case, where the union had obtained signed authorization cards from a majority of the employees, that "[i]n the absence of any bona fide dispute¹² as to the existence of the required majority of eligible employees, the employer's denial of recognition of the union would have violated § 8(a)(5) of the Act." 351 U.S., at 69. We see no reason to reject this approach to bargaining obligations now, and we find unpersuasive the Fourth Circuit's view that the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments, enacted some nine years before our decision in *United Mine Workers*, *supra*, require us to disregard that case. Indeed, the 1947 amendments weaken rather than strengthen the position taken by the employers here and the Fourth Circuit below. An early version of the bill in the House would have amended § 8(5) of the Wagner Act to permit the Board to find a refusal to bargain violation only where an employer had failed to bargain with a union "currently recognized by the employer or certified as such [through an election] under section 9." Section 8(a)(5) of H.R. 3020, 80th Cong., 1st Sess. (1947). The proposed change, which would have eliminated the use of cards, was rejected in Conference (H.R.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Conf. Rep. No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 41 (1947)), however, and we cannot make a similar change in the Act simply because, as the employers assert, Congress did not expressly approve the use of cards in rejecting the House amendment. Nor can we accept the Fourth Circuit's conclusion that the change was wrought when Congress amended § 9(c) to make election the sole basis for certification by eliminating the phrase "any other suitable method to ascertain such representatives,"¹² under which the Board had occasionally used cards as a certification basis. A certified union has the benefit of numerous special privileges which are not accorded unions recognized voluntarily or under a bargaining order¹⁴ and which, Congress could determine, should not be dispensed unless a union has survived the crucible of a secret ballot election.

The employers rely finally on the addition to § 9(c) of subparagraph (B), which allows an employer to petition for an election whenever "one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim¹⁵ to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9(a)." That provision was not added, as the employers assert, to give them an absolute right to an election at any time; rather, it was intended, as the legislative history indicates, to allow them, after asked to bargain, to test out their doubts as to a union's majority in a secret election which they would then presumably not cause to be set aside by illegal antiunion activity.¹⁶ We agree with the Board's assertion here that there is no suggestion that Congress intended § 9(c)(1)(B) to relieve any employer of his § 8(a)(5) bargaining obligation where, without good faith, he engaged in unfair labor practices disruptive of the Board's election machinery. And we agree that the policies reflected in § 9(c)(1)(B) fully support the Board's present administration of the Act (see p. 14, *ante*); for an employer can insist on a secret ballot election, unless, in the words of the Board, he engages "in contemporaneous unfair labor practices likely to destroy the union's majority and seriously impede the election." Brief for Petitioner 36.

In short, we hold that the 1947 amendments did not restrict an employer's duty to bargain under § 8(a)(5) solely to those unions whose representative status is certified after a Board election.¹⁷

We next consider the question whether authorization cards are such inherently unreliable indicators of employee desires that whatever the validity of other alternate routes to representative status, the cards themselves may never be used to determine a union's majority and to support an order to bargain. In this context, the employers urge us to take the step the 1947 amendments and their legislative history indicate Congress did not take, namely, to rule out completely the use of cards in the bargaining arena. Even if we do not unhesitatingly accept the Fourth Circuit's view in the matter, the employers argue, at the very least we should overrule the *Cumberland Shoe* doctrine (see p. 6, *supra*) and establish stricter controls over the solicitation of the cards by union representatives.¹⁸

The objections to the use of cards voiced by the employers and the Fourth Circuit boil down to two contentions:¹⁹ (1) that, as contrasted with the election procedure,²⁰ the cards cannot accurately reflect an employee's wishes, either because an employer has not had a chance to present his views and thus a chance to insure that the employee choice was an informed one, or because the choice was the result of group pressures and not individual decision made in the privacy of a voting booth; and (2) that quite apart from the election comparison, the cards are too often obtained through misrepresentation and coercion which compound the cards' in-

herent inferiority to the election process. Neither contention is persuasive, and each proves too much. The Board itself has recognized, and continues to do so here, that secret elections are generally the most satisfactory—indeed the preferred—method of ascertaining whether a union has majority support.²¹ The acknowledged superiority of the election process, however, does not mean that cards are thereby rendered totally invalid, for where an employer engages in conduct disruptive of the election process, cards may be the most effective—perhaps the only—way of assuring employee choice. As for misrepresentation, in any specific case of alleged irregularity in the solicitation of the cards, the proper course is to apply the Board's customary standards (to be discussed more fully below) and rule there was no majority if the standards were not satisfied. It does not follow that because there are some instances of irregularity, the cards can never be used; otherwise, an employer could put off his bargaining obligation indefinitely through continuing interference with elections.

That the cards, though admittedly inferior to the election process, can adequately reflect employee sentiment when that process has been impeded, needs no extended discussion, for the employers' contentions cannot withstand close examination. The employers argue that their employees cannot make an informed choice because the card drive will be over before the employer has had a chance to present his side of the unionization issues. Normally, however, the union will inform the employer of its organization drive early in order to subject the employer to the unfair labor practice provisions of the Act; the union must be able to show the employer's awareness of the drive in order to prove that his contemporaneous conduct constituted unfair labor practices on which a bargaining order can be based if the drive is ultimately successful. See, e.g., *Hunt Oil Co.*, 157 N. L. R. B. 282 (1966); *Don Swart Trucking Co.*, 154 N. L. R. B. 1345 (1965). Thus, in all of the cases here but the Charleston campaign in *Heck's* the employer, whether informed by the union or not, was aware of the union's organizing drive almost at the outset and began his antiunion campaign at that time; and even in the *Heck's-Charleston* case, where the recognition demand came about a week after the solicitation began, the employer was able to deliver a speech before the union obtained a majority. Further, the employers argue that without a secret ballot an employee may, in a card drive, succumb to group pressures or sign simply to get the union "off his back" and then be unable to change his mind as he would be free to do once inside a voting booth. But the same pressures are likely to be equally present in an election, for election cases arise most often with small bargaining units²² where virtually every voter's sentiments can be carefully and individually canvassed. And no voter, of course, can change his mind after casting a ballot in an election even though he may think better of his choice shortly thereafter.

The employers' second complaint, that the cards are too often obtained through misrepresentation and coercion, must be rejected also in view of the Board's present rules for controlling card solicitation, which we view as adequate to the task where the cards involved state their purpose clearly and unambiguously on their face. We would be closing our eyes to obvious difficulties, of course, if we did not recognize that there have been abuses, primarily arising out of misrepresentations by union organizers as to whether the effect of signing a card was to designate the union to represent the employee for collective bargaining purposes or merely to authorize it to seek an election to determine that issue. And we would be equally blind if we did not recognize that various courts of

appeals and commentators²³ have differed significantly as to the effectiveness of the Board's *Cumberland Shoe* doctrine (see p. 6, *supra*) to cure such abuses.

Thus even where the cards are unambiguous on their face, both the Second Circuit (*NLRB v. S. E. Nichols Co.*, 380 F. 2d 438 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1967)) and the Fifth Circuit (*Engineers & Fabricators, Inc. v. NLRB*, 376 F. 2d 482 (C. A. 5th Cir. 1967)) have joined the Fourth Circuit below in rejecting the Board's rule that the cards will be counted unless the solicitor's statements amounted under the circumstances to an assurance that the cards would be used only for an election, or for no other purpose than an election. And even those circuits which have adopted the Board's approach have criticized the Board for tending too often to apply the *Cumberland* rule too mechanically, declining occasionally to uphold the Board's application of its own rule in a given case. See, e.g., *NLRB v. Southbridge Sheet Metal Works, Inc.*, 380 F. 2d 851 (C. A. 1st Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Sandy's Stores, Inc.*, 398 F. 2d 268 (C. A. 1st Cir. 1968); *NLRB v. Swan Super Cleaners, Inc.*, 384 F. 2d 609 (C. A. 6th Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Dan Howard Mfg. Co.*, 390 F. 2d 304 (C. A. 7th Cir. 1968); *Furrs, Inc. v. NLRB*, 381 F. 2d 562 (C. A. 10th Cir. 1967); *UAW v. NLRB*, 392 F. 2d 801 (C. A. D. C. Cir. 1967). Among those who reject the *Cumberland* rule, the Fifth Circuit agrees with the Second Circuit (see *S. E. Nichols, supra*), that a card will be vitiated if an employee was left with the impression that he would be able to resolve any lingering doubts and make a final decision in an election, and further requires that the Board probe the subjective intent of each signer, an inquiry expressly avoided by *Cumberland*. See *NLRB v. Southland Paint Co.*, 394 F. 2d 717, 728, 730 (C. A. 5th Cir. 1968); *Engineers & Fabricators, Inc. v. NLRB, supra*. Where the cards are ambiguous on their face, the Fifth Circuit, joined by the Eighth Circuit (see, e.g., *NLRB v. Peterson Bros.*, 342 F. 2d 221 (C. A. 5th Cir. 1965), and *Bauer Welding & Metal Fabricators, Inc. v. NLRB*, 358 F. 2d 766 (C. A. 8th Cir. 1966)), departs still further from the Board rule. And there is a conflict among those courts which otherwise follow the Board as to single-purpose cards (compare *NLRB v. Lenz Co.*, 396 F. 2d 905, 908 (C. A. 6th Cir. 1968), with *NLRB v. C. J. Glasgow Co.*, 356 F. 2d 476, 478 (C. A. 7th Cir. 1966)).

We need make no decision as to the conflicting approaches used with regard to dual-purpose cards, for in each of the five organization campaigns in the four cases before us the cards used were single-purpose cards, stating clearly and unambiguously on their face that the signer designated the union as his representative. And even the view forcefully voiced by the Fourth Circuit below that unambiguous cards as well present too many opportunities for misrepresentation comes before us somewhat weakened in view of the fact that there were no allegations of irregularities in four of those five campaigns (*Gissel*, the two *Heck's* campaigns,²⁴ and *Sinclair*). Only in *General Steel* did the employer challenge the cards on the basis of misrepresentations. There, the trial examiner, after hearing testimony from over 100 employees and applying the traditional Board approach (see n. 5, *supra*), concluded that "all of these employees not only intended, but were fully aware that they were designating the union as their representative." Thus, the sole question before us, raised in only one of the four cases here, is whether the *Cumberland Shoe* doctrine is an adequate rule under the Act for assuring employee free choice.

In resolving the conflict among the circuits in favor of approving the Board's *Cumberland* rule, we think it sufficient to point out that employees should be bound by the clear language of what they sign unless that language is deliberately and

Footnotes at end of speech.

clearly canceled by a union adherent with words calculated to direct the signer to disregard and forget the language above his signature. There is nothing inconsistent in handing an employee a card that says the signer authorizes the union to represent him and then telling him that the card will probably be used first to get an election. Elections have been, after all, and will continue to be, held in the vast majority of cases; the union will still have to have the signatures of 30%²⁵ of the employees when an employer rejects a bargaining demand and insists that the union seek an election. We cannot agree with the employers here that employees as a rule are to unsophisticated to be bound by what they sign unless expressly told that their act of signing represents something else. In addition to approving the use of cards, of course, Congress has expressly authorized reliance on employee signatures alone in other areas of labor relations, even where criminal sanctions hang in the balance,²⁶ and we should not act hastily in disregarding congressional judgments that employees can be counted on to take responsibility for their acts.

We agree, however, with the Board's own warnings in *Levi Strauss*, 172 N.L.R.B. No. 57, 68 L.R.R.M. 1338, 1341, and n. 7 (1968), that in hearing testimony concerning a card challenge, trial examiners should not neglect their obligation to ensure employee free choice by a too easy mechanical application of the *Cumberland* rule.²⁷ We also accept the observation that employees are more likely than not, many months after a card drive and in response to questions by company counsel, to give testimony damaging to the union, particularly where company officials have previously threatened reprisals for union activity in violation of § 8(a)(1).²⁸ We therefore reject any rule that requires a probe of an employee's subjective motivations as involving an endless and unreliable inquiry. We nevertheless feel that the trial examiner's findings in *General Steel* (see n. 5, *supra*) represent the limits of the *Cumberland* rule's application. We emphasize that the Board should be careful to guard against an approach any more rigid than that in *General Steel*. And we reiterate that nothing we say here indicates our approval of the *Cumberland* rule when applied to ambiguous, dual-purpose cards.

The employers argue as a final reason for rejecting the use of the cards that they are faced with a Hobson's choice²⁹ under current Board rules and will almost inevitably come out the loser. They contend that if they do not make an immediate, personal investigation into possible solicitation irregularities to determine whether in fact the union represents an uncoerced majority, they will have unlawfully refused to bargain for failure to have a good faith doubt of the union's majority; and if they do make such an investigation, their efforts at polling and interrogation will constitute an unfair labor practice in violation of § 8(a)(1) and they will again be ordered to bargain. As we have pointed out, however, an employer is not obligated to accept a card check as proof of majority status, under the Board's current practice, and he is not required to justify his insistence on an election by making his own investigation of employee sentiment and showing affirmative reasons for doubting the majority status. See *Aaron Brothers*, 158 N.L.R.B. 1077, 1078. If he does make an investigation, the Board's recent cases indicate that reasonable polling in this regard will not always be termed violative of § 8(a)(1) if conducted in accordance with the requirements set out in *Struksnes Construction Co.*, 165 N.L.R.B. No. 102 (1967). And even if an employer's limited interrogation is found violative of the Act, it might not be serious enough to call for a bargaining order. See *Aaron Brothers*, *supra*; *Hammond & Irving, Inc.*, 154 N.L.R.B. No. 84 (1965). As

noted above, the Board has emphasized that not "any employer conduct found violative of section 8(a)(1) of the Act, regardless of its nature or gravity, will necessarily support a refusal-to-bargain finding," *Aaron Brothers*, *supra*, at 1079.

Remaining before us is the propriety of a bargaining order as a remedy for a § 8(a)(5) refusal to bargain where an employer has committed independent unfair labor practices which have made the holding of a fair election unlikely or which have in fact undermined a union's majority and caused an election to be set aside. We have long held that the Board is not limited to a cease-and-desist order in such cases, but has the authority to issue a bargaining order without first requiring the union to show that it has been able to maintain its majority status. See *NLRB v. Katz*, 369 U.S. 736, 748, n. 16 (1962); *NLRB v. P. Lorillard Co.*, 314 U.S. 512 (1942). And we have held that the Board has the same authority even where it is clear that the union, which once had possession of cards from a majority of the employees, represents only a minority when the bargaining order is entered. *Franks Bros. Co. v. NLRB*, 321 U.S. 702 (1943). We see no reason now to withdraw this authority from the Board. If the Board could enter only a cease-and-desist order and direct an election or a rerun, it would in effect be rewarding the employer and allowing him "to profit from [his] own wrongful refusal to bargain," *Franks Bros.*, *supra*, at 704, while at the same time severely curtailing the employees' right freely to determine whether they desire a representative. The employer could continue to delay or disrupt the election processes and put off indefinitely his obligation to bargain;³⁰ and any election held under these circumstances would not be likely to demonstrate the employees' true, undistorted desires.³¹

The employers argue that the Board has ample remedies over and above the cease-and-desist order, to control employer misconduct. The Board can, they assert, direct the companies to mail notices to employees, to read notices to employees during plant time and to give the union access to employees during working time at the plant, or it can seek a court injunctive order under § 10(j) (29 U.S.C. § 160(j) (1964 ed.)) as a last resort. In view of the Board's power, they conclude, the bargaining order is an unnecessarily harsh remedy that needlessly prejudices employees' § 7 rights solely for the purpose of punishing or restraining an employer. Such an argument ignores that a bargaining order is designed as much to remedy past election damage³² as it is to deter future misconduct. If an employer has succeeded in undermining a union's strength and destroying the laboratory conditions necessary for a fair election, he may see no need to violate a cease-and-desist order by further unlawful activity. The damage will have been done, and perhaps the only fair way to effectuate employee rights is to re-establish the conditions as they existed before the employer's unlawful campaign.³³ There is, after all, nothing permanent in a bargaining order, and, if, after the effects of the employer's acts have worn off, the employees clearly desire to disavow the union, they can do so by filing a decertification petition. For, as we pointed out long ago, in finding that a bargaining order involved no "injustice to employees who may wish to substitute for the particular union some other . . . arrangement," a bargaining relationship "once rightfully established must be permitted to exist and function for a reasonable period in which it can be given a fair chance to succeed," after which the "Board may . . . upon a proper showing, take steps in recognition of changed situations which might make appropriate changed bargaining relationships." *Frank Bros.*, *supra*, at 705-706.

Before considering whether the bargaining orders were appropriately entered in these cases, we should summarize the factors that go into such a determination. Despite our

reversal of the Fourth Circuit below in Nos. 573 and 691 on all major issues, the actual area of disagreement between our position here and that of the Fourth Circuit is not large as a practical matter. While refusing to validate the general use of a bargaining order in reliance on cards, the Fourth Circuit nevertheless left open the possibility of imposing a bargaining order, without need of inquiry into majority status on the basis of cards or otherwise, in "exceptional" cases marked by "outrageous" and "pervasive" unfair labor practices. Such an order would be an appropriate remedy for those practices, the court noted, if they are of "such a nature that their coercive effects cannot be eliminated by the application of traditional remedies, with the result that a fair and reliable election cannot be had." *NLRB v. Logan Packing Co.*, 386 F. 2d 562, 570 (C.A. 4th Cir. 1967); see also *NLRB v. Heck's*, *supra*, 398 F. 2d, at 338. The Board itself, we should add, has long had a similar policy of issuing a bargaining order, in the absence of a § 8(a)(5) violation or even a bargaining demand, when that was the only available, effective remedy for substantial unfair labor practices. See, e.g., *United Steelworkers of America v. NLRB*, 376 F. 2d 770 (C.A.D.C. Cir. 1967); *J. C. Penney Co., Inc. v. NLRB*, 384 F. 2d 479, 485-486 (C.A. 10th Cir. 1967).

The only effect of our holding here is to approve the Board's use of the bargaining order in less extraordinary cases marked by less pervasive practices which nonetheless still have the tendency to undermine majority strength and impede the election processes. The Board's authority to issue such an order on a lesser showing of employer misconduct is appropriate, we should reemphasize, where there is also a showing that at one point the union had a majority; in such a case, of course, effectuating ascertainable employee free choice becomes as important a goal as deterring employer misbehavior. In fashioning a remedy in the exercise of its discretion, then, the Board can properly take into consideration the extensiveness of an employer's unfair practices in terms of their past effect on election conditions and the likelihood of their recurrence in the future. If the Board finds that the possibility of erasing the effects of past practices and of ensuring a fair election (or a fair rerun) by the use of traditional remedies, though present, is slight and that employee sentiment once expressed through cards would, on balance, be better protected by a bargaining order, then such an order should issue (see n. 32, *supra*).

We emphasize that under the Board's remedial power there is still a third category of minor or less extensive unfair labor practices, which, because of their minimal impact on the election machinery, will not sustain a bargaining order. There is, the Board says, no *per se* rule that the commission of any unfair practice will automatically result in a § 8(a)(5) violation and the issuance of an order to bargain. See *Aaron Brothers*, *supra*.

With these considerations in mind, we turn to an examination of the orders in these cases. In *Sinclair*, No. 585, the Board made a finding, left undisturbed by the First Circuit, that the employer's threats of reprisal were so coercive that, even in the absence of a § 8(a)(5) violation, a bargaining order would have been necessary to repair the unlawful effect of those threats.³⁴ The Board therefore did not have to make the determination called for in the intermediate situation above that the risks that a fair rerun election might not be possible were too great to disregard the desires of the employees already expressed through the cards. The employer argues, however, that his communications to his employees were protected by the First Amendment and § 8(c) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 158(c) (1964 ed.)), whatever the effect of those communications on the union's majority or the Board's

Footnotes at end of speech.

ability to ensure a fair election; it is to that contention that we shall direct our final attention in the next section.

In the three cases in Nos. 573 and 691 from the Fourth Circuit, on the other hand, the Board did not make a similar finding that a bargaining order would have been necessary in the absence of an unlawful refusal to bargain. Nor did it make a finding that, even though traditional remedies might be able to ensure a fair election, there was insufficient indication that an election (or a rerun in *General Steel*) would definitely be a more reliable test of the employees' desires than the card count taken before the unfair labor practices occurred. The employees argue that such findings would not be warranted, and the court below ruled in *General Steel* that available remedies short of a bargaining order could guarantee a fair election. 398 F. 2d, at 340, n. 3. We think it possible that the requisite findings were implicit in the Board's decisions below to issue bargaining orders (and to set aside the election in *General Steel*); and we think it clearly inappropriate for the court below to make any contrary finding on its own (see n. 32, *supra*). Because the Board's current practice at the time required it to phrase its findings in terms of an employer's good- or bad-faith doubts (see Part II, *supra*), however, the precise analysis the Board now puts forth was not employed below, and we therefore remand these cases to the Board for proper findings.

We consider finally petitioner Sinclair's First Amendment challenge to the holding of the Board and the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. At the outset we note that the question raised here most often arises in the context of a nascent union organizational drive, where employers must be careful in waging their antiunion campaign. As to conduct generally, the above noted gradations of unfair labor practices, with their varying consequences, create certain hazards for employers when they seek to estimate or resist unionization efforts. But so long as the differences involve conduct easily avoided, such as discharge, surveillance, and coercive interrogation, we do not think that employers can complain that the distinctions are unreasonably difficult to follow. Where an employer's antiunion efforts consist of speech alone, however, the difficulties raised are not so easily resolved. The Board has eliminated some of the problem areas by no longer requiring an employer to show affirmative reasons for insisting on an election and by permitting him to make reasonable inquiries. We do not decide, of course, whether these allowances are mandatory. But we do note that an employer's free speech right to communicate his news to his employees is firmly established and cannot be infringed by a union or the Board. Thus, § 8(c) (29 U. S. C. § 158(c) (1964 ed.)) merely implements the First Amendment by requiring that the expression of "any views, argument or opinion" shall not be "evidence of an unfair labor practice," so long as such expression contains "no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit" in violation of § 8(a) (1). Section 8(a) (1), in turn, prohibits interference, restraint or coercion of employees in the exercise of their right to self-organization.

Any assessment of the precise scope of employer expression, of course, must be made in the context of its labor relations setting. Thus, an employer's rights cannot outweigh the equal rights of the employees to associate freely, as those rights are embodied in § 7 and protected by § 8(a) (1) and the proviso to § 8(c). And any balancing of those rights must take into account the economic dependence of the employees on their employers, and the necessary tendency of the former, because of that relationship, to pick up intended implications of the latter that might be more readily dismissed by a more disinterested ear. Stating these obvious principles is but another way of recognizing that

what is basically at stake is the establishment of a nonpermanent, limited relationship between the employer, his economically dependent employee and his union agent, not the election of legislators or the enactment of legislation whereby that relationship is ultimately defined and where the independent voter may be freer to listen more objectively and employers as a class freer to talk. Compare *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964).

Within this framework, we must reject the Company's challenge to the decision below and the findings of the Board on which it was based. The standards used below for evaluating the impact of an employer's statements is not seriously questioned by petitioner and we see no need to tamper with it here. Thus, an employer is free to communicate to his employees any of his general views about unionism or any of his specific views about a particular union, so long as the communications do not contain a "threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit." He may even make a prediction as to the precise effects he believes unionization will have on his company. In such a case, however, the prediction must be carefully phrased on the basis of objective fact to convey an employer's belief as to demonstrably probable consequences beyond his control or to convey a management decision already arrived at to close the plant in case of unionization. See *Textile Workers v. Darlington Mfg. Co.* 380 U.S. 263, 274 n. 20 (1965). If there is any implication that an employer may or may not take action solely on his own initiative for reasons unrelated to economic necessities and known only to him, the statement is no longer a reasonable prediction based on available facts but a threat of retaliation based on misrepresentation and coercion, and as such without the protection of the First Amendment. We therefore agree with the court below that "conveyance of the employer's belief, even though sincere, that unionization will or may result in the closing of the plant is not a statement of fact unless, which is most improbable, the eventuality of closing is capable of proof." 397 F. 2d, at 160. As stated elsewhere, an employer is free only to tell "what he reasonably believes will be the likely economic consequences of unionization that are outside his control," and not "threats of economic reprisal to be taken solely on his own volition." *NLRB v. River Togs, Inc.*, 382 F. 2d 198, 202 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1967).

Equally valid was the finding by the court and the Board that petitioner's statements and communications were not cast as a prediction of "demonstrable economic consequences," 397 F. 2d, at 160, but rather as a threat of retaliatory action. The Board found that petitioner's speeches, pamphlets, leaflets, and letters conveyed the following message: that the company was in a precarious financial condition; that the "strike-happy" union would in all likelihood have to obtain its potentially unreasonable demands by striking, the probable result of which would be a plant shut-down, as the past history of labor relations in the area indicated; and that the employees in such a case would have great difficulty finding employment elsewhere. In carrying out its duty to focus on the question "what did the speaker intend and the listener understand," Cox Law and the National Labor Policy 44 (1960), the Board could reasonably conclude that the intended and understood import of that message was not to predict that unionization would inevitably cause the plant to close but to threaten to throw employees out of work regardless of the economic realities. In this connection, we need go no further than to point out (1) that petitioner had no support for his basic assumption that the union, which had not yet even presented any demands, would have to strike to be heard, and that he admitted at the hearing that he had no basis for attributing other plant closings in the area to unionism; and (2) that the

Board has often found that employees, who are particularly sensitive to rumors of plant closings,² take such hints as coercive threats rather than honest forecasts.³⁰

Petitioner argues that the line between so-called permitted predictions and proscribed threats is too vague to stand up under traditional First Amendment analysis and that the Board's discretion to curtail free speech rights is correspondingly too uncontrolled. It is true that a reviewing court must recognize the Board's competence in the first instance to judge the impact of utterances made in the context of the employer-employee relationship, see *NLRB v. Virginia Electric & Power Co.*, 314 U.S. 469, 479 (1941). But an employer, who has control over that relationship and therefore knows it best, cannot be heard to complain that he is without an adequate guide for his behavior. He can easily make his views known without engaging in "brinkmanship" when it becomes all too easy to "overstep and tumble into the brink." *Wassau Steel Corp. v. NLRB*, 377 F. 2d 369, 372 (C. A. 7th Cir. 1967). At the least he can avoid coercive speech simply by avoiding conscious overstatements he has reason to believe will mislead his employees.

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in No. 585, and we reverse the judgments of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in Nos. 573 and 691 insofar as they decline enforcement of the Board's orders to bargain and remand those cases to the Board for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

FOOTNOTES

¹ At the outset of the Union campaign, the Company vice president informed two employees, later discharged, that if they were caught talking to union men, "you g—d things will go." Subsequently, the Union presented oral and written demands for recognition, claiming possession of authorization cards from 31 of the 47 employees in the appropriate unit. Rejecting the bargaining demand, the Company began to interrogate employees as to their union activities; to promise them better benefits than the Union could offer; and to warn them that if the "union got in, [the vice president] would just take his money and let the union run the place," that the Union was not going to get in, and that it would have to "fight" the Company first. Further, when the Company learned of an impending Union meeting, it arranged, so the Board later found, to have an agent present to report the identity of the Union adherents. On the first day following the meeting, the vice president told the two employees referred to above that he knew they had gone to the meeting and that their work hours were henceforth reduced to half a day. Three hours later, the two employees were discharged.

² The organizing drive was initiated by the employees themselves at Heck's Charleston warehouse. The Union first demanded recognition on the basis of 13 cards from 26 employees of the Company's three Charleston warehouses. After responding "No comment" to the Union's repeated requests for recognition, the president assembled the employees and told them of his shock at their selection of the Union; he singled out one of the employees to ask if he had signed an authorization card. The next day the Union obtained the additional card necessary to establish a majority. That same day, the leading union supporter (the employee who had first established contacts with the Union and had solicited a large number of the cards) was discharged, and another employee was interrogated as to his union activities, encouraged to withdraw his authorization, and warned that a union victory could result in reduced hours, fewer raises, and withdrawal of bonuses. A second demand for recognition was made two days later, and thereafter the president summoned two known union sup-

porters to his office and offered them new jobs at higher pay if they would use their influence to "break up the union."

The same pattern was repeated a year later at the Company's Ashland, Kentucky, store, where the Union obtained cards from 21 of the 38 employees by October 5, 1965. The next day, the assistant store manager told an employee that he knew that the Union had acquired majority status. When the Union requested recognition on October 8, however, the Company refused on the ground that it was not sure whether department heads were included in the bargaining unit—even though the cards represented a majority with or without the department heads. After a second request for recognition and an offer to submit the cards to the employer for verification, respondent again refused, on grounds of uncertainty about the definition of the unit and because a poll taken by the Company showed that a majority of the employees did not want union representation. Meanwhile, the Company told the employees that an employee of another company store had been fired on the spot for signing a card, warned employees that the Company knew which ones had signed cards, and polled employees about their desire for union representation without giving them assurances against reprisals.

"Throughout the Union's six-month organizational campaign—both before and after its demand for recognition based on possession of cards from 120 of the 207 employees in the appropriate unit—the Company's foremen and supervisors interrogated employees about their union involvement; threatened them with discharge for engaging in union activities or voting for the union; suggested that unionization might hurt business and make new jobs more difficult to obtain; warned that strikes and other dire economic consequences would result (a supervisor informed a group of employees that if the union came in, "a nigger would be the head of it," and that when the Company put in 10 new machines, "the niggers would be the operators of them"); and asserted that, although it would have to negotiate with the Union, it could negotiate endlessly and would not have to sign anything.

"The cards used in all four campaigns in Nos. 573 and 691 and in the one drive in No. 585 unambiguously authorized the Union to represent the signing employee for collective bargaining purposes; there was no reference to elections. Typical of the cards was the one used in the Charleston campaign in *Heck's* and it stated in relevant part:

"Desiring to become a member of the above Union of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, I hereby make application for admission to membership. I hereby authorize you, or your agents or representatives to act for me as collective bargaining agent on all matters pertaining to rates of pay, hours or any other condition of employment."

"Accordingly, I reject respondent's contention that if a man is told that his card will be secret, or will be shown only to the Labor Board for the purpose of obtaining election, that this is the absolute equivalent of telling him that it will be used 'only' for the purpose of obtaining an election.

"With respect to the 97 employees named in the attached Appendix B Respondent in its brief contends, in substance, that their cards should be rejected because each of these employees was told one or more of the following: (1) that the card would be used to get an election (2) that he had the right to vote either way, even though he signed the card (3) that the card would be kept secret and not shown to anybody except to the Board in order to get an election. For reasons heretofore explicated, I conclude that these statements, singly or jointly, do not foreclose use

of the cards for the purpose designated on their face."

"See, e.g., *Joy Silk Mills, Inc., v. NLRB*, 87 U.S. App. D. C. 360, 185 F. 2d 732 (C. A. D. C. Cir.), cert. denied, 341 U.S. 914 (1951); *NLRB v. Gotham Shoe Mfg. Co., Inc.*, 359 F. 2d 684 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1964); *NLRB v. Quality Markets, Inc.*, 387 F. 2d 20 (C. A. 3d Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Phil-Modes, Inc.*, 396 F. 2d 131 (C. A. 5th Cir. 1968); *Atlas Engine Works, Inc. v. NLRB*, 396 F. 2d 775 (C. A. 6th Cir. 1968), petition for certiorari pending; *NLRB v. Clark Products, Inc.*, 385 F. 2d 396 (C. A. 7th Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Ralph Printing and Lithographing Co.*, 379 F. 2d 687 (C. A. 8th Cir. 1967); *NLRB v. Luist Truck Lines*, 384 F. 2d 842 (C. A. 8th Cir. 1967); *Furr's, Inc. v. NLRB*, 381 F. 2d 562 (C. A. 10th Cir. 1967), cert. denied, 380 U.S. 840 (1968).

In addition to the First Circuit below, four courts of appeals have subsequently considered the Fourth Circuit's view of the cards and specifically rejected it. *NLRB v. United Mineral and Chemical Corp.*, 391 F. 2d 829, 836, n. 10 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1968); *NLRB v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.*, 394 F. 2d 711, 712-713 (C. A. 5th Cir. 1968); *NLRB v. Atco Surgical-Supports*, 394 F. 2d 659, 660 (C. A. 6th Cir. 1968); *NLRB v. Ozark Motor Lines*, — F. 2d — (C. A. 8th Cir. 1969).

"In 1967, for instance, the Board conducted 8,116 elections but issued only 157 bargaining orders based on a card majority. *Levi Strauss*, 172 N. L. R. B. No. 57, 68 L. R. M. 1338, 1342, n. 9 (1968). See also J. Sheinkman, *Recognition of Unions Through Authorization Cards*, 3 Ga. L. Rev. 319 (1969). The number of card cases that year, however, represents a rather dramatic increase over previous years, from 12 such cases in 1964, 24 in 1965, and about 117 in 1966. H. L. Browne, *Obligation To Bargain on Basis of Card Majority*, 3 Ga. L. Rev. 334, 347 (1969).

"See, e.g., *Aaron Brothers*, 158 N. L. R. B. 1077 (1967); cf., *General Shoe Corp.*, 77 N. L. R. B. 124 (1948). An employer, of course, may not, even if he acts in good faith, recognize a minority union, *Garment Workers' Union v. NLRB and Bernard-Altmann Corp.*, 366 U.S. 731 (1961).

"*NLRB v. Dahistrom Metallic Door Co.*, 112 F. 2d 756, 757 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1940).

"See, e.g., *Denver Auto Dealers Assn.*, 10 N. L. R. B. 1173 (1939); *Century Mills, Inc.*, 5 N. L. R. B. 807 (1938).

"The right of an employer lawfully to refuse to bargain if he had a good faith doubt as to the Union's majority status, even if in fact the Union did represent a majority, was recognized early in the administration of the Act, see *NLRB v. Remington Rand, Inc.*, 94 F. 2d 862, 868 (C. A. 2d Cir. 1938), cert. denied, 304 U.S. 576 (1938).

"See n. 11, *supra*.

"Section 9(c) of the Wagner Act had provided:

"Whenever a question affecting commerce arises concerning the representation of employees, the Board may investigate such controversy and certify . . . the name or names of the representatives that have been designated or selected. In any such investigation, the Board . . . may take a secret ballot of employees, or utilize any other suitable method to ascertain such representatives."

"E.g., protection against the filing of new election petitions by rival unions or employees seeking decertification for 12 months (§ 9(c) (3)), protection for a reasonable period, usually one year, against any disruption of the bargaining relationship because of claims that the union no longer represents a majority (see *Brooks v. NLRB*, 348 U.S. 96 (1954), protection against recognition picketing by rival unions (§ 8(b) (4) (C)), and freedom from the restrictions placed in work assignments disputes by § 8(b) (4) (D), and on recognition and organizational picketing by § 8(b) (7).

"Under the Wagner Act, which did not prescribe who would file election petitions, the Board had ruled that an employer could

seek an election only when two unions presented conflicting bargaining requests on the ground that if he were given the same election petition rights as the union, he could interrupt union drives by demanding an election before the union had obtained majority status. The 1947 amendments resolved the difficulty by providing that an employer could seek an election only after he had been requested to bargain. See H.R. Rep. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 35 (1947).

"The Senate report stated that the "present Board rules . . . discriminate against employers who have reasonable grounds for believing that labor organizations claiming to represent the employees are really not the choice of the majority." S. Rep. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 10-11 (1947). Senator Taft stated during the debates: "Today an employer is faced with this situation. A man comes into his office and says, 'I represent your employees. Sign this agreement or we strike tomorrow.' . . . The employer has no way in which to determine whether this man really does represent his employees or does not. The bill gives him the right to go to the Board . . . and say, 'I want an election. I want to know who is the bargaining agent for my employees.'" 93 Cong. Rec. 3954 (1947).

"As aptly stated in H. Lesnick, *Establishment of Bargaining Rights Without an Election*, 65 Mich. L. Rev. 857, 861-862 (1967):

"Cards have been used under the Act for thirty years; [this] Court has repeatedly held that certification is not the only route to representative status; and the 1947 attempt in the House-passed Hartley bill to amend section 8(a) (5) . . . was rejected by the conference committee that produced the Taft-Hartley Act. No amount of drum-beating should be permitted to overcome, without legislation, this history."

"In dealing with the reliability of cards, we should re-emphasize what issues we are not confronting. As pointed out above, we are not here faced with a situation where an employer, with "good" or "bad" subjective motivation, has rejected a card-based bargaining request without good reason and has insisted that the Union go to an election while at the same time refraining from committing unfair labor practices that would tend to disturb the "laboratory conditions of that election. We thus need not decide whether, absent election interference by an employer's unfair labor practices, he may obtain an election only if he petitions for one himself; whether, if he does not, he must bargain with a card majority if the Union chooses not to seek an election; and whether, in the latter situation, he is bound by the Board's ultimate determination of the card results regardless of his earlier good-faith doubts, or whether he can still insist on a Union-sought election if he makes an affirmative showing of his positive reasons for believing there is a representation dispute. In short, a union's right to rely on cards as a freely interchangeable substitute for elections where there has been no election interference is not put in issue here; we need only decide whether the cards are reliable enough to support a bargaining order where a fair election probably could not have been held, or where an election that was held was in fact set aside.

"The Board's reliance on authorization cards has provoked considerable scholarly controversy. Compare criticism of Board policy, particularly its treatment of ambiguous, dual-purpose cards, in H. L. Browne, *supra*, and Comment, *Union Authorization Cards*, 75 Yale L. J. 805 (1966), with defense of Board practice in H. Lesnick, *supra*; M. J. Welles, *The Obligation To Bargain on the Basis of a Card Majority*, 3 Ga. L. Rev. 349 (1969); and Comment, *Union Authorization Cards: A Reliable Basis for an NLRB Order To Bargain?*, 47 Tex. L. Rev. 87 (1968).

"For a comparison of the card procedure and the election process, see discussion in

NLRB v. Logan Packing Co., 386 F. 2d 562, 564-566 (C.A. 4th Cir. 1967).

²¹ See nn. 7-8, *supra*.

²² See Comment, Union Authorization Cards: A Reliable Basis for an NLRB Order to Bargain?, *supra*, at 94 and n. 32.

²³ See n. 19, *supra*.

²⁴ In the Charleston campaign in *Heck's*, the employees handled the card drive themselves from beginning to end, contacting the union, obtaining the blank authorization cards, and soliciting their fellow employees on that basis; no union agents were involved in the card signing.

²⁵ See 1969 OCH Guidebook to Labor Relations § 402.4.

²⁶ Criminal sanctions are imposed by § 302 (29 U.S.C. § 186) which makes it unlawful for an employer to pay to and for a union representative to receive "any money or other thing of value." Section 302(c)(4) (29 U.S.C. § 186(c)(4)) exempts payments by employers to union representatives of union dues, however, where an employee has executed a "written assignment" of the dues, i.e. a check-off authorization. Signatures are also relied on in § 9(c)(1)(A) (29 U.S.C. § 159), which provides for Board processing of representation and decertification petitions when each is supported by a "substantial number of employees" (the basis for the 30% signature requirement, see n. 25, *supra*), and in § 9(c) which specifically provides for 30% of the signatures in the bargaining unit to empower the Board to hold a union shop deauthorization election.

²⁷ In explaining and reaffirming the *Cum-berland Shoe* doctrine in the context of unambiguous cards, the Board stated:

"Thus the fact that employees are told in the course of solicitation that an election is contemplated, or that a purpose of the card is to make an election possible, provides in our view *insufficient* basis in itself for vitiating unambiguously worded authorization cards on the theory of misrepresentation. A different situation is presented, of course, where union organizers solicit cards on the explicit or indirectly expressed representation that they will use such cards *only* for an election and subsequently seek to use them for a different purpose . . ."

The Board stated further in a footnote: "The foregoing does not of course imply that a finding of misrepresentation is confined to situations where employees are expressly told in *haec verba* that the 'sole' or 'only' purpose of the cards is to obtain an election. The Board has never suggested such a mechanistic application of the foregoing principles, as some have contended. The Board looks to substance rather than to form. It is not the use or nonuse of certain key or 'magic' words that is controlling, but whether or not the totality of circumstances surrounding the card solicitation is such, as to add up to an assurance to the card signer that his card will be used for no purpose other than to help get an election." 172 N.L.R.B. No. 57, 68 L.R.R.M. 1338, 1341, and n. 7.

²⁸ See J. Sheinkman, *supra*, at 332-333.

²⁹ See Judge Brown's "*Scylla and Charybdis*" analogy in *NLRB v. Dan River Mills*, 274 F. 2d 331, 388 (C.A. 5th Cir. 1957).

³⁰ The Board indicates here that its records show that in the period between January and June 1968, the median time between the filing of an unfair labor practice charge and a Board decision in a contested case was 388 days. But the employer can do more than just put off his bargaining obligation by seeking to slow down the Board's administrative processes. He can also affect the outcome of a rerun election by delaying tactics, for figures show that the longer the time between a tainted election and a rerun, the lesser are the union's chances of reversing the outcome of the first election. See n. 31, *infra*.

³¹ A study of 20,153 elections held between

1960 and 1962 shows that in over two-thirds of the cases, the party who caused the election to be set aside won in the rerun election. See D. Pollitt, NLRB Re-Run Elections: A Study, 41 N.C.L. Rev. 209, 212 (1963). The study shows further that certain unfair labor practices are more effective to destroy election conditions for a longer period of time than others. For instance, in cases involving threats to close or transfer plant operations, the union won the rerun only 29% of the time, while threats to eliminate benefits or refuse to deal with the union if elected seemed less irremediable with the union winning the rerun 75% of the time. *Id.*, at 215-216. Finally, time appears to be a factor. The figures suggest that if a rerun is held too soon after the election before the effects of the unfair labor practices have worn off, or too long after the election when interest in the union may have waned, the chances for a changed result occurring are not as good as they are if the rerun is held sometime in between those periods. Thus, the study showed that if the rerun is held within 30 days of the election or over nine months after, the chances that a different result will occur are only one in five; when the rerun is held within 30-60 days after the election, the chances for a changed result are two in five.

³² The employers argue that the Fourth Circuit correctly observed that, "in the great majority of cases, a cease and desist order with the posting of appropriate notices will eliminate any undue influences upon employees voting in the security of anonymity." *NLRB v. Logan Packing Co.*, *supra*, at 570. It is for the Board and not the courts, however, to make that determination, based on its expert estimate as to the effects on the election process of unfair labor practices of varying intensity. In fashioning its remedies under the broad provisions of § 10(c) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 160(c) (1964 ed.)), the Board draws on a fund of knowledge and expertise all its own, and its choice of remedy must therefore be given special respect by reviewing courts. See *Fibreboard Paper Products Corp. v. NLRB*, 379 U.S. 203 (1964). "[I]t is usually better to minimize the opportunity for reviewing courts to substitute their discretion for that of the agency." *Consolidated v. FMC*, 383 U.S. 607, 621 (1966).

³³ It has been pointed out that employee rights are affected whether or not a bargaining order is entered, for those who desire representation may not be protected by an inadequate rerun election, and those who oppose collective bargaining may be prejudiced by a bargaining order if in fact the union would have lost an election absent employer coercion. See Lesnick, *supra*, at 862. Any effect will be minimal at best, however, for there "is every reason for the union to negotiate a contract that will satisfy the majority, for the union will surely realize that it must win the support of the employees, in the face of a hostile employer, in order to survive the threat of a decertification election after a year has passed." D. Bok, *The Regulation of Campaign Tactics in Representative Elections Under the National Labor Relations Act*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 38, 135 (1964).

³⁴ Under the doctrine of *Bernal Foam Products Co.*, 146 N.L.R.B. 1277 (1964), there is nothing inconsistent in the Union filing an election petition and thereby agreeing that a question of representation exists, and then filing a refusal-to-bargain charge after the election is lost because of the employer's unfair labor practices.

³⁵ See D. Bok, *supra*, at 77: n. 31, *supra*.

³⁶ See *c.g.*, *Kolmar Laboratories, Inc.*, 159 N.L.R.B. 805, 807-810, and cases (relied on by the trial examiner here) cited in n. 3, enforced, 387 F. 2d 833 (C.A. 7th Cir. 1967); *Surprenant Mfg. Co.*, 144 N.L.R.B. 507, 510-511, enforced, 341 F. 2d 756, 761 (C.A. 6th Cir. 1965).

OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record the text of a very moving and thought-provoking address given recently by Mr. Manuel Aragon, Jr., at Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Calif.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY MANUEL ARAGON, JR.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. I have come here to enlist your help as citizens. I am deeply convinced that only if we immediately mobilize your support can we achieve the imperative transformations in our institutional system required for an escape from total social chaos and moral confusion.

Today is greatly different from the day this College opened its doors two generations ago.

Then, the forces which have brought us to our present crisis were taking shape as problems to be solved or opportunities to be secured. Those who were charged with solving the problems and using the opportunities in the forty years since the founding of this school were to have the advantages of the best training, the most advanced technology, more information, and the greatest social and economic power of any ruling group in history.

Then, the Nation was poised on the edge of an economic depression and, within a few years, a world wide war.

In 1949, after twenty years of depression, war and the beginning of nuclear terror, the Nation could look forward to unparalleled opportunities to educate its citizens, achieve racial justice, strengthen its representative government, and eliminate poverty, for all of the necessary economic, legal, and technological resources were at the hands of those in power. The only things lacking were the will and the foresight to do what was right.

Today, like a doomsday machine poised for self-demolition, our massive institutional system methodically destroys the Nation's greatest treasures; its wealth, its natural resources, its water and air, and finally, most tragic of all, vast groups of its people through poverty and racism, and especially its young people through war and alienation. We are on the brink of what may be an overwhelming moral and social crisis.

Unlike the previous domestic crisis during the depression which was primarily economic, today's is mainly one of values; it has to do with what is right and what is wrong as well as with what works and what doesn't work.

It is clear to me that we have reached this juncture because those who preceded us were unwilling to foresee and take responsibility for the moral and human consequences of their actions. They operated on the principle of securing the greatest political, military, social and economic advantage for that particular moment. The cumulative result of their expedient, short-sighted decisions, is a massive structure of institutions, priorities, and ethics which is unworkable, ineffective, inhumane, and, ultimately, immoral.

In the name of National defense we built a military establishment which now lies upon us like a heavy hand, demanding a greater and greater share of the Nation's wealth. For the first time in our history the military has become a major political force and, backed by its natural allies in the defense industry, seems likely to maintain its influence. At the moment neither Congress nor the President seem to be having much success in curbing its appetite for a giant share of the National budget.

Not content with having bankrupted the war on poverty and other urgent domestic programs in order to finance the Viet Nam fiasco, the military has already made its plans to buy a new generation of weapons just in case that unhappy war should stop or be scaled down.

The current rate of Viet Nam spending is some thirty billion dollars a year. This is more than enough, for example, to finance the war on poverty at its present National level for the next fifteen years. When we spend fifty times more for one month of war in Viet Nam than we do for a whole year of poverty programs for one million poor people in Los Angeles County, then something is drastically wrong with our National priorities and the means by which they are set. We must demand a total reordering of what is most important and all of us must insist on nothing less than a vast and immediate commitment by this Nation to invest the money and the energy needed to eliminate the inhumanity of poverty.

We created a school system which is entitled by law to take our money and our children but which seems unable to provide large numbers of our youth, especially in the barrio and ghetto, with even the most rudimentary survival skills. How can we say that a school which produces a 50% drop-out rate for Black children and one college student out of two-hundred Chicano youth is anything but a disastrous failure. Yet that is exactly what has been happening since even before Los Angeles City College opened its doors forty years ago.

What happened to all those young drop outs? What became of them? Who can calculate the cost of lost dreams and empty lives because we and the schools can't or won't measure up.

I have criticized the military and the schools yet essentially the same criticism could be made of most of our other major institutions; the welfare system, the tax system, transportation system, national radio and television networks, and local government.

Looking at these problems from my perspective as one who has the responsibility for eliminating the conditions which create poverty in Los Angeles and which produce generation after generation of helpless people, I conclude that rapid and in some cases immediate institutional change offers the only possibility for making a serious advance in the war against poverty. This means a concerted community action effort by the poor people themselves as well as by those of you who wish to ally yourselves with them, not only as professionals but as committed human beings.

Your generation has already demonstrated its commitment to fight for what it believes to be right, you have shown again and again that you will not easily accept things as they are. You bring the advantages of moral conscience and great motivation to this battle: We need you, welcome you, and will make way for you.

At the same time you cannot afford to make the mistakes which caused us to come to our current unhappy state. Unlike previous generations you cannot and must not ignore the human and moral consequences of your actions. It is not enough to say as Tom Hayden of SDS did, that first you make the revolution then you decide what for. That can only lead to worse moral and social chaos. But I believe you are farsighted and honest enough to look at the consequences of your actions, and certainly it is imperative that you act, and guide yourselves accordingly.

Yet your generation disturbs me for even in its finest moments it has demonstrated a self-indulgent, "Me first" personality which seems to say, as Tom Hayden has, we are not

interested in helping minorities or others, we are out to save ourselves. This self-indulgent, consumption-oriented trait is in large part a product of television's brainwashing since that medium has assiduously cultivated this ethic in order to sell you everything and anything. If you permit this urge for self-gratification to predominate over your more generous instincts, then you may well achieve power only to become the most self-seeking, reactionary ruling group in American History. Thus, the current crisis of values exists not only between your generation and earlier ones, it also lies within your own ranks, and no one can do anything about it but you.

There is much to be done. We need you, we want you, and we will expect you. Thank you very much.

THE COMING REVOLUTION IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal this morning carried an excellent article by Mr. Jonathan Spivak describing a concept in American education which in my judgment offers great promise of major breakthroughs in raising achievement skills for our Nation's young people.

Mr. Spivak performs a notable service by calling attention in great detail to an experiment soon to be launched in Texarkana, Ark.

Under this experiment, the U.S. Office of Education through its Associate Commissioner, Leon Lessinger, will enter into a contractual agreement with one of the Nation's top education technology firms to provide teaching techniques in six Texarkana junior high schools and six high schools in an effort to bring all youngsters up to grade level in verbal skills.

The unique aspect of the Texarkana experiment is "guaranteed performance."

The contractor must promise to bring backward Texarkana students up to normal grades for their age levels at a given cost and in a given time—or else pay a money penalty.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, I shall watch this experiment closely for, indeed, if it succeeds in Texarkana it is a concept that we will want to employ throughout the country.

I believe private industry has much to offer in educational technology and such firms as IBM, McGraw-Hill, RCA, and many others have performed a notable service to this country in becoming deeply involved in developing electronic equipment which can make education more meaningful and productive.

Dr. Lessinger deserves the gratitude of the American people in having the foresight to encourage this experiment and hopefully give overworked teachers in this country the assistance they can get from these major breakthroughs in education technology.

Mr. Spivak's excellent article follows:

FIRMS VIE TO SHOW HOW TO HALT DROP-OUTS IN ARKANSAS SCHOOLS: EXPERIMENT COULD GIVE BUSINESS ENTRY INTO A BIG MARKET; MONEY PENALTY IF THEY FAIL

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—Private industry is beginning to bid for a significant new place in public education—far beyond anything so humdrum as supplying textbooks, films or records.

Some large education technology firms, including IBM, McGraw-Hill and RCA, are hotly seeking a small Federal contract soon to be awarded in Texarkana, Ark. It calls for a \$3 million remedial education project to prevent weak students from dropping out of school. The winning bidder will use modern equipment and instruction methods to bring lagging pupils up to snuff in reading, math and other basic skills.

No one will make a killing out of the Texarkana project. But success there could give the winner a convincing competitive advantage in merchandising its teaching wares elsewhere and could provide the new technology with its first major entry into the public school market. So far, many school administrators have shied away from education technology because of cost, suspicion of private industry and concern that the new methods don't really work.

The Texarkana project to discourage dropping out, one of the 10 such projects to be financed by the Federal Government, is based on a concept unusual in education: Guaranteed performance. The competing bidders must promise to bring backward Texarkana students up to normal grades for their age levels at a given cost and in a given time—or else pay a money penalty.

BACKING THEIR BELIEFS

"We are telling people, 'If you really believe in hardware and equipment you should be willing to deliver,'" says Charles Blaschke, a Washington educational consultant who directed the design of the Texarkana project.

The bidders' proposals are expected to average about \$100 per pupil for 100 to 150 hours of instruction. But there is bound to be wide variation in the costs proposed, for one object is to have the contractors come up with almost any solution that promises to succeed. If the winning bidder achieves the desired results at less than the estimated cost, it will gain a money reward.

"Accountability for results is the basic principle; it's a profoundly new principle for education," says Leon Lessinger, an associate commissioner at the U.S. Office of Education here. The basic goal is to gain specific educational results rather than simply hire more teachers, purchase more books or furnish more special services; up to now, many Federal education programs have concentrated on such means rather than the ends to be attained, officials emphasize.

Success of the Texarkana project will be determined by achievement test scores. But the contractor must prove that the required gains persist for at least six months after the pupils return to their regular classrooms. Otherwise, teaching techniques might be geared solely to tests given on a specific date, without lasting benefits for the students.

Eventually, the project will be taken over by the Texarkana schools; after five years all Federal support will end. "We've no objection to industry or anyone else coming in if they feel they can be successful," says Ed Trice, superintendent of schools in Texarkana. "The idea of the whole project is they'll teach us how to do it."

The immediate beneficiaries will be six junior and senior high schools in Texarkana, Ark., and its companion city of the same name across the state line in Texas. Next year the effort will be extended to elementary schools, and other contractors will be invited to bid.

The Texarkana schools, like many others with large concentrations of low-income students, are plagued with dropout difficulties; almost 30% of their students don't graduate from high school. It's hoped that remedying their academic deficiencies—the idea being applied in all 10 anti-dropout projects—will help hold them in school. (The other projects, in cities including Seattle, Baltimore and St. Louis, employ more conventional educational approaches without industry involvement.)

"YOU BET YOUR SOCKS"

The bids for the Texarkana project will be opened next Monday. The winner will be selected by Sept. 10, and the operation is due to start by early December. So far, 17 companies have indicated they will bid, although some big companies are coy about their intentions for competitive reasons.

"You bet your socks we're interested in bidding; it's an out-and-out challenge to prove it can be done," declares Lloyd Dorsett, president of Dorsett Educational Systems in Norman, Okla. Some firms, like Mr. Dorsett's, manufacture their own teaching machines and are convinced they have the equipment to do the trick.

But other educational experts insist the task at Texarkana will be to pick from the welter of existing remedial education programs—developed for the Job Corps, the Armed Forces and others—those elements that will work best in a public school setting. "The most intelligent approach is to modify or use combinations of existing hardware and equipment," reasons James Gillis, president of Washington's Quality Educational Development Inc., another competitor.

In any case, planners figure that a private contractor will have greater freedom to innovate and may be more successful in motivating Texarkana students than the regular school system has been. One idea could be giving pupils extra time to goof off as a reward for work well done. Or, as an experiment, some students might be paid to take tests, a chore they have found distasteful.

The instruction will be provided at a separate "accelerated learning achievement center" in a now-vacant elementary school. The students will be bused from their regular classrooms during the school day to spend up to four hours at the learning center; the contractor will determine the exact amount of time.

All the pupils who will get remedial education are at least two grades behind standards for their age level in arithmetic and reading. It's believed the contractor can bring even the most deficient up to standard in a single year.

At first, 150 to 200 students in the 7th through 12th grades will be enrolled. But in 1971 the project will be expanded to include as many as 500 more students including those in the elementary grades. Catching laggards earlier could make dropout prevention easier and less expensive.

The aim is to develop a pattern of private industry-public school cooperation that could be applied elsewhere. School officials in New York City, Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles are eager to sponsor similar projects.

But the Texarkana project could also prove the feasibility of contracting out part of the school curricula to private firms—in competition with regular public-school operations. This concept appeals to some parents who are convinced the schools are unresponsive to the needs of their children.

In fact, some education theorists insist that only by breaking the public school's "monopoly" on the teaching process will instruction be improved. Says James Hopkins, a professor of social relations at Johns Hopkins University: "The school would find it necessary to compete with the system's external contractors to provide better education, and the parent could, for the first time in education, have the full privileges of consumer's choice."

MOON LANDING SUNDAY SERMON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding message delivered by the pastor, Rev. A. Hubert Rust, at Eastminister Presbyterian Church, Knoxville, Tenn.

This sermon on pride and humility is especially timely, and I recommend it to all readers of the RECORD:

MOON LANDING SUNDAY SERMON: WITH HONEST PRIDE AND SINCERE HUMILITY

"The tribune came and said to him, 'Tell me, are you a Roman citizen?' And he said, 'Yes.' The tribune answered, 'I bought this citizenship for a large sum.' Paul said, 'But I was born a citizen.'" Acts 22:27-28.

I wonder if you catch the sense of pride with which each of these men spoke of his Roman citizenship? Paul was a Roman citizen by virtue of his birth. On the other hand the tribune or chief captain had purchased his citizenship, no doubt with a great sum of money. Perhaps we wonder how a man like Paul could be proud of the Roman empire. Why should Paul at first a devout Jew, but now a Christian Jew, be proud of that pagan civilization? But I suppose every citizen of every country can be proud of his citizenship even though he may live in one of the poorest of governments, even though he may live under a most tyrannical government. In any event, there are always some virtues or qualities about which a citizen can take some satisfaction. Perhaps Paul, the Christian, took satisfaction in the fact there was a peculiar unity about the Roman Empire. There was also a general peace that prevailed throughout the Roman world at that time. There was also freedom of intercourse and travel. The network of Roman roads made it possible for Paul to travel with ease on his missionary journeys and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. Thus Paul could be proud of his Roman citizenship without accepting Roman morals, without condoning its paganism, without bowing down in worship to the emperor, without yielding to its lustful and personality-degrading practices. Paul could say, "I am a Roman" with the mingled emotions of honest pride and sincere humility.

So it is that you and I can affirm "I am an American" and do so with honest pride and sincere humility.

Let me call your attention to just a few things in which we can take honest pride today:

1. We can certainly be proud of that great host of men and women who helped to make America great. Martin Luther once said, "The prosperity of a country depends not on the abundance of the revenues, nor on the beauty of its public buildings, nor on the strength of its fortifications; but it consists in the number of its cultivated citizens, its men of enlightenment, education, and character. Here are to be found its true interests, its chief strength, its real power."

Our nation has had an ample share of great men and women. We can take honest pride in our founding fathers—men like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln. We can be proud of our inventors, musicians, and scientists—indeed all who have helped to make America what it is today. Certainly these men had their imperfections, their weaknesses, their short comings, but they have given us just cause for honest pride.

Roger Babson, the great economist, and statistician, who died just recently, was once

asked why North America was so advanced and progressive and South America so backward and superstitious. He wisely answered, "North America was settled by men who came in search for God, while South America was settled by men who came in search for gold."

2. We can also be justly proud of the freedom that we have long enjoyed. By freedom I mean the kind that flows from obedience to God and His Son Jesus Christ, from willing subjection to law, from the discipline of self-control. I do not mean by freedom what so many have in mind today—license to do as you please, without any restrictions or obligations whatsoever.

Our American freedom is a rock upon which men took their stand and brought forth the Declaration of Independence, wrought out the Constitution of the United States, established a democratic government, opened up a continent to a liberty-loving people, and built great institutions of learning and religion, of culture and industry. Indeed years ago, John Quincy Adams said, "Posterity! you will never know how much it cost the present generation to preserve your freedom. I hope you will make good use of it. If you do not, I shall repent it in heaven that I ever took half the pains to preserve it." Let's be proud of American freedom! Let us do all we can as individuals to preserve for succeeding generations the freedom that we have long enjoyed.

3. Furthermore, we can be justly proud of the multitude of achievements made by our country. This land called America was a marvelous gift of God to liberty-loving men. Just think of it—in a little more than 350 years "this nation under God" has performed one of the most prodigious feats in history—transforming a bare wilderness into the richest and strongest nation of all time.

Today we need to look back at our history in retrospect and see where we began and how far we've come. We need to try to visualize the land as it was before the Colonists landed at Jamestown in 1607. We need to suffer with the Pilgrims during those early days at Plymouth. We need to follow the Colonists as decade after decade they conquered the natural obstacles and opened up the continental area from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Just think also of our space program and how far we have come in a comparatively short time. A few decades ago the idea of landing a man on the moon belonged to the realm of fantasy. But today, July 20, 1969, our prayers and interests follow our astronauts as they attempt landing on the moon and a safe return to earth. As we think of all our achievements, our great institutions, our industries, our scientists, our medical discoveries, our space program—of all the great progress that has been made—let us be justly proud, but let us also give due thanks-giving to God for His gracious providence and for the outpouring of His blessings on our nation. Let us remind ourselves of the exhortation of the Psalmist, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Psalm 127:1. Yes, like Paul, we can affirm "I am an American" with honest pride.

II

But like Paul a true patriot will bow his head in same and true repentance. Paul was proud of his Roman citizenship, but he was not proud of everything the Roman Empire stood for.

We cannot and we must not agree with Steven Decatur when he said, "Our country, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." That is not true patriotism. That is folly. A nation sins just like individuals, simply because of the reason that a nation is composed of many individuals. We cannot condone sin in our national life any more than we can condone sin in our individual life. I believe that Paul was repentant for the sins and failures of Rome and he did everything that he could as an individual to help right those wrongs.

Today atheistic Communism poses as one of the greatest threats to the future of our country. We need to be aware of what Communism is and how it subtly and unscrupulously invades a nation and gradually destroys freedom and the rights of its citizens. Unquestionably, today Communism is the most diabolical threat to the security and freedom of our country from without.

Yet equally as diabolical and destructive are those forces eating away like a cancer at the very heart of America from within.

I wonder if Macauley, the British historian, was not more of a prophet than he realized. More than 100 years ago, in 1857, he wrote these words to an American friend, "Your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th, with this variance, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

1. We need to bow our heads in shame and with true repentance at the increasing crime rate within our country. Almost every year J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI shocks us with the statistics which show there has been an increase in crime rate over the previous years. The places where crime is prevalent do not always coincide with the slum areas either. In fact today many criminals and delinquents are coming out of our better, more well-to-do homes. Indeed wherever men cheat and defraud, whether in the school or in the shop, whether in sports or in the government; wherever men sell their honor for prestige or power or for money; wherever men degrade or cheapen their own bodies and defile the bodies of others by lust, immorality or drink, there crime prevails. And where is the neighborhood, the hamlet, the village, the town, the city in this great land of ours that does not display examples of gross crime?

2. We need to bow our heads in shame and with true repentance at the grave injustices that prevail in our country. Without a question the major internal problem in our national life today is the Civil Rights movement. The fact that this problem has become so widespread and prominent is evidence that gross injustices have been committed toward many in our minority groups. I am not advocating this morning equality for all, simply because we are not equal. I don't believe that God intended for us to be equal. Some people are born with a "silver spoon in their mouth," while others are born in poverty; some are born with strong and robust bodies, while others are born blind or deaf or mute, or with other physical or mental deformity. Some are born with one talent, others with five talents, still others with ten. No, we are not equal. The Bible doesn't speak of equality, but it does speak of justice. The Bible is the most outspoken book in the world against the injustices of men. In the Old Testament this was one of the greatest sins the prophets condemned. Amos pleaded with his hearers, "Let justice roll down like water, and righteousness like an overflowing stream." (Amos 5:24.) And Micah exhorted, "He has showed thee, O man, what is good, and what does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." (Micah 6:8.) While progress is being made in this field of human relations, we as individuals need to do what we can to deal justly, honestly, fairly and above all, in a Christlike manner with all men.

3. We need to bow our head in shame and with true repentance at our indifference and irresponsibility toward God, toward Jesus Christ, toward the church, and toward our fellowmen. It is a terrible thing not to care, not to feel a sense of responsibility or obligation. Too many of our citizens today are willing to accept the privileges and opportunities of our American citizenship and of Christianity without accepting cor-

responding responsibility and duties. Nations all around us have lost their freedom because of indifference and irresponsibility on the part of their people. It grieves me to hear many of our people say, "Oh, it can't happen here." But don't you believe it! It can happen here! Already we have lost many of our freedoms, and we are on the verge of losing others. We need to shout from the housetop, "America, for God's sake, wake up before it's too late!" "In God we trust" was a motto adopted by the fathers of our country in the days when we were a weak and struggling nation. The fathers felt the absolute necessity of trusting in a higher and greater power than themselves for the making and the preservation of the nation. But with the increase of wealth and prestige and power, there has come a corresponding decrease in the consciousness of our need for God. We trust in our national wealth, our great military power, our fame, our intellect, and God is all too often left out of the picture.

A true repentance on the part of the church and Christian people must include a rededication to the evangelistic task of the church, the Christian education of our people, a felt obligation to live by the Sermon on the Mount, and a desire to set a good example in personal Christian living. Our fathers carried America westward in her development, our scientists will carry America outward in space, but we Christians must lift America upward toward God!

Dr. Elton Trueblood in one of his books pleaded for Christians to face the world with a philosophy, a program, and a passion. We have the philosophy in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Let us rediscover it. We have a program in that same Gospel—to preach and teach, and heal and redeem in the name of Jesus Christ. My concern is this—do we have the passion? Do we really love America as we claim? Do we really care about our fellowmen? And above all have we really devoted ourselves to the Lordship of Jesus Christ?

They tell me thou art rich, my country;
Gold in glittering flood has poured into thy chest;
Thy flocks and herds increase, thy barns are pressed
With harvest, and thy stores can hardly hold
Their merchandise; unending trains are rolled
Along thy network rails of East and West;
Thy factories and forges never rest;
Thou art enriched in all things bought and sold.

But dost thou prosper? Better news I crave.
O dearest country, is it well with thee?
Indeed, and is thy soul in health?
O nobler people, hearts more wisely brave,
and thoughts that lift men Godward,
make them free—

These are prosperity and vital wealth.
—HENRY VAN DYKE.

AMAZING INHERITANCE FOR NEIL ARMSTRONG FROM UNKNOWN FRENCH WIDOW

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

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

AFTER THE MOON, WHAT?

The personal fortune of Mme. Anna Emille Guzman, the somewhat eccentric widow of a wealthy French industrialist, is about to find a home. It has been held in trust since her death 78 years ago and, if all goes well,

sometime this summer it will be awarded to the first man to set foot on the moon. That man, presumably, will be an American.

This oddest of all legacies, which amounted to 100,000 francs,¹ was entrusted to the Academy of Science of the Institute of France, to be awarded without distinction of nationality to the first scientist who will succeed in making personal contact with any heavenly body, excepting the planet Mars.

What Mme. Guzman had against Mars, no one knows. No matter. Man is not yet ready to journey to that or any other planet. But, incredible though it still seems to most of us, man is finally going to pay a personal visit to his planet's only satellite—the moon. His voyage, quite possibly, will be the most spectacular single event in mankind's history.

The United States has come a long way since that day in October 1957 when the Soviets shocked the world into the space age by firing Sputnik I into orbit around the earth. And the nation has spent an enormous amount of money—about \$24 billion—to catch up. Right now, on the edge of accomplishment, seems an appropriate time to ask if it has been worth it and, more important, to question just how much more of our resources we should commit to the further exploration of space.

URBAN LAW

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, from the expanse which bridges prenatal to post mortem events, we are faced with the consistent presence of the law. To some, this has given rise to the law's description as "a seamless web and a jealous mistress." Yet, few will deny that our system of laws and the lawyers who exercise its viability are essential for the maintenance of society.

Within the past few years, legal education has undergone a metamorphosis, an increased effort to bring our time honored laws into closer alignment with the immediate problems which face us. One area of specialization to spring from this is the field of urban law. Concentrating on the unique problems of city life—zoning laws, transportation problems, housing code violations and other matters—it stands as one of our most promising tools for reshaping and nurturing our cities.

Concurrently, the lawyers who direct their efforts and interests toward this speciality, represent a group of persons who will provide us with the help we need to insure that city dwellers and in effect, all citizens receive "equal justice under the law."

One of the many fine universities which is meeting the challenge of urban law is Washington University in St. Louis, Mo. Along with appropriate course work in this area, the law school publishes an Urban Law Review, which affords an exceptional vehicle for interpreting the law in terms of urban problems.

I have requested leave to extend my remarks in order to bring to my colleagues

¹ At the time this was about \$20,000, a respectable fortune in those days. Over the years devaluation has reduced the value of the legacy to \$290, not counting any interest that may have accrued.

attention this challenging new legal specialty which in my estimation offers tremendous potential for solving our present and likely future urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to have the opportunity to bring the Urban Law Review of Washington University to my colleagues' attention since the 1969 editor-in-chief of the journal, Harold L. Sarnier of Glen Head N.Y., is a resident of the Third Congressional District which I represent. Mr. Sarnier, I feel, is an excellent example of the talented, bright, and dedicated persons who are focusing their efforts upon answering the crises of the city with more than just cynical indifference.

I believe that the law is a living thing. And in light of the development of urban law, I feel that we may have discovered a new source of life for our moribund cities.

INDIANA'S RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPERATIVES MOVE AHEAD

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD two editorials from the August 1969 Indiana Rural News which bear upon the continuing progress of the rural electric systems of the State of Indiana.

The editorials follow:

PRIDE IN ACCOMPLISHMENT

Indiana's REMCs, without exception, strongly endorsed and supported the action of their national association at its last annual meeting to provide for future financing of America's rural electric cooperatives. This was a most progressive step.

By an overwhelming vote of the nation's 1,000 rural system representatives, the decision was reached to establish an independent financing institution critically needed to meet growth capital requirements.

To be called the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation (CFC) its purpose is to provide urgently needed funds over and above the amounts anticipated annually from the Rural Electrification Administration.

The new institution will be funded by the rural electric systems from their own reserves. The amount each will invest will be based on an equalization formula that will be fair to all. The original capitalization is expected to be about \$300-million, contributed over a 15-year period with half of the total amount coming in during the first three years.

Borrowers from the new financing institution will pay substantially higher interest than the prevailing rate from REA. This will open the way for attracting new capital from private sources and hopefully, tend to dampen the criticism that has been so unfairly heaped upon America's electric cooperatives because of REA's favorable interest charges.

The fact remains, however, that adequate REA financing is imperative for many of the member-owned systems to survive. They are serving the more sparsely settled rural areas, the rugged mountainous regions and the vast open plains where there are so few electric consumers revenue does not always meet expenses. To assure the continuity and the necessary expansion of this vital service to

millions of rural people, low-interest REA financing must continue for the foreseeable future. The private power companies refused to serve such rural areas from the start and they have no commercial interest in them now.

America's rural electric cooperatives are to be commended for taking the initiative and demonstrating their capacity to design and implement a plan that will supplement the financing available from REA. At the same time they will be making it possible for REA to have more money available for the systems most in need of it.

It was the imagination, resourcefulness and dedication to the needs of Rural America that helped make a success of the cooperative rural electrification program during the past 34 years. These same qualities can be expected to assure the success of the new financing institution in the years ahead.

Indiana's REMC leaders are more than justified in their sense of pride over having been in the vanguard of the movement to establish America's first "rural electric bank" and for helping to make it a reality.

A CONTINUOUS JOB

The people of America's rural electric systems know their job is a continuous one. While they made the kerosene lamp a family heirloom in most rural homes, they know that some rural communities are still without dependable, pure water.

As rural America grows, rural communities face different needs. In one, it may be water . . . in another, houses or jobs. Across the nation, America's rural electric systems are helping to meet these needs. They are working in their community—they are committed to their community's progress and future.

THE PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. President, anyone who has followed current events in the United States in recent years will concede that the American public is concerned with the increase of obscene and pornographic materials within our Nation today. Legislation and statements by Members of Congress, in addition to articles in the public press indicate that the problem is a very real one indeed. The recent establishment of a Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography seemed to be a responsible first step in coming to grips with this increasingly grave problem.

As I have introduced legislation to combat this evil, I have followed the Commission's progress with great interest. Yesterday, I received in the office a progress report by the Commission which I perused with some misgivings. Having been informed some time ago that the General Counsel of the Commission was reported in the press to be a member of the executive board of the American Civil Liberties Union, and knowing that ACLU's position on obscenity is in essence that any literary or pictorial garbage is protected by the first amendment, I was doubly curious about the Commission's operation. If I remember correctly,

the ACLU opposed the establishment of the Commission in years gone by, and for a member of this organization to hold such a key position on the Commission seemed to me to warrant future close scrutiny.

The progress report of the Commission has now been made public to the public and some questions concerning the Commission's operation so far have been raised by one of the Commission's members. Because many here in Congress have placed a great deal of reliance on the eventual findings of the Commission in our national effort to combat the proliferation of obscenity and pornography, all views, pro and con, concerning the effectiveness of the Commission's operation should be given serious consideration and corrective measures, if necessary, should be effected before the Commission goes out of existence. For this reason, I include the separate remarks of Commissioner Morton A. Hill, S.J., of the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in the RECORD at this point:

SEPARATE REMARKS, 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 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."

Falling 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."

TRIBUTES TO CONGRESSMAN BATES COME FROM MANY SOURCES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in addition to those previously quoted, I wish to include in the RECORD several more of the tributes which have come from a wide range of sources, both in and outside of government, to the memory of our beloved colleague, the late Congressman William H. Bates of Massachusetts, a distinguished member of both the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mostly in messages to Mrs. Bates, these include:

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission:

On behalf of my fellow Commissioners and the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission, I must tell you of our sorrow over Bill's passing. We respected him, admired him, liked him, and now we will miss him so very much.

Bill was a splendid servant of the people and a gentleman. His death in the prime of life is a tragedy to the country, as it must be to you. We join in your bereavement.

Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, USA, Director of Selective Service:

Mrs. Hershey and I were grieved to learn of the death of your husband. For ourselves and on behalf of my staff, our profound sympathy is extended to you and the family.

The Nation is deeply indebted to him for the dedication and devotion to its safety and welfare which distinguished his career as a citizen and a leader of the Congress.

To all of us privileged to know him, his death is a deep personal loss.

Richard Helms, Director, Central Intelligence Agency:

The sense of loss which those of us who have known and admired Bill here in Washington share with you is not the kind of thing that can easily be put into words. But I do very much want you to know that Bill had, and always will have, a very special place in the hearts of those of us in CIA. His wisdom, integrity, understanding and goodwill are certain to be sorely missed in the days ahead, but you can be certain that they will not be forgotten by those who have been privileged to know and work with him in connection with some of the most critical issues of our time. I trust that the high standards of public office he set will serve as an example to those who follow.

Lt. Gen. Marshall S. Carter, USA, Director, National Security Agency:

I was distressed to learn of the tremendous loss you have suffered and wish to extend my deepest sympathy to you and your family.

I had the pleasure of enjoying a fairly close association with your husband over the past seven years, first during my years as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and since then as Director of the National Security Agency. He earned my highest admiration and respect, both for his personal virtues and for his professional capabilities. I will always remember him warmly for his unflinching courtesy and objectivity and for his absolute integrity. It was truly a privilege to have known him.

Julian D. Steele, commissioner, Department of Community Affairs, Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

I wish to extend to you and your family my profound condolences on the passing of your husband, Bill. As a longtime friend of Bill Bates, I am deeply grieved and saddened by his untimely death after a long and courageous fight.

Bill's passing is an irreplaceable loss to his country, his state, and his constituents whom he served so admirably as a U.S. Representative. His work as a public servant in Congress was in the finest tradition of the Bates family and of American patriotism. His devotion to duty and the national interest, his outstanding ability as a legislator, and his humane concern for the individual will long be remembered by his countrymen.

I personally have known Bill, as a public figure and a private citizen, for many years, shared with him a warm and cherished friendship, and relied upon his wise counsel. His loyalty, sincerity, integrity, and above all, his decency as a gentleman, will not soon be forgotten by me or by any person whose life was touched by Bill Bates.

Edward C. O'Keefe, president, Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children, Inc.:

On behalf of the Board of Directors and members of the Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children, as well as of myself personally, please accept our heartfelt expressions of condolence for the loss of your husband, Representative William H. Bates.

His disappearance from the political arena has deprived the citizens of Massachusetts of a dedicated, honest and forceful servant. However, his many and outstanding achievements in the service of the Commonwealth will continue to be an inspiration for all his fellow workers.

Therefore, allow us to share with you the sorrow you and your family are experiencing, and accept our sincere homage to his memory.

ATHLETE AND FRIEND

In his high school and college days, Bill Bates was a football star, and he always maintained an interest in sports. Golf was his principal participation sport during his nearly 20 years in Congress, but he followed football and baseball news closely.

Paul H. Mackesey, Alumni Office at Brown University, Representative Bates' alma mater, recalled Bill's college days when he wrote to Jean Bates:

The news of Bill's death was received with great sadness here on campus, and I send to you my personal sympathy as well as that of his classmates and of the many Brown Alumni who respected and admired him.

As a North Shore product myself and as one who played football at Brown, I came to know Bill as an undergraduate. The great ends of his team—Bates, Progers, Finklestein and Nash—will long remain a part of Brown's football history. But Bill will also be remembered as an honest, sincere and dedicated patriot and Congressman.

Hubert A. Schneider, president of Burning Tree Club, Bethesda, Md., said in his letter to Mrs. Bates:

Although many of us have personally expressed to you our profound grief and sympathy on Bill's death, I would like to record it officially on behalf of all members of Burning Tree.

Bill was one of our most cherished members. He brought to the Club a wit, a sense of companionship and fellowship, and a competitive spirit which was unmatched. Whenever he was in our midst his exuberance lifted all our spirits and made the day so much better for those who were fortunate enough to be in his company. We shall miss him terribly, but at the same time we are grateful that a Bill Bates once lived and played among us and that we were privileged to know him and enjoy his friendship.

Bill served with distinction on many important committees where his opinions and judgments, based upon a deep devotion to the best interests of the Club and its members, were greatly respected.

(Bill's picture in the Club) will now serve as a constant reminder of one of the finest men who ever graced the halls and fairways of Burning Tree.

Arch Macdonald, newscaster for WBZ-TV, Boston, wrote to Bill Bates' widow in much the same words he expressed on television on June 23:

Your husband was one of the finest and most able men I have ever known in government—and that covers a span of 30 years.

Bill was far more than a "news source" to me. I considered him a friend as well for whom I had affection and great respect.

The many tributes paid him by the great and less great alike indicate that myriads share your loss. But none of us can alleviate you beyond praying fervently for you. That I can and will do.

Again—my heartfelt sympathy. Your husband was not just a good man—he was one of the best. His goodness and love of fellow man remains alive so long as anyone he touched remains alive.

Anthony Cama, poet and feature writer for the Lynn, Mass., Sunday Post, printed this tribute on June 29, 1969:

WILLIAM H. BATES

This is a poetic eulogy to Congressman William H. Bates, dedicated, fearless, and valiant American who served his country with an indomitable will and a profound love. He truly was a "servant of the people" with a compassionate heart, an uplifting smile, and a spirit that shall ever be a living, memorable flame.

O, Valiant spirit, tranquil be your sleep
And restful be your soft, enduring flame.
You are now part of God's eternal deep
And blessed is your bright, courageous name!
To you the hero's wreath, the lance of light,
You loved and served your nation ever true.
The name of Bates shall star the spangled night,

You were a part of us and we of you,
God bless you, Bill, in your eternal rest!
You fought to keep this nation strong and free;
How many times you raised your valiant voice

To keep this land a torch of liberty,
The democratic dream; the people's choice.
This nation mourns your sad and anguished loss;

As through life's mortal gates you now depart.

To you, the fulgent crown, the sacred Cross,
As you return within God's loving heart,
God bless you, Bill, in your eternal rest!

—ANTHONY CAMA.

Another poetic tribute was this, by Laurence Burns of Swampscott, Mass., published in the Lynn, Mass., Daily Evening Item:

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

The flag's half-staff, the mournful sound,
Is Gabriel's horn, and in Time's distant realm;

An airplane crash, his father gone,
A Navy man must rise to take the helm.

So there he was, in Congress' halls,
He helped his country find its way;
Through tangled paths, the leaders come,
They cannot bring him back, but pause to pray.

The many that he helped crowd 'round
his bier,

His body's gently lowered in the fresh
spring sod;

The sound of taps is gentle as a spirit freed,
The crowds disperse, he walks the distant paths with God.

—LAURENCE BURNS.

Mark Evans, vice president and director of public affairs for Metromedia, Inc., Washington, D.C., wrote the following letter to the editor, The Evening News, Salem, Mass., Bill Bates' home city:

Feeling a sense of frustration, I am resorting to this means of contacting the Sixth District citizenry.

It has been my good fortune for the past 25 years to have a ringside seat to observe the workings of the Federal Government, both as a broadcaster and as a broadcast executive. I have seen men of stature come and go in political defeat and in death. I can honestly state that I have never known a finer American or a more dedicated human being than Congressman William Bates of Salem.

I have known him intimately for the past five years. I have seen him under most every circumstance. I have known him when the going was rough and when the going was smooth. I have seen him on the golf course; I have fished with him; I have watched him in the legislative halls. In those years and under all those circumstances, I have never known the man to say a mean thing about any other human being. I have never seen him angry. I have never heard him profane. I have never heard him tell an off-color story. I have never seen him take a drink or use tobacco. In short, I must confess this man was as near perfection as any man I have ever known.

The devotion and love he showed his wife and daughter were exceeded only by the devotion he showed for Salem, Massachusetts, New England and the country he served so well.

My purpose in writing is simply to thank the people of the Sixth District for sending such a man to the Congress of the United States for so many years.

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the key responsibilities of a Member of Congress is to keep his constituents fully informed on his activities on their behalf in the Nation's Capital.

For that reason, I would like to include in the Record at this point the text of my 20th Report From Washington to the residents of California's 30th Congressional District.

In addition to this series of regular reports, I have also sent out 14 special reports to cover some of the more significant events and legislative issues considered by Congress, which are of particular interest to the citizens of our Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON VETERANS COMMITTEE

I was honored to receive a second major legislative assignment in Congress this year as a member of the important House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This appointment is in addition to my work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and will provide an opportunity to be of service to California's nearly 3 million veterans—more than any other state in the Nation.

In fact, almost 50 percent of our citizens are affected, either directly, or indirectly, by activities of the Veterans Committee in such fields as veterans housing, education and training programs; VA hospitals and medical care; GI insurance; compensation and vocational rehabilitation; and veterans pensions.

I believe America has a time-honored national commitment to attempt to repay, at least in some small measure, the tremendous personal sacrifices made by our veterans to help protect and preserve the sacred freedoms we all enjoy.

WELFARE REFORM

One of the most important domestic issues facing the country today is the urgent need for reform and revision in our public assistance programs.

For that reason, I am hoping for early Congressional action on my bill, H.R. 11044, to relieve state and local taxpayers of the major financial burden of supporting the country's fast-growing welfare programs (including aid to the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children; medical; as well as emergency assistance and local administrative expenses) by providing for 90% federal funding, while establishing uniform national standards for minimum benefits to apply across-the-board in all fifty states.

In endorsing H.R. 11044, Los Angeles County Aid Director Ellis Murphy said, "In view of the recent Supreme Court decision eliminating residence requirements for welfare, national standards become imperative.

"Ninety percent federal funding would mean a saving to Los Angeles County property taxpayers of more than \$84 million annually, equal to a 46 cent decrease in the tax rate. At a time when increasing taxes place more and more of a burden on the property owner, this reduction would be especially welcome."

HOUSE APPROVES ROYBAL ANTICRIME BILL

By a record vote of 343 to 18, the House of Representatives passed legislation, which I co-authored, to create a select committee to conduct a thorough investigation and study all aspects of the growing crime crisis in the United States.

I believe this action clearly shows a deep Congressional concern for controlling and preventing crime in our cities; for improving the effectiveness of local law enforcement; for making it safe for all citizens to walk without fear in the nation's streets; and for creating in America a good place in which to live and raise a family.

SENIOR CITIZENS

With Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas and a Committee aide at legislative field hearings held in Los Angeles to find ways of improving the effectiveness of federal programs designed to benefit America's senior citizens.

A suggestion made by several witnesses was to try to expand the number of worthwhile opportunities for older persons to continue to

serve their fellow men during retirement years.

For instance, it was pointed out, the Peace Corps is now looking for retired teachers for placement in the developing countries overseas. Teachers are held in great respect in these countries, for they realize that education holds the key to their future progress. Interested and qualified persons, willing to accept the challenge of a new language, new people, a new part of the world, should contact the Los Angeles Peace Corps office on 666-8023.

PAY TV

During the last several weeks I have received many cards, letters, and petitions signed by thousands of constituents in the 30th District who are deeply concerned by the possible harmful effects of subscription, or Pay TV, on our present "free" commercial television system, on the nation's movie theater industry, as well as on a large segment of the American television viewing public.

Opponents of subscription TV claim it will be in such a strong financial position that it will gradually siphon-off most of the better television talent and programming, and virtually monopolize coverage of major college and professional sports "special events."

This could severely reduce the quality of free broadcast entertainment available to viewers without charge; threaten the economic survival of regular commercial television stations; unfairly compete with neighborhood movie theaters by showing first-run feature films; and discriminate against a substantial percentage of our population—including millions of lower-income and elderly citizens—who may not be able to afford to watch Pay TV.

I certainly share the concern expressed on this matter, and because of the seriousness of the allegations made, as well as the important public policy questions involved, I believe Congress should have an opportunity to review the entire problem thoroughly.

For that reason, I have urged the House Commerce Committee, which has legislative jurisdiction in this area, to conduct an in-depth and impartial investigation of all aspects of this complex issue, so it can recommend appropriate Congressional action to resolve the many outstanding questions in a satisfactory and equitable fashion.

I'll keep you informed of further developments on this subject.

SUPERIOR AWARD

Congratulating Mr. Santos A. Sandoval of Los Angeles on receiving a Superior Performance Award from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for his outstanding work in improving the effectiveness of the Food Stamp Program in the County—with special recognition for his personal initiative and ability to establish and maintain good communications with Spanish speaking residents.

Congress is placing more emphasis on the Food Stamp Program this year as one of the best ways of fighting poverty and improving the quality of life in America's urban centers.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING

The cost disclosure provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act, which I co-sponsored, have just gone into effect.

This landmark consumer interest legislation bans hidden finance charges, and helps protect the Nation's private borrowers from deception and fraud by requiring loan companies, banks, savings and loan associations, department stores, credit card firms, auto dealers, mortgage brokers, and retail merchants to make disclosures of total credit costs and annual interest rates on cash loans, revolving accounts, and other forms of consumer credit and installment purchase contracts.

The new law assures that complete, honest and comparable information on credit costs will be provided in every transaction, and allows the borrower to compare the cost of

credit among various lenders, and shop around for the best buy.

SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS

I am again asking all young men from the 30th District who are interested in competing for 1970 nominations to the Air Force, Naval, Military or Merchant Marine Academies to plan to take the U.S. Civil Service Commission's special Academy Designation Exam scheduled to be given in Los Angeles several times this summer and fall. For more information, contact our District office on 688-4870.

WELCOME TO A NEWLY-ARRIVED ORPHAN

I was happy to greet Mr. and Mrs. Denney Jung of Los Angeles when they visited our District Office, and to extend my personal welcome to their 11-year-old orphaned nephew on his recent arrival in the United States.

The Jung's had tried for several years to establish sufficient documentary evidence to enable them to adopt their nephew and to comply with the strict requirements of the U.S. Immigration Laws to bring him to America as a member of their family.

It was a pleasure for me to be able to help out in this effort, and play at least a small part in making this long-awaited family reunion possible.

CLEAN AIR VICTORY

Recent federal approval of California's request to strengthen our pioneering auto-smog air pollution control regulations, and to enforce stricter motor vehicle emission standards than those in the other 49 states, was a tremendous victory for the cause of clean air in the Golden State.

By implementing the "California Amendment" to the Federal Air Quality Act, this action carries out the intent of Congress to organize a truly national program to eliminate the dangerous impurities in the air we breathe, and to create the kind of clean, wholesome atmosphere we want for ourselves and for our children.

AT YOUR SERVICE

The members of my Congressional office staff in Washington, as well as those in our Los Angeles District Office, are anxious to help you in any way they can. Please continue to make full use of the many services available through our offices by contacting us whenever you feel we can be of personal assistance.

EDUCATION

Discussing the House-passed Elementary & Secondary Education Act with National Education Association President George Fischer.

I agree with the position of the education community and deeply appreciate its strong support for more significant federal efforts to expand educational opportunities, as a solid investment in the future of our country.

Such federal assistance is of vital importance to our larger metropolitan urban school districts, like Los Angeles, where the ever-increasing demand for more schools and teachers has placed a severe strain on existing sources of state and local tax revenues.

INTERNATIONAL DRUG SMUGGLING

At a recent hearing in San Diego of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee investigating the growing illegal drug traffic across the United States—Mexico Border into California, I was surprised to learn that upwards of 90 percent of the narcotics and dangerous drugs—such as amphetamines, barbiturates and LSD—which are smuggled in across the border, are actually made right here in this country by well-known U.S. pharmaceutical firms.

Inadequate American controls on manufacturing and export sales are responsible for these dangerous drugs being diverted from legitimate international trade channels into an ever-increasing flow of clandestine traffic brought back into California and the other border states—and contributing greatly

to the rising rate of domestic crime and juvenile delinquency.

To help meet this problem, I have introduced two bills in Congress, one to provide a 50 percent increase in the number of Customs agents assigned to border ports-of-entry, the other calling for a comprehensive year-long study of means to improve our effectiveness in combating these illicit drug imports.

In addition, I believe it is imperative that some kind of export licensing system for U.S. drug firms be devised requiring that such drugs be shipped under government bond, as alcohol shipments are now—so there would be strict inspections control, and a complete record kept of each export sale made.

Of course, industry self-policing would be preferable, but if this procedure does not work, I believe Congress will be forced to take affirmative action to protect the interest of citizens on both sides of the border.

Finally, it is vital that an effective teamwork approach to law enforcement be developed in our border areas. This can be done by establishing an official U.S.-Mexico bilateral organization to strengthen and coordinate the battle against the international narcotics traffic—to the mutual benefit of our two "good neighbor" countries.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are among the most fortunate people in the world. We are free.

Yet this heritage of national independence—which we too often take for granted—is denied to millions of the world's population: the people who are being held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia in August of 1968 and the continuing military occupation has served as a grim reminder of the suppression of the people of the Communist-controlled countries of central and Eastern Europe, including those in the once-free Republics within the Soviet Union, and of their heroic struggle for freedom. These self-determined people have been forcibly separated from the atmosphere of progress which prevails in Western Europe. They have been denied free access to the ideas which represent this progress.

Yet they are our allies. They seek our support to help them achieve freedom from the tyranny which has been imposed upon them by subversion, terror, and military force. Their goals are the same as ours: liberty and national independence.

For these captive peoples to remain our allies, it is essential that the citizens of the United States, along with those of the other free nations of the world, provide their moral support and encouragement. We must keep alive the aspirations of these people by showing our concern for their current plight and by strengthening our alliance with them. The observance of Captive Nations Week each year is one such expression

of our support for these suppressed people.

A large number of the citizens of my district have family ties with many of the captive nations. They understand the struggle of their friends and relatives for freedom. It is my sincere desire that Americans everywhere would share this understanding, for, without it, we may never realize our ultimate goal on earth: a family of nations dedicated to world justice and peace.

IMPRISONED AMERICANS IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from the wife of an Air Force major who was shot down over North Vietnam over 4 years ago. This letter informed me that a group of wives and parents of POW's have joined together for mutual sharing of sympathy and action in having their loved ones returned to them. This group, calling itself the Association of Wives and Families of Captured and Missing American Military Men, is urging stronger efforts be made toward getting our servicemen out of enemy hands and reunited with their families.

I heartily concur and sympathize with the activities of this organization. Greater energy must be expended in retrieving these men who have fought bravely for the United States and now live under enemy subjugation, seemingly forgotten by their own countrymen. Just a few weeks ago, three American war prisoners were released by the North Vietnamese. This act is certainly commendable, but when one realizes that there are an indefinite number of between 300 and 1,000 Americans still under enemy control, it becomes only a token effort.

Along with the "toughening up" at the Paris peace talks, should not the Government be demanding that the North Vietnamese abide by the Geneva Convention? These internationally acknowledged regulations call for inspection of all POW camps by the Red Cross. The inspections, which insure the humane treatment of all captives, have been refused by North Vietnam. Mail transfers in and out of the camps have also not been allowed by the North. Heavy pressure should be put on its allies to influence Ho Chi Minh to end his irresponsible actions. More prisoner exchanges should be negotiated. In the thousands of Vietcong and North Vietnamese prisoners we hold, surely the North feels some valuable enough to trade. The United Nations should be encouraged to renew efforts in this area.

For weeks, months, and years these American women and families have waited anxiously for word and feared for the safety of their captured relatives. It is time something is done by the Government of the United States.

FIVE BILLS INTRODUCED TO SHARE COSTS BORNE BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today five bills to provide Federal funds for sharing the costs borne by State and local government. This assistance is in addition to all other Federal aid.

We have long known that most units of local government have nearly exhausted the sources of tax revenue available to them. They must put greatest reliance on the property tax at the local level, but the property tax is most regressive and fails to provide a tax base that would grow with the growing needs for local government services.

Most State governments are also trying hard to raise the funds necessary to provide education, welfare, health, natural resource, and other services needed from them. The sales tax and State income tax have both been adopted by most States, but revenues cannot keep up with the urgent needs of our people.

The State and local government assistance acts I have introduced will let the Congress examine carefully the ability of each level of government to provide services and the need for a greater share being borne by the Federal Government. The five bills are:

H.R. 13531: The Education Assistance Act of 1970, which has been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor;

H.R. 13532: The Public Safety Assistance Act of 1970, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary;

H.R. 13533: The Public Works and Sanitation Assistance Act of 1970, which has been referred to the Committee on Public Works;

H.R. 13534: The General Government Assistance Act of 1970, which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; and

H.R. 13535: The Health, Welfare, and Recreation Assistance Act of 1970, which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Each bill authorizes an appropriation in an amount roughly equal to 5 percent of the total State and local expenditures for that function of government, as reported in the Census Bureau report, "Governmental Finances in 1966-67." The bills are worded to permit the authorization to increase each year as the expenditures at the State and local level increase. The initial authorizations are as follows:

Education Assistance Act of 1970, \$2 billion; Public Safety Assistance Act of 1970, \$250 million; Public Works and Sanitation Assistance Act of 1970, \$950 million; General Government Assistance Act of 1970, \$750 million; and Health, Welfare, and Recreation Assistance Act of 1970, \$800 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to give serious thought to these bills as new ways of sharing the heavy burden now being

carried by our cities and villages, our county, school board, and State governments.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA BRINGS SUIT AGAINST CAR DEALER CHARGED WITH TAKING ADVANTAGE OF SERVICEMEN

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1966, I headed a special subcommittee of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee that conducted hearings in Newark, N.J., into the problems faced by servicemen when they borrow money or make large purchases.

One of the operations that the subcommittee looked into at that time was Kardon Chevrolet of Mount Holly, N.J., and Kardon Motors of Vallejo, Calif. The subcommittee was told that Kardon Chevrolet was responsible for more complaints at the Judge Advocate's office at McGuire Air Force Base than any other car dealer.

The subcommittee was told of a number of ways in which Kardon Chevrolet took advantage of servicemen.

A representative of the Better Business Bureau of South Jersey informed the committee that his office had received more complaints against Kardon Chevrolet than any other car dealer in the south Jersey area.

The better business bureau representative told the committee:

Because of our experience with this company, we were forced to issue a "proceed with extreme caution" warning to all inquirers and we suggested to them that they might consider having legal advice prior to signing a contract and that they should determine absolutely if the car they contemplated purchasing was to be listed as new or used; and that the price being paid be compared with prices charged at other dealerships for comparable automobiles.

On a few occasions, we shopped various advertisements of this company, picking out autos which seemed to be unusually low priced. Generally, these "bargains" were not available and the usual excuse was that it had been sold.

Mr. Speaker, following the hearings, Mr. Michael Kardon, the principal stockholder of both the New Jersey and California operations, steadfastly denied that his company had been engaged in any wrongdoing. On a number of occasions, Mr. Kardon and his representatives maintained that if any serviceman had been taken advantage of, it was done by former employees whose employment had since been terminated.

Last week, the attorney general of California filed suit in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Solano against Kardon Motors, Inc., Kardon Chevrolet, Michael Kardon, and the president and other directors and officers of the California operation. In the suit the people of the State of Cali-

fornia seek an injunction, civil penalties, and punitive damages against the Kardon operations. The complaint asks for \$2,500 penalty for each violation of the laws prohibiting false and misleading representations and punitive damages in the amount of \$200,000. The court was also asked to order Kardon to set aside funds for customers to make claims against if they could show they have been defrauded. A press release prepared by the Department of Justice of the State of California outlines the various ways in which Kardon operates.

In his continuing effort to protect American servicemen against consumer fraud, Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch today moved to halt the operations of Kardon Motors, Inc., of Vallejo.

In a complaint filed in Solano County superior court, the attorney general seeks an injunction, civil penalties, and punitive damages against Kardon and its president, Murrell N. Woolman.

Lynch said that although the firm advertises in local newspapers for sale to the general public, the bulk of its advertising and operation is geared to the large market of servicemen stationed throughout the world.

Kardon Motors is owned by Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., of New Jersey, with branches in Japan and Germany.

Full page ads are regularly run in the Air Force Times, Army Times, and Navy Times, which are circulated wherever American servicemen are stationed, the attorney general reported.

Both Kardon firms are located near the largest embarkation and arrival points of Air Force and Army personnel—Travis Air Force Base and Oakland Army Terminal in California, and McGuire Air Force Base, Fort Dix, N.J.

Lynch said that while still overseas the servicemen are induced to make monthly deposits on new and used automobiles on which they will take possession when arriving home.

Overseas salesmen for Kardon, the attorney general added, actively solicit deposits from servicemen, promising "big military discounts," availability of thousands of new and used cars, "free transportation from arrival terminal to Kardon," "free motels" while taking delivery, "low bank rates" and "no money down."

Lynch said that in particular, Kardon "baited" servicemen with ads of very low prices on specific cars that had in fact already been sold.

The attorney general said:

For example, Kardon on February 26, 1969 advertised for sale in the Air Force Times a 1967 Buick for \$1,949 which had already been sold in December for \$3,100. In the newspaper in July of 1969, a 1968 Plymouth was priced at \$2,899 which in fact had been sold in June for \$3,022.

Such incidents can be cited by the hundred.

John C. Porter, deputy attorney general who filed the action, said that to further encourage deposits by impressing the overseas servicemen with the vast selection of cars available to them, Kardon ran an ad showing an aerial view of an enormous car lot holding several hundred autos.

The ad read, "Twenty minutes from Travis Air Force Base and Oakland Army Terminal." However, said Porter, the lot depicted in the ad is in New Jersey, not Vallejo.

Also, he said, the free transportation and motel accommodations were paid by the customer out of the difference between the advertised and the actual selling price.

Various methods of denying the serviceman the specific car on which he made a deposit and switching him to another car were accomplished by the following, according to the complaint:

First. Telling the serviceman the car on which he made a deposit had already been sold, or that his deposit had not been received soon enough.

Second. Telling the serviceman that the car needed repair work and was removed from the lot and was not available.

Third. Telling the serviceman that he did not qualify for the financing for the particular car selected.

In each case, Kardon would try to switch the serviceman to the purchase of an automobile on which the firm would realize an exorbitant profit at amounts grossly over the amount advertised.

Attorney General Lynch said:

The sad part of this highly successful fraudulent scheme was the taking advantage of the returning serviceman's eagerness to return home to or with his family, his unfamiliarity with actual prevailing prices, his inability to do comparative shopping due to a tight travel schedule.

In addition, the serviceman finds himself without transportation once he has arrived at Kardon's, plus concern over retention of his deposit, and many other means and methods designed to and intended to coerce the serviceman into the purchase of a car he didn't order, and at an exorbitant price.

The investigation of the scheme and evidence gathered was initiated by the Department of Motor Vehicles. The department performed a superb job.

The complaint, prepared by Deputy Attorney General James R. McCall, seeks a \$2,500 penalty for each violation of the laws prohibiting false or misleading representation, and punitive damages in the amount of \$200,000.

In addition, the court will be requested to order Kardon to set aside funds for customers to make claims against if they can show they have been defrauded.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be noted that Kardon Chevrolet and Kardon Motors, in late 1968, agreed to "assurance of voluntary compliance" with the Federal Trade Commission in which they agreed not to engage in certain advertising and sales practices.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kardon has complained that he has not had an opportunity to tell his side of the story and to prove his innocence. The action by the State of California will give Mr. Kardon an opportunity to fully present his case before an impartial body.

I am including in my remarks today a copy of the California action as well as a copy of the Federal Trade Commission's assurance of voluntary compliance involving Kardon:

[In the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Solano]

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, PLAINTIFF(S) V. KARDON MOTORS, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION; KARDON CHEVROLET, INC., A NEW JERSEY CORPORATION; MICHAEL M. KARDON; MURRELL N. WOOLMAN; BETTY ANN MECREDDY; JEROME LIPMAN; CHARLES GREENBURG; AND DOES I THROUGH XXX, DEFENDANT(S)—SUMMONS

The people of the State of California to the above named Defendant(s):

You are directed to file with the clerk of this court in which the above entitled action is brought a written pleading in response to the complaint within ten days after the service on you of this summons, if served within the above named county, or within thirty days if served elsewhere (except that if the action is against the state pursuant to Section 738.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure, within 180 days). You are notified that unless you so file a written responsive pleading, the plaintiff(s) will take judgment for any money or damages demanded in the complaint, as arising upon contract, or will apply to the court for any other relief demanded in the complaint.

You may seek the advice of an attorney on any matter connected with the complaint or this summons. Such attorney should be consulted within the time limit stated in this summons for filing a written pleading to the complaint.

NEIL CRAWFORD,
County Clerk.

[In the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Solano]

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, PLAINTIFF, V. KARDON MOTORS, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION; KARDON CHEVROLET, INC., A NEW JERSEY CORPORATION; MICHAEL M. KARDON; MURRELL N. WOOLMAN; BETTY ANN MECREDDY; JEROME LIPMAN; CHARLES GREENBURG; AND DOES I THROUGH XXX, DEFENDANTS

(Complaint for injunction, civil penalties, punitive damages and other relief)

The People of the State of California, by and through Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General of California, and E. Glynn Stanley, District Attorney of Solano County, State of California, allege:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Jurisdiction and venue

I

Thomas C. Lynch, as Attorney General of the State of California, and E. Glynn Stanley, District Attorney of Solano County, acting to protect the public as consumers and as competitors from deception, fraud and misrepresentation, and unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices, bring this action in the public interest in the name of the People of the State of California.

II

The Attorney General's authority to bring this action is derived from each of two sources:

(a) From the common law of the State of California, as chief law officer of the state (Cal. Const. art V, Sec. 21), and as head of the Department of Justice (Gov. Code secs. 15000-01).

(b) From the statutory law of the State of California, specifically Civil Code section 3369(5).

The District Attorney's authority is derived from Civil Code section 3369(5).

III

Defendants transact business within the County of Solano and the violations of law herein described have been and are now being carried out wholly or in part within the County of Solano. The acts of defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally as set out below are in violation of the laws and public policy of the State of California

and are inimical to the rights and interest of the general public as consumers and to their competitors.

IV

Defendant Kardon Motors, Inc., is a California corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Solano, State of California. It is owned and controlled by Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., a New Jersey corporation, whose principal place of business is at Mt. Holly, New Jersey. Defendant Kardon Chevrolet and/or Michael Kardon, however, does business in California in that Kardon Motors, Inc., is merely the alter ego of Michael Kardon and/or Kardon Chevrolet and they exercise complete control of their California subject and exercise all of its corporate powers, controlling its advertising, its personnel and policies. Defendant Michael Kardon is the sole stockholder of Kardon Motors, Inc., and that Kardon Motors, Inc., and Kardon Chevrolet are operated as a unit and failure to recognize that Kardon Motors Inc., is the alter ego of Michael Kardon and/or Kardon Chevrolet will promote fraud and injustice upon the People of the State of California.

V

Defendant Michael M. Kardon, at all times mentioned herein, is the president of Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., a New Jersey corporation, and a director and the sole stockholder of Kardon Motors, Inc., a California corporation, and in those capacities has conducted, managed and operated the business of both corporate defendants.

VI

Defendant Murrell N. Woolman, at all times mentioned herein, is the president and treasurer of Kardon Motors, Inc., a California corporation, and in that capacity has conducted, managed and operated the business of said corporate defendant.

VII

Defendant Betty Ann Mecreddy, at all times mentioned herein, was and now is the secretary of defendant Kardon Motors, Inc., a California corporation.

VIII

Defendants Jerome Lipman and Charles Greenburg, at all times mentioned herein, were and now are directors of defendant Kardon Motors, Inc., a California corporation.

IX

The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of defendants named herein as Does One through Thirty, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

X

Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges that each of the defendants designated herein as Does One through Thirty have acted in concert with the named defendants or have acted in some other manner to carry out the unlawful acts complained of herein.

XI

Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act of defendants Kardon Motors, Inc., and Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., such allegations shall be deemed to mean that the officers, directors, agents and employees of said defendants did or authorized such acts while actively engaged in the management, direction, or control of the affairs of said corporate defendants, and while acting within the course and scope of their employment.

XII

Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act of defendants, such allegation shall be deemed to mean the act of each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

Nature of business involved

XIII

The two corporate defendants are engaged in the sale of new and used cars at the respective locations named above. In addition, they maintain branches in Japan and Germany. Although they advertise in the local newspapers for sale to the general public in Solano County and the State of New Jersey, the largest part of their advertising and operation is geared to the large market of American servicemen stationed throughout the world. Full page ads, similar to Exhibits A, B, and C, are regularly run in the Air Force Times, Army Times and Navy Times, which are circulated wherever American servicemen are stationed. They describe themselves as the "largest military dealer." Both are located in close proximity to the largest embarkation and arrival points of Air Force and Army personnel at Travis Air Force Base and Oakland Army Terminal on the West Coast, and McGuire Air Force Base in Fort Dix, New Jersey, on the East Coast. Through their advertisements circulated throughout the world where American servicemen are stationed they attract servicemen to their places of business by various means more particularly described below which are intended to and do create the impression that the serviceman can obtain much greater savings through defendants than through their competitors. The servicemen are induced while still overseas to make monthly deposits on new and used automobiles on which they will take possession when arriving home. Overseas salesmen for Kardon also actively solicit deposits from servicemen at various places in Europe and Asia wherever American servicemen are stationed. "Big Military Discounts," availability of "thousands" of cars, new and used, "all makes and models," "free transportation from arrival terminal to Kardon," "free motels" while taking delivery, "low bank rates" and "no money down" are all promised in order to obtain deposits and otherwise commit the servicemen to come to Kardon to make a purchase.

Offenses charged

XIV

Beginning at an exact date unknown to plaintiff but at least since September 27, 1965 and continuing to the present date, defendants, individually and severally, and each in conspiracy with the others, engaged in a pattern of conduct contrary to public policy and in violation of the laws of the State of California with the intent of inducing members of the public and servicemen in particular to purchase their new and used automobiles and to enter into conditional sales contracts for the purchase of defendants' automobiles. In so doing defendants performed repeated and frequent acts of false and misleading advertisements and other representations all made unlawful and prohibited by Business and Professions Code section 17500 and Vehicle Code section 11713.

In particular, defendants "baited" the servicemen with advertisements of very low prices on specified automobiles that had in fact already been sold for much higher prices.

A. Defendants did on February 26, 1969, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1967 Buick, I.D. #444657 H2106935, for the price of \$1949 which in fact had already been sold on December 2, 1968 for the price of \$3100, or \$1151 more than the advertised price. ("Price" as hereinafter alleged means the selling price exclusive of sales tax, vehicle license fees, insurance premiums, financing charges, and after consideration of any alleged discount.)

B. Defendants did on July 2, 1969, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1968 Plymouth, I.D. #PL45C8D155-944, for the price of \$2,899 which in fact had already been sold on June 27, 1969 for the price of \$3,022, or \$123 more than the advertised price.

C. Defendants did on December 18, 1968, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1967 Ford, I.D. #7774H137549, for the price of \$2,299 which in fact had already been sold on December 14, 1968 for the price of \$2,895, or \$596 more than the advertised price.

D. Defendants did on December 18, 1968, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1966 Chevrolet, I.D. #156696J-283302, for the price of \$1,099 which in fact had already been sold on December 9, 1968 for the price of \$1,675, or \$576 more than the advertised price.

E. Defendants did on December 18, 1968, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1967 Chevrolet, I.D. #156117L-110563, for the price of \$1,349 which in fact had already been sold on December 2, 1968 for the price of \$2,175, or \$826 more than the advertised price.

F. Defendants did on December 18, 1968, advertise for sale in the Air Force Times newspaper, a 1967 Chevrolet, I.D. #156697C-192107, for the price of \$1,399 which in fact had already been sold on November 26, 1968 for the price of \$2,125, or \$726 more than the advertised price.

G. Defendants did on October 30, 1968, advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1962 Plymouth, I.D. #2225135198, for the price of \$249 which in fact had already been sold on August 26, 1968 for the price of \$654, or \$405 more than the advertised price.

H. Defendants did on October 30, 1968, advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1964 Chevrolet, I.D. #40437N241367, for the price of \$1,199 which in fact had already been sold on September 30, 1968 for the price of \$1,510, or \$311 more than the advertised price.

I. Defendants did on October 30, 1968, advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1967 Plymouth, I.D. #PM4367410-5100, for the price of \$1,899 which in fact had already been sold on October 2, 1968 for the price of \$2,500, or \$601 more than the advertised price.

J. Defendants did on September 11, 1968, advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1965 Mercury, I.D. #5J32T507771, for the price of \$999 which in fact had already been sold on July 30, 1968 for the price of \$1,468, or \$469 more than the advertised price.

Defendants have, as a consistent and regular practice, advertised hundreds of automobiles already sold at prices grossly above the advertised prices which were intended as "bait" for new deposits, all of which advertisements were false, misleading and in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500 and Vehicle Code section 11713.

XV

Defendants have, as a consistent and regular practice, offered for sale or sold automobiles at prices substantially in excess of the prices in their advertisements which were not bona fide offers to sell but were intended as merely "bait" for deposits by servicemen or to draw customers to defendants' place of business where they could be "switched" to purchase automobiles at high profits to defendants.

In particular, defendants have:

A. On February 19, 1969, advertised for sale in the Vallejo Times Herald newspaper, a 1964 Datsun, I.D. #PL410902210, for \$799 which to persons visiting their lot on February 20, 1969 they stated the price was \$925 and \$849, or as much as \$126 over the advertised price.

Defendants advertised for sale on December 18, 1968, in the Air Force Times newspaper the same car for \$599, or \$200 less than the advertisement to civilians.

B. On February 18, 1969, defendants did advertise for sale in the Vallejo Times Herald newspaper, a 1965 Chevrolet, I.D. #164375R-134817, for \$1,399 which they sold the same

day for \$1,849, or \$500 over their advertised price.

C. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1966 Chrysler, I.D. #CH23563284270, for \$2,799 which they sold on September 21, 1968 for \$3,086, or \$287 over their advertised price.

D. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1966 Ford, I.D. #6J67Z140196, for \$2,199 which they sold on September 16, 1968 for \$2,430, or \$231 over their advertised price.

E. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1966 Chevrolet, I.D. #166476C116-850, for \$2,049 which was sold on September 26, 1968 for \$2,325, or \$276 over their advertised price.

F. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1966 Plymouth, I.D. #RH23D65128-590, for \$1,699 which was sold on September 27, 1968 for \$2,141.76, or \$442.76 over their advertised price.

G. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1964 Ford, I.D. #4J64Z104928, for \$949 which was sold on September 17, 1968 for \$1,282, or \$333 over their advertised price.

H. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1964 Rambler, I.D. #Z162481, for \$749 which was sold on October 17, 1968 for \$1,225, or \$476 over their advertised price.

I. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1965 Pontiac, I.D. #237695P146364, for \$699 which was sold on October 1, 1968 for \$1,332, or \$633 over their advertised price.

J. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1966 Plymouth, I.D. #PH43E62251-668, for \$1,649 which was sold on September 12, 1968 for \$2,595, or \$946 over their advertised price.

K. On September 11, 1968, defendants did advertise for sale in the Army Times newspaper, a 1967 Chevrolet, I.D. #134357Z118172, for \$1,949 which was sold on October 19, 1968 for \$2,286, or \$337 over their advertised price.

Defendants have, as a consistent and regular practice, advertised hundreds of automobiles for less than the price at which they intended to sell them, that said advertisements were intended as "bait" for deposits from servicemen and to attract customers, all of whom defendants intended to "switch" to more profitable sales and that said advertisements were false and misleading within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17500 and Vehicle Code section 11713.

XVI

Defendants did on December 4, 1968, December 18, 1968, January 15, 1969, January 29, 1969, February 14, 1969, February 26, 1969, March 5, 1969, and at various times before and since the specific dates alleged, advertise in the Air Force Times newspaper as follows: "68 Cars Must Go. Big Discount—Save \$1,000 to \$1,800."

Said advertisements are false and misleading and, therefore, unlawful in that they were intended to suggest and imply that such savings could be had on new 1968 automobiles when in fact the savings quoted were merely a comparison between the suggested new retail price of a similar make, model and year vehicle and the then current retail value of an actual or demonstrator vehicle and not an actual savings of any kind.

XVII

Defendants did on January 15, 1969, in the Air Force Times newspaper, advertise, as illustrated by Exhibit C, that they had available for sale brand new 1968 and 1969

automobiles of "all makes and models" when in fact defendant Kardon Motors, Inc., is unfranchised to sell only Chrysler Motor products under its California vehicle dealer's license and that the other makes of vehicles listed on Exhibit C are not available from the inventory of said dealership or from a manufacturer or distributor. Similar advertisements were made in the Air Force Times, Army Times and Navy Times at various dates both before and after January 15, 1969, including but not limited to June 8, 1968, September 11, 1968, October 30, 1968, December 4, 1968, December 18, 1968, January 29, 1969, February 19, 1969, February 26, 1969 and March 5, 1969.

The above false and misleading advertisements were placed by defendants with the intent of conveying the impression they had a virtually unlimited selection of automobiles available to their customers when in fact they did not and the advertisements were placed to encourage servicemen overseas to send in deposits on vehicles and to insure that returning servicemen would in fact commit themselves to come in to Kardon Motors on their return from overseas.

XVIII

In order to further encourage deposits by impressing the overseas servicemen with the vast selection of cars available to them through defendants, said defendants did cause to be placed in the Air Force Times newspaper an advertisement with an aerial view of an enormous automobile lot with several hundred automobiles, as shown by Exhibit A, with the description:

"20 minutes from Travis Air Force Base and Oakland Army Terminal—Free transportation from Travis AFB, Oakland Army Terminal, San Francisco Airport and Seattle. . . ."

The advertisement is false and misleading in that the lot in question is in New Jersey, not Vallejo.

XIX

On all of the dates referred to above when advertisements were placed, defendants represented through such advertisements, as illustrated by Exhibits A, B, and C, and through the mailing of written material to servicemen answering defendants' advertisements that they offered:

"Free transportation for you and your family from Travis AFB, Oakland Army Terminal, San Francisco Airport and Seattle. Free motel accommodations for you and your family."

In fact the transportation and accommodations were not free but were paid for by the customer out of the difference between the advertised price and the actual selling price.

XX

On all of the above dates and other dates before and after, defendants advertised "Big Military Discounts" and that the consistent theme of all of their advertising was that great savings could be made by servicemen on purchases from defendants. In fact the large savings supposedly available by the advertising of specific vehicles were not available and sales of those vehicles were not intended by defendants but defendants used such advertised prices as "bait" to encourage and solicit deposits by servicemen overseas and that defendants did always intend to "switch" the buyers to more expensive automobiles which were at prices in excess of local prevailing prices and greatly in excess of the specific advertised prices as shown more specifically by the allegations of Paragraphs XIV and XV.

XXI

Various methods of denying the returning serviceman the specific car on which he had made a deposit and switching him to another car were accomplished by the following:

1. telling the serviceman when he appeared at defendants' place of business that the car

on which he had made a deposit had already been sold;

2. telling the serviceman that his deposit had not been received soon enough;

3. telling the serviceman that his deposit could not be returned that day because no one was available to sign the check;

4. telling the serviceman that the car on which he had made a deposit needed repair work and was removed from the lot and was not available;

5. telling the serviceman that the car on which he had made a deposit was an East Coast car and was not readily available; and

6. telling the serviceman that he did not qualify for the financing for the particular vehicle in question.

In each case defendants would then try to "switch" the serviceman to the purchase of a vehicle on which defendants would realize an exorbitant profit at amounts grossly over the amount advertised. In accomplishing this switch defendants would take advantage of the returning serviceman's eagerness to return home either to or with his family, his unfamiliarity with the actual prevailing prices for automobiles, his inability to do comparative shopping due to a tight travel schedule, the lack of alternative transportation when having availed himself of "free" transportation to Kardon Motors, Inc., and finds he can no longer go anywhere else, concern by the serviceman over the retention of his deposit by defendants and many other means and methods designed to and intended to coerce the serviceman into the purchase of an automobile he didn't order, at an exorbitant price.

XXII

Defendants advertise, as shown by Exhibits A, B and C, "no money down" when in fact such terms were never made available by defendants themselves, never available at the "Low Bank Rates" referred to in their advertisements such as illustrated by Exhibit B, and were only rarely available at all and then by a combination of bank loans and personal loans at very much higher rates than the "low, low bank rates" advertised, all of which is an unlawful and prohibited type of advertising pursuant to Vehicle Code section 11713(k) and false and misleading advertising under Business and Professions Code section 17500.

XXIII

In order to create the impression that defendants had a special fraternal concern and sympathy for servicemen, defendants utilized in their correspondence, as shown in Exhibit D, fictitious correspondents with retired military titles such as:

"Wm. (Bill) Foley—C.P.O. U.S.N. (Ret.)
"Dick Rich—CM Sgt. (E9) U.S.A.F. Ret."

In fact no such persons with such titles exist.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

XXIV

Plaintiff re-alleges and re-incorporates by reference Paragraphs I-XX, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

XXV

All of the conduct of defendants referred to above represents an unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practice and as such is unfair competition within the meaning of Civil Code section 3369(3) and that the above business practices injure the honest and legitimate competitors of defendants who do not use such unlawful business practices in the conduct of their business. Such unfair competition is enjoined by the Attorney General and the District Attorney under Civil Code section 3369(5).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Plaintiff re-alleges and re-incorporates by reference Paragraphs I-XX, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

XXVI

Each and every allegation of this complaint when taken together demonstrates an unlawful, fraudulent, oppressive and malicious business practice which has affected thousands of citizens of the County of Solano, State of California, and the United States servicemen throughout the world. The defendants' conduct demonstrates the necessity for exemplary damages pursuant to Civil Code section 3294 for the sake of example and to punish defendants; that such oppressive conduct described above can be adequately dealt with only with an award of exemplary damages sufficient to remove the profit from such unlawful behavior, for the sake of example and by way of punishing defendants within the meaning of Civil Code section 3294.

PRAYER

Wherefore, plaintiff prays that:

1. Defendants Kardon Motors, Inc., and Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., their officers, directors, successors, members, agents, representatives, employees and all persons and corporations who act under, by, through, and on behalf of said corporation and individuals, Michael M. Kardon, Murrell N. Woolman, Betty Ann McCreedy, Jerome Lipman, Charles Greenburg, and Does One through Thirty, and all persons acting in concert or participating with them with actual or constructive notice of this injunction be temporarily and permanently restrained and enjoined from doing any of the following acts directly or indirectly:

(a) Placing any advertisement in any newspaper or advertising in any other manner, when such advertisement offers for sale any automobile which has in fact been sold on the date the advertising copy is submitted to the publishers or other advertising media.

(b) After an advertisement is made for a specific automobile for a specific price, attempting to sell that automobile to anyone at a price in excess of the advertised price. If a time limit is to be placed on the advertised price, the advertisement must expressly say so in large type.

(c) Advertising savings on current year new cars, such as 1969, when in fact the cars offered for sale are used or demonstrator automobiles.

(d) Placing any advertisement which states "No money down" unless defendants themselves offer the financing on those terms.

(e) Placing any advertisements which state defendants offer "low bank rates" unless such rates are in fact available.

(f) Showing in their advertising a photograph of any automobile sales lot other than at the place of business suggested by the advertisement.

(g) Placing any other advertisements which are not factually correct.

(h) Soliciting any further deposits from prospective customers wherever located, unless defendants are prepared and able to refund to the customer the full amount of the deposit upon request at any time during normal business hours.

(i) Soliciting any deposit on any specific car or make and model of car, unless defendants are willing and able to hold that specific car or the specific make and model of the new car until a date agreed upon with the customer.

(j) Advertising that any specific service is free unless it is given without obligation or without raising the sales price, and that if free transportation to the place of business is offered, then defendants must likewise offer free transportation to the customer to place of origin or to some closer place requested by the customer.

2. Defendants Kardon Motors, Inc., and Kardon Chevrolet, Inc., each be assessed a civil penalty of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500.00) for each false and mis-

leading representation as provided in Business and Professions Code section 17536.

3. Defendants Michael M. Kardon, Murrell N. Woolman, Betty Ann McCreedy, Jerome Lipman, Charles Greenburg, and Does One through Thirty each be assessed a civil penalty of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500.00) for each false and misleading representation as provided in Business and Professions Code section 17536.

4. The court adjudge and decree that defendants place an amount of money into an escrow account at an appropriate financial institution, within the State of California, there to be held in trust for members of the public who can establish claims against the defendants by showing that they paid more for an automobile than the price at which the automobile was being advertised.

5. All amounts ordered by the court to be returned by the defendants to the customers shall include interest computed at 7% per annum from the date of the sale to and including the date on which the funds are returned to the customers.

6. That defendants be assessed punitive or exemplary damages for the fraudulent, unlawful, oppressive and malicious conduct described herein in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000.00) pursuant to Civil Code section 3294.

7. That plaintiff have such other and further relief as the nature of this case may require and the court deems proper to fully and successfully dissipate the effects of the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent acts complained of herein.

8. That plaintiff recover its costs of suit. Dated: August 6, 1969.

Attorney for plaintiff:

THOMAS C. LYNCH,
Attorney General.
HERSCHEL T. ELKINS,
Deputy.

JAMES R. McCALL,
Deputy.

JOHN C. PORTER,
Deputy.

E. GLYNN STANLEY,
District Attorney of Solano County.

ASSURANCE OF VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

(In the Matter of Michael Kardon, individually and as principal officer and majority stockholder of Kardon Chevrolet (former MK Chevrolet) and Kardon Chevrolet, a corporate entity and Murrell Woolman, individually and as principal officer of Kardon Motors and Kardon Motors, a corporate entity—Affidavit File No. 6723702)

Michael Kardon and Murrell Woolman, being severally sworn, depose and say:

That each is a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years and reside at 2401 Pennsylvania Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Apartment 3B, Holiday Gardens, Vallejo, California, respectively.

That Michael Kardon is the President, Treasurer, Director and principal stockholder of Kardon Chevrolet (formerly known as MK Chevrolet), a New Jersey Corporation, whose offices and principal place of business is located on Route 38, Mt. Holly, New Jersey, and sole stockholder of Kardon Motors, a California corporation, whose offices and principal place of business is located at 1515 Solano Avenue, Vallejo, California.

That Murrell Woolman is the President and Treasurer of Kardon Motors, described hereinabove.

That in his capacity as President and majority stockholder of Kardon Chevrolet and sole stockholder of Kardon Motors, deponent Kardon is the person primarily responsible for formulating, directing and controlling the policies and business practices, including the responsibility, supervision and control of advertising claims made on behalf of Kardon Chevrolet and Kardon Motors appearing in newspapers.

That from their principal places of busi-

ness, as forementioned, Kardon Chevrolet and Kardon Motors have been and continue to be engaged in the sale of automobiles at the retail level in commerce, as commerce in defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

That in the course and conduct of the business of the companies, Kardon Chevrolet and Kardon Motors prepared and disseminated certain advertising literature to various members of the armed forces stationed in foreign countries throughout the world which contained certain advertising claims and depictions or portrayals therein; as follows:

1. A seal similar to the Seal of the United States, upon which seal appeared the statement "United States Military Service Department" and/or "Kardon Military Service Department."

Deponents state that in truth and fact Kardon Chevrolet is an authorized Chevrolet distributorship and Kardon Motors is an authorized Chrysler-Plymouth distributorship, neither company having any connection whatever with any arm of the military services of the United States.

2. "Lowest Prices Anywhere"

3. "World's Largest Military Dealer"

4. "Military Price"

Deponents on behalf of their respective companies state that they have been informed that the aforementioned practices may constitute a violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, in that said practices may be misleading and deceptive and likewise constitute unfair methods of competition.

Deponents on behalf of their respective companies, their officers, subsidiaries and affiliates and through agents, representatives and employees do hereby agree that in the future:

1. Depictions and/or portrayals of a seal similar to the Seal of the United States of America will be omitted.

2. The phrase "United States Military Service Department" will likewise be omitted.

3. That if a similar phrase, such as "Kardon Military Service Department" is employed, it will be accompanied by language such as "not affiliated with the United States Government", to dramatically underscore the fact that no connection exists between proposed respondents and any governmental agency or military arm of the United States Government.

The phrase "lowest prices anywhere" and words of similar import will be omitted.

The phrase "world's largest military dealer" and words of similar import will be omitted.

That price brochures disseminated to members of the armed forces serving overseas assignments will henceforth have the price columns designated in the following manner:

"Manufacturer's Suggested Retail Price" in place of "Retail" in keeping with the language of Public Law 85-506 (The Automobile Information Disclosure Act) and "Kardon Overseas Price" in place of "Military Price".

That in connection therewith, deponents' literature disseminated to members of the armed forces as stated hereinabove, will contain a statement in clear type that the "Manufacturer's Suggested Retail Price" in keeping with the language of Public Law 85-506 for the automobiles described in price brochures and elsewhere, does not necessarily reflect the prices at which these automobiles are sold by the subject companies.

That attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference as if fully set forth herein and identified as Kardon Exhibit A is an artist's rendition evidencing the changes made and indicating in part how the subject companies propose to conform to the promises made in this affidavit.

Deponents, on behalf of their respective companies will distribute copies of these assurances and otherwise inform all operating divisions and affiliates of these assurances.

The subject companies will each file reports of compliance within six months after acceptance of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance. These reports will contain full and detailed accounts of compliance showing the actual steps taken to carry out these assurances. Submitted therewith will be sample copies of all current advertising.

Deponents state that this affidavit is made for the purpose of concluding the pending investigation of the Federal Trade Commission and for the purpose and with the intent of avoiding any other and further proceedings herein and is made without any admission either individually or as corporate officers of Kardon Chevrolet and Kardon Motors respectively, that there have been or are now present any violations of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission or any rules or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

Deponents acknowledge that this affidavit does not grant either of them any promise of immunity, nor does it in any way bind the Federal Trade Commission as to final action in this matter.

MICHAEL KARDON,
(Individually).

KARDON CHEVROLET,

By MICHAEL KARDON, *President*.

MURRELL WOOLMAN,
(Individually).

KARDON MOTORS,
By MURRELL WOOLMAN,
President.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
County of Burlington ss:

LOIS G. DAVIS.

On the 29th day of Nov., 1968, before me personally came Michael Kardon, to me known and known to me to be the individual described in, and who executed, the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Solano, ss:

On the 2nd day of December, 1968, before me personally came Murrell Woolman, to me known and known to me to be the individual described in, and who executed, the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

AUSTIN F. USSURY.

CUMBERLAND GI DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. George S. Kimmell, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed in Vietnam recently. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CUMBERLAND GI DIES IN VIETNAM—Pfc. GEORGE KIMMELL WAS MISSING SINCE JULY 12

Pfc. George S. Kimmell, a 21-year-old Cumberland soldier who was reported missing in action July 12, one month after his arrival in Vietnam, was listed as a combat fatality by the Defense Department yesterday.

Private Kimmell was a 1968 graduate of Fort Hill High School in Cumberland. A slightly built young man during his high school days, he lifted weights and "put on weight" before enlisting in the Army in January, his sister, Mrs. Mary F. Deffinbaugh, said.

HOPED TO BUY HOUSE

Like many youths in the Western Maryland city, he was an avid hunter, his sister said. "He used to hunt deer and squirrel in season," she said.

Private Kimmell arrived in Vietnam in June and was stationed with an infantry outfit. His family received one letter from him during his period of service there.

He wrote to say, his sister said, that "he didn't think it would be long before he would be back home."

It was his ambition to return to Cumberland after his Army service and get a job, and then purchase a home for his parents.

His sister said that Private Kimmell was "the last boy at home, and his mother, 63, continues to work, doing house work. He wanted her to retire, and move out of the family's rented home into a house he planned to buy her."

Surviving are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jess Kimmell; two sisters, Mrs. Deffinbaugh and Mrs. Edna P. White; two brothers, Jesse Lee and Richard D. Kimmell, all of Cumberland, and three stepbrothers, Curtis Yost, of Eckart, Md., Conrad Yost, of Cumberland, and Bernard Yost, of Pittsburgh.

NWRO—THE BROOD MARE MOTHERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare not to approve a \$300,000 grant to the militant National Welfare Rights Organization is certainly the correct one when the past activities of this group are reviewed. In view of the fact that NWRO has already received a grant of \$434,930 from the Labor Department and that the HEW rejection is possibly but a temporary one, NWRO's role in this administration's newly proposed welfare program might well prove to be as disruptive and divisive in the future as it has in the past.

According to its literature, NWRO is a nationwide organization of, by, and for welfare recipients and other poor people. Individuals may join NWRO only by joining a local group. Services provided by NWRO include materials on welfare regulations, legislation, and research on special problems; help in locating lawyers for local WRO's, information on legal issues which affect all welfare recipients, and legal help from skilled welfare lawyers. In addition, NWRO claims that its assistance to local groups extends to "ideas and suggestions on how to make local contacts, greeting cards and jewelry to sell at a profit for your local group; help with ideas for writing proposals to get money from local foundations, institutions, churches, and so forth, help in organizing Friends of NWRO groups."

While the purpose and services of NWRO look good on paper, some of its past performances include bullying tactics, harassment and threats to obtain its ends. In the process, social welfare workers, mired down in a hopelessly unworkable welfare system, have been alienated by the rule-or-ruin tactics of NWRO. A good example is the havoc caused by NWRO and other militant groups at a recent convention of social welfare workers in New York City in May.

The Washington Post of June 1, 1969,

carried an article by Eve Edstrom entitled "Radicals' Demands Stun and Polarize Welfare Leaders," which described the disrupting of the 96th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare held at the New York Hilton. The article began "... or get off the pot," and continued:

The full, obscene demand was shouted over a seized microphone last Sunday night as more than 5000 of the Nation's social welfare leaders convened to hear an opening address by their president.

The account continued:

In stunned silence, those who had devoted decades to helping the poor heard themselves called "racist pigs," and "fat cats," and members of the "white imperialistic oppressive society."

This was the manner in which the 5-day convention of the social welfare leaders commenced as the platform was taken over by dissident students, new organizations of militant social workers, and welfare mothers.

The NWRO was represented at the convention by its executive director, Dr. George A. Wiley, who demanded a sum of \$35,000 to enable more poor people to attend the conference conventions. Delaying the opening session by 3 hours, Wiley and a group of welfare mothers blocked the exits after he had vowed that no one would be permitted to leave planning of the disruption was evident until the sum had been collected. Pre-as plastic ice buckets were passed around to collect the contributions. A temporary ballroom dividing wall had to be removed before the conference could begin.

The New York Daily News editorially described the Storm Trooper tactics of the NWRO as "the outrage of the year to date" and asked:

Why the 4,000 didn't throw the 300 out, we don't know; nor why the numerous police and plainclothesmen who were on hand allowed the stickup to be performed.

Later in the conference Director Wiley went into action again, according to the New York Daily News of May 27:

At a general meeting earlier in the day 5,000 delegates got a first-hand taste of disruption tactics when George Wiley, director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, seized control of the speaker's microphone from conference president Arthur S. Flemming.

The responsibility for not quashing the disturbances must be laid at the door of Mr. Flemming who, according to the Edstrom article, adopted a conscious strategy of inaction. When turning the gavel over to the new president, Wilbur J. Cohen, Flemming was quoted as saying:

I did not use this gavel once this week—I didn't think it appropriate.

Flemming's sad lack of leadership proved at least one militant's strategy to be correct. Derrick A. Bell, Jr., director of the Western Center on Law and Poverty at the University of Southern California, stated at the convention that "aggressive, militant tactics work." Bell was further quoted by the New York Daily News of May 27 as saying:

Defense of the present welfare system is simply contrary to the best interests of the

poor. The need is for an aggressive militance, an unwillingness to be reasonable and a determination to serve the clients by any means necessary.

A month before, the NWRO sponsored a Central Park rally after which the several thousand welfare recipients and sympathizers in attendance marched downtown and were dispersed opposite Grand Central Terminal by scores of mounted policemen who pressed into screaming crowds. Foot patrolmen wrestled some demonstrators to the ground and 15 arrests were made. As reported by the New York Times of April 16, Wiley, in leading the demonstrators, shouted:

When the poor people want money they are going to get it by people power, or there's going to be — to pay in New York City.

As NWRO literature indicates, agitation, and even illegal activities are part and parcel of the movement. Here are several excerpts from NWRO pamphlets instructing local groups on how to operate:

Work on the problems people have with welfare but try to avoid just working on cases—develop issues and work to change policies. *Create your own forms of public protest and pressure.* (Emphasis added.)

If welfare (authorities) say person is not eligible, demand that they allow the person to apply anyway; ask for an immediate written statement why the person is not eligible and file an appeal.

Permission to leaflet and talk with recipients in the waiting room of the Welfare Department and even to set up a welfare rights table to recruit members. You have a legal right to do all of these things so long as you are not physically interfering with the operation of the welfare office.

In at least two cases the use of the Welfare Department's facilities by welfare rights supporters turned into vehicles for harassment, according to welfare workers. In Philadelphia, for instance, a petition signed by more than 500 case-workers charged that the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization was attempting to "wreck the system which we are trying to administer according to law." Their petition, sent to the Governor of Pennsylvania, cited "abusive and intimidating practices of certain representatives of NWRO, who have been permitted to occupy space in the district offices—and—have made it impossible for us to carry out legal responsibilities in administering the welfare program."

Recently in Baltimore the new chairman of the State Board of Social Services recommended legislation to consolidate local welfare departments into the State agency. The chairman, Nicholas Mueller, served notice that he would not "put up with any truculence or brow-beating" of State and local welfare officials by the newly organized welfare recipient groups. Evidently welfare rights supporters have been granted office facilities in Baltimore as in the case of Philadelphia. Chairman Mueller stated—as reported by the Baltimore Sun of July 23:

It's not quite cricket to give someone a desk and phone so that he can harass you, and that's what the city's done.

As for possible illegal action, the NWRO offers this advice to its local

groups which find themselves besieging a welfare office:

Be sure that everyone knows there is a possibility of being arrested for trespass if you are in the Welfare Center after it is officially closed for the day... But in case of threatened arrest you can always leave just before the actual arrest is going to be made. Leaving before arrest should be by the whole group, not individuals, and if that is the plan, everyone should decide that together.

One can imagine the possibilities of widespread disruption if a goodly number of NWRO's claimed membership of 30,000 members in 250 local chapters in more than 100 cities were to occupy welfare offices thus inviting arrest.

In addition to welfare workers and officials, Sears, Roebuck & Co. has been the target of NWRO's disruptive policies. For some time now NWRO has been pressing Sears to extend credit to welfare recipients. One demonstration against the company in New York was sponsored by the Citywide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups which NWRO literature says "serves as the NWRO office for that area." The chairman of the New York group is Mrs. Beulah Sanders, who organized the Sears demonstration and who is second vice chairman of the NWRO in New York City. The New York Daily News of July 4 described the demonstration:

The demonstrators hung a banner in the street-floor window and occupied the store for nearly two hours, strewing trash on the floors, turning on television sets and phonographs, defacing price tags, operating washing machines and dumping wet rags across the sales floor.

The News account ended:

And later, leaving the store in a mess, Mrs. Sanders announced: "We'll be back next week."

What does NWRO want of Sears, Roebuck & Co.? NWRO literature lists these demands:

First. Credit of at least \$150 be extended to any affiliated NWRO member.

Second. A letter of reference from NWRO should be adequate proof that the recipient is a good credit risk, and there be no other investigation.

Third. That Sears make a formal written agreement with NWRO on this matter.

Fourth. That the Sears-NWRO agreement be binding on all local Sears stores.

Fifth. That there be no extra credit charges or other treatment discriminating against welfare recipients.

This is the ridiculous "package" that NWRO has demanded of Sears, illustrating the totalitarian tactic of making impossible demands followed by vindictive action when the demands are not met.

The NWRO is not above employing incentives in addition to its use of impossible demands and disruptive action. For instance, a Member of Congress, whose committee passed legislation to which NWRO was opposed, was excoriated in an NWRO pamphlet in this fashion.

Wanted for conspiracy to starve children, destroy families, force women into slavery and exploit poor people; Public Enemy Number 1.

If, as reported by UPI on August 6, "HEW is considering a long-range plan

to form working relationships with grassroots organizations such as NWRO," serious consideration had better be given by that Department before including organizations such as NWRO whose record in the past has been marked with bullying agitational tactics, irresponsible demands and charges, and the alienation of sincere, concerned welfare workers and officials who have had to labor under an impossible welfare system. This much is certain: Congress will not look kindly on the use of Federal funds to finance irresponsible organizations or individuals with the experiences of some ill-advised OEO projects still so fresh in memory.

Concerning the use of Federal funds by the NWRO, mention has already been made of the Department of Labor grant of the \$434,930 which NWRO was allotted last December. As to the use of these funds which went to an NWRO affiliate, the National Self-Help Corp., at least one member group of NWRO has made inquiry. Mrs. Roxanne Jones, chairman of the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, has stated that her 1,000-member chapter, composed mainly of welfare mothers, "would like to know what NWRO is doing with that money."

Other sources of funds for NWRO are gifts from private individuals, NWRO memberships and dues, foundation grants, and subscriptions to the National Welfare Leaders Newsletter. Director Wiley, in October of last year, estimated the national budget of the organization to be between \$200,000 and \$300,000, with approximately \$25,000 being spent in October, 1968, alone.

One foundation, the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization—IFCO—has been kind to NWRO to the tune of approximately \$105,000, according to the Washington Star of October 5, 1968. IFCO which was founded several years ago and is funded by ten large religious denominations, put up the money for the National Black Economic Development Conference in Detroit where James Forman made public for the first time his Black Manifesto, demanding \$500 million of the various churches for injustices suffered by the Negro people over the years.

NWRO is not the only militant recipient of IFCO funds, according to the statement of Sgt. Robert Thoms of the Los Angeles police intelligence division before the International Security Conference recently in Chicago. Thoms claims that "83 percent of IFCO's funds have gone to support community groups involved in militant or disruptive activities such as picketing 'Black Power' rallies, demands on schools and school boards, unions, and support of the Black Panthers."

Another foundation source for NWRO funds, but to a much smaller degree than IFCO, is the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation of New York City, according to Combat, the reliable newsletter on subversive activities. Combat states that the Rabinowitz Foundation "annually pours hundreds of thousands of dollars into the left, to finance propaganda films glorifying Communist China and revolutionary activity in Berkeley, to finance socialist conferences, and in effect to subsidize Marxist and Communist publishing houses. Combat lists George Wiley,

Washington, D.C., the national executive of the National Welfare Rights Organization, as a recipient of a \$1,000 grant in 1967.

A few months ago, NWRO mothers made a trek to Washington to demand more welfare. I was present at one of their press conferences. They proudly proclaimed that they had between 11 and 21 children—children, I might add, that they would not support. They proudly referred to themselves as the "brood mare mothers." They, of course, want a guaranteed income. They made it clear that they were demanding—not asking—for these dollars. "We brood mare mothers will begin to stomp if we don't get more money," one militant black woman said. We have already begun to see what they mean by "stomping" and their organization should be studied very closely before any guaranteed income proposal is considered. President Nixon continually referred to a "family of four" in his nationwide speech on welfare. The effect of his proposal on the "brood mare mothers" should also be considered before we enact any program which will induce these families to grow and grow and grow.

U.S. MERCHANT FLEET AT LOW EBB

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. BOGGS Mr. Speaker, I have often spoken to my colleagues in the House about the necessity of maintaining a strong and vibrant merchant marine.

It is clear to me that this great industry has, in the past, played a key role in the progress and economic development of the United States. It is equally clear to me that steps must be taken to assure that the merchant marine will be able to continue to fulfill its historic role in our future growth.

Earlier this month, a talented reporter for the Washington Evening Star, Miriam Ottenberg, published a very perceptive article discussing the problems of this industry. I would like to take this opportunity to commend it to all my colleagues in Congress.

Here follows the article:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Aug. 3, 1969]

CRISIS AT SEA: U.S. MERCHANT FLEET AT LOW EBB

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The nation's once proud merchant marine has fallen on hard times.

Maritime experts agree that unless the Nixon administration establishes a broad ship replacement program, the United States will be down to about one-third of its present thousand-ship merchant fleet in a couple of years.

Many of the Liberty and Victory ships that slid down the ways in a fantastic show of wartime mass production are still around several wars later. Right now, in fact, World War II ships make up almost two-thirds of our merchant fleet.

How much longer can these ships last? Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson warns: "We are three or four years away from disaster."

And Undersecretary of Commerce Rocco C. Siciliano told a convention of the AFL-CIO Seafarers' International Union here last week: "We feel that the merchant marine has to go back up. If the merchant marine goes down any further, it will go down the drain."

For years, congressional committees have been declaring that the nation is running out of time to save the merchant marine. And for years, Congress has voted more for the merchant marine than the administration has spent. More than \$101 million appropriated to replace rust buckets is still unused.

Despite repeated bipartisan demands from Capitol Hill and repeated presidential promises, the past two administrations have failed to come up with any positive program to maintain the United States as a first-rate seafaring nation.

The last such program came in the Eisenhower administration, when a building program of some 30 ships a year was projected to overcome the block obsolescence of the World War II merchant ships. Currently, that program is some 100 ships behind schedule.

The lack of a long-range program brings other grief to a troubled industry. Uncertain of how much government support to expect, shipping interests tangle in abrasive argument and labor is reluctant to make concessions for fear there won't be enough jobs to go around.

Matching this thread of self-interest are the diverse concerns of various government agencies often operating at cross-purposes in maritime affairs.

For example, under the law, half of the government's "food-for-peace" and foreign aid cargo is supposed to be carried in American ships. But shipping industry officials claim it doesn't always work out that way. They say the Agriculture Department wants the cheap rates of foreign shipping and the State Department and the Agency for International Development want to score points with foreign governments by using their ships.

Recently, the General Accounting Office told the Agriculture Department it had found that ocean transportation costs amounting to over \$416,000 were paid to foreign carriers when U.S. carriers were available at the same rate.

U.S. flag ships carry only 5.6 percent of this country's total foreign trade. In sharp contrast, Soviet ships carry 50 percent of the USSR's international seaborne trade and the Soviets expect to increase this to 75 percent by 1975.

Nowhere does the absence of a program show itself more forcibly than in actual shipbuilding. Shipyards kept alive only by naval ship orders have lacked the incentive to modernize and expand. Only in very recent years have they started to improve their facilities—prompted by the conviction that a positive merchant shipbuilding program must be forthcoming. Meanwhile, foreign shipyards are booming.

More than national pride is at stake. The Navy is now seriously concerned about future sealift of supplies to armed forces in Vietnam and around the world.

FACING FACTS

Here are some of the facts facing those dealing with the problem today:

The United States has to import 66 commodities classed as strategic and critical, but it has to rely on foreign flag ships to carry 95 percent of those imports. Warns Vice Admiral L. P. Ramage, commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service: "We are a nautical dependent in an era when we should be commercially and militarily standing on our own feet."

This increased dependence on foreign flag shipping is adding to our balance of payments deficit. A maritime industry study shows that if the percentage of U.S. trade carried in American ships from 1960 to 1967

had been as high as existed before World War II (30 to 35 percent), the country would have had a positive balance of some \$5 billion instead of a \$23.5 billion deficit.

SOVIET GROWTH ALARMING

To many, the most disturbing aspect of the American maritime decline is the growth of the Soviet fleet. In 1950, Russia was rated 21st among maritime nations, with only 432 major merchant vessels totaling 1.8 million dead-weight tons. Today, the Russians have an estimated 1,442 ships with a total of 12 million tons and by next year they hope to have 2,600 ships.

The Soviet merchant fleet also has an age advantage. Four out of five Soviet merchant ships are less than 10 years old. Four out of five U.S. ships are 20 years old or older.

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chief of naval operations, believes that following the Suez Canal crisis, that USSR shifted its concept of maritime strategy from a defensive to an offensive, worldwide one.

"What they are doing," Moorer says, "is using their maritime power—merchant ships, oceanographic ships, their fishing fleet—as an instrument of foreign policy."

GOODWILL AMBASSADORS

Soviet merchant seamen are specially trained to stay out of trouble and avoid notoriety in liberty ports while extolling the Soviet way of life.

Legislators like Sen. Warren G. Magnuson, D-Wash., chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, preach the importance of American seamen as goodwill ambassadors around the world and the vital role of American ships in bringing Western ideology to developing nations.

Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, in a recent report on Soviet sea power, noted that "in the ports of developing countries, the ships can reinforce the Soviet claims to scientific and technological supremacy and enhance the appeal of the Soviet system as the route to national development."

Along with the Soviet economic penetration of new nations, Admiral Moorer cited the intelligence of Soviet trawlers—"a potential which Russia exploits in many ways, including surveillance of our missile range operations and our fleet operations."

Pointing out that more than 500 ships of the American merchant fleet currently are being used to carry supplies to Vietnam and other U.S. armed forces outposts and to transport food and other aid to hungry nations, the men responsible for maintaining our logistic lifelines pose these questions:

What would we do if another Vietnam-type conflict began now, requiring another 200 to 300 ships as well as additional sealift to bolster our flanks in Europe? What will we do five or 10 years from now when none of these ships will be around?

RESERVE FLEET AT 144

Much was once made of America's reserve fleet with a grand total of more than a thousand ships. Recently, Maritime Administrator Gibson told the House Merchant Marine Committee that "the only real reserve fleet we have now, in my judgment, are those ships which have been reconditioned for the Vietnam war and are in operating status."

That, he reported, amounts to 144 ships. The average cost of putting them in operating shape for Vietnam was \$700,000.

Rep. William S. Mailliard, R-Calif., ranking minority member of the committee, commenting on an estimate of 1,165 in the reserve fleet, said, "we are constantly given these over-all figures of ships in the reserve fleet and I think it gives everyone a false sense of security to seriously consider that those ships have any real value as a reserve."

More than 15 million dead-weight tons of American-owned ships flying the flags of Liberia, Panama or Honduras are classified as available to the United States in an emer-

gency, but critics question the value of this setup.

CAN ALLIES HELP?

They contend that the concept that the United States has "effective control" over those ships is a "fallacy" because they are foreign ships in foreign waters manned by foreign seamen who owe no loyalty to the United States.

Another question: How much can this nation count on the ships of its allies in situations where there are major policy differences? There have been several instances where ships of a friendly nation refused to haul cargo to Vietnam. In other cases, the issue was avoided by a sounding before the ship was actually loaded. Commented Mailliard: "Vietnam has shown us that where allies are not in sympathy with what we're doing, we can't rely on them for sealift."

In the past three years there have been some 35 studies of the merchant marine, its problems and its future. Typical of the conclusions was this one from the Senate Commerce Committee: "The clear lesson gleaned from our committee's study is beyond dispute: The U.S. merchant fleet is in a critical condition, its future is in doubt and remedial action of a major nature is essential if the United States is to remain a leading seafaring nation."

NIXON'S PROMISE

Less than two months after that report was printed last year, Richard M. Nixon promised a revitalized merchant marine if he became president.

"The maritime industry of the United States has been permitted to decline to a point at which the nation's defense and economic welfare are imperiled," he warned.

Rep. Edward A. Garmatz, D-Md., chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, is hopeful that the administration will soon come through with the program Congress has been awaiting. "There's no question about it," Garmatz says. "It's a different climate now. We didn't get through to the last administration."

Undersecretary Siciliano, in his speech last week, promised that the program probably would go to Congress within 60 days.

POINT REYES IN CALIFORNIA A PATCHWORK PARK IN TROUBLE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important resources that the United States possesses is the natural beauty of its land. The lush green forests, deep canyons, and roaring rivers which lie within our boundaries are, along with the wildlife found within and around them, some of the few monuments we have to pass along to future generations. As long as these areas exist, those yet unborn will be able to see and enjoy the natural splendor of America and realize what a wild, untamed country it was when our forefathers first settled it.

Yet as important as these sites are, they and areas which so far have not been declared national parkland, are still in danger of being devoured by our ever-expanding modern civilization and urbanization. History shows us that once a natural tract of land is gone, it can never be restored.

In a recent article in the New York Times, entitled "Point Reyes in California A Patchwork Park in Trouble,"

Gladwin Hill warns of the threat to the Point Reyes area in California. This breathtakingly beautiful tract of land which should have been declared a national park years ago, thus insuring its existence, is now in danger of being lost to real estate developers.

Because Mr. Hill's article serves as a timely warning to all Americans to save our precious resource of natural beauty. I would like to introduce his article into the RECORD at this time:

POINT REYES IN CALIFORNIA A PATCHWORK PARK IN TROUBLE

(By Gladwin Hill)

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

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

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

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

CATTLE, FIRS, DUNES, CANYONS

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

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

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

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

NEARLY \$20 MILLION SPENT SO FAR

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

Why not?

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

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

The peninsula has been described as "an island in time," geographically, sociologically and ecologically. Its mainland edge follows precisely the great San Andreas fault. (When San Francisco was rocked by an earthquake in 1906, the whole peninsula moved northward 20 feet.) The peninsula's

most spacious bay is believed by many to be the place where Sir Francis Drake refitted the Golden Hind in 1579.

ESCAPED URBANIZATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"It's a shame," he says. "It should be in Government ownership. We've been trying to sell or swap the ranch with the Government for 10 years. But we just can't afford to wait any longer. We paid about \$22,000 in taxes last year and took in about \$2,400 in leases. We just don't have the assets to continue."

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

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

EIGHT BILLS INTRODUCED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ironically, the Point Reyes crisis peaked just as Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel was ordering the National Park Service to give top priority to development of parks near big urban centers.

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

MAN'S NEXT STEP

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, now that man has accomplished what formerly had been considered an impossible feat—the landing of two astronauts on the moon—thoughts turn to the future implications of extraterrestrial explorations.

One question which has probably entered many minds is this, if we have the knowledge and technology to land two men on the moon, why is it so difficult to solve our problems on earth? Although we have successfully reached the moon; war, poverty, racial tension, pollution, and insufficient funds for educational programs still exist on earth.

Realizing the interest of my colleagues in Apollo 11 and its meaning for mankind, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Old Colony Memorial, of Plymouth, Mass.:

MAN'S NEXT STEP

One of the most remarkable achievements in the history of mankind took place Sunday, July 20, as man first set foot on the moon.

It was an inevitable happening and Jules Verne described such a journey in the last century. His fictional account of man's first trip to the moon was somewhat more colorful than the real thing, however, as have been similar accounts since. While watching the historic undertaking with millions of other television viewers, it was difficult to believe we weren't seeing a science fiction movie and we almost expected some strange moon monster to suddenly appear above the horizon.

The moon scene was at least as good as a Flash Gordon film and the very knowledge that we were seeing it live gave it the highest drama.

We could have hoped for a little more emotion in the dialogue—at least a few yells or yippees when the ship touched down. We are told that Armstrong's heart rate jumped considerably but a good part of the conversation was in cold military-like jargon. There was, however, plenty of emotion expressed on earth for this awesome achievement as the human race established its first contact with extraterrestrial soil.

Marshall McLuhan might say that man has now extended his nervous system to include the moon as the senses of millions of people throughout the world recorded the accomplishment.

In an evolutionary sense, it may be as promising as when the first amphibian crawled onto the beach for the first time in the Devonian age. On the other hand, we just spent \$24 billion to pick up 60 pounds of dirt and leave a million dollar junk pile.

The implications of the event were more important than the actual task, as in many things.

This act could contribute a good deal towards a greater sense of brotherhood, and an end to conflict on this one out of many planets. We should now see ourselves clearly as earthmen rather than black or white or Americans or Russians. We are all on this earth together—and we had better make the most of it.

Now that we know we are technically able to explore other planets—a man's flight is planned for sometime after 1980—it might be a good idea to set our affairs in order down here before we attempt to explore other planets.

A respected professor of astro-physics from Boston University told a Boston area Rotary group last year that the main reason for the space program was not curiosity but to guarantee the survival of the human race. According to the professor, it was only a matter of time before life on earth is destroyed by a nuclear holocaust since we have the means to accomplish that right now. He said that the colonization of other planets is the only way to guarantee our survival. This is certainly a pessimistic reason for space exploration but it may be a valid one.

It would appear that our technological developments are unlimited. It is a pity, however, that at the same time we have hardly changed the social structure of man one iota in comparison.

It seems unreasonable that man has the power to reach other planets but cannot mend the problems on his own planet—and it hardly seems fair to bring these problems to the other planets. Why do we find it easier to believe in universal space travel than in a utopian life here on earth? If we cannot change our social actions to coincide with our scientific achievements then perhaps we should keep our primitive social system to ourselves, at least for a thousand years or two, before we consider contaminating other worlds.

A small beginning might have been to stand a United Nations flag alongside Old Glory on the Moon, and in future flights—

there's no stopping them now—it would be an excellent idea to have participation by other nations as Cong. Hastings Keith has so commendably suggested.

If man can take this giant leap, why could he not also solve the much easier and less complex problem of ending misery and poverty on the earth?

The astronauts deposited on the Moon the plaque with its words of peace—which there has been a decided lack of lately, except on the Moon. Perhaps the next \$24 billion could be spent more profitably on something "down to earth" such as peace or the elimination of hunger, now that we have gotten this task out of the way.

NO NATION EXCELS THE UNITED STATES IN MODERN SHIP DESIGN

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, because the United States has a construction subsidy to certain American ship operators who construct their ships in American shipyards, often criticism is voiced that foreign shipyards are more efficient.

However, I think it should be known that neither our steamship industry nor our shipbuilding industry is second to foreign competition.

Our costs are higher because our living standards and labor costs are higher.

But, we do build the best ships and design technically superior ships.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite just one example. Four American steamship operators, Lykes Lines, Prudential Lines, the Pacific Far East Line, and Central Gulf have adopted the so-called LASH system which, in short, are various types of barge carriers. These new vessels are designed to operate 95 percent of the time; in other words, to have fast turnaround times with only little time in port and thereby to greatly increase efficiency and lower costs over conventional freighters.

Now, it appears European lines intend to adopt this technique. Holland-America Line is ordering vessels of this new LASH design.

S. W. Thayer, director, steamship construction, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., speaking at a Maritime Administration conference at Woods Hole, Mass., described this idea as a new system and, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what it is called, it points up that American steamship lines are ready and anxious to carry American cargoes at competitive prices on the seas.

The following statement of Mr. Thayer indicates this determination and gives rise to hope that the U.S. merchant marine, if given a break, will not be driven off the seas.

Mr. Thayer's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. THAYER

1. The present break bulk ships on the North European run, fully loaded with deadweight cargo, could carry about 9,000 tons inbound and 9,000 tons outbound on a turn around of about 60 days (30 days in port total and 30 days at sea total) for a total yearly carriage of about 108,000 tons per year, per ship. The Lykes' Seabee, on the other hand, will carry 23,700 tons outbound and 23,700 inbound tons with a 30-day turn

around (4 days in port, 26 days at sea) for a total yearly carriage of 568,000 tons per year, per ship. Thus the cargo carried on one Seabee in a year is more than that carried on 5 modern break bulk ships in a year and at today's prices, these 5 vessels would cost approximately \$80 million as compared with the Seabee's cost of approximately \$37 million.

2. The operating costs, with regard to fuel, are about 4 times higher than the conventional break bulk vessel, which, in this particular case would represent a savings of about 20% when comparing the Seabee with 5 conventional vessels. With regard to crew costs, it is recognized that the crew costs for a single Seabee, of necessity, must be considerably lower than the crew cost for 5 ships.

3. Other fixed costs such as hull insurance, P&I insurance and the like, of necessity, will be lower for the single \$37 million investment than they will for the 5 ships, totaling some \$80 million.

4. Charges, such as pilotage, tow boat and tug boat charges will be considerably reduced on the Seabee, since we are comparing 12 round trips a year for the barge carrier as compared with 30 round trips a year for its 5 equivalent break bulk vessels.

5. Port charges can be reduced considerably if the vessel does not tie up to a dock in the port proper, but rather loads and discharges its barges in an area outside the port.

Finally, we hope we have demonstrated the Lykes idea of a new system, and I must repeat this word system, not ship method of transportation. A system which is compatible and can be easily integrated with existing systems such as roll-on/roll-off, containerization and river transportation; the concept which reaches far into the interior of the United States; into areas where ocean transportation has previously been unknown. We have nothing but enthusiasm with this new idea and we hope that in some small way it will help to bring back the superiority of the American seagoing transportation system which was once the envy of all the world.

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION COMMENDS OCCIDENTAL LIFE OF CALIFORNIA FOR PROGRESS IN IMPROVING MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission citing Occidental Life of California for showing "real progress in improving minority employment."

This kind of commendation is certainly an encouraging example of how private enterprise initiative can help our Nation overcome patterns of discrimination and lack of equal job opportunity now existing for many of our citizens who are members of minority groups.

Occidental Life has also been commended for its record of minority utilization by the Compliance Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as by EEOC Commissioners Clifford Alexander and Vicente Ximenes during the Commission's Los Angeles field hearings held earlier this year.

Better than 41 percent of Occidental's

employees are listed as being from the minority sectors of Los Angeles. This includes 19 percent Spanish-surnamed, 15 percent Negro, and 6 percent oriental. These employees comprise 53 percent of the California insurance firm's clerical work force, over 23 percent of its technical force, nearly 20 percent of its professionals, and over 4 percent of its officials and managers.

The text of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's statement, correcting an earlier EEOC news release which had been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is as follows:

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission today stated: A news release from EEOC, concerning the Commission's public hearings in Los Angeles, inadvertently included Occidental Life of California in a list of companies showing a "pattern of underemployment of minorities."

Occidental Life should not have been included in an undifferentiated listing of employers since it shows real progress in improving minority employment patterns.

THE MASON-DIXON LINE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Mason-Dixon Line is, perhaps, one of the most famous boundaries in the United States because of its historic significance. It has been mentioned in songs and novels over the years and is very often referred to in articles in the daily press as well as in private conversation.

Yet, notwithstanding the fact that the existence of this line is well known, comparatively few persons know its exact location as the boundary between the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania on the north and between Maryland and Delaware on the east. Thus, all of Maryland is south of this line which has existed for over 200 years.

The "Free State" of Maryland publishes a truly beautiful and informative magazine which proudly bears the name of our State as the name of this periodical. In its spring 1969 issue an excellent article appeared about the Mason-Dixon Line which sheds considerable light on the origin and history of the border or divisions between the North and the South. Knowing of the general interest of my colleagues in the Congress and of the people in this subject, I insert this article entitled "A Hard Line To Follow" at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A HARD LINE TO FOLLOW

(By Jesse F. Garber)

Most Marylanders realize the Mason-Dixon Line is a ridgepole across the State, providing a boundary with Pennsylvania and Delaware. And most Marylanders recall the Line bears the names of two English astronomers and surveyors who laid out the boundary to settle the rival claims of the Penns and the Calverts. But few people realize how today's maps might look had the claims of either Quaker or Cavalier been fully sustained.

The problem developed because those involved had limited knowledge of American geography as well as longitude and latitude.

The scene was set in 1606 when King James I granted the London Company, New World lands bounded by four degrees of latitude, from the 34th to 38th parallel. At the same time, he gave the Plymouth Company, territory from the 41st to 45th parallel. The three degrees in between the New England and Virginia settlements remained neutral or common territory.

It didn't stay that way long. In 1632, Charles I granted Lord Baltimore the lands that, "... lieeth under the Fortieth Degree of North Latitude ... And all the Tract of that Land ... passing from the Delaware Bay in a right line, by the degree aforesaid, unto the true Meridian of the first fountain of the River of Pattowmack ..."

While the early Maryland settlers were busy "developing" their land, William Penn, also interested in land development, petitioned the King for land north of Maryland. Lord Baltimore and Penn exchanged views on a common boundary and agreed that the Susquehanna Fort should be the northern boundary of the Maryland province. But for some unknown reason Penn's actual grant failed to include this. It stated the southern boundary would be established, "by a circle drawne at twelve miles distance from New Castle Northwards, and Westwards unto the beginning of the fortieth degree of Northern Latitude; and then by a streight line Westwards, to the limitt of Longitude mentioned. ..."

Two difficulties immediately developed. First, it is impossible to draw the described circle and have it reach the 40th degree of latitude. There was also the question of just what is a degree of latitude. Apparently, it was not an imaginary line as we think of it, but a 69½ mile wide band between two latitudes. As far as Lord Baltimore's charter was concerned this caused no problem. It indicated the lands lying under the 40th parallel were his. But Mr. Penn preferred to interpret his charter as giving him the lands north of the 39th.

The issue was further confused when it was found that the map in use was in error. The 40th parallel actually belonged about 12 miles farther north, placing it in the vicinity of the site of Philadelphia. The two sides tried to resolve their differences through a series of meetings. The more they met, the more the situation deteriorated. Penn informed some citizens in Maryland's Cecil and Baltimore counties that they belonged to Pennsylvania and should no longer pay taxes to Maryland. In return Lord Baltimore ordered the residents of Marcus Hook to stop paying taxes to Penn. Something of a standoff developed.

To protect their interests, both proprietors encouraged the settlement of German farmers in the disputed border regions, for they had the reputation of "staying put" and would help establish land claims.

The Quaker Penns were particularly successful in encouraging settlement of Germans in the border area and two leading Maryland partisans tried to disperse them.

Capt. John Charlton, in the service of Lord Baltimore, carried out the eviction of 52 German settlers from what is now a section of York County in southern Pennsylvania. Although the group had settled under Maryland tenure, having been given transportation and grants of land, they renounced Maryland authority in 1736 and declared they belonged to Pennsylvania. They were evicted and Captain Charlton gained control of their property.

A more active Maryland partisan was Col. Thomas Cresap, who settled on the west bank of the Susquehanna River in 1732 and two years later tried to "annex" the land of a neighbor. When his German neighbors renounced Maryland authority, Cresap took an active part in trying to reclaim their lands for Maryland. His York County home became a fort and rallying point for Maryland of-

ficials who sought to enforce their laws and to collect Maryland taxes.

Eventually Colonel Cresap was arrested by a Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, sheriff's posse and imprisoned in Philadelphia. There he maddened his captors by praising Philadelphia as the fairest city "in all of Maryland."

A Maryland delegation demanded his release and finally his plight was referred to the King who ordered his freedom.

Confusion over the actual proprietor caused numerous other contentions in the disputed territory.

When tenants refused to pay rents or taxes, sheriffs and armed posses tried to enforce the "law," which often resulted in bloodshed, reprisals, burning of homesteads and all the incidents of border warfare. This state of hostility sometimes caused incidents involving the Indians, and probably contributed in some measure to excesses of the French and Indian War.

Possibly it is only coincidence, but the establishment of the Mason-Dixon Line generally coincided with the end of the Indian disputes.

The Marylanders called the Pennsylvanians "quaking cowards," acknowledging Penn's pacifist Quaker religion, and the Pennsylvanians called their southern neighbors "hominly gentry," mocking the titles of the successive Lords Baltimore.

While all this was going on, Penn gave his attention to another aspect of the problem. Suspecting his colony might not have an outlet to the sea, he persuaded his friend, the Duke of York, to grant him land on the west shore of the Delaware River.

The Duke had taken the land from the Dutch in 1674 and appeared to have title. Lord Baltimore had tried to establish control over the area by encouraging settlement, but with little success.

This was disquieting to Lord Baltimore, for in this case personal friendship counted for more than royal ties. With the Duke of York about to become King of England, the Calvert claim to Delaware didn't appear too strong.

Eventually Penn and Lord Baltimore met at New Castle. Baltimore insisted on the 40th parallel as his northern boundary and Penn offered to buy land to give his province an outlet to the Chesapeake, but was rebuffed.

The dispute was referred to the Board of Trade and Royal Plantations. Their 1685 decision appeared to fix Maryland's northern boundary as the 40th parallel and split the Eastern Shore area that was under question.

Under King William III both proprietors "lost" their colonies, which were restored later to their heirs, who revived the boundary disputes.

Eventually, given a royal shove to adjust their differences, the proprietors agreed on a temporary line in 1732. The agreement provided for a line due west from Fenwick Island to the midpoint of the peninsula from which another line would run tangent to a circle 12 miles from New Castle and a meridian from the tangent point would run due north to a point on the parallel lying 15 miles south of Philadelphia. This agreement would divide the upper part of the peninsula between Chesapeake and Delaware bays, giving the Penns the eastern half which later became Delaware. The agreement also fixed the east-west boundary on the parallel 15 miles south of Philadelphia and disallowed Cresap's old claim that Philadelphia was in Maryland.

The commissioners appointed to establish the line couldn't agree on the center or size of the New Castle circle. Instead of resolving the matter they signed a statement to the effect that they could not reach an agreement.

The King decided to do what the commissioners could not and ordered a line established that was very close to the 1732 agreement. Neither side was satisfied and both

pushed the Crown for a more beneficial decision.

Part of the problem was resolved when it was decreed that the New Castle circle with a radius of 12 miles would have its center in the town.

After more disagreements, the commissioners accepted the line run from Fenwick Island to Chesapeake Bay and fixed its midpoint in 1760. They then attempted to establish the line from the midpoint to the New Castle circle. After making and correcting several errors they were about to complete the tangent line when both sides agreed to bring in more competent personnel.

Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon were hired to run the actual line and arrived in late 1763 to make preparations for the survey, which began in early 1764.

Both men were uniquely qualified for their task. Each was a trainee of the Astronomers Royal of the Greenwich Observatory.

In 1761, just prior to coming to America, they had been sent by the Royal Society to sail to Sumatra in the Pacific Ocean to measure the transit of the planet Venus across the disc of the Sun. Their vessel was running behind schedule so they stopped at Cape Town to make their astronomical observations.

Shortly after returning to England they were engaged by the proprietors of the two colonies. Their work continued until early 1768 and included surveying, cutting brush and timber to clear a 24-foot vista for the monument stones, resurveying the transpeninsular and tangent lines and negotiating with the Indians for permission to continue westward from the Cumberland Valley.

The proprietors shared the \$75,000 cost of the boundary operation but had only a few years to enjoy the fruits of peace brought about by the settlement. Seven years after the boundary was established the Revolutionary war broke and the principle of ownership by royal grant was set aside.

Although the Mason-Dixon Line is called a compromise by most historians, it appears most of the compromising was done by the Marylanders and the Penns came out ahead.

One of the more moderate views expressed by a Maryland partisan came from Colonel Cresap who wrote, "The Lords Baltimore in their disputes with the Penns ... had long and deep heads to contend with and did not get their full rights."

When the boundary was settled the disputes were forgotten, only to reappear when the Mason-Dixon Line became the freedom boundary sought by fleeing slaves.

Although slaves were sold in Franklin County, Pennsylvania as late as 1828 many Pennsylvanians offered haven to escapees on the Underground Railroad. At the same time many Marylanders were active as slave catchers.

It is interesting to speculate on the course of the Civil War had the boundary line been shifted 19 miles to the north. Chambersburg, in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, might have been spared its 1864 firing by the Confederates since it was burned in retaliation for Union burnings in Virginia.

It's doubtful the Battle of Gettysburg would have been fought on southern soil for General Lee sought to make a stand in the North.

For most people today, the line belongs to history even though it still exists. Since private property blocks access to most portions, few people have ever seen a Mason-Dixon marker, which may not be such a terrible thing since it has served to protect the markers from vandalism. Not all have escaped damage, however. Some are chipped or worn by the elements. Others are broken off, buried in land fills or submerged behind dams.

Despite its present condition or true historical significance, the Mason-Dixon Line will surely remain as an artificial division as long as writers refer to the North and the South.

MR. NIXON'S FIRST 6 MONTHS

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an evaluation of the first 6 months of the Nixon administration which appeared recently in the editorial column of the *Standard-Times* of New Bedford, Mass.

This perceptive newspaper points out that the President has focused his attention on foreign affairs during his first 6 months in office, and I think we all must agree that the results have been promising. Mr. Nixon has renewed our ties with our European allies, he has recently returned from a successful tour of Asia, and most importantly, he has made significant progress toward ending the war in Vietnam.

On the domestic front, the paper points out that the administration is making progress in the battle against inflation—and has recommended a revolutionary approach to public assistance. While there is much more that must be done before our domestic problems are brought under control, Mr. Nixon has succeeded in restoring the confidence of the American people in the Presidency. One cannot help but feel that Mr. Nixon will accomplish a great deal if the pattern of his first 6 months continues.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

MR. NIXON'S FIRST 6 MONTHS

In his inaugural, President Nixon promised a low-key, low volume administration aspiring to modest managerial competence, and at the end of his first six months in office, this is approximately the image that has emerged.

Opponents criticize him for indecision; proponents praise his cautious deliberation and pragmatism. Meanwhile, polls show the President's popularity has increased greatly since his hair's-breath election, in part because this summer is cooler, and shorter than last.

Instead of violence in the streets, Apollo 11's breath-taking success has captured Page 1, boosted American pride, and generated new talk of better understanding on earth.

Mr. Nixon's global tour, enhanced by the U.S. moon-landing, was a personal success, no matter whether it produces much or little. His receptions were enthusiastic; his manner vigorous; his remarks temperate, and the aura of the trip was such as to make Americans—who have been much given to self-criticism in recent years—think somewhat better of themselves.

His administration is not exciting, bold, or daring, nor has it negotiated impressively with the opposition Congress. If prolonged, this might be harmful; yet to this moment, it has produced a pause that many Americans find welcome in the wake of a several-year period of escalating war, spiraling inflation, assassination, world tension, and unparalleled domestic friction.

Clearly, the President has established two top priorities—ending the war in Vietnam, and curbing inflation.

With regard to the first, he has brought about the withdrawal of some U.S. troops, has lowered intensity of the war effort, and prodded Saigon into a position of greater political flexibility, all of which ought to help the peace efforts in Paris.

His efforts to make the dollar worth more have included a federal budget reduction, tighter watch on government spending practices, limited extension of the surtax, and a serious effort to prune unnecessary military and space programs, as well as to halt Pentagon cost overruns and blank-check weapon buying.

His administration, at least insofar as its first six months have not contributed to massive increases in federal spending, can also take certain pride in announcing the first budget surplus since 1960.

The President thus far has demonstrated more boldness and initiative in foreign affairs than in home affairs.

He has called for a revitalization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; delineated a new Asia policy that tells Asians we will not abandon them, but they must help themselves; indicated he desires to bring Communist China into the family of nations, and moved toward accommodation with the Soviet Union that would seek a strategic arms race curb and development of machinery to control crises involving the superpowers.

To some degree, as yet not clear to the general public, these efforts have won friendly signals from Moscow, Peking, Europe, and

perhaps even Hanoi. The Soviets especially seem to understand and to accept Mr. Nixon as a practical politician.

The President seems to be thinking about a foreign policy that will reflect the long-range view and, in the words of Democratic Majority Leader Mansfield, insure that we do "not become captive to the shifts and turns of the moment." Insofar as this will help us to avoid crises such as Cuba and Vietnam, the American public undoubtedly hopes he succeeds.

His home front efforts have been principally in the direction of assessing and reorganizing existing projects. It may be that his hesitancy in moving forward with urban action, job training and health programs stems from two factors: (a) The need of overhauling Great Society programs that failed to help the poor because of loose administration and inadequate planning, and (b) We do not yet know how much halting inflation will cost in unemployment and this is certainly important to any new social welfare program.

He has made mistakes at home, in our view, among them calling for antiballistic missile deployment; permitting a more benign attitude toward the South in civil rights law enforcement; rejected Dr. John H. Knowles as assistant HEW secretary; blocking the nomination of Franklin A. Long as head of the National Science Foundation—an error Mr. Nixon admitted—and catering to party conservatives by finding a high-salaried job for Otto Otepka.

The President has not yet done much to heal divisions among Americans, an effort to which he is pledged. While moderates and liberals within his administration struggle for dominance, and it cannot be seen yet who is winning, restive liberals believe we must have a rapid overhaul of national priorities to avoid major domestic upheaval and racial conflict.

Time undoubtedly will add substance to their case; at the moment, most Americans appear to accept the fact that halting the Vietnam war and stopping the inflation spiral will take more undivided presidential time. We agree.

Eventually, Mr. Nixon must do something more about the fact that the middle class of Americans feels overtaxed and the poor classes feel neglected.

At the moment, he may be accepting Jefferson's advice that "great innovations should not be forced on slender majorities," and a majority larger than that which elected him seems willing to go along with the President's interpretation of his mandate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 3, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake."—I Peter 2: 13.

Accept our thanks, O God, for all that this land has given us. Realizing that Thou has provided sufficient for the needs of the human family, help us to do our part that all may share in this abundance and none go hungry or be enslaved. Keep us aware of all who are in need, near and far.

We thank Thee for the reign of law established among us by Thy faithful servants. Lead those who now have responsibility for making and enforcing laws that we with Thy help might make

it safely through the troubled waters of our time.

Help us by our thoughts, words, and actions to extend reverence for the laws that will bring a united society and a world of peace.

Our prayer is in the name of Thee, our Lord, to whom we yield final obedience. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 13, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

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

S. 40. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the operation of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming, for fishery conservation;

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.";