

By Mr. SCOTT:
H.R. 13706. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend by one year the period in which certain guaranty and insurance entitlement may be used by World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:
H.R. 13707. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:
H.R. 13708. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLAY:
H.J. Res. 890. A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:
H.J. Res. 891. A resolution designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ABBITT:
H. Con. Res. 327. A resolution protesting the treatment of American servicemen held prisoner by the Government of North Viet-

nam and backing the administration in its efforts on behalf of these servicemen held captive by the North Vietnamese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:
H. Con. Res. 328. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. Res. 537. A resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DADDARIO:
H.R. 13709. A bill for the relief of Francine Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:
H.R. 13710. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Taormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:
H.R. 13711. A bill for the relief of Dr. Er-

nesto Tanguilig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:
H.R. 13712. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Pellicano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

230. By Mr. COUGHLIN: Petition of resolution of the council of the city of Philadelphia regarding right of farm workers to bargain collectively; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

231. By Mr. COUGHLIN: Petition of resolution of Township of Lower Merion, Montgomery County, Pa., regarding tax status of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

232. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to observation of the birthday of M. K. Gandhi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Marshall Chamber of Commerce, Marshall, Tex., et al., relative to the unsolicited mailing of pornographic literature; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TELEPHONE CONSUMERS NEED ADVOCATE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Florida consumers are dissatisfied with the General Telephone Co. of Florida. The Florida Public Service Commission is holding hearings regarding the company's rates and service, and the public is responding in large numbers to voice its complaints on the subject. But, as the St. Petersburg Independent aptly points out, there exists no public advocate to represent the interests of the people:

Only one side has attorneys. Only one side has access to the records. Only one side is able to produce reams of statistics to back up its arguments.

The utility has a built-in advantage for its side of the case. Having just participated in hearings on S. 607, a measure which would provide for the service of a Utility Consumers' Counsel in just such an instance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this pertinent editorial from the St. Petersburg Independent of July 31.

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

GENTEL REAPS HARVEST OF ILL WILL

We hope General Telephone Co. of Florida and the Public Service Commission (PSC) are learning the lessons being taught at a series of public hearings in the Tampa Bay area.

The lessons are being driven home with the authority of a schoolmaster with a long ruler in his hand.

The lesson for General Telephone is that inadequate service, unkept promises and high rates are the basic ingredients for a revolt of telephone users.

Both in Tampa and St. Petersburg, large crowds have turned out to tell of the problems they have had with phone service. These people were only those who had detailed information of what they considered inadequate services and who were anxious to tell the PSC about it. How many more people are dissatisfied but simply could or would not attend the hearings is not known.

The lessons for the PSC is that there is indeed a general dissatisfaction with telephone service in Tampa and St. Petersburg, and that the people, given a fair opportunity to air their complaints, are only too happy to tell commissioners what is wrong.

Such large crowds have turned out for these hearings and so many people are anxious to be heard that it is conceivable the commissioners may never be able to complete the hearings if the present format of allowing the public to be heard first is continued.

The hearings have not been noted for their decorum and formality. At times they have resembled ancient Roman circuses with the audience cheering and clapping each time a witness made a thrust at the company.

This points up the need for a public advocate. The rules of the commission for such hearings are the same as those of the Circuit Court.

But only one side has attorneys. Only one side has access to the records. Only one side is able to produce reams of statistics to back up its arguments.

Attorneys for GenTel will have the opportunity to cross examine opposing witnesses, which will create a hardship on many of them since they will have to miss another day's work in order to appear. But who will have the opportunity to cross examine telephone company executives? Does every member of the complaining public have this right?

A public advocate could do a great deal to simplify the proceedings by screening witnesses and vigorously contesting evidence presented by the utility.

It must now be evident to both GenTel and the PSC that telephone subscribers in this area are angry and dissatisfied.

They know they are paying high prices for service inferior to that in almost all areas of the country.

Time simply has caught up with General Telephone Co. of Florida. The people who are forced to buy their service have had enough.

In 1971, the St. Petersburg freeholders will vote on renewing the company's franchise in the city. Company officials must now be looking forward to that date with concern for it is obvious the opposition is beginning to jell.

The company must stand on its record. It may be too late for GenTel to build a record that will meet public acceptance.

The public, at last, is getting the message across.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE GETS HIGH PRIORITY IN JACKSONVILLE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, John M. Waters, Jr., director of public safety, Jacksonville, Fla., recently addressed the third International Congress on Medical and Related Aspects of Motor Vehicle Accidents, and his address was reported in the August 1969 edition of Traffic Safety. This dedicated public official has in his remarks set out the realistic program which Jacksonville has inaugurated to provide quick, efficient services for sick and injured. The program may well serve as a model for other large cities; and therefore, I include here the article as it appeared in Traffic Safety:

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE GETS HIGH PRIORITY IN JACKSONVILLE

Providing emergency medical services is a growing problem in all areas of the world in which the use of the automobile is increasing. It is a complicated problem in the large cities, where heavy traffic often impedes the transfer of the injured from the scene of the accident to a treatment center.

There are several fundamental differences between the problem in this country and that facing our friends in some other countries.

First, we have an acute shortage of physicians and nurses, and little prospect of remedying this matter in the foreseeable future. The shortage is not merely in numbers but in capabilities, for specialization has greatly reduced the percentage of physicians capable of coping with severe trauma or acute medical episodes outside their specialty. Therefore, we will rarely find a physician treating an accident patient outside the hospital.

Next, we must realize the size of our country, and the millions of miles of roads in it. What might be a practical alerting system on the autobahn between Hamburg and Kiel would provide prohibitively expensive for the highway of more than 1,000 miles between Chicago and Denver. Any suggested general highway improvements are deterred by the very massiveness of the system and the consequent costs of improvements.

Fortunately, our telephone system is widespread and in nearly all cases efficient, and along most roads, we can find homes and places of business with phones. In a city, it is highly improbable that a crash could occur without someone being aware of it and phoning in.

Lastly, our problem is complicated by the number of cars, now in excess of 100 million and increasing steadily. It has become a deadly race between our efforts to reduce the accident rates and the increasing exposure that raises the number of deaths and injuries.

While there are some basic differences between our situation and that of other countries, there are also mutual problems. I can testify from a recent trip to Europe that their cities have traffic congestion just as we do, though it seldom approaches anywhere in the world what exists in New York City. Likewise, I imagine that cities everywhere are faced with the problems of increasing costs without a comparable increase in tax revenues. Our American cities are caught in what seems to be almost an insolvable dilemma as to how to provide all the services required without bankrupting the taxpayer.

Oddly enough, until less than five years ago, there was no concerted national effort to do much about automobile accidents, which by then were claiming 50,000 dead yearly. In sharp contrast, we, probably to a greater degree than any other nation, have for over 100 years maintained an extensive rescue system for ships at sea, and in later years for aircraft. Cost has not been a deterrent to this complex and efficient rescue system; and, although only 3,000 non-combat people were lost at sea and in the air in our areas of responsibility in the last year recorded, the Coast Guard incurred a cost of \$34,000 for every seaman and airman saved, while the Air Force in Viet Nam paid out \$48,000 per save. While cheap in terms of human life, the highway victim in comparison had little or nothing spent to rescue him, and thousands died needlessly. It often became literally true that a citizen could be safer on a boat sinking 20 miles at sea than he could in a wreck in the middle of one of our largest cities.

As an example, several years ago a tanker fire occurred in New York harbor. The injured were evacuated in less than 10 minutes by Coast Guard helicopters from the ship. Yet a pedestrian, struck by an automobile in the incurring confusion, could not be reached by an ambulance for nearly 45 minutes due to the traffic congestion.

The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 was a sweeping one, aimed at all facets of highway safety. One of them was the medical care and transportation of those injured on the highway. In early 1967, I was loaned from the Coast Guard, where I had been chief of the search and rescue division, to the newly

created National Highway Safety Bureau (NHSB) to see if the methods and techniques of our military system could be applied to our highway problem at the state and city level. We made a great deal of progress in the next 18 months, initiated considerable research and passed out volumes of guidance to the states. In the summer of 1968, I elected to retire from the military, left the NHSB and became director of public safety of Jacksonville, Fla. In this position, I think I am well situated to evaluate the problem from both sides of the hill, compare theory with practice and report on our progress in emergency medical services in a dynamic and forward looking city. Some of our "Ivory Tower" thinking from Washington has been battered a bit, but on the whole, I think we may develop a system which, though not ideal, will be unsurpassed in this country.

At the very outset I ran into realism with a jolt, and the jolt was produced by one main factor—money. We, like every major city in this country, are fighting a desperate rearguard action against rising costs. Most cities are retreating; I like to think that we are holding our own, and in at least one sector, emergency medical services (EMS), are advancing on a fairly broad front. In order to do so, we have had to take a realistic approach, discard the merely desirable and stick to the essentials. This involved not only some hard-nosed management decisions, but a quick separation of facts from myths.

Jacksonville is a city unique in many ways, the most notable being the recent "consolidation" of the City of Jacksonville and Duval County, in which the county was abolished, the city limits extended to the county line and several sets of duplicating governments replaced by one. Now we have one mayor, one police department, one fire department and a unified chain of command. The creation of one governmental unity to replace many has not only greatly simplified government and avoided duplication and confusion but has made us into the largest city in the world geographically, with an area of 848 square miles and a population of 525,000 people. It consists of dense urban areas, rural terrain, rivers and ocean, express highways and city streets. The city contains three large military bases and two colleges, with a third university building. The implication of this large group of over 50,000 sailors and students for the auto accident rate is clear. Jacksonville serves as the gateway to the Florida vacationland for the entire East Coast and much of the Midwest, and out-of-state transient traffic is very heavy. As a resort, the city and its beaches draw hundreds of thousands in the summer months. A large retired population contributes to the medical problems. More than 125,000 of the city's population are medically indigent.

In 1967, faced with inadequate ambulance service provided mostly by morticians, the city took over emergency ambulance services. The fire department was directed to operate it, and a federal grant was obtained to assist in purchasing 10 ambulances and operating them for the first year. This has resulted in largely solving the emergency ambulance problem in Jacksonville, and has been done at a considerable lower cost than in most other cities of similar size. With all 10 ambulances deployed, 90 per cent of the citizens of Jacksonville are within a seven-minute response time of quality ambulance service.

The National Highway Safety Bureau has stated that an efficient highway EMS system (outside the hospital) consists of communications, emergency care at the scene, transportation and command and control. One more item should have been included here—the physician and hospital team, and their role in definitive medical care. This omission was a calculated policy of the NHSB to avoid any implication that the government was entering further into the world of pro-

fessional medicine. Yet, we have major problems in our hospitals, and they must be solved before we can have an efficient emergency medical services system.

Communications. The matter of communications in a city EMS system is no great mystery. The simple fact is that most calls for help come by phone into our fire department or police operations centers, and the fire center promptly dispatches an ambulance. Our problem is greatly simplified since we went into a consolidated form of government, abolishing the county and small suburbs. All dispatching is done by one city fire department operations center. It is silly to set up a special center to handle medical calls only. The already established centers in any city, whether they be police or fire, can do a highly effective job of dispatching; after all, that is their 24-hour job. We found that most of our citizens did not know emergency telephone numbers and usually called the telephone operator for help. Delays sometimes resulted. To remedy this, we are sending out in our regular city electrical billings two gummed labels containing the number for fire and ambulance (same), police and suicide control. We are urging that these be stuck on each phone in every home and business. This will give our citizens direct dialing service to the people who can help. In July, 1970, we are installing the "911" universal emergency number, but this does not invalidate the stickers on the phones; in fact, by dialing the number on the sticker, you avoid the screening switchboard used by the "911" number.

We have replaced all the old fire alarm pull boxes with emergency telephones. In our main city area, they are located on every other corner. One simply opens the box picks up the phone, and talks directly to the fire operations center. A large wall chart in the center shows a light where the street phone is in use, so our men know the location immediately. When called on these phones, we can dispatch police, firemen, ambulances or auto repairmen to the caller. An interesting phenomena is that our fire false alarm rate has dropped from 90 per cent to less than 5 per cent since we installed these phones. People apparently cannot lie well over a phone while they are being recorded on tape. An equally great advantage is that people can tell us in advance what their trouble is. In the old pull box days, a fire alarm pulled in mid-city required us to dispatch a full assignment of fire equipment adequate to deal with a large building fire, even though the trouble may have been only an auto with ignition wires afire. Now, knowing the trouble in advance, we can respond appropriately. We intend to add more of these street emergency phones, primarily in our ghetto areas, where most homes do not have phones, and one on the corner will provide emergency communications for the whole neighborhood in time of trouble. We have these emergency phones at every cutoff, from the main expressways. The highway department is putting up signs on the highways pointing out that the emergency phones are at the exits. Furthermore, we have placed large signs over each such phone to let people know they are for public use. Many people thought they were either the old pull type fire alarms, or were for use of police and firemen only.

The placing of emergency telephones at one mile intervals along the highways is a thing we cannot financially afford in this country. I have seen this arrangement on European highways; but, as I pointed out in the beginning, we have many more miles of road. In our city, we have placed emergency phones at the exits from the major express highways and are placing signs on the highways pointing out their locations. Actually, in most cases within the city, crashes are generally accompanied by traffic congestion, and it is amazing how sensitive the people living along the road are to this. We quickly hear by phone from citizens liv-

ing nearby and dispatch police cars and ambulances. So I don't worry too much about delays in alerting on our highways in Jacksonville.

In a couple of places, notably on Highway 295 around the Maryland area of Washington, D.C., they have placed, at one-mile intervals, pushbutton boxes, which are cheaper to install than telephones. One can push buttons marked "Police," "Service," or "Fire," and wait until the radio signal is received at a center and a patrol car is dispatched. In practice, the motorists, many of whom merely wish information, will not wait, and over 30 percent of calls are false alarms. The cost in patrol cars running out to investigate is high, and the frustrations of the waiting motorists immeasurable. This is a system that was fine in theory but fell flat in actual application. It has all the drawbacks of the old fire-pull alarm system, which is 50 years behind the new street phone alarm system we are using in Jacksonville.

There has also been a great deal of talk about use of radios in taxicabs, fleet trucks and municipal equipment to broadcast a radio alert in case of wrecks or other trouble. The Motorola Co. sponsored one such program called Community Radio Watch, and we participated in Jacksonville. The results have been mediocre, and the real need for such an organization is doubtful. People traveling with two-way radios in their vehicles will radio in to their own dispatching center of their own free will if they see something, though the chance that a radio vehicle will come along when needed is fairly remote. In eight months, though my car is radio equipped, I have reported one wreck and several stalled motorists who had not been previously reported. With a rising crime rate, and a limited police force, we feel our radio patrol cars are more needed in the high-crime-incidence areas than on the highways.

As a result, nearly all alerting is going to be by phone with only a very small minority of cases by radio.

Dispatching. Let me again stress that in a large city, ambulance dispatching should be handled by the fire or police department operations center, depending on which is providing the service. Even where municipal ambulances are not provided, and private ambulances are used, they should be dispatched for emergency calls by the city center. I favor the fire department operations center doing it, because they don't have as many total calls daily as do the police. The use of private ambulances on routine patient transfer calls is no real concern of ours. However, if it is an emergency run, we either dispatch the private ambulance from the fire operations center, or they inform us if they have been called by a private party. The fire department is responsible for emergency ambulance service, but we may need backup from private operators on occasion.

When an ambulance is dispatched, all times are kept on a running card punched by a time machine. All conversations, radio and telephone, are recorded on 24-hour tapes. The center has direct "red phone" connections with every hospital emergency room in the city and can quickly determine load condition and readiness to receive patients. In serious cases, we alert the receiving hospital while the ambulance is still outbound, following this up with an estimated time of arrival when received. All of our ambulances have two-way radio communications, not only with the operations center, but with the emergency rooms of all the hospitals. This was an easily solved problem. We found that the hospitals all had a civil defense radio in each emergency room. We, therefore, put the civil defense frequency crystal on one channel in all of our ambulance radios, and we were in business. We perform a radio check with very hospital at a set time each morning, then the volume of the radio in the emergency room is turned all the way down and the set left on. When an ambulance op-

erator wishes to talk with the emergency room, he asks center, which tells the emergency room by "red phone." "Call rescue seven." The emergency room nurse then merely turns up the radio volume and calls to establish communication. We have actually had little use for this, as our men usually know what to do in first aid, and center can relay needed information quickly to the emergency rooms. However, we expect the use of direct communications with the emergency room to pick up as our cardiac program progresses.

We feel that with our new \$600,000 fire operation center, our regular and emergency phone systems, and a flexible and efficient radio system, our communications and dispatching problems are solved. The proof of the matter is the satisfaction of our citizenry, and the average response time in the city area is less than five minutes from call until arrival of an ambulance. In remote areas where ambulance response time may be delayed, we dispatch a fire engine company to render first aid until the ambulance arrives.

I have mentioned that in area we are the largest city in the world, 848 square miles extending 37 miles east and west, and 33 miles north and south. To cover this large an area might seem an insurmountable problem with our resources. However, we have relatively light traffic as it is spread over such a large area, and the fast express highways allow our ambulances to travel at speeds up to 80 m.p.h., nearly as fast as a helicopter. As a result, one of our ambulances may be able to reach a patient 10 miles away faster than one in New York City could arrive at a scene one mile away.

Transportation. Our ambulances are not luxury jobs but practical cabins mounted on one-ton Chevrolet chassis. Complete with equipment, they run about \$12,500 each. Our last four are in full conformance with the "Medical Requirements for Ambulance Design and Equipment" of the National Academy of Science, both as to vehicle and equipment; in fact, we have already exceeded the equipment requirements. From an economy viewpoint, these ambulances are winners. Not only are they cheaper initially than the large custom jobs, but every two or three years we simply insert a new chassis and have a new vehicle. We expect the cabin to last through three chassis. These ambulances have plenty of working space and ample stowage space for both medical and extrication equipment. Our ambulance personnel carry out all except heavy extrication. The primary drawback of this type ambulance is that it rides roughly on bad roads, and a fast run can be excruciatingly painful for a person with broken bones. In such cases, we return at a slow speed without lights or siren. In fact, 80 per cent of our return runs are made in this manner, for we emphasize treating and stabilizing the patient on scene and returning at a safe speed whenever possible. Outbound, we seldom have enough information to determine the seriousness of the case, and such runs are made with light and siren; we never forget, however, that running a red light still leaves us as the responsible party should an accident occur, and street intersections are crossed at reduced speeds.

Emergency Case. In Jacksonville we have a long and intensive training program for rescue ambulance personnel, and we have long tenure with little or no turnover. Without the latter, we could not afford the training. The firemen have good pay and exceptionally good working hours. To participate in the rescue program, a fireman must volunteer for the duty; have two years on the department with excellent record, and hold an American Red Cross Advanced First Aid card. He then passes through five stages of training:

Stage One: Review of advanced first aid procedures (20 hours);

Stage Two: Advanced procedures taught by 25 doctors (30 hours);

Stage Three: Extrication from autos, aircraft and trains (25 hours);

Stage Four: Hospital training in ER's, intensive care units, and OB (50 hours);

Stage Five: Hospital training in emergency cardiac care (231 hours).

This program is, we believe, the most advanced of any in the country. In the beginning, much of it was done in the men's off time. When this became burdensome and the men began seeking extra compensation, we began basing our ambulances at the hospitals, where training can be obtained on the job while the men are between calls. Our first trials of hospital basing have been an unqualified success, enthusiastically supported by both the medical staffs and the ambulance personnel. If there is one message I wish to give to anyone planning a similar program, it is to base your ambulances at hospitals, while at the same time keeping them under control of the operations center for dispatching. Our men sleep at some of the hospitals; at others, they are there during daylight hours, returning to the fire stations at night. The emergency room staffs have been surprised, not only at the ability of the ambulance personnel to help them in the emergency room, but at the rapidity with which the men absorb the training. In a city in which we have a severe shortage of doctors and nurses, the presence of two trained emergency medical technicians in the emergency room, when not on runs, has proved a boon. At the same time, our men are receiving excellent training, and I might add that this is only made possible by the enthusiastic cooperation of our fine doctors and nurses, and the strong support of our medical society.

At a recent meeting of the American College of Surgeons and of the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, it was recommended that this concept of the highly trained ambulance attendant be adopted. It was also recommended that the emergency medical technician be adopted as a full member of the medical team, and that appropriate job description and training courses be prepared. The training recommended was similar to that I have just outlined. It would appear that the training of these men and their acceptance as part of the professional team offers a partial solution to the acute shortage of nurses in our emergency rooms and intensive care units. Certainly, our Armed Forces hospital corpsmen carry out functions even in advance of that allowed nurses in some locations, and the emergency medical technician, with similar training and under supervision of a physician, could carry out many functions now required of physicians and nurses when not on ambulance runs.

As a result of this training, I have every confidence in the ability of these rescue ambulance personnel of the fire department to handle nearly any first aid situation. Twenty-nine babies have been delivered without mishap. I have accompanied our ambulances to attempted suicides, to acutely ill patients, heart attacks and many severe auto crashes. At these crashes, it is most satisfying to watch the men work. No one is moved until his airway is checked, he is splinted and bleeding has stopped and backboards have been inserted. Then, in the words of our chief of rescue, "We do not extricate a seriously injured victim, we disassemble the car around him." In most cases, the care at the scene is so complete that the trip to the hospital is at regular road speeds without siren or lights. Once at the hospital, the victims are kept on the special backboards until after x-ray, for x-ray will penetrate the material.

Hospital Emergency Departments. Surveys in a number of our states have indicated gross deficiencies in the emergency departments of many of our hospitals. Long delays in treatment of patients may be common, and

the quality of care poor. With an increasingly transient population, many of whom have no family doctor, the emergency room has become the focal point for an increasingly large number of patients, only a minority of whom are actual emergencies. This crowding aggravates an already poor situation, with the result that treatment in the emergency rooms of the nation's hospitals may often be as inept and as backward as is the majority of ambulance service. The need for reform is great. I will go a step further. In the very near future in some areas, highly trained emergency medical technicians manning rescue ambulances are going to be more proficient in doing their job of emergency care and transportation than are some hospital emergency departments in providing the definitive treatment with which they are charged. While we municipal officials are searching for ways to improve rescue, care and transportation outside the hospitals, the medical and hospital professionals needs to do some deep soul searching. I think that in our city we are progressing well here, but much still remains to be done, especially in obtaining sufficient physicians and nurses. One trend that is on the increase is the formation of groups of physicians devoted to emergency practice only. Such a group, consisting usually of four physicians alternating on eight hour watches, perform all emergency room services, turning the patient over to his regular doctor or to a specialist after emergency care is administered and the patient stabilized. This system insures the presence in the emergency room of a physician and relieves the rest of the hospital staff of having to rotate on duty in the emergency room.

Private Ambulances. In our city, we have a number of private ambulance services, including a number of funeral directors. For the most part, they are not interested in emergency service. Some funeral homes haul chronically ill patients to and from hospitals free, realizing that they will get the funeral business later. I see nothing wrong with the practice, especially when it involves indigents. Florida is one of the few states that has an ambulance law, but it is a weak one. We realize that our private ambulance operators can neither afford the salaries nor the equipment to render service comparable to that given by our fire department rescue service. Yet, if they are going to engage in emergency service at all, we must insist on minimum standards. A new city ambulance law is now pending before the city council, and I am confident that it will pass. It will be a major step forward in eliminating marginal and untrained operators, and we intend to enforce it strictly. Those remaining in the emergency business will do so under the supervision of the department of public safety and the health department.

Despite the widespread criticism of private ambulance service, I have seen a number of fine services, well managed, well trained and efficient. Private enterprise can give quality service if it has a franchise to eliminate destructive competition, a subsidy when required, and is under government inspection. However, for sophisticated treatment, such as we describe later for heart attack patients, few private ambulance companies can afford the equipment or retain the highly trained personnel required. Such procedures must be carried out in our cities by government. We regard emergency ambulance service in the same category as police and fire protection. In fact, we make more ambulance runs yearly than fire runs.

Costs. To operate 10 rescue ambulances, we require 66 men, a chief of the rescue branch, a training supervisor and a secretary. Personnel services, including fringe benefits and pensions, total \$595,481 yearly. Each private, for example, is paid \$8,357 yearly, including benefits. Commodities total \$22,986, and other direct costs about \$16,000. Each am-

bulance costs us \$63,447 per year to run, of which 94 per cent is for personnel. The predominance in personnel costs and the great disparity between public and private salaries are what separate private and public ambulance service. Yet, if we are to have quality, we must pay enough to get high type individuals and retain them. Ambulance service costs, like all medical costs, are skyrocketing. We are attempting to defray this in many ways. We charge \$17.50 per run, and are going to raise the fee to \$22.50, primarily to discourage needless calls. Our collection rate, which is running at about 40 per cent, must be raised, and we are looking for ways to do this. We are receiving a subsidy from the NHB of \$11,890 per ambulance, which helps defray expenses. Lastly, as the number of runs increases, the cost per run decreases. We estimate that by 1970, we will be making 13,000 emergency runs yearly. The cost breaks down as follows:

Cost per run-----	\$48 85
NHBS subsidy-----	9 15
Fee collected-----	9 00
Tax supported-----	30 70
Total -----	48 85

In summation, the total cost of operating a first rate emergency ambulance system in our city is 76 cents per capita.

Our figures are considerably below those given for government operated services in the NHB publication, *Economics of Highway Emergency Ambulance Services*, and well below those of most other cities of similar size. Most of this difference can be attributed to the difference in salary scales for firemen in southern cities as compared with those in the north. In my opinion, the NHB economic study, while generally an excellent one, errs on the high side in estimating costs of ambulance service and on the low side in estimating the number of ambulances required to service a certain number of persons. Almost certainly more ambulances are required to service the 525,000 people in our 850-square-mile city than would be needed for the same number of people in a city of 50 square miles. The number needed and the money the city can afford to devote to the service must vary with the peculiarities of each city.

Helicopters. Despite my continual protests, I have acquired a reputation over the past few years as the man who advocates replacing ground ambulances with helicopters. Nothing could be further from the truth. I see little use for helicopters in a dense urban area, or where adequate and efficient ground ambulance service is available. If a ground ambulance can reach a patient in 10 minutes, there is no need for a helicopter. On the other hand, I do see need for helicopters in remote or inaccessible areas and in transporting critically ill patients of all kinds from outlying community hospitals to major medical centers. To determine the feasibility of this (which the military has long ago determined for their people) for civilian use, I recommended in 1967 that arrangements be made for use of military helicopters from some 200 continental military bases to aid in severe civilian injury cases. Although the various military services were amiable, the proposal was bungled and mishandled by bureaucrats in Washington, with the result that finally only the commandant of the Coast Guard took action, issuing an order to his operational commanders to cooperate whenever possible with state authorities in aiding highway victims. In other cases, agreements have been made between local authorities and nearby military base commanders, though helicopters are in short supply due to the Viet Nam war.

No one doubts that the helicopter can do a superb job of medico evacuation. The problem is one of costs. We cannot justify a helicopter just to evacuate highway injured.

We can, however, in certain localities, use one economically (1,000 hours yearly or more) if we use it for highway rescue, sea and land rescue, police and highway patrol, apprehension of lawbreakers, riot control, accident investigation, cardiac and inter-hospital transport, fire control (both urban and forest), photo missions and administrative flying. These missions would be assigned on a priority basis, with rescue as top priority. Until we utilize the helicopter on such a basis, with firm central control, or unless we can obtain use of available military helicopters, I see little prospect of widespread and successful use of these machines in EMS.

Operation Heartbeat—Answer to the Greatest Threat. For the months I was with the NHB, my attention was devoted to the highway victim and, as a result, trauma. For 20 years before that in the Coast Guard, I had been concerned with aid to the distressed at sea and in the air. Naturally when I came to Jacksonville, it was with visions of starting up vigorous programs in these fields. But when I asked for the vital statistics for the past year, it caused a realignment of my thinking and a drastic change in perspective.

In 1968, in Jacksonville, 26 persons died in water accidents; 139 in traffic mishaps, and, far overshadowing these, 1,497 of heart disease. Not only was heart disease by far the greatest killer of Jacksonville citizens, but in EKG tests of 10,000 of our citizens made by the Heartmobile of the American Heart Society in February, 1969, one of every three of our citizens tested showed signs of cardiac abnormalities. The greatest single life threat to a citizen in Jacksonville today is not the criminal on the street, nor fire in the home, nor death on the highway, it is an acute myocardial infarction. We must consider the cardiovascular "accident" along with traffic accidents.

One cardiologist, in reflecting the prevalent attitude of physicians, recently stated:

"If I suspect a cardiac condition, I will have the patient meet me at the emergency room. If I went to the home, I simply wouldn't have the equipment with me to properly diagnose and treat him. I would have to transfer him to the emergency room anyway."

Logical as this reasoning is, it is cold comfort to the hundreds of thousands of people who will suffer heart attacks to realize that they must make it to a hospital on their own, or rely on an ambulance crew to get them there.

Nationally, due to the poor quality of ambulance services, not only can long delays in response be expected, but the attendants may be poorly trained and incapable of rendering meaningful help. In many cases, they will not have minimum equipment even by present lax standards.

That definitive treatment can be effectively given in the field and in ambulances has been proved in a number of locales, but to date it has been given by physicians and nurses. Belfast, Ireland; Waveney Hospital, North Ireland, and St. Vincent's in New York are among facilities reporting on this procedure. A number of other groups are planning or are experimenting with telemetry of EKG's from the field or ambulance in the hospital so that physicians in the hospital can read an EKG and recommend to the rescue crew further action. One report on telemetry estimates that of 16 patients DOA (dead on arrival) on whom telemetry readings were received, 11 may have been salvageable with proper therapy, which was not available. Waveney reports that of 95 heart attack patients transported, not a single death occurred in transport, due undoubtedly, in many cases, to the presence of proper equipment and trained medical personnel. In all of these cases, however, physicians with proper equipment were operating in a relatively small area. These conditions do not prevail in Jacksonville, where

we are faced with providing care to the largest city area in the world, and with little likelihood of physicians or nurses accompanying the emergency rescue ambulance.

The president of the medical society appointed an advisory committee of some of the city's leading cardiologists to work with us on this matter. A number of alternatives were explored by the committee. From these discussions, a plan was evolved to equip all of our 10 ambulances with necessary equipment and trained para-medical personnel to allow quick access to any place in the city in which one of our citizens suffers a heart attack. An early plan to employ two large cardiac ambulances staffed by physicians and nurses was abandoned when it became evident that the time required for two centrally located vehicles to reach the suburbs would be excessive, and that we could not provide properly qualified physicians for this service due to the acute shortage in the city. It was agreed that if more definitive treatment were to be given cardiac victims outside the hospital, it would have to be by our rescue personnel. They would require not only special equipment but, more importantly, special training. This proposal was presented to the executive committee of the county medical society, and after consultation with the American Medical Association, the executive committee has formally endorsed the program, contingent on proper training of the rescue personnel. The training syllabus and methods of training have now been developed by the cardiac advisory committee and planning is already well underway.

This concept is a bold one in medical care. Already, inquiries have been received from many parts of the country. To the more conservative who have doubts about the wisdom of the program, it is well to remember that only two or three years ago grave doubts were expressed as to the feasibility of utilizing nurses in intensive care units to administer treatment to heart patients. Now it is a commonly accepted practice, but its coming was expedited because of the shortage of physicians to carry out these functions. This same shortage makes it imperative that we expedite the training and equipping of our rescue personnel to deal with cardiac emergencies outside the hospital.

At this time, more than 50 of our rescue ambulance personnel are engaged in hospital training. The time required to fully train a man for this type of work is in excess of 200 hours, but it has already become evident that the high type of personnel we are utilizing quickly learn the procedures taught. No man will be allowed to perform any procedure until he has been thoroughly checked out and certified by medical professionals. The amount of responsibility placed on the rescue personnel will be greatly increased as their training progresses.

The extent of treatment will be determined by the patient's condition. In many cases, a cardiac victim can simply be transported to the nearest suitable hospital. In others, his condition may be such that an attempt to transport him would be fatal, and the rescue crew will carry out CPR and defibrillate when necessary. In addition, after consultation with a physician, by radio and telemetry, of EKG, they will administer drugs when directed by the physician. At this point, the rescue crewmen will basically be performing the same function in their portable intensive care (IC) unit, as does the nurse in the hospital IC unit.

The training of the personnel will require time and will be a continuing process. The equipment is being procured now. We believe the number of people saved will be considerable. If we can bring to the hospital, alive, every patient we take into the ambulance with a detectable pulse and breathing, our

program will be a great success. We believe this goal is attainable. We believe the chance is worth the \$51,000 of special equipment for our ambulances and special crew training involved. Compare the cost for this city of over half a million with a heart transplant cost of \$30,000. If we save only one person, the equipment will have been paid for.

In summary, hundreds of our citizens are going to suffer heart attacks outside hospitals, and the majority who fail to survive will not have medical help. Due to the shortage of doctors, and their inability to give definitive treatment without equipment and outside the hospital environment, doctors will not go to the scene of the attack. The initial treatment during the critical first hour is going to have to be given by properly equipped and trained emergency medical technicians, and the patient delivered alive to hospital intensive care units, where chance of survival is high. We feel that this is the pattern of the future, and we intend to pursue it vigorously.

Providing emergency care to a large city is a complex and never ending job, and we must be prepared for anything. We feel that our progress has been great. In addition to being known as the Bold New City of the South and an All-American City, we hope that Jacksonville will also become known as the safest place in the country to have an accident or a heart attack.

SOVIET SUPPORT OF GUERRILLA ACTIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent weeks various stories have appeared in the press saying that the Soviets no longer had any interest in promoting guerrilla style insurrections in Latin America. Similar statements have alleged that Cuba is no longer a base for subversion and some commentators even say that it is time to normalize relations with Cuba.

In my judgment, such statements are merely wishful thinking which do not accord with the determined campaign of subversion which is now being waged against the responsible governments of Latin America. The facts of the situation have been put forward in an article in the current Human Events by Mr. Paul Bethel, who has frequently appeared before Senate committees as an expert witness on Latin American affairs. Mr. Bethel's article cites dates and facts based upon newspaper reports and official intelligence sources of the Latin American government's concern. Mr. Bethel concludes:

(1) That the Communists are indeed behind terrorist and guerrilla attacks in Latin America; and (2) That the Soviet Union has both the policy and the plan to assault free nations of our hemisphere.

Mr. Bethel's article was obviously written before the recent kidnapping of Ambassador C. Burke Elbrick in Brazil. This kind of gangster activity is typical of the operations now being conducted in Latin America. It is remarkable that news reports say that the so-called 15 political prisoners for whom the Ambassador was held hostage are reported to be going to

Cuba from Mexico. I find it shocking that the news media continuously refers to these men as political prisoners as though they were members of a political opposition put in jail for their views. The facts do not seem to bear out this designation. One of those exchanged, for example, was arrested 6 months ago and charged with directing the machinegun assassination plotted against U.S. Capt. Charles R. Chandler in Sao Paulo. Others are identified Communist Party leaders and leaders of violent demonstrations.

Mr. Bethel's article, on the other hand, clearly cites the specifics about the pro-Soviet connection of revolutionary leaders throughout Latin America and his article deserves a careful reading by all those concerned with the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Liberals Call for U.S. Pull-Back in Latin America" from Human Events of September 13, 1969 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

LIBERALS CALL FOR U.S. PULL-BACK IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Mr. Paul Bethel)

In yet another assault on America's commitment against Communist aggression, a small but powerful group of people is proposing that the United States retire its military missions from Latin America and terminate military aid to our friends. Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) has used his Subcommittee on Latin America to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a very effective platform to propagate these views. A stream of liberals, many of whom served under President Kennedy, are willing and ready to oblige him—among them Ralph Dungan, ambassador to Chile 1964-67; David Bronheim, a former coordinator of the Alliance for Progress; and George Lodge, an assistant secretary of labor under Eisenhower and JFK.

Bronheim straight-facedly told the Church subcommittee: "Demonstrations and rebellions today in Latin America are not led by Communists nor encouraged by Russia." And further: "The Russians today do not have a policy for fomenting guerrilla war in Latin America, and, accordingly, rebels and demonstrators alike look on the local Moscow-line Communists as reactionaries." Bronheim, who directs the Ford Foundation-financed Center for Inter-American Relations in New York, stressed again: "My point is simply the insurgency threat today is not from the Communists." Period.

Ralph Dungan, who is largely responsible for U.S. support of Chile's Christian Democrats despite their steady march toward Marxism, had this to say: "The principal threat to the United States in Latin America is not communism but a form of Nasserism which tends to grow in Latin American republics." (This may be considered a variation on the "agrarian reformer" theme used in the 1940s to describe Mao Tse-tung's Communist legions, I suppose.) Dungan arrives at this astonishing conclusion: "To continue to assist the Latin American military means to encourage insurrection rather than to insure stability."

Mr. Lodge is equally uninformed: "The organization of the Communist party in Latin America does not constitute a revolutionary force or even a serious threat to American interests." Referring to Brazil, Lodge states: "The most radical elements are not the Communists, but the priests."

For his part, Sen. Church extends the attack on U.S. military assistance to Latin America with the comment that it is a "hydra-headed monster that has very strong support in Congress, in the State Department and even in the White House." For which, we might add, thank God. Uninformed and irrational attacks on the military—any military, anywhere—have reached serious proportions and threaten the very security of our country and that of our allies.

What about the facts?

With no more research than a mere reading of news dispatches and official statements, Sen. Church, Mr. Bronheim, et al., would learn (1) that the Communists are indeed behind terrorist and guerrilla attacks in Latin America; and (2) that the Soviet Union has both a policy and a plan to assault free nations of our hemisphere. Let's examine just a few bits of evidence, all taken from published reports:

Colombia's *El Tiempo* reported on January 12 that the government (ruled, incidentally, by the Liberal party) had "discovered an international Communist subversive plot which extends to Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, Brazil and Colombia." *El Tiempo* reported in the same edition that "70 guerrilla delegates from five countries met in the Andes Mountains along the Venezuelan-Colombian border to 'integrate' their activities in a continental war of subversion and terror." The meeting took place between December 20-31 last year and was attended by three Soviet KGB agents, one identified by the government as B. Tarasov.

On January 13 Venezuela's minister of interior, Reinaldo Leandro Mora, confirmed the *El Tiempo* story, saying that his information "fully coincides with the reports published in the Bogotá daily."

Urban riots, which the Bronheim-Lodge-Dungan axis concludes have not received support or encouragement from Communists, convulsed five Colombian cities last January and left 13 killed and 200 arrested. They were the direct result of plans made at the guerrilla conference.

Citing another Bogotá daily, *El Espectador*, that two members of the Soviet Embassy attended a meeting of Marxist labor leaders which planned those riots, *El Tiempo* went on to say on January 19: "The rioters received instructions from the Central Committee of the pro-Soviet Communist party in Bogotá to take advantage of a labor dispute involving a hike in bus fares to create a wave of terror." The signal to start the riots was given by radio from Havana. President Lleras Restrepo was able to control the situation only after mobilizing tens of troops and placing the five cities under a form of martial law.

Moreover, President Lleras discovered that an official from the Soviet Embassy in Havana periodically traveled to Mexico City to turn over money to a Castroite courier. The courier then took the funds to Bogotá for the purpose of supporting Communist guerrillas. One was captured at El Dorado airport in Bogotá with \$100,000 in U.S. money together with Soviet plans to intensify both urban and rural guerrilla wars in Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia and Panama.

These initial Soviet beginnings in creating a united "continental guerrilla force" have advanced considerably over the following six months.

On July 1 the French news service AFP moved this startling story. Said AFP over a Bogotá dateline: "Military sources here revealed today that Colombian and Venezuelan guerrillas recently merged. They did so on the recommendation of the Soviet Union. Venezuelan Pompillo Figueredo has announced that the Soviet Union is prepared to finance these rebel groups on the condition that the merger will formally take place to put an end to ideological quarrels among

the group which had been divided between pro-Chinese, pro-Soviets and pro-Castroites." In other words, the Soviet Union has consolidated the guerrilla groups under its command.

El Espectador had more to say on the subject. "According to military intelligence sources," reported the Bogotá daily, "Commander Pompillo Figueredo was said to be able to deliver \$1 million in U.S. currency in the name of the Soviet Union to achieve the unification of the guerrilla struggle."

Moreover, *El Espectador* reported that "the Soviet Union submitted the name of Manuel Marulanda (alias 'Tiro Fijo') as commander-in-chief, and Castroite Fabio Vasquez as his deputy." AFP also quotes the Colombian intelligence sources on the \$1-million figure, then adds that other subversive civilian groups have been brought into the new front, identifying them as "the Worker-Student-Peasant Movement, and 'progressive' priests." "Tiro Fijo" is a member of the Politburo of the Soviet-controlled Colombian Communist party which also works hand-in-glove with Fidel Castro.

On August 5 *El Tiempo* charged the Kremlin with financing two Communist meetings "disguised as student assemblies," and organized by something called the "World Federation of Democratic Youth." The purpose of those meetings, *El Tiempo* reported, "is to adopt measures for uninterrupted promotion of subversion. Though Peking-line and Camillista supporters will be present at the conferences, actually they are financed and organized by the Moscow line."

Among the subjects to be treated at the October 9-12 meeting is the distribution of funds made available by the USSR for maintaining guerrilla movements and a membership drive within universities, schools, labor unions and the like.

Soviet intrigue extends southward toward the tip of the continent. In Brazil, Gov. Abreu Sodre of São Paulo State said recently that terrorists operating in his country receive both local and foreign aid from Communists.

The governor's statement came on the heels of the discovery of a Castro-Communist training camp containing a powerful radio transmitter capable of reaching Cuba, a helicopter landing site and large amounts of arms and ammunition.

Thirty-two members of the Revolutionary Movement of October 8 were captured, including a Paraguayan who had received guerrilla training in Cuba. The movement, called "MR-8," was found to be operating on funds provided initially by Cuba and Russia plus money taken in bank robberies by urban terrorists who had been trained in the art in Cuba.

On August 4 Bolivia's morning paper, *El Diario*, quoted a captured guerrilla to the effect that former Vice President Juan Lechin (a far-leftist) was recruiting guerrilla candidates for training in Cuba. The guerrillas, identified as Félix Melgar Antelo, had been enlisted by Lechin, trained in Cuba and then returned to a ready-made organization of subversion set up in his absence. He stated that Cuba is now elaborately equipped to support guerrilla subversives—with false passports, disguises, money and sophisticated equipment of all sort.

Soviet-Cuban coordination in spreading guerrilla wars, urban terrorism and the like was exposed only recently by a Castro defector, Orlando Castro Hidalgo. He revealed that Cuban intelligence is under the absolute control of the Soviet Union, and said that as a member of that service in Paris he supplied Latin American revolutionaries and guerrilla leaders with money, passports and hideouts.

Castro Hidalgo also stated that the myth that Castro is easing up on his export of guerrilla wars is nonsense; to the contrary, it is proceeding with greater finesse under So-

viet supervision (explaining, in part at least, the Soviet interest in creating a united guerrilla front in Latin America).

On July 11 Argentina's prestigious paper, *La Prensa*, published a detailed plan for the Communist conquest of eight countries—Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, Venezuela, Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay and Colombia. Citing intelligence reports from Uruguay, Argentina and Peru, *La Prensa* revealed that the plot had been approved "by a central revolutionary committee of Castro-Maoist Communists" which met in Montevideo, Uruguay, last June to follow up the guerrilla conference held six months earlier in Colombia.

The plan contains a combination of sophisticated subversion and military action. It is worth reproducing in condensed form:

"Universities: Catholic Universities will be the true motor of actions planned and carried out in the streets. The demand: 'Change the universities; change the political structure of the nation!'

"The Church: It is now publicly recognized to be revolutionary and reformist. . . . It must be made to declare, from the pulpit and every other suitable place, this new orientation for the masses. To support this goal, we must have 1,500 active clergymen to convert the Church into the major base for the revolutionary movement of the left. The slogan: 'Each hour a disturbance, on each street corner a riot!'

"Workers: Make demands for privileges and wages that will shake the capitalist regime. Government of the workers and the overthrow of the system of government by politicians and militarists!

"Professors and Teachers: Professors must be surrounded and made to work in harmony with the priests.

"Campesinos: It is a proven fact that these are the most difficult to incorporate into our movement. They must, therefore, be directed by local priests in the interior of the country and made to occupy the land."

It is perhaps necessary to add that *La Prensa* is no stooge of President Juan Carlos Onganía; Publisher Gainza Paz established his integrity long ago when he steadfastly opposed Juan Perón and was sent into exile for years.

In any event, Communist (and specifically, Soviet) complicity in guerrilla wars and the advancement of continental subversion on a well-organized basis is so obvious as to be ostentatious—making hash out of the incredible theories proffered by the Bronstein-Lodge-Dungan trio.

Indeed, in many Latin countries only the police and military establishment stand against Soviet intrigue and the formidable array of cold-and-hot-war weaponry the Communists employ. Thus, Venezuela's defense minister, Martín García Villamil, acknowledged the importance of U.S. aid when he declared on August 12 that Communist subversion was on the march in Latin American countries and that "the technical advice of U.S. military missions is useful to the armed forces of our country."

Opposing the Church-Lodge-Dungan-Bronheim assault on both common sense and the U.S. military is the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. In recent hearings Gen. George R. Mather pointed out defense costs of 15 Latin American nations averaged only 10.9 per cent of national budgets last year—less than 2 per cent of their gross national product. What is more, the money going to the military is to replace antiquated equipment, some of it dating back to pre-World War II days. Little or no expansion is being made in military forces, though such expansion would seem to be badly needed at this point.

Many Washington officials are concerned over the testimony given to the Church subcommittee by Messrs. Dungan, Bronheim and Lodge. For example, Mr. Bronheim was a key member of Gov. Rockefeller's recent mission

to Latin America on behalf of President Nixon. If the report—which was submitted by the governor last week, but not made public—contains the prejudices and unsupported theories as expressed by Mr. Broheim before the Senate, then the credibility of the whole report will be very much open to question.

Those liberals who constantly deplore the shrinking image of the United States in the eyes of Latins, and allege that it stems from unwarranted U.S. support to Latin American military dictators, had better take a long look at the display of intellectual dishonesty, ignorance or just plain naivete as it appeared in the Senate.

There are many points on which one can agree with Mr. Bronheim, as, for example, "the leading mythology which claims that the very poor and oppressed are an explosive element and that by improving their lives they will be less explosive." But all that Mr. Bronheim has done is to substitute his own mythology that communism is no driving force in Latin America and that the best way to handle problems there is to cut off military aid.

This slack-jawed, lazy-minded view is aptly described in the editorial appearing in the July 6 edition of *O Estado do Brasil*: "To hold that the armed forces are a factor of instability [referring to Mr. Dungan's testimony] is similar to arguing that communism is a force compatible with the exercise of democracy. And that, in résumé, is what those who testified before the U.S. Senate wanted to prove."

The editorial concludes: "It remains only to say that if the characterization as 'doves' and 'hawks' is apt for the two currents of thought on American policy, the personalities we mention in this commentary [Dungan, Bronheim, Lodge] in all justice deserve to be included in a category that is not at all novel: that of ostriches."

"THE MAN NOBODY SAW"

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I had the privilege of being in the audience at the Smithsonian Auditorium to view a play entitled "The Man Nobody Saw." This was a production of the Plays for Living Division of the Family Service Association of America, and was inspired by the report of the Kerner Commission.

Ben W. Gilbert, a Washington Post staff writer, explored the meaning of the drama in a recent Post article. He offers the opinion that the drama is "an acknowledgment of what the Kerner Commission has called the 'destructive environment unknown to most white Americans' that segregation and poverty have created in the Nation's ghettos."

I was deeply affected by the play. Millions of Americans, black and white, should have the opportunity to see it. Perhaps to do so would make well-intentioned white Americans aware that sympathy and outrage at the plight of black Americans are not enough; that, more important, there must be recognition of the way white America, consciously or unconsciously, influences ghetto life. For, until white America permits this awareness to surface and accepts it, racism cannot be erased.

Mr. Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League,

and Mrs. Adelaide Eisenmann, coordinator of the National Capital pilot demonstration project responsible for the 14 organizations involved in staging this production, are to be particularly commended for their efforts. Should Mr. Young and Mrs. Eisenmann achieve their goal in having this play performed again, hopefully throughout the Nation, I would recommend it highly to my colleagues. But in the meantime, Mr. Gilbert's review captures the full essence and meaning of the play, and because of the drama's deep and subtle meaning, I want to bring his review to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I insert the review at this point in the RECORD:

A DRAMA EXPLORES MEANING OF RACISM (By Ben W. Gilbert)

The young black lawyer turns to the two white courtroom witnesses, a man and a woman, and angrily charges that they are guilty of the violent crimes for which his black client, Nathan Richardson, is on trial. It is the opening scene of "The Man Nobody Saw" at the Smithsonian Auditorium.

The lawyer's charge appears too stark, too shocking to reach many persons in the audience yet. The two white actors who will play a succession of roles no doubt will turn out to be mean, horribly racist persons whose outrageous behavior will confirm the lawyer's charge and thereby establish the innocence of the defendant who is both black and poor. And then, the audience will be asked to decide what should be done with the white characters.

But no, it turns out that the whites portrayed are generally well-intentioned, ordinary persons—insensitive, perhaps, but not hateful. They fail to realize the impact of their casual, occasionally prejudicial, but seldom overtly hostile actions on the young Negro family, Richardson, his wife who is a domestic, and their two children.

Is this failure of whites to understand this lack of sensitivity and empathy, racism? The unasked question becomes the central problem of the play and a key element of the audience discussion to follow. The Kerner commission whose report inspired the play said that white society is "deeply implicated" in the ghetto, but is not aware of the part it plays. Tom Wicker of the New York Times in an introduction to the riot report said that "until the fact of white racism is admitted, it cannot conceivably be expunged." The design of the play is to produce that awareness.

A white widow's husband, an accountant, was a hospital trustee who saw that the institution ran on a "sound fiscal basis," a policy that deprived Richardson's mother who died in childbirth of prenatal care. The widow does volunteer work at the adoption center where there is nothing to do for black children including Richardson.

A white father favors bussing black children to the school his youngsters attend, but does not show up for the crucial vote because his wife is opposed. So Richardson loses an educational chance. Richardson is turned away at the union hall because he lacks qualifications to be a journeyman and there are no openings for apprentices. An employer refuses to give him a job requiring little training because he lacks experience.

The whites in the audience begin to feel sorry for the Richardsons. They are making such an enormous effort, but get absolutely nowhere. Some notion of what it means to be both black and poor reaches the audience. It is not long before the white spectator senses that he too is on trial. It is becoming evident that he shares responsibility for the plight of the Richardsons. Does that make him a racist? That's a tough question and the audience is becoming uneasy.

The play moves rapidly to a predictable climax. A banker has just refused to grant Richardson a mortgage loan to enable him to become a partner in a small dry cleaning plant. He goes berserk after learning that his younger child has succumbed to rat bites in the family's frightful hovel.

Mrs. Richardson, who is one of the victims of her husband's rage, reacts to the shattering of his hopes for independence and says how hard it is to see her husband "made meaner and smaller" each day. But, she won't press charges against him, although the authorities want her to, because she is glad to find he can still fight back.

Discussion leaders ask audience groupings to write on index cards what they think the play means to them. Outrage and frustration are typical answers. The Richardsons are trapped by the system. Acknowledgment of guilt is slow to appear, but it is there. A few whites in the audience of 450 find it all too painful and depart.

The leaders probe gently. What can be done about it? Clear-cut answers do not emerge, but that is not surprising. Nevertheless, there is evident identification of the problem and the system that produced it, thereby providing a better understanding of what is meant by the charge of white racism.

Although the charges against Richardson are serious—"arson, assault, attacking his wife, felonious stealing and other acts of an incendiary nature," a thread of compassion ties the audience to him and focuses discussion on his plight, rather than his offense, an acknowledgement of what the Kerner commission has called the "destructive environment unknown to most white Americans" that segregation and poverty (and white racism) have created in the Nation's ghettos.

In a discussion guide prepared for the evening, Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, defines white racism as "the effect of white institutions on the life of the ghetto . . . the things that more or less well-meaning white people do, unknowingly and unthinkingly, that cripple lives in the black community."

"White racism," Young says, "doesn't mean that Americans in any large numbers want to lynch Negroes or send blacks back to Africa, but it does mean that the vast majority of white Americans . . . to make basic assumptions of their own superiority . . . to justify actions injurious to black citizens."

Although the play by Elizabeth Blake, a production of the Plays for Living division of the Family Service Association of America, was prepared primarily for white audiences, the group at the Smithsonian literally was mixed.

The sponsors, of course, hoped that the audience took away more than an emotional jolt and would want to see the play shown to other community groups. There was some evidence of members of the audience being affected. For instance, one black woman, a Federal employee, reported that a white co-worker came to her the next day to discuss the meaning of the play.

"You know," the black woman reported, "I felt that she saw me for the first time."

THE APPALACHIAN POWER CO. ASSISTS AN ANTIMUNICIPAL POLITICAL GROUP

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have on previous occasions described the situation that exists in Danville, Va., as a classic example of the struggle of a small, municipally owned electric system against takeover by a large investor-

owned utility, in this case Appalachian Power Co., a subsidiary of American Electric Power.

The accusation had been made by the Danville City Council that the New Day for Danville Committee, which was waging the fight against local power bond referendums, was being assisted financially by the Appalachian Power Co.

I have received correspondence from Mr. John W. Daniel, chairman of the New Day for Danville Committee, concerning his denial at a recent Senate hearing that Appalachian Power had in any way assisted the political activities of the committee, along with correspondence from the advertising agency of Cochran, Harding, & Stuart, indicating that through an "error in billing and payment" the Appalachian Power Co. had paid printing and mailing expenses for the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW DAY FOR DANVILLE COMMITTEE,
Danville, Va., March 26, 1969.

HON. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We certainly appreciate your Committee hearing our side of the Danville story pertaining to the various power bond issues.

As promised during our appearance before your Committee on March 19th, we submit the following information from our records. To the date of this letter, we have received 302 contributions to our New Day for Danville Committee ranging from \$1.00 on up. The total amount received to date is \$3,818.25. In reviewing the above contributions, we do not find that Appalachian Power Co., American Electric Power Co. or any official of these companies are listed among the contributors, and to our knowledge we have not received any contribution from any employees of either power company.

Hope the above is the information you desire.

Very truly yours,
JOHN W. DANIEL,
Chairman.

JULY 19, 1969.

MR. JOHN W. DANIEL,
Chairman, New Day for Danville Committee,
Danville, Va.

DEAR MR. DANIEL: Enclosed is evidence introduced this week in the Federal Power Commission proceedings regarding Appalachian Power Company. This statement, by Russell E. Faudree, Jr.,* an FPC auditor, deals in part with the New Day for Danville Committee. The information he put in evidence does not accord with that which you furnished the Subcommittee in your appearance last March and subsequent statement.

When I concluded hearings on S. 607 on 9 July, I stated that the record will be open for two weeks. However, I shall keep the record open until Monday, July 28, in the event that you wish to amend your denials of assistance from Appalachian Power and submit additional financial data regarding the New Day for Danville Committee.

Very truly yours,
LEE METCALF.

*Text of Mr. Faudree's report printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1969.

NEW DAY FOR DANVILLE COMMITTEE,
Danville, Va., July 25, 1969.

HON. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: On returning to Danville on July 24th I found your letter of July 19th.

In regard to your offer to change my "denials of assistance from Appalachian Power" given in testimony before your subcommittee on March 19, 1969:

My testimony stands as given. I was not then aware that Appalachian had—through a mistake in billing—paid a bill which should have been sent to the New Day For Danville Committee. As soon as the local press printed a report of the FPC Audit of Appalachian expenditures showing this payment, I asked the Committee's advertising agency to determine if this had happened. When the agency informed me that it had occurred (see enclosed letter), I made arrangements to take care of this expenditure out of Committee funds.

I repeat, my testimony given before your subcommittee stands as given, as it represented the facts as I knew them at the time.

I am enclosing a statement I released to local news media the day after the story on the FPC audit was printed.

Very truly yours,
JOHN W. DANIEL,
Chairman.

COCHRAN HARDEN & STUART, INC.,
Greensboro, N.C., July 21, 1969.

JOHN W. DANIEL,
Chairman, New Day For Danville Committee.

DEAR MR. DANIEL: I am sorry that I was out of town Friday (July 18) when you tried to contact me. When I returned to the office today I found a clipping from the Danville Register that you had sent to me. I was so surprised as you were to read that Appalachian Power Co. had allegedly paid some bills for the New Day For Danville Committee. On checking into the matter, I discovered that indeed the expense for printing the Committee's first letter, the labor involved in folding and stuffing the letter and the postage for mailing it had been paid for by Appalachian.

I regret that this happened as I know it has caused you some undeserved personal embarrassment. And I especially regret it because you told me repeatedly that the Committee was paying all of its expenses, in that you and the committee were fighting for a principle and "not fighting any battles for Appalachian."

I have requested Appalachian to bill our agency for any expenses involved in getting out the first mailing, and as soon as this bill is received I will in turn render a statement to the Committee.

Once again, Mr. Daniel, let me say how much I regret this error in billing and payment; and I hope this method of re-payment will meet with your approval.

Cordially,
JERRY REECE.

NEWS RELEASE FOR NEW DAY FOR DANVILLE COMMITTEE

(Statement by John W. Daniel, July 19, 1969)

I have not knowingly made any misstatement of fact as to anything that the New Day for Danville Committee has been concerned with.

When I appeared before the Metcalf Subcommittee in Washington on March 19, 1969, I knew that the New Day's letter to the people of Danville had been prepared by the New Day Committee and had gone out. It was my understanding that all expenses in connection with this letter were to be billed to the Committee by Cochran Harden & Stuart, Inc., the advertising agency which

had been employed by the Committee to assist with its publicity.

Subsequently, in April, the Committee received from Cochran Harden & Stuart, Inc. the invoice appearing below which contained an item of \$783.56 for "design, layout and printing of envelopes and letterhead (paid to Stuart Studio)." It was my belief that this item included all expenses in connection with the Committee's letter.

The newspaper story published Friday, July 18th, was the first I knew that the \$298 cost of printing the letter was separately paid by Appalachian and not included in the bill rendered the Committee by Cochran Harden & Stuart, Inc.

The bill above referred to is as follows:

Conferences and creative time for account executive (Jerry Reece)	\$1,335.00
Advertising bill paid by CHS.....	1,260.25
Outside services purchased by CHS:	
Production of jingle, taping of radio spots (paid to Sound Creators)	337.50
Voice for spots (paid to William Alspaugh)	100.00
Art, production and layouts for newspaper ads (paid to Stuart Studio)	2,385.99
Design, layout and printing of envelopes and letterhead (paid to Stuart Studio)	783.56
Design, layout and printing of small card and brochure (paid to Stuart Studio)	1,010.78
Design and layout of two billboards (paid to Stuart Studio)	279.23
	<hr/> 7,492.31

This entire bill has been paid by the Committee and I remain personally responsible on a note used to raise the money to pay it.

The committee and Appalachian Power Company both had a clear right to spend money to inform the people and to get their views across. The City Government evidently felt that it had the same right since it did not hesitate to expend a large amount of the taxpayers money in promoting the Power Bond Issue.

It would be only fair for the City to consent to have the amount it has spent in this matter revealed by an independent audit.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
CHARLES S. JOELSON

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 9, 1969

MR. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I watch my friend, CHARLES S. JOELSON, leave the House of Representatives and return to his home State of New Jersey to assume the position of judge of the superior court.

My feelings are mixed because I will be losing a warm and valuable friend but I am pleased because "Chuck's" long and capable years of service to the people of New Jersey are again being recognized by this new appointment.

I have enjoyed working with "Chuck" JOELSON and in the 8 years we have served together, I have come to think of him as one of my closest friends. We in the Halls of Congress will be losing an able legislator who has served with distinction on the Education and Labor

Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

I wish to join with my other colleagues today in the House of Representatives in wishing "CHUCK" JOELSON all the very best in the years to come.

ON ASSESSING HO CHI MINH

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this body has heard some discussion in recent days over the assessment by his own countrymen of the career of North Vietnamese Leader Ho Chi Minh. It has unfortunately been implied that to recognize Ho's standing as a nationalist and patriot in his own country is somehow to praise him and to dishonor the memory of American soldiers who have died in South Vietnam.

In light of this line of argument, I was interested to note in reading through one edition of a paper from my home town, the Chicago Daily News, two columns which treated—one seriously and one humorously—the significance of Ho Chi Minh's career and of his death. The widely read publisher and columnist John S. Knight had a column under the headline "Yes, Ho Was a Red, But Also a Firm Nationalist." One of Chicago's most talented writers and humorists, Mr. Mike Royko, has made somewhat the same point mixed with some shrewd observations about the attitude of Americans toward the war in South Vietnam.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that a Member's comments about Ho Chi Minh's standing among his own countrymen reflects adversely on his qualifications to sit in this body. I submit that this is no more true than that John S. Knight's comments reflect adversely on his qualifications as a publisher or Mike Royko's on his qualifications as a columnist and journalist. The most important point, however, is that this body must remain, as it has traditionally been, a forum in which all opinions may be heard and all voices raised without fear of misrepresentation or recrimination. To the extent that this freedom of comment and debate is hindered or restricted, all the Members of this House and all the people of this Nation are the losers.

The articles referred to follow:

YES, HO WAS A RED, BUT ALSO A FIRM NATIONALIST

(By John S. Knight)

The death of Ho Chi Minh marks a milestone in the history of Indochina.

Ho was a dedicated Communist, trained in Moscow. But he was likewise a confirmed nationalist who roused his people with the cry for independence of his homeland.

In his youth, this ruthless, intelligent and resourceful man was impressed by President Woodrow Wilson's 14 points as enunciated at Versailles. He sought unsuccessfully to petition the Versailles conference with similar guarantees for these freedoms in Vietnam.

When spurned, Ho turned to Communism as the only effective way to gain his objective.

Ho's further frustration came in 1946 when the French reneged on an agreement to permit the Democratic Republic of Viet-

nam to become part of the French union as a free state within the Indochina Federation.

Ho had been recognized by the French as chief of state and was promised a plebiscite in the south on the question of unified Vietnam under his leadership.

France's repudiation of this agreement brought on a 7-year war. Until the victory of Dien Bien Phu, Ho received no official diplomatic recognition from either Communist China or Russia.

The cease-fire accord signed at Geneva divided Vietnam at the 17th Parallel, creating a North and a South Vietnam. Elections were promised as a means of unifying the country.

Although a party of the Geneva accord, the United States declined to sign it. South Vietnam, also a nonsignatory, refused to hold the elections. It was Gen. Eisenhower's opinion at the time that if elections had been held, Ho would have received about 80 per cent of the vote.

The United States made a lamentable mistake in appraising the Vietnam situation following World War II.

Ho had collaborated with American O.S.S. agents during the Japanese occupation. He hoped, and with some cause, that the Americans might support Vietnamese independence after the Japanese defeat.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had declared his distaste of colonialism and remarked that Vietnam must never be returned to the French.

Yet the United States sided with the French and supported return of their colonial power to Indochina. At that time, popular opinion in this country was imbued by the fear of a monolithic communism which might one day dominate the world.

We had learned nothing from the French fiasco and even less about the impossibility of shooting down either nationalism or communism with superior fire power.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is why we are today in Vietnam—uncertain, bewildered, boastfully reciting the huge enemy casualties one day and pleading in Paris with North Vietnam for peace on the next.

No one can be sure yet whether Ho's passing will raise or diminish our hopes for an end to the fighting.

This will largely depend upon Ho's successors, all tough and seasoned disciples of their fallen leader's philosophy. But the impression persists that they may lack the old man's tenacity of purpose and even find it to their advantage to become less dogmatic at Paris.

After a proper interval, President Nixon should take the initiative.

This is not the hour to make threats, belabor the past and snarl over trivia.

Rather we should be generous in our proposals and seek a workable compromise which may not satisfy the hard liners on either side.

Of prime importance is to devise a way to bring the fighting to an end as we, together with other nations, strive for solutions which can alleviate world tensions and bring to all of Vietnam the democratic processes so essential to the welfare and progress of that beleaguered land.

In my various editorial capacities, I have published Drew Pearson's column since 1934 and often to the disgust of some readers.

In explanation as to "Why you print that so-and-so," the reply has always been made that while Drew is sometimes careless with the facts, he nevertheless manages to dig up pertinent information we don't get from any other source.

And Pearson never took exception to the editor's authority to set him straight, point out errors or simply toss the offending column in the round file.

On his more than 50 libel suits, Drew once wrote me: "I am rather proud of them because it would be fairly easy to settle and

instead I have spent an awful lot of money and even more time proving I was right. I suppose some day I'll get set back on my heels, but I'm still going to fight them anyway."

Drew Pearson's exposes of men in public life demanded great courage. Presidents called him nasty names, the late Joe McCarthy kicked him in the groin, accused him of being a Communist and inspired a successful boycott of his radio program.

The columnist's revelations led to the censure of Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut. Pearson was denied a Pulitzer Prize, although recommended by the jury, because of distaste for the methods he used.

Withal, Drew Pearson was a quiet, self-effacing man with the manners of a diplomat and the conscience of his Quaker birthright.

His faults notwithstanding, Drew Pearson's crusades turned the light on the dark crevices of government where lesser men sought to conceal their deceptions.

WE'VE RUN OUT OF "BAD GUYS"

(By Mike Royko)

The day after President Truman announced that Hitler was finally dead, the Illinois Legislature happily passed this resolution:

"We hereby commend Hitler on the one good act of his career . . . and condemn him for not having died 56 years ago."

British radio marked the event by quoting Shakespeare: "The day is over. That bloody dog is dead."

Everyone was happy. Strangers bought each other drinks, celebrated, cheered. People beamed and talked about it on the street. It couldn't have happened to a more deserving monster, they all agreed.

The reaction was the same, on a lesser scale, when Mussolini got his. And when Tojo tried to kill himself, people hoped he'd survive, which he did, because they wanted to see him hanged, which he was.

And why not? Next to a total victory over the enemy nation, there's nothing as encouraging as the death of the enemy nation's leader.

That's why I couldn't wait to get downtown after I turned on the radio and heard that Ho Chi Minh had died.

Stuffing my pockets with confetti and party noisemakers, donning a red-white-and-blue straw hat, and humming a medley of George M. Cohan songs, I set out to join in the patriotic outbursts I was sure would be sweeping the Loop.

Strangely, I couldn't find any happy crowds gathering at State and Madison. People went about their business as if nothing wonderful had happened.

And in the bars, nobody made "V" signs with their hands, drank a toast, or sang "Roll me over in the clover. . . ."

So I hurried to the office to read the papers and make sure I hadn't misunderstood the radio announcer.

No mistake. It was right there in black and white. Ho was dead, all right.

At least, I thought, there would be the satisfaction of reading about the monster's end. I began looking for the stories quoting out national leaders about what a great victory for freedom his demise was; about how death was too good for this Red octopus who tried to crush us in the tentacles of international communism. I wanted to savor the editorials that would say the world can rest a little easier today, and that this terrible man left a dark splat on the pages of history.

But the situation got even more confusing.

The President hadn't even commented on Ho's death. Hardly anyone in public life said anything. There were no sardonic resolutions being passed by legislatures anywhere.

Even more remarkable, some stories and editorials described him as being a "George Washington to millions of Vietnamese."

One editorial talked about his "unrelenting and unswerving fight of more than 30 years to free all of Vietnam from foreign domination."

A hard-bitten war correspondent who had spent more than two years in the thick of the Vietnam battles, described Ho as being "venerable, bearded, ancient, gracious, grandfatherly."

And the most flag-waving paper in town, which I had expected to verbally dance on his grave, didn't say one editorial word.

Just about the only harsh comment I could find was the rather obvious fact that he was a big Communist. But even that was tempered by the observation that he was even more of a Vietnam nationalist than a Communist.

Unbelievable as it was, there is no getting around it: He came off sounding better than some of the people who are on our side.

What kind of patriotism is that? Common sense alone should tell us that he was a fiend of the darkest evil. Why else would he be killing his followers by the hundreds of thousands, and losing more than 30,000 of our own men doing it? If that many of his followers are bad enough to deserve killing, imagine what he, the leader, was like?

And the fact that we've been at it longer than we were in World War II should be prima facie evidence that he was probably the most evil man in the world, because if he wasn't, why aren't we fighting the guy who is?

I hope the next time we get into a limited war, we find an enemy with a more hateful leader. After all, we do have freedom of choice.

NEWSLETTER

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to keep the people of the Eighth District informed I send out a newsletter to all who request it and am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of the September issue for the information of the membership:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS CONGRESSIONAL VACATIONS

The Congress was in recess for three weeks and reconvened last Wednesday. This is a departure from the usual procedure of having a continuous session beginning in January. However, the sessions have become so long that they almost run throughout the year, and some of the younger Members with school age children urged a vacation time during the summer which they could share with their families.

Inez and I spent a portion of the time on our boat on the Potomac, some of the time working around the house, but the entire vacation within the district. We also had an opportunity to attend some activities sponsored by civic groups, to spend some time in the district office at Fredericksburg, and the remainder in the Washington office.

ELECTORAL REFORM

A most important measure is now before the House of Representatives for consideration. It proposes to amend the constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President and to eliminate the electoral college. Under the proposal, a single vote would be cast for two persons who have consented to the joining of their names as candidates for the offices of President and Vice President. No candidate could consent to the joining of his name with more than one person. The pair of persons receiving the

greatest number of votes for President and Vice President would be elected, provided however, that if no one received at least 40% of the whole number of votes cast, there would be a run-off election between the two pairs of persons who received the highest and second highest number of votes. While a 2/3rd vote is required for passage, the measure is popular and will probably be approved in the House of Representatives. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, however, has recommended a different plan for electing the President and the Vice President. Under its proposal, known as the "District Plan, the President and Vice President would be selected by receiving the greater number of votes in a majority of each of the 435 Congressional Districts in the country, and in addition, a majority of the at large votes corresponding with the two Senators from each state.

The present electoral system for electing the President and Vice President was a compromise which grew out of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Some wanted the President to be elected directly by the people while others felt that the selection should be made by either the Congress or the State Legislature. However, the present method provides that the Chief Executive be chosen by electors equal to the 535 members of both Houses of the Congress plus three electors from the District of Columbia, and in order to be elected President or Vice President, a candidate must receive a majority of all electoral votes.

Certainly a direct vote of the people is a democratic way of selecting our two top government executives. However, in our cities we have bloc voting to a great extent and the District Plan adopted by the Senate Committee has considerable appeal. The measure was scheduled to be considered for the balance of the week with the understanding that if final action were not taken, it would go over for further consideration next week. Some rescheduling may be made because of the death of Senator Dirksen. This should be one of the most interesting and important matters considered by the Congress in recent years and I want to hear arguments on the proposed amendments, but do intend to vote for abolishing the present electoral system.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

The President has indicated that many public projects financed in whole or in part by the federal government will be curtailed, and I am not sure at this time what effect, if any, this determination will have upon any proposal within our district. However, inflation is a matter that concerns us all, and especially a person on a fixed salary or a retirement income. Therefore, it seems reasonable to support efforts to control spending and to establish a stable dollar. Another proposal of the President relates to welfare. He speaks of transferring people from the welfare roll to the payroll and the key word in his plan appears to be "work." We would all agree that there is an obligation to support persons unable to care for themselves because of age, mental or physical deficiencies, but as I understand the President's proposal, it will be to encourage persons to obtain employment in private industry and develop a plan whereby it will be in their financial interest to work rather than stay on relief. A provision is also included for job training and a person able to work who will not accept training or a job will be eliminated from the welfare rolls.

NATIONAL CEMETERY

The Committee on Veterans Affairs will conduct a hearing on September 23 at 10:00 a.m., on H.R. 8818, to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery adjacent to the Manassas Battlefield Park. During the past century, Arlington has become an outstanding and cherished national shrine commemorating the lives and services of members of the armed forces. A number of con-

stituents have expressed concern about the limited burial space there and the restrictions recently established. Even under the restricted rules, however, Arlington will be completely filled by 1985. The suggestion was made that an auxiliary be established at the Manassas Battlefield Park as a supplement to Arlington. Of course, the battlefield is already an historical shrine in view of the first and second battles of Bull Run or Manassas during the Civil War. However, a heroes' cemetery such as exists at Arlington would relieve the present congestion and provide a buffer area against encroachment by commercial interests. My bill would authorize the acquisition of not more than 500 acres of land to meet present and future burial needs. Even though I know your views on this proposal because of the annual questionnaire and personal contact, you may want to share them with the Chairman of the committee conducting the hearing. He is Congressman Olin Teague, Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has favorably reported a bill to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission to fix future federal employees' salaries, subject to appeal to a Board of Arbitration and ultimately a Congressional veto. It provides an additional pay raise for postal workers but none for other government employees. Each year, the commission would report its recommendations to the Congress on the first of February and these recommendations would become law unless vetoed by the Congress within thirty days. The Postal Employees Union generally support the measure but other Government Unions oppose it. There is considerable doubt in my mind as to whether the Congress and the President should abdicate their jurisdiction over federal salaries. The responsibility for developing a budget rests with the President and government employees' salaries constitute a large portion of the budget. Therefore, it does not seem reasonable to have these salaries determined without any opportunity for him to pass upon them, and none is provided in the bill. As Congress has a responsibility to appropriate funds, it seems reasonable that it would also have a voice in determining the amount of salaries. However, there should be an opportunity to amend or rewrite the measure when it is considered on the floor of the House, and I am not sure of how the final version will read.

FLOOD RELIEF

Six counties in our Congressional District were affected by the recent heavy rainfall and flooding. Although other areas of Virginia suffered more damage, these counties are said to qualify for federal assistance. Assistance, if needed, is available through the Small Business Administration (SBA), the Department of Agriculture, and, of course, the various private agencies. The SBA regional office in Richmond can take applications for loans to repair businesses and homes damaged or destroyed by the storms and floods. Loans may be made direct or in cooperation with local banks. In some cases, the SBA will guarantee a loan made directly by a bank. It must be pointed out that emergency loans are for emergency purposes only, such as to replace furniture destroyed in the flood or to repair homes damaged by the flood. In addition to its vital role in feeding victims of the storm, the Department of Agriculture also provides aid for farmers. Emergency loans are available through FHA, and feedgrain is available on an interim basis for farmers whose stores were affected by the storm. The six counties eligible for these services include Caroline, Charles City, Goochland, Hanover, New Kent, and Louisa. Information and literature can be obtained through the appropriate agency or through this office.

AMONG OUR CORRESPONDENCE

A constituent wrote regarding the inadequacy of the postal facilities at Dumfries indicating that persons parking at the facility had to back out into U.S. Route 1. The Postmaster General, however, advised on September 5 that the department is proposing construction of a new facility for the community and that a report will be sent at an early date.

NEWSLETTER

If you are not presently receiving the newsletter and would like copies each month, please let us know. However, if you are already on the mailing list and are regularly receiving it no further action on your part is necessary.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

Noah didn't wait for his ship to come in; he built his own.

JUDGE TO JUSTICE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the U.S. Supreme Court has drawn a certain amount of fire, as every Supreme Court nomination does. In Judge Haynsworth's case the critics argue that he has "dragged his feet" on civil rights in his earlier decisions in the South.

The critics are finding it difficult to gain much support in their efforts to block the nomination of the judge, for the simple reason that they have a poor case. Those who have examined Judge Haynsworth's overall record find it to be a fair and progressive one. While one might quarrel with some of his earlier civil rights rulings, the majority of his decisions in this area—and certainly most that he has made in recent years—show an outstanding degree of fairness and regard for the merit of the individual case.

Although a southerner, Judge Haynsworth has drawn editorial praise from every end of the country, including my own area of New England. The Boston Herald Traveler recently ran such an editorial, and I am glad for the opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

JUDGE TO JUSTICE

President Nixon's nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. of South Carolina to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court seems to be an excellent choice.

Mr. Haynsworth, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth District, meets superbly what President Nixon considers the qualifications for the nation's highest tribunal: He is prudent, fair-minded, erudite and keen.

These qualifications should commend Judge Haynsworth to the U.S. Senate, notwithstanding complaints from some liberal and civil rights leaders about some of Judge Haynsworth's earlier decisions.

Mr. Haynsworth himself is the first to concede that he has, like most men, changed his mind over the years, and although some of his earlier opinions showed conservatism and caution in civil rights cases, he cannot be categorized as a foot-dragger in the federal judiciary's steady expansion of civil liberties. In 1965, for example, he decreed

the integration of the South Carolina Dental Society.

Judge Haynsworth, the fifth generation of the same family that has produced esteemed members of the bar in South Carolina, has shown that he likes to decide each case on its merits and its constitutionality. His judicial temperament and scholarship have earned him a reputation as a distinguished jurist, a reputation which we hope his tenure on the Supreme Court will further embellish.

DESALTING PLANT IN ISRAEL

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to authorize the United States to participate in the development of a large desalting plant in Israel. The proposal presently is pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and I urge favorable consideration of this worthwhile project by the members of that body.

The project in question is a dual purpose power and desalting plant designed to eventually produce 40 million gallons of fresh water per day. Under the legislation, the U.S. Government would extend \$40 million to Israel to pay half the cost of constructing the water plant and half the cost of 5 years' operation. Israel would cover the balance for the water plant and assume the entire cost of the power facility. A conservative estimate has placed the projects total cost to Israel at approximately \$100 million.

Israel anticipates a severe water shortage in the next decade and must seek assistance in the development of fresh-water conversion methods. By necessity, Israel maintains a large defense force at great expense to her citizens. Unlike the Arab governments, Israel is not receiving free arms assistance from any nation. When available, essential armaments must be purchased at staggering costs from the few nations willing and able to cooperate toward the goal of a free, sovereign, secure Israel at peace with her neighbors.

The development in Israel of the world's first major desalination installation promises rich dividends to the United States in return for a modest investment. A critical shortage of fresh water for home and industrial use will confront much of the world, including parts of the United States, in future decades if a solid beginning of research and development in desalting is not made promptly. As former President Lyndon Johnson said on February 6, 1964:

Our own water problems in this country are not yet solved. We, like Israel, need to find cheap ways of converting salt water to fresh water, so let us work together.

Israel constitutes the ideal setting for a prototype project in desalination to benefit all mankind. Anticipating a severe water problem, the Israel Government already has begun to acquire skill and experience in the management of her meager water supply and the production of fresh water. Moreover, Israel

has consistently demonstrated an outstanding ability in science, economic growth, and agriculture. Her strides in all areas of endeavor over the short span of two decades serve as indisputable testimony to her ability to tackle and to overcome the most difficult obstacles.

Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of this legislation in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 will mark a giant step in the world's effort to assure a more peaceful and a more prosperous future for all mankind.

EULOGY OF THE LATE EDWARD A. KELLY

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recent weeks have seen the passing of distinguished Americans whose service to the Nation can never be fully measured. Not least among these stands the name of Edward A. Kelly, dear friend and honored colleague of whose life it is my privilege to speak on this occasion.

To an exceptional degree, Edward Kelly was very much a part of the dramatic event which shaped American—and therefore world—history during the great years of the New Deal and the Second World War, an era crucial to the survival of this Nation and, indeed, of those ideals and values which our Judeo-Christian tradition has held before men's eyes through centuries of struggle—freedom, justice, and compassion. Edward Kelly came to the Congress of the United States in 1931 in the heart of the depression. Always a vigorous supporter of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he served not only in the 72d but in the five succeeding Congresses until his defeat in 1942. In 1945 he returned to the city on his election to the 79th Congress. Defeated in his bid for the 80th Congress in 1946, he was able to look back upon some 14 years of distinguished service in this House, years of triumph and of defeat alike, years which marked the recovery of our people from the most serious economic crisis of our history and which prepared them for the fierce time of testing which began at Pearl Harbor and culminated at Berlin and Hiroshima. It was Edward Kelly's privilege to serve in this body during that time and to participate in the shaping of decisions, national and international, which were to vindicate the cause of representative government in the never-ending conflict with tyranny and oppression.

Edward Kelly was a man loyal to party, in the best tradition of American political life. He recognized that the two-party system is an effective means to the common good. In this spirit he served his party tirelessly. Born in the city of Chicago in 1892, he was a lifelong Democrat who, at the age of only 23, was elected president of the 32d ward of his party organization. Political and civic responsibility were for him a way of life. From 1944 to 1946 he served with distinction on the Chicago Planning Committee. From 1943 to 1945 he was assistant to the

chief justice of the Chicago municipal court.

His patriotic zeal found expression in the Great War: from 1917 to 1919 he served with the American Expeditionary Force in Battery D of the 32d Field Artillery, including 9 months overseas. Prior to the coming of the war, he had attended business college—in 1911. From 1916 to 1920, barring the war years, he was an accountant for the Illinois Steel Co. The experience thus acquired led him into real estate and insurance brokerage; in 1920 he organized the E. A. Kelly Co. This interest, which gave him practical insight into the problems of industry, continued, and in 1947 he returned to the field of industrial real estate as a broker, following his retirement from Congress.

He is remembered today with respect and affection not only by the people of the Third District of Illinois whom he served for so many years but by all who came into contact with him in this House, where he was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

To his family—his dear wife, the former Rosemary Eulert; his two brothers and three sisters; his children—Robert, formerly of the U.S. Naval Academy and all-American halfback at Notre Dame, Edward A. Jr., and Rosemary; and to his eight grandchildren—I extend deepest sympathy in their and our loss. Surely they may find consolation not only in the assurances of faith but also in the honored memory of his life, a life characterized by loyalty, service, and fidelity, ideals which, precious in every generation, constitute a noble legacy to us all.

THE 747 GENERATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we have survived, happily, the changes 10 years of the jet transport age have wrought. It was in the autumn of 1958 when Pan American World Airways inaugurated jet service between the United States and Europe with 707 aircraft. Before the year is out Pan Am will bring still another new sophistication to international air transport with the introduction of the gigantic and breathtaking 747 service.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to report that this new 747 service will have its inauguration on a Pan Am flight from San Francisco to Hawaii. Shortly thereafter, according to Pan Am's president, Jeeb Halaby, Pan Am will be flying nonstop from San Francisco to Tokyo.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD the text of Mr. Halaby's timely address before the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco concerning the future of air transport as it concerns the San Francisco gateway:

THE 747 GENERATION
(By Najeab E. Halaby)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a great job to be here with San Franciscans, classmates and friends, and probably a few competitors and critics as well. We are very happy to say that we are going to usher this

747 generation in—just about Christmas time—by offering you flights from San Francisco to Hawaii. Shortly thereafter we'll be flying from San Francisco to Tokyo, perhaps without even a fuel stop all the way, with this fabulous space jet.

When you hear the word space jet, you think maybe of astronauts, you think maybe of jets, you think of space. And that's the real thing we're going to sell—all of us airlines are going to fly this airplane. Since our boys are on the way to the moon, I think this is an auspicious day to make predictions. Considering what is happening within these last few years, I can't think of anything that would be way out any more and, on the other hand, if any company president makes predictions that may be considered way in, he may find himself in trouble with the SEC. Even after skipping a dividend.

I'm going to try to talk to you about something that is here and now, and to intrigue you with a little bit of the future. All of our lives will be affected by two great motions, or tides, I think. The mystery of life itself is now being seen in a completely new perspective, and the mastery of change which is engulfing us in so many ways, with so many vortices all around the world. A big order, I think, but let me try.

The Boeing 747 is hardly a small machine, as our chairman pointed out. It's I think a bird that will bear people all over the world, all over this great universe of ours, and it will I guess, create a generation gap in the sense of the difference between what we've been accustomed to and what we'll become accustomed to.

Now, as Mr. Dinkelspiel said, it is only a bit more than a triple size 707 with a bump on its nose, but it will fly about 50 miles an hour faster. It's startlingly quiet, and leaves no trail of black smoke for the neighbors to be irritated by. All of these things are more than new makeup on an old lady. Some airline friends of ours have tried to change personalities by painting themselves up a bit, and I must admit it gets initial attention, if that's what you need.

But the payoff comes from what's underneath the paint and that applies to an airplane as much as to a lady. The first generation of commercial jets, the 707s, DC-8s were very productive and amazingly reliable. They provided a new perimeter—a sort of an expanded envelope for human activity. They really have, through their technology, enlarged all of our lives. Unhappily, as more and more people flock to these airplanes, the airports became too crowded, the terminals too small, the airport access routes too cluttered and clogged. In a sense, we've had almost too much success.

Now we're only beginning to face up realistically to these problems, explore better ways to exploit the great technological advance that this first generation of jets has offered. And along comes the Boeing 747, as one magazine puts it—ready or not. And after seeing one, I suppose some of you might ask who needs it. Especially those harassed airport managers who have to accommodate this giant bird.

On the other hand, go back to the railroads. Visualize—perhaps 80 or 90 years ago—the possibilities of high speed transportation, when somebody, or maybe a whole group of railroaders, woke up screaming at this new state of the art, and said—who needs it?—and they didn't provide it. Therefore, I think something is far worse than the unwillingness to face this rapidly changing state of the art, and that's to block it out.

So today, and tomorrow, we have the lunar excursion above us. And, by the way, as of last night, we had 36,000 applications for the first Pan Am moon flight. They are all in the computer by number, and they are real people and they are from all over the world. It's fascinating that there is this much vision and courage. Some of them propose to pay later, unfortunately. One letter from a young

man in Australia said, "I'd like the reservation now, and I will send you the check in 1984."

I suppose in some respects things may be easier getting out to San Francisco International Airport for that first moon flight, too. Bart will be working by then, and I hope it will be extended to the airport, and maybe even to the moonport. All of us here remember what flying was like only a decade ago. In his generous introduction, Mr. Dinkelspiel pointed out that I'd had the privilege as a Lt. JG in the Navy to fly a propellerless airplane across the United States, just about 15 years ago. It really was a startling event. I recall, contrary to all regulations of the Navy and FAA and everyone else, that flying a little formation at a discreet distance from commercial airliner, we got in fairly close and the co-pilot looked over and saw this propless beast, off his wing, and he damn near fainted.

The prospect, too, of an airplane taxiing without any propellers into an airport, was a rather scary one then. I think 10 years ago, millions of people weren't quite aware that they'd stepped into a mobile decade. The engineers even then were rolling doodles off their drawing boards, but a lot of them never got airborne. There were lots of brainstorming sessions—many of them here in San Francisco as the aerodynamicists and electronicists of the area planned our future.

One of those impossible doodles did take off just a short time ago for a nonstop flight from Seattle to Paris. It was the first 747 to fly the ocean, and that particular airplane will be delivered to us in September of this year. It drove up next door to another doodle called the Concorde Supersonic Transport—a fabulous partnership across the Channel between two great nations and their technologies. And due, but not present at the Paris Air Show, was another doodle—from Moscow. The TU144, designed by a very brilliant engineer, Andre Nicolavitch Tuppelef, who at 81, with his son, designed this fabulous supersonic transport which has now been tested at supersonic speeds. We have to face the possibility that it will be flying first across Siberia and then across the Atlantic in competition with our airliners and those of the rest of the world.

We've been invited to go and see it, and it will be for an antique test pilot, a very exciting adventure. This moment in Paris was a bit sad because our supersonic airliner is still in a paper debate, and although Europeans have two designs and three airplanes flying, it looks as though it will be in the late 70s, before we are able to field one. It may be a serious and expensive mistake. We've certainly given our friends abroad a gift of lead time, and they've been doing it, and they've been developing a machine that is as inevitable in man's future as time.

I'm a great believer, as I think most of the members of this great commonwealth club of California are, in meeting and talking to each other. I don't think it's realistic to carry on a love affair by telephone. I don't think major corporations can do business with full success around the globe, by memo. And I don't think it's possible for nations to live in peace without being able to exchange citizens freely and en masse.

And I would predict that this 747 is going to be the greatest people to people machine man has ever devised. We are only a few weeks away from putting it into service, and, of course, there are only a few who have ever heard of this very creative beast. Many think it carries over 500 people which, I suppose, it could if you were interested only in cattle steerage. Some think it's a supersonic plane, with devastating sonic boom. It isn't.

Many think they will be herded like cattle, and dropped off at airports with a perfunctory anonymity of baggage. Many are convinced they'll never see their baggage again. And a few indicate that it's just too big to

fly safely—it'll fall. I mention these specific untruths, not at random, but after market research has disclosed some of these contemporary preliminary misconceptions.

Now our motives as a public service organization are very plain really—to satisfy a growing public demand around the world. And that's why we've advanced 250 million dollars to date, on the purchase price of the first of these planes. We have 33 on order, and at 20 million dollars a copy, plus the ground facilities and supporting equipment, we will have a billion dollar investment, by the end of 1972.

Now we do need currently to conserve some cash and that interest rate, that Wells and Bevy and others seem to be thriving on, makes us conserve a little money and maybe we would have to pass a dividend. But that's no indication of any weakness in our financial strength or in our resolve and our expectation for the future. A short term dip in the airline business has never deterred the long term growth.

Now 27 other airlines of the world have ordered this airplane, and the total for 16 foreign carriers and the other U.S. carriers is now 150 of these spacious jets, as Boeing calls them. That's a lot of money, of course. It's a very good positive factor in our balance of payments. It's only a beginning, however. A constant renewal is part of our airline business, and we look ahead to the supersonic transport with some trepidation, but with confidence that it's really an intercontinental time machine of the highest order.

And then later, as the astronauts have proved, a kind of hypersonic, many times the speed of sound, and finally space ships. Some people say you shouldn't talk about space transportation until you have solved the problems of getting people in and out of the airplane comfortably with their baggage at the same time and the same place. And I agree. That's our primary emphasis. But, there is a concept now emerging, which we will hear more and more about in the next few days. It's the concept of boosters that can be re-used, of a space station which is like an airport in space with frequent trips between the orbiting station and various points on the moon, which will be points for laboratory experimentation and very serious and expensive exploration. And finally, toward the end of the century, when we are only 30 years older than we are now, there will be sightseeing trips out into the universe for the affluent curious.

No more fantastic really than the first jet flight 20-30 years ago. Coming back to the 747, you could put 500 souls on board this bird, but that would be doing it the inconsiderate way. That would be making it a really steerage kind of airplane. We intend about 360 passengers divided into five compartments. You will not feel as though you were going into a subway train or even into a crowded theatre. You will be airborne in a series of lobbies or salons.

The way the load factors are working out these days on the airlines, with less than half of the seats sold last year, only about 75 per cent of the time will the airplane be more than half full. So you will get up and roam around and choose your seats. And you will eat, sleep and work. Upstairs there will be a very handsome lounge.

Below, there will be a huge cargo deck, a hold that can carry almost as much cargo as a full 707 does today. A new cabin service, and for those of you who are addicted to watching birds in flight, will be a full load, 14 beautiful stewardess. We are having a hard time coming up with a good name for this airplane. 747 sounds kind of numerical. Some say it should be called the Superjet. Boeing calls it the spacious jet. Even the space jet has suggested itself.

Fortunately, these huge four-engine airplanes are not going to be providing a noisy New Year. They appear to be quieter than

expected, and certainly with all that power, the airplane will climb out of the airport fairly rapidly. It will do the work of almost three 707s, and yet it can use the same airport runway.

I think this machine is going to change our lives qualitatively as well. I think by this very massive exchange of people, we can, for example, have airborne schools and colleges. Instead of going for a term to Florence or Vienna, you can literally take a whole high school class to a school abroad, and take a 90-day semester. After all, there's no better way to get understanding than the eyeball to eyeball, mouth to mouth, hand to hand, mind to mind approach.

Let's start it back in high school and college. Let's see the world. Let's understand it. Let's penetrate a lot of the old myths and shibboleths that our generation has carried around with us.

I think we'll see new cities created by these big airplanes, just as San Francisco to a large extent was created by ships, and Chicago by trains. The airport will pace the development. It's really falling a little behind this great new bird, provided by private enterprise and relatively private technology. The future, in other words, is full of prospect and promise.

Knowing this technology is available, we also know that the world wants to travel. For example, there are three and a half billion people in the world, and I would estimate that not more than two per cent of the three and a half billion have ever been in an airplane. That gives us 98 per cent of three and a half billion which over the next 30 years will grow to six to seven billion unless we make planned parenthood a reality.

The race between the pill and the airplane and the plow will be an interesting one. You might say why would an airline executive be interested in birth control? And I would tell you very frankly that we are interested because we want a healthy, well-fed, well-heeled population in the world that can fly on our airplanes. I think that's the kind of world in which peace will prosper.

We'll see in the next 10 years, three times as many people flying airplanes as now. We will see many of these big and these faster planes here. Now what are you going to do about it? You the leadership of a nest of aviation, certainly for Pan Am, one of our three greatest stations, what are you going to do to convert this technology to the users of mankind?

I suggest there are some things that you can do now by meeting the challenge posed by technology. I think first is to recognize and understand the problem. We are more and more dependent on the airplane. There are less and less alternative methods of travel. Therefore, let's try to develop the airplane in such a way that it serves all of us. I think for that purpose you need an enlightened public and certainly the Commonwealth Club is one of the enlighteners of the public in our country.

We need, I believe, a master regional plan for transportation, and work on that is being done in your various bay area groups. I think that from the moon, Neil Armstrong, would look back and see how tiny we are, how compressed we are, how absolutely inconsequential the fences and barriers of counties and cities and jurisdictions thrown around our communities of interest must look from that distance.

Maybe we can take that kind of perspective about some of our bay area problems. We have to, as I see it, organize for the development and operation of a regional transportation system. We have to fund such a plan, as a third step. If there's no more bond money available for this purpose, then you've got to look toward some not-for-profit-authority, with a sound basis for issuing tax exempt bonds to get on with the

conversion of technology to serve the public.

We need an airport rapid transit link to serve not only the city but the whole community and the economy that develops from it. Whether it's an extension of Bart, down across the old red car right away, whether it's the GE monorail, whether it's the West Bay Plan, I don't know. But, I do know that in Cleveland it only takes 18 minutes to get to the airport. And I do know that we have a plan even in Manhattan (which is not the ideal politically-organized community in the world) to get from the Penn Station to JFK in less than 25 minutes.

Then, within the airport, it should not be an ordeal; it should be another step in smooth and safe and comfortable transportation. Cargo is going to develop very rapidly; we're going to have to move off the airport some of the warehousing and distribution, and confine to the airport the actual handling of the cargo in and out of the airplane.

Finally, you're going to have to confront, as I see it, a need for something in New York we call a fourth jetport. You do have some fabulously good airports in this area. San Francisco International is one of the world's great airports; Oakland is a fine airport; San Jose is an airport that is on its way in growth. You're going to need another airport, and I'm not going to try to tell you where to put it. I am, however, urging you to be thinking about it; to be locating one or two sites and getting them under option and under zoning, and to be prepared to convert this fabulous technology of the future to your benefit.

That's a lot of optimism. Some people think this world is in a mess, and that the bigger and faster we get, the worse we are. I think that that is not so. I believe that with a little optimism and a little idealism things are moving toward a more peaceful world than two or three years ago. I think that this people to people, eyeball to eyeball, hand to hand and mind to mind generation, that technology can bring, is going to bring with it progress.

JOHN PORY: SPEAKER OF THE FIRST REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NEW WORLD

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a Pennsylvanian with ancestral lines tracing back to early Virginia, and as a student of constitutional government, I have long been interested in the history of our legislative bodies for both the State and general governments that make up our Federal system.

The year 1969 marks the 350th anniversary of the formation in 1619 of our first legislative body—the first General Assembly of Virginia. The principal leader in organizing this first representative assembly of the new world was John Pory, a former member of Parliament, traveler, and diplomat.

Bringing to Virginia a wealth of knowledge gained by a broad background of experience and study, Pory was a natural choice for speaker of the first Virginia General Assembly over which he presided from 1619 until 1622. A brief story of his life by William S. Powell with special reference to his legislative achievements was published in a

recent issue of *Cavalcade*, the quarterly publication of the Virginia State Library.

In order that the indicated story may be suitably recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote it as part of my remarks:

SPEAKER JOHN PORY: A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT HELPED ORGANIZE THE FIRST REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY IN THE NEW WORLD

(By William S. Powell)

The debt which the United States owes to England for her institutions, customs, and other aspects of her heritage has often been acknowledged. There are a very few cases, however, where one can point to a special place and time, and say with any degree of certainty, that then and there a particular English practice was transplanted in America. This year marks the 350th anniversary of just such an event: the first session of Virginia's Grand Assembly, which met at Jamestown on July 30, 1619. Thus, the English form of representative government was introduced to the New World.

John Pory, the man responsible for organizing America's first representative assembly, is little known today. Yet in his time he moved in the best circles in London. As a member of Parliament he gained the political experience that would prove invaluable in the development of Virginia's political life. When the first assembly of elected representatives met at Jamestown late in July, 1619, Pory was chosen as Speaker of that body. He organized it and directed its work, drawing on his experiences in the House of Commons between 1605 and 1611.

Pory was born in the fen country of Norfolk north of London in 1572, and was the great-nephew and namesake of the master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The family was not wealthy but it was well connected. Young Pory's first cousin, Temperance Flowerdew, married George Yeardley, who was to become governor of Virginia.

At the age of sixteen Pory entered Caius College, Cambridge, from which he was graduated in 1592; he was made a Master of Arts three years later and became an instructor in Greek at the college. In 1597, Pory began a period of study and work under Richard Hakluyt, the historian, and assisted him in the preparation of the final volume of his *Voyages*. The master commended the pupil as his "very honest, industrious and learned friend," and predicted that Pory's "special skill and extraordinary hope to performe great matters in the same" would be "beneficial for the common wealth." Pory soon saw a work of his own come from the press. This was *A Geographic Historie of Africa*, a translation of the work of Leo Africanus, which appeared in 1600. He also published the *Epitome of Ortelius*, based on the work of the great Flemish geographer, Abraham Ortelius. In 1605 Pory was elected to Parliament from the borough of Bridgewater in Somerset and served in that body for six years. During that time the Crown attempted to stifle the debates of the House of Commons, but the members resisted, declaring that it was an "ancient general and undoubted right of Parliament to debate fully all matters which do properly concern the subject."

When King James submitted six "Demandes" to Parliament, the members rejected some but compromised on the others. Committees were set up to consider these demands and report on them before final action was taken. Committees were established by Pory in Virginia in 1619, and the committee system has been an integral part of representative government in America to this day.

After Parliament was dissolved on February 9, 1611, Pory entered the employ of George Lord Carew, then Master General of the Ordnance. Like Pory, Carew was a mem-

ber of the Virginia Company. That spring Pory was sent on a mission to Paris by Lancelot Andrewes, the Bishop of Winchester. He stayed in France until the early summer of 1613, when he travelled on to Turin in Italy. Later that summer he went on to Constantinople, where he found service with the English ambassador, Sir Paul Pindar. By January, 1617, he was back in London and was employed at Whitehall by Sir Ralph Winwood, principal Secretary of State. Later he came to the attention of Sir Dudley Carleton, the English ambassador to the Netherlands.

During these years, Pory was also using his position, his knowledge, and his ability by serving certain wealthy and prominent men as a professional newsletter writer. In a day before newspapers were published in England, persons of position often relied on professional correspondents to keep them posted on important events at home and abroad. In 1605 and 1606 he seems to have served Sir Robert Cotton, the antiquarian, in this capacity; in 1610 he was corresponding with Sir Ralph Winwood, and in 1612 with George Lord Carew; all three were members of the Virginia Company. While he was at Constantinople, Pory corresponded with Sir Dudley Carleton, and from 1619 to 1622, while he was in Virginia, Pory frequently wrote to Sir Edwin Sandys, treasurer of the Virginia Company, concerning affairs in the colony.

Pory's letters, which generally were written at regular intervals of a week, are filled with comments and observations on such diverse subjects as Ben Johnson's masques and the beheading of Sir Walter Raleigh; the grisly details of his account of that execution suggest that Pory had a front row position.

Late in October, 1618, Sir George Yeardley was appointed governor of Virginia. Shortly thereafter Yeardley recommended to the Virginia Company that Pory, his wife's kinsman, be named secretary of the Virginia colony for a three year term. The Company appointed him to this post, and the new officers reached Jamestown on April 19, 1619. Almost immediately Pory was made a member of the Governor's Council.

A new day was dawning for Virginia. The new governor brought with him commissions and instructions from the Company "for the better establishing of a Commonwealth here." By proclamation, he let the people know "that those cruell lawes, by which we had soe longe bene governed, were now abrogated, and that we were to be governed by those free lawes, which his Majesties subjects live under in Englande." Martial law was abolished, and the English common law substituted. A broad program of reform had been instituted by the Virginia Company to attract the more stable sort of settlers who were needed for the advancement of the colony. It was felt that wider interests in agriculture should be developed, as well as a system of schools, inns to accommodate newcomers, and better homes for all. A representative assembly was to be established as a part of this program, and Yeardley brought over instructions concerning it.

A call for the election of burgesses, or members of the Assembly, was issued in June and on July 30, 1619, the governor, a four-member Council, and twenty-two elected Burgesses—two from each of the eleven major settlements—gathered in the "Quire of the Church" at Jamestown.

The Assembly began work with a minimum of formality. Pory reported that "the Governor, being sett downe in his accustomed place, those of the Counsel of Estate sate next him on both hands excepte onely the Secretary [Pory] then appointed Speaker, who sate right before him, John Twine, clerke of the Generall assembly, being placed next the Speaker, and Thomas Pierse, the Sergeant, standing at the barre, to be ready for any service the Assembly should comaund him."

In a simple opening ceremony the Rev.

Richard Bucke prayed "that it would please God to guide and sanctifie all our proceedings to his owne glory and the good of this Plantation." All the Burgesses were then "intreated to retire themselves into the body of the Church, which being done, . . . they were called in order and by name, and so every man (none staggering at it) tooke the oathe of Supremacy, and entered the Assembly."

The House of Commons in 1586 had asserted its right to determine the eligibility of its members; the first General Assembly in America did the same thing in 1619. The right of three members to take their seats was challenged, and after a full debate, one of them was seated. The other two were denied their places, because they represented Martin Brandon, Captain John Martin's plantation, which was exempted from the laws of the colony by a special grant.

After the matter of membership was settled, Speaker Pory "delivered in briefe to the whole assembly the occasions of their meeting," after which he "read unto them the commission for establishing the Council of Estate and the general Assembly, wherein their duties were described to the life." He then read to them "the greates Charter, or commission of privileges, orders and laws" brought over by Sir George Yeardley. To facilitate the consideration of the matters covered in these documents, Pory divided the provisions of the Charter into "fower books," and then read them a second time. Two committees of eight burgesses each were appointed to consider the various sections in turn. The Speaker directed these committees to determine which of the company's instructions "might conveniently putt on the habite of lawes." The legislators were also to consider "what lawes might issue out of the private conceits of any of the Burgesses, or any other of the Colony," and to decide "what petitions were fitt to be sente home for England."

During its first session, the Virginia Assembly twice sat as a court, in accordance with parliamentary precedent. A servant was tried for "falsely accusing" his master, and Captain Henry Spelman was found guilty of having "spoke very unreverently and maliciously" against Governor Yeardley while at an Indian village.

On the final day of the session the Burgesses commended Pory for his "great paines and labour" as speaker. It was he, they said, "who not onely first formed the same Assembly and to their great ease and expedition reduced all matters to be treated of into a ready method, but also . . . wrote or dictated all orders and other expedients and is yet to write severall bookes for all the General Incorporations and plantations both of the great Charter, and of all the lawes."

While in Virginia, Pory travelled widely and wrote long descriptive letters to his former patrons in England. A 500-acre plantation on the Eastern Shore was granted to him for his support in place of a salary, and he visited this property in what is now Northampton County several times. The "Secretary's Land" belonged to the office rather than the individual, and it was later held by Pory's successors.

The Secretary became interested in the possibility of iron production in the colony, and he encouraged the establishment of the ironworks at Falling Creek in what is now Chesterfield County. He criticized the wasteful process of boiling sea water to produce salt and he proposed that a more efficient method, similar to one he had observed on his visits to France and the Low Countries, be used. In the spring of 1622 the Virginia Company adopted his recommendations and sent over a "Rocheller" from France to establish more productive salt works. Pory was also interested in the production of naval stores, hemp and flax. After a voyage of exploration into what was to become North Carolina, he recommended that the pine forests which he found there might free

England from her dependence on Norway for tar, pitch, and turpentine.

Pory's three year appointment expired late in 1622, and he returned home by way of Plymouth colony in New England, and he wrote a glowing account of that settlement. While he was in New England, he "collected a small dictionary" of the language of the local Indians and found many of their words were similar to those used by the Indians in the "South Colonie, and of the easterne shore of the bay."

In the spring of 1623, soon after Pory returned to England, he was appointed to a royal commission which was assigned the task of inquiring into the state of affairs in the colony. Pory and John Harvey, another commissioner, arrived in Virginia about the end of February, 1624, where they were met with a stiffly polite but not cordial reception. The Assembly was uncooperative, and many officials proved to be stubborn, since they were suspicious of the purposes of the commission. The commissioners returned to England late in April, taking with them a report in which they recommended various changes and improvements. When the commissioners arrived in England again, they discovered that on May 24, 1624, the Company's charter had been declared vacated, and that Virginia had come under the rule of the Crown.

Pory spent the next five or six years in London, busily engaged in his old occupation as a writer of newsletters. In addition to his regular patrons, he also corresponded from time to time with Sir Thomas Lucy and Sir Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke. Shortly after 1631 he retired to his home in Lincolnshire, where he died in the autumn of 1635. He was never married. As a young man he was said to have been "fond of the pot," and in later life he seems to have accumulated substantial personal debts.

Pory's estate, such as it was, was administered by his sister, Mrs. Anne Ellis. He left three acres of land to the church warden in his local parish with the provision that two "Commemoration Sermons" be preached each year. The church at Sutton St. Edmund, Lincolnshire, still holds Pory's land, and the rector of the local church preaches the required sermons.

His greatest legacy, however, was his work in organizing the first legislature in America. From that beginning grew the system of representative government that flourishes today, although this is a result of which Pory probably never even dreamed.

BEN WOOTEN—DYNAMIC TEXAN

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, Dallas has no natural resources. We have no oil. We lack an ocean port. Our water reserves are very low. It is a hot town in the summer. It is a flat land that is a dusty place in the spring, and a mighty cold place when we get northern winds.

But Dallas has been blessed with the greatest asset of all—we have had the greatest men in the world make their homes here and dedicate their lives toward building a progressive city. One of the finest of these is Ben Wooten. In the Baptist Church, he is a plain spoken member in any session. When the final day comes on a community charity drive building a hospital, a university endowment, the United Fund or whatever we are raising money for—you can count on Ben to lay down the law as to what

everyone's share is going to be, because Dallas is going over the top.

Bankers built our city by loaning folks the money. With this borrowed capital our neighbors have been able to build and repay it. When he was at the First National, they had a slogan which I always liked, "Give us an Opportunity to say yes." You will be interested in this summary of some of the highlights of the life of Ben Wooten. I think Felix McKnight, editor of the Dallas Times Herald, summed up well the 50 year anniversary of Ben H. Wooten, as follows:

Men reap rich reward from a Golden Anniversary, and the 50 years of living woven into it. But few men sense the full satisfaction five-fold.

Ben H. Wooten is about as household a word as one can get around Dallas—and the springy, 75-year-old business-civic figure is capping it all right now with an incredible performance.

He is celebrating five significant 50th anniversaries in one swoop.

If his ankle weren't bothering him a bit at the moment, he probably could go out to the golf course and celebrate it all by shooting his age. He did it two years ago by carving a 73 at Dallas Country Club.

It is quite a story about this man born Dec. 21, 1894, at R.F.D. 4, Box 22. That was a small East Texas farm seven miles northwest of Timpson.

Fifty years ago a hawk-nosed, lean second lieutenant who served as a machine-gunner in Co. A, 345th Machine Gun, 90th Division, survived the hellish battles of St. Mihiel and Meuse Argonne in World War I and was mustered out—very honorably—in July, 1919.

Fifty years ago Ben Wooten came home to the Broadway ticker tape showers and the giant pines of his East Texas and joined the American Legion—an association that has taken him in that span to the loftiest levels of the veterans' outfit.

Fifty years ago Ben Wooten, graduate of the North Texas State University he now serves as chairman of its Board of Regents, hurried out of uniform and was elected principal of the high school at Alba, Tex. (pop. 1,200).

Fifty years ago Ben Wooten suddenly, and quite characteristically, decided that he did not want to be a high school principal; tendered his resignation and started a banking career that has brought national renown.

Fifty years ago, and most importantly he notes, he married Miss Margaret Kay, the town belle of Center, Tex.—an event they prayerfully acknowledged together a couple of weeks ago.

Fifty years ago the Dallas Federal Savings & Loan Association, where he daily sits as chairman of the board, opened shop in a three-room office. Today, it is Texas' largest. Indeed, it was the Wooten year—1919.

The golden path of Ben and Margaret Wooten started when he accepted the position of assistant cashier at the Alba National Bank in December 1919. He entered the banking business with a title—but chuckles today when confessing that there were three employees of the institution. He was the least.

"We had a good thing going at Alba. The T&P Railroad built a line to get lignite out of nearby reserves. But something happened; they played out."

Ben Wooten moved over to Farmersville with the Farmers and Merchants National Bank in 1923, and actually took off on the fascinating trip to the top in 1926 when he became a state bank examiner.

In chaotic 1932, the Federal Home Loan Banking System was created by the Congress, and Wooten became its chief examiner in Washington. Three months later he was elected president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Little Rock, Ark.—servicing the

states of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas and New Mexico.

Ben Wooten, the East Texan, wanted to come home, and in 1944 he returned to Dallas as vice president of the Republic National Bank. It was the day of the two banking giants separated only by the alley that runs between Elm and Main. On Feb. 6, 1950, Ben Wooten made that walk across the alley and became president of the First National Bank.

Folks just thought, on Jan. 1, 1964, that Ben Wooten was retiring. He made another walk across the street and became chairman of the board of Dallas Federal. He sits there today as father counselor to young and driving president Lloyd Bowles.

Fifty years, says Ben Wooten, actually isn't too much time. Really just gives a man time to stretch out in several directions. Here is a man who has held every high-level civic job; hit the heights in banking; ascended to the highest positions in his Baptist church; given mightily to education and been rewarded with doctor of laws degrees from Arkansas, Baylor and North Texas State.

Service to his country has been recognized by his appointment as one of only three civilian aides-at-large to the secretary of defense. But he identifies the 50 years with Margaret Kay Wooten as the anchor anniversary. The other four just came naturally.

Ben Wooten can handle five simultaneous golden anniversaries. He is rugged—and competent.

PETER RODINO NAMED "FRIEND OF LITHUANIA"

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 24 my good friend and dean of the New Jersey delegation, PETER RODINO, was awarded the "Friend of Lithuania" medal and citation at the 56th annual convention of the Knights of Lithuania. Over 400 persons attended the presentation banquet at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark, N.J., which was presided over by the newly installed officers; Dr. Jack J. Stukas, Hillside, N.J., president; Mrs. Diane Daniels, Philadelphia, Pa., Leon Pauksta, Chicago, Ill., and Longinas Svelnis, South Boston, Mass., vice presidents; Miss Stella Sankel, Cleveland, Ohio, treasurer; and Miss Dorothy Dutkus, Maywood, N.J., secretary.

As a former recipient of this cherished award, I want to extend my most sincere congratulations to PETER, who was cited as a "recognized authority on immigration and refugee settlement, who has aided many Lithuanians, among other victims of Communist tyranny, to gain a haven in America."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the continuing struggle of the brave Lithuanian people to once again taste the joys of freedom, and I want to include in the RECORD the following resolution, which was passed at the convention:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, despite its tremendous propaganda efforts, Soviet Russia continues to enslave Lithuania against the free will of her people; and

Whereas, House Concurrent Resolution 416, passed by Congress some three years ago, calls for our President to bring the question of the freedom of Lithuania and the Baltic States before the United Nations organization and further calls for free elections under

the guidance of the United Nations to take place in those countries;

Now therefore, be it resolved, that the Convention respectfully urge the Government of the United States to fulfill the conditions of House Concurrent Resolution 416 in behalf of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States;

Be it further resolved, that the Convention manifest its sincerest gratitude to the Government of the United States for its consistent and continued non-recognition of the Soviet annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States;

Be it further resolved, that copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, the Honorable William Rogers, to the Ambassador of the United States Delegation at the United Nations, to the Honorable Chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committee and to the press.

LARRY JANONIS,

Chairman.

(Mrs.) SUSAN K. BORASKAS,

Secretary.

I know PETER RODINO joins me in hoping that it will some day be possible for Lithuania to once more enjoy the independent status that is hers.

THE CHANGING MOOD ON VIETNAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House on the need for new American initiative to break the stalemate which has developed in our policy toward the Vietnam war. One factor that I emphasized was the apparent changing mood of this country—at all levels, from all types of people—on the objectives we seek in Vietnam.

No longer is it possible to say that the American people are largely in favor of a military victory. Poll after poll, letter after letter indicate that a majority of Americans want us to get out of Vietnam, and the sooner the better.

An equally large shift in opinion has come right at the top of Government. As Stewart Alsop points out in the current issue of Newsweek, the Nixon administration now aims not to win the war but not to lose it either. And that is a startling reversal from all the goals of the past 4 years when the key objective was a military victory.

Certainly, as the mood changes here in the United States, it is undergoing equally subtle permutations in Hanoi. No one can tell at this point the exact effect the death of Ho will make upon the future course of negotiations, but one observer, Arthur J. Dommen of the Los Angeles Times Saigon bureau, wrote last week that the outlook may favor a somewhat softer war line from the North.

Yet, the only place where these new attitudes seemingly are not making a dent is in Saigon. There, the militarists who run both the South Vietnamese Government and the American military machine still fantasize dreams of eventual and complete victory in the field for "our side." And, as long as we procrastinate on such crucial issues as the pace of troop withdrawals and acceptance of

offered cease-fires, I foresee no alteration at all in the snail's pace at which we are now moving in our efforts to reach a settlement in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, just today I have found a group of current news items and reports which go into more depth on the changing mood over Vietnam. Two of the articles, the Alsop piece from Newsweek and Dommen's story from the Los Angeles Times, I have already mentioned. In addition, I would like to insert in the RECORD two fascinating articles from this week's New Republic magazine, one, the column by T. R. B. and second, the lead editorial, "Leave or Get Out."

The items follow:

[From Newsweek, Sept. 15, 1969]

VIETNAM: THE NIXON GAME PLAN

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—If the specialists in such matters are right, the death of that undoubted genius, Ho Chi Minh, is very unlikely to result in the near future in any real change in the policy line laid down by Ho. That policy line was based on a simple assumption—that domestic political pressures would sooner or later force the Nixon Administration to accept, perhaps with some light camouflage, the Communist terms for a settlement in Vietnam.

Those terms, tirelessly repeated in Paris, amounted to unconditional surrender—unilateral withdrawal of all American troops and the replacement of the anti-Communist Saigon regime with a Lublin-model Communist-front government. The Communist terms have been repeated so tirelessly that they have led the President and his advisers to a somber conclusion—that a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is simply not possible, as long as Hanoi is convinced Washington has no choice but to liquidate the war at any cost.

As this conclusion has come to seem more and more obvious and unavoidable, the President and his chief advisers have had to discard the pet theories of how to end the war which they brought with them into office. The President's pet theory was that the Russians could somehow be pressured or persuaded to arrange an acceptable settlement. Dr. Henry Kissinger's pet theory was the "two-track" idea—that a military settlement, based on mutual withdrawal, could be negotiated between Washington and Hanoi, while a political settlement was negotiated between Saigon and the NLF.

CLOUD COVER

These theories have been exploded by events. In their place, what that ardent sports fan President Nixon calls a "game plan" for Vietnam has emerged in rather clear outline, beneath a cloud cover of apparent indecision and intentional obfuscation. Barring some sudden change in the situation resulting from Ho's death, the Nixon game plan will from here on out govern American policy in Vietnam.

The purposes of the Nixon game plan are twofold. One purpose is not to win the war—which the Nixon Administration has recognized as unwinnable in any traditional sense—but (to split an infinitive) to not lose the war. The other purpose is to create the domestic political conditions necessary to persuade Hanoi that the U.S. is capable of continuing indefinitely to not lose the war.

Hanoi, in short, is to be persuaded that Washington, too, can play the waiting game, and thus eventually—if the theory behind the game plan works—an "honorable" settlement of the war will be achieved, tacitly or by negotiation. What Defense Secretary Melvin Laird likes to call "Vietnamization" of the war is the first part of the game plan.

PRESENT INTENTION

By "Vietnamization"—substituting Vietnamese infantry for American infantry—the bulk of the American ground combat forces will be withdrawn. The present intention is to reduce the total U.S. troop commitment to "around 300,000, or maybe less" before the Congressional elections in November 1970. By that time, according to the game plan, the basic mission of the American troops still in Vietnam will be to supply the Vietnamese infantry with logistic support, air- and fire-power.

Since the infantry takes almost all of the casualties, American casualties will—according to the theory—be much reduced. But President Nixon and his advisers are convinced that the draft, even more than American casualties, provides the really combustible fuel for antiwar passions, especially on the college campuses.

Therefore, the game plan calls for a determined effort to pass lottery-type draft legislation in this session of Congress. If such legislation passes, only about one boy out of three will be affected by the draft—the other two will be free to go about their business, unworried by the draft, after the age of nineteen. This, the authors of the game plan believe, would do much to cool campus passions.

If legislation cannot be passed, administrative action will be used, to the extent possible, to accomplish the same end. Everything will also be done to keep draft calls to a minimum. Finally, the Pentagon will be ordered to reduce the proportion of draftees in Vietnam—now about 29 percent of the 500,000-plus men there—to a minimum, leaving in time only volunteers or regulars to carry on the war there.

The game plan thus envisages a situation in which only one unlucky boy out of three is affected by the draft, and the unlucky one (as well as his girl friend or his fond mama) can be assured he will not be sent to Vietnam against his will. In this situation—or so the authors of the game plan reason—the passions of dissent will be stilled, and the United States can continue, if necessary for a long time, a limited effort sufficient to assure that the war will not be lost.

This plan is not stupid or irrational. But as Robert Burns pointed out, the best laid game plans of mice and men gang aft a-gley. The plan calls for a rapid withdrawal rate—around 20,000 troops a month as an average for the next year. The military are simply not going to agree willingly to such a withdrawal rate.

In June, President Nixon wanted to announce a withdrawal of 60,000 troops, but he was persuaded by the military to hold the withdrawal to 25,000. As reported last week in this magazine, the delay in the expected withdrawal announcement in August was caused by a hassle between the White House and the Joint Chiefs on the size of the withdrawal. In short, if the Nixon game plan is to operate on schedule, the President is going to have to buck the generals.

REAL RISK

Bucking the generals is not as risky as it once was, and the President has a useful ally in Secretary Laird, who is liked by the generals and who is determined to push through his program of "Vietnamization." The real risk is that the generals could turn out to be right. What they fear as a result of the rapid rate of U.S. withdrawal envisaged in the Nixon game plan is some sort of military disaster, and the disintegration of the whole anti-Communist front in Vietnam.

That risk is of course real. Is it what Secretary of State William Rogers calls "a sensible risk for peace"? A clue to the answer to that question will be found in the soon-to-be-announced "second-slice" withdrawal. If it is 40,000 or more, that can be taken to mean that the President intends to buck the generals and push ahead with his game

plan. That in turn will mean that the President has concluded that the war, fought as it is now being fought, is poisoning the body politic of the United States; and that it is better to risk military disaster in Vietnam than political disaster in the United States.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 5, 1969]
HANOI REGIME LIKELY TO REASSESS WAR OPTIONS—WINNERS OF POWER STRUGGLE EXPECTED TO IMPOSE NEW MILITARY, DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY

(By Arthur J. Dommen)

SAIGON.—President Ho Chi Minh's death probably will force a reassessment in Hanoi of North Vietnam's options in fighting the war in the south and in negotiating in Paris.

North Vietnam can continue for a time by exploiting Ho's memory and by naming Vice President Ton Duc Thang, 81, as acting president to maintain a facade of unity among its leaders.

But one faction or the other within the Politburo probably will achieve dominance and impose its own strategy, analysts here believe.

The pressing problem of the war in the south, affecting as it does the Hanoi regime's foreign relations as well as almost every facet of its internal daily life, cannot be put off indefinitely.

STRUGGLE IN VOID

Even if the elderly Thang is named acting president—what one analyst calls the "Voroshilov solution"—the void created by Ho's death could induce a power struggle similar to that in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin. The aging Klementi Y. Voroshilov was Soviet president, mainly a titular post, for seven years after Stalin's death in 1953 while Stalin's successors vied for power.

In case of such a struggle, Hanoi's Nikita S. Khrushchev is likely to turn out to be Le Duan, whose post of secretary general of the Vietnam Workers (Communist) Party gives him a head start.

Le Duan's preeminence seemed to be confirmed by the listing of the state funeral committee broadcast by Hanoi Radio a few hours after Ho's death. The listing provides analysts with the first lineup of the contenders for Ho's dual positions as president and party chairman. Le Duan was named head of the funeral committee over Thang.

MILITARY EMPHASIS

In the history of the debate within the Politburo, Le Duan has favored a reliance principally on carrying the war through to victory by military means. His position on the issue stems from his opposition in 1954 to the party's acceptance of partition of Vietnam, a partition that cut off the South, where Le Duan had for a time led the resistance against the French.

Opposed to this faction is a faction led by Truong Chinh, chairman of the National Assembly. Included in this faction are three other Politburo members—Le Duc Tho, Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh, and Hoang Van Hoan, a member of the Viet Minh delegation to the 1954 Geneva conference.

SOFTER WAR LINE

The members of this second faction, while they also support the use of military force in the south, reportedly believe the southern war must remain essentially a civil revolutionary war, one waged principally by southerners instead of northerners. They also think that negotiations should be pursued simultaneously with the fighting and given equal importance.

The difference in viewpoint between the two factions is basically a difference in interpretation of the mixture of political and military action. Thus, the first faction would argue that the halt to the American bombing of North Vietnam last Nov. 1 was primarily a result of the heroic fight waged by millions of North Vietnamese with guns,

while the second faction would be inclined to give credit to the persistent expounding at Paris of Hanoi's "principled stand" demanding that the United States call off the bombing.

Until the new leaders have achieved a new balance of power, no new initiatives at the Paris negotiations involving risk-taking by Hanoi can be expected. This new balance of power could come about relatively quickly.

GREAT LEADER LOST

For one thing, Hanoi must take into consideration that in Ho's death it lost not only a leader whose prestige was so much greater than that of the men around him that he could settle a debate with a single word, but also a figure whose familiarity among all Vietnamese, Communist and non-Communist alike, made him a uniquely exploitable symbol in the war in the south.

"It is difficult to imagine the Viet Cong fighting for a collective leadership dominated by, say, Truong Chinh," one analyst here observed. Hanoi must find someone to replace Ho who is acceptable as a figure in the south as well as in the north and someone who is not simply a remote theoretician, but someone who can be identified with the southern struggle.

Ho's prestige from the first Indochina war as a nationalist fighter was so great that as long as he was alive Hanoi could slur over the distinction between its aim of total rule over a united Vietnam and the professed aim of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front to be fighting for an independent South Vietnam.

Ho, while president of a state whose constitution proclaimed it to be the sole legal government of all of Vietnam, could still make it look as if the struggle waged by the NLF to evict the Americans from the south was the natural sequel to the Viet Minh struggle against the French.

Of late, the contradiction between these two ideas has been sharpened by the needs of the Paris negotiations. Minister Xuan Thuy, for instance, has been known to voice in the course of a single session of the Paris conference both his support for the NLF's southern identity and the contention that any Vietnamese has the right to fight anywhere in Vietnam.

The creation of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam last June appeared for a time to have tipped the balance in the direction of a separate state in the south with a "special representation" in Hanoi at the seat of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. But this was counterbalanced by ever more strident personal appeals by Ho, even including reference to Saigon as "Ho Chi Minh City."

The only two Politburo members who have anywhere near the prestige of Ho from the war against the French are Ho's two trusted lieutenants, Premier Pham Van Dong and Defense Minister Vo Nguyen Giap. But both are outclassed in the party hierarchy and are rated outsiders in any race for supreme power.

Giap was listed in seventh place in the state funeral committee, just after Le Duc Tho, a fact that appeared to confirm reports that he had been even further downgraded.

Giap is a northerner, as is Truong Chinh. Premier Pham Van Dong and party secretary Le Duan were born in what is now South Vietnam.

The emergence of a predominantly northern leadership would create widespread distrust among the ranks of the southern insurgents, many of whom are not Communists, and aggravate Hanoi's problem in retaining control of the insurgency.

Such a situation might lead eventually to the takeover of the southern insurgency by Peking, an eventuality Hanoi may be presumed to want to avoid at all costs.

Analysts here believe that the debate on strategy within the Politburo serves to slow the progress of the Paris negotiations, and

that a clear-cut victory by one faction or the other, even the "war" faction, could result in decision in Hanoi that would enable a settlement to be negotiated rapidly.

The ten Politburo members, all included in the 26-member state funeral committee broadcast by Radio Hanoi, were listed in the following order Thursday:

(1) Le Duan; (2) Ton Duc Thang; (3) Truong Chinh; (4) Pham Van Dong; (5) Pham Hung, the Politburo member in charge of directing the war in the south, who has not been seen in Hanoi since Sept. 29, 1967; (6) Le Duc Tho; (7) Vo Nguyen Giap; (8) Nguyen Duy Trinh; (9) Le Thanh Nghia, and (10) Hoang Van Hoan.

[From the New Republic magazine]

THE SHORT WAR

In the summer of 1967, I took a 10,000-mile trip across America in a battered old Rambler, asking people everywhere what they thought of the war. They didn't think much of it. It had been going on 17 years for the Vietnamese but only about two for the U.S. If you start from the big troop buildup. People shrugged; they didn't like the war but felt it had to be finished; it was bound to be short, thank God.

Then about midsummer President Johnson suddenly said that the nation faced a \$25-billion deficit and that he wanted a \$10-billion tax increase. Maybe it was my imagination but I thought I felt the mood stiffen. By Denver I was pretty sure of it. "President Johnson is in trouble, bad trouble," I wrote.

The war still goes on and two or three hundred Americans get killed every week. There have been several new developments. Ho Chi Minh has died. The State Department is weighing what Hanoi's chief negotiator at Paris meant when he said a sizable withdrawal of U.S. troops might break the deadlock (was this a signal?). In Saigon, our man Thieu picked a new premier (a general), and enlarged his cabinet (soldiers and technicians of the old regime) but didn't broaden its base which is what it agonizingly needs. Truong Dinh Dzu, the runner-up peace candidate in the September, 1967 election, got five years in jail for his presumption.

Here at home, the draft generation is going back to college. Everybody hopes they won't be violent. After all, why should they be? The country is prosperous! It is in the eighth year of the longest uninterrupted upswing in history, and the Vietnam war is fattening dividends, making big corporations bigger and pumping \$30 billion a year into the economy. Why should those kids behave so uncooperatively; what's bugging them, anyway? They have nothing to lose but their lives.

"But what are we fighting for?" ask the youngsters. Ah, to be sure; that's the question. Glad you asked me that.

We are fighting, I suppose, for reasons that go back a long way. America has a yen for world-crusading, followed by resentful periods of isolationism. After World War II our ersatz partnership with Russia collapsed suddenly in angry confrontation. If you believed spheres of influence were bad, that a balance of power was a makeshift, that Soviet control was temporary, that saboteurs in the State Department had "betrayed" China, that nations would implacably put ideology ahead of national interest, and that Communism was a monolithic world conspiracy—then the war in Vietnam made sense.

So, perhaps, would any war of containment. The U.S. had very good reason for wanting to stop Moscow after the war, but it developed into a frenzy that threatened to commit the country beyond its capacity. General Douglas MacArthur warned that anyone who got the U.S. into a land war in Asia ought to have his head examined. Walter Lippmann looked at the matter with Olympian calm. He urged succeeding Pres-

idents to uphold our presence in Asia by sea and air forces and not to get bogged down in guerrilla fighting. It would be like an elephant fighting a swarm of mosquitoes, he said. Vietnam was not external aggression, he declared, but a civil war. In December, 1966, he wondered in print whether Lyndon Johnson "will not withdraw before 1968?" He wrote that "if the only way out of the quagmire is to elect a Republican it is not improbable that there will come forward a Republican to elect." Mr. Lippmann has made his share of mistakes in 60 years of journalism but as he reaches his 80th birthday, September 23, he can boast remarkable prescience on Vietnam.

The great theory of monolithic Communism fell apart when Peking and Moscow split. (There is even now talk of a preemptive Russian strike against China.) In Europe Mr. Nixon has just visited a Communist country, Rumania. This softens a little the rationale of our Asian crusade.

But there was the "domino theory." Depending on circumstances it may have validity, but then, why is the US so agonizingly alone in the war? James C. Thomson, Harvard East Asian specialist, says, "the domino theory was not merely inaccurate but also insulting to Asian nations." Again, there was Walt Rostow's theory that phased bombing would bring North Vietnam quickly to its knees. Well, it didn't. It is now almost universally acknowledged that the bombing strengthened Vietcong morale.

There was the 1964 Tonkin Gulf incident that gave LBJ the "functional equivalent of a declaration of war". Only two senators voted against the resolution, Morse and Gruening—both defeated in 1968. A startling book is just to be published, "Truth is the First Casualty: The Gulf of Tonkin Affair," by Joseph C. Goulden (\$6.95; Rand McNally). I can read it with no other thought than that Congress was deceived, perhaps deliberately. Even while US retaliatory bombs were falling on North Vietnam the Administration was frantically pleading for verification that enemy patrol boats in Tonkin Gulf had actually attacked our destroyers, and getting foggy answers. In fact, in that eerie, overcast night, with fitful lightning flashes and a damaged sonar system, it is not certain that enemy boats were even present.

The public now mostly thinks the war was a mistake. One casualty is social reform at home—the poor old Great Society. Lyndon Johnson was saying only last year that the amount of money required to bring every last American up out of deep poverty was only the equivalent of a quarter of the nation's annual economic growth. In a war with bands and banners, and patriotic zeal, you can wage war on two fronts, but this was different. A taxpayers' strike doomed the double effort.

Two years ago people across America weren't bothering much about the merits of the war, the big thing was that it would be over quickly; it would be cheap and easy. Anybody could see a primitive land of 16 million couldn't stand up long against a giant of 200 million. . . .

So why fight now? Because, I suppose, we feel we have certain obligations and to save face, and because we are trapped. Is that worth 200 to 300 lives a week? Not for me, it isn't.

[From the New Republic magazine]
LEAVE OR GET OUT

After the French had more or less made up their minds to get out of Algeria, they found to their dismay that the war the young men hated and even the old men had grown to loathe went on much as before. France seemed bewitched. President Nixon may yet play de Gaulle's Algerian role and get this country out of Vietnam, but there are doubts. Not long ago, everything and everyone seemed to be converging on withdrawal.

Former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford said we should get all ground troops out by end 1970; Mr. Nixon appeared to have said, in rejoinder, why wait that long? But there are still 515,000 uniformed Americans in Vietnam—and 50,000 in Thailand—and withdrawals of real magnitude from either place appear far off.

Averell Harriman has made two proposals for finding a way out of Vietnam. He suggested that heat be put on President Thieu to broaden his Saigon government so as to make it a more popular instrument, capable of concluding the fighting. By far the most effective form of pressure would be a firm timetable of large withdrawals of American forces; each time the Thieu regime balked, the timetable would not be slowed down, but speeded up. Harriman also suggested there ought to be a "cease-fire in place", deliberately cutting back the level of fighting. The prescription seems worth trying. But Thieu has reshuffled his cabinet in the opposite direction and Mr. Nixon exhibits no distress. The Thieu government is bigger, but narrower; more militant, and even less popular. In fact it looks very like a wilful slap at President Nixon's professed Vietnam policy, as well as at Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh's successors there. Yet Mr. Nixon behaves as though he now believes that if he withdraws American forces slowly, buying the Saigon generals still more time than they've been given already, they will be able to take over the fighting, and impose their military solution on Vietnam with our arms. The entire history of the war suggests this is a pipe dream; current events do, too. Thieu's army is riddled with desertion, his "pacification" is a flop and his land reforms are fraudulent. The French hung on in Vietnam until they went down in resounding defeat, but this country is stuck in a can't win, can't lose position. Thieu's position is disastrously different. Ho Chi Minh is gone, but Nguyen Van Thieu will never be Uncle. Thieu can only lose. The US choice isn't win or lose, it's leave or get out; orderly but genuine withdrawal, or cut-and-run.

THE HONORABLE CHARLES S.
JOELSON

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, "CHUCK" JOELSON leaves the House of Representatives with the respect, admiration and affection of all who knew him. I congratulate him as he assumes the high honor of a place on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey. It is a sorrow, however, to contemplate working in the House without the wisdom, wit, skill, and dedication of this gifted man I am privileged to call a friend.

"CHUCK" JOELSON, intelligent and eloquent, first came to Congress in January, 1961, having been elected as the Representative of the Eighth Congressional District on November 8, 1960. He served continually—with unwavering devotion to the public interest—since that time, having been reelected to the 88th, 89th, 90th, and the present 91st Congress.

He was one of the most progressive and innovative legislators to serve in the House, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and later the Committee on Appropriations. He tackled every assignment with enthusiasm and

creativity and the strength of character to support causes in which he believed.

"CHUCK" JOELSON is well trained in the complexities of the law, having held many important judicial positions before coming to the Congress. The gain of the judiciary of his home State is a loss for the people of this Nation who he served at all times with wisdom, virtue, and patriotism. For he was always on the human side of an issue—particularly his courageous efforts in behalf of education.

I am proud to be a friend of this outstanding Democratic statesman. Although we in the House will miss him, the people of New Jersey will indeed be fortunate to have his wise counsel and fine judgment on the bench of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

I wish him continued good health, happiness, and success.

WHITHER THE BERTH LINE?

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, berth line trade is a most vital and irreplaceable segment of our foreign commerce—yet, there is a chance that this type of operation may be phased out of existence. Berth line operation is common carriage with regular service between given trading areas and to established destinations, as provided by the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

The following brochure, published by the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, outlines the reasons why preservation of the berth line is essential to the continued functioning of our merchant marine fleet.

The brochure follows:

SUSTAIN THE BERTH LINE SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL MARITIME LAWS WHICH PROMOTE IT

Regular and repetitive service is the lifeblood of the general cargo trade. This is so vital to the nation that the 1936 Merchant Marine Act was enacted in principal measure to support and sustain it. Any demise or substantial deterioration of this service would disrupt the general cargo movement in U.S. foreign commerce. It would lay the nation more broadly open to the mercies of foreign flag shipping, including that of the Soviet Union. This brochure treats of the essentiality of the berth line service and some of the problems it faces.

BERTH LINE SERVICE—WHAT IT IS

Berth line operation is common carriage with regular service between given trading areas and to established destinations.

A ship is said to be on berth when it repetitively offers itself to transport cargo on an established trade route with regularity of service.

Berth lines operating under the 1936 Act receive Government support, measured only in terms of the differential cost between U.S. and foreign ship operation for a few essential items. In return, such lines—

- Must confine operations to trade routes declared essential by the U.S. Government;
- May not choose customers;
- Must accept any general cargo offered;
- Must sail on schedule even if vacant space remains;

May not normally vary from fixed and approved itineraries;

May not unilaterally increase or diminish established ranges in yearly sailing schedules;

Must receive Government approval for modifying maximum and minimum sailings; Must operate under "efficient business principles" subject to Government examination;

Must provide modern competitive ships on a rotating replacement basis built and repaired in U.S. shipyards;

Must purchase stores, supplies, and maintenance needs in the U.S.;

Must hold customer service pre-eminent over all other factors;

Must operate under profit limitations established by law;

Must submit to profit recapture where earnings exceed established limits;

Must successfully compete with all foreign competition in the trade;

Must lay aside yearly reserves for continuing ship replacement; and

Must satisfy Government that the objectives of the 1936 Act are being met.

Berth line operation under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, provides the best possible type of service to the nation and its citizens.

It does not necessarily provide the most profitable enterprise for those operating under its provisions.

BERTH LINE PARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN COMMERCE—A STABILIZING FORCE

U.S.-flag participation in foreign commerce [tonnage-wise] slid from 57.6% in 1947 to 5.6% in 1967. Some seek to place the blame on the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

They are principally dry cargo carriers who for some 20 years have operated World War II ships purchased from the government at [tax payer-supported] bargain prices, but devoid of Government obligation or restriction.

During that 20 year period few sought to be embraced within the orbit of the 1936 Act. Nor did they appear to oppose or fault its basic provisions.

Now, however, with inadequate provision for vessel replacement, their ship capability is running out of gas.

The real toboggan slide was not in the subsidy contract berth line service but in the dry and liquid bulk transport field.

Total U.S. dry cargo carriage slid from 55.8% in 1947 to 6.9% in 1967. U.S. tanker carriage slid from 62.8% in 1947 to 3.5% in 1967.

Subsidized liner operation did not resume immediately after the war. However, during the 10 year period 1956-65, it transported [tonnage-wise] an average of 23.3% of all U.S. liner type foreign commerce (reached as high as 30.1%). This was 78.8% of all cargo carried by U.S.-flag liner ships. Dollar-wise, the percent of liner carriage by subsidy contract lines was appreciably higher.

Taking the equivalent period 1956-1965, all U.S. liner services shrank from 38.7% to 21.5% (the latter transported principally by subsidy contract lines). Non-liner carriage shrank from 13.6% to 2.9%. Tanker carriage alone shrank from 20.6% to 3.5%.

Bulk carriers represent approximately one half of all private U.S. shipping. Yet the greatest relative cargo shrinkage is in this segment where the 1936 Act has never been applied.

Reduction in the size of the U.S. bulk fleet is the principal reason; furthermore, ship replacement has been overtaken by fleet obsolescence.

Attacks of the dissident carriers on the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, as a reaction to their own dilemma, is unjustified. It resembles burning down a city to gain what has not otherwise been secured.

The Labor-Management Maritime Committee is in no wise opposed to those segments of merchant shipping not encompassed within the berth line category. Indeed, it has

pled their cause in many publications and in testimony before both Houses of Congress. However, it is vigorously opposed to advancing the cause of one shipping segment at the unwarranted expense of another, as has been done by the so-called "charter advocates", or those seeking a monopoly on government cargoes.

With a world threatened by massive Russian merchant fleet expansion and with U.S.-flag participation at its lowest point in history, a way must be found to advance the cause of all segments of the American Merchant Marine, including berth lines, tramp services, dry bulk carriers, and upon proven need, tanker carriers as well. Such an advancement would provide greater employment for shipyard workers, longshoremen, and merchant seamen. The Labor-Management Maritime Committee will devote its full efforts to such a cause and the cause of the men who man the ships.

THE BERTH LINE TRADE—DESCRIPTIVE OBSERVATIONS

The berth line trade involves all general cargo transportation (including containerization).

General cargo includes all items of transport except liquid and dry bulk cargo.

As a river's channel is mandated by the topography of the terrain, so the course of berth line service is mandated by the flow patterns of general cargo.

Fixed commercial trade channels involving producers and their consumer counterparts abroad require timely and regular deliveries to meet contract agreements and compliance dates.

Thus, timely repetitive and dependable service with emphasis on its regularity is the essence of the berth line trade.

Failure to supply such service would have serious impact on the American economy.

The manufacturing and marketing complex of the nation is intricately dependent on efficient berth line services to foreign outlets.

Such services must be responsive to adjustment. The vicissitudes of time and the incidence of change erode old trade channels as the streams of progress break forth into new courses.

No period of the 20th century has wrought such volatile change as the current decade.

An age which attains the circumnavigation of the moon, struggles with an ever accelerating population explosion, and contends with unprecedented social and economic change, must expect corresponding impact upon commerce and trade.

The shipping industry is no exception. Berth line services cannot be maximized if there is excessive containment of operations or denial of necessary flexibility for adaptation to changing times.

The regulatory rigidity of berth line operation on essential trade routes under the 1936 Act must be appreciably modified and tempered to meet today's trade developments.

Containerization and other transport innovations call for: liberality in adjusting maximum and minimum sailings; facility in modifying ports of call; and broader trade route determinations based on ultimate intermodal destinations.

Partial transport by land as an interim transit on a water-borne voyage (termed the land bridge) and a broader definition of the "commerce of the United States" are essential.

Such modifications do not impair the berth line concept. They only make liner operation more responsive to changing conditions.

PROFILES OF INCENTIVE—ADVANTAGES OF THE BERTH LINE SERVICE

Incentives in Berth Line Operation under subsidy contract

Carriers operating under subsidy contract are not guaranteed a profit. They must earn it.

Operating cost-differential support pro-

vides no advantage over lower cost foreign competition. It is only intended to equate limited items of operating expense (wages, maintenance, repairs and insurance). Under current Government practices it does not even do that.

Today's high operating costs give no assurance that freight income plus differential subsidy will provide a profit.

An unfavorable balance is a constant threat.

The incentive to achieve highest income with lowest cost is a dynamic and ever present force. Subsidy with inadequate cargo is a "go broke" formula.

Subsidy contract lines have generally shown a modest profit overall.

Incentive has been sufficiently productive to offset:

1. Uncompensated increases in operating cost;
2. Inflationary trends in the economy;
3. Ever increasing foreign competition;
4. Deficiencies in parity payments under current Government practices; and
5. Government lag in providing shipyard differential subsidy to construct new ships.

Incentive under subsidy contract has produced a commitment of over \$2 billion in private funds for modern ship construction.

No such incentive is evident in any other segment of U.S. merchant shipping.

Incentives under proposed long-term "Charter/Sub-Charter" operations

Long or short term Government charters, reasonably conceived, are not objectionable. However, Government charters that underwrite all risks in shipbuilding and ship operations federalize the American Merchant Marine and destroy incentive.

Certain carriers propose to assure private financing for fleet replacement by leasing new ships to government on 20 year bareboat charters, thus guaranteeing entire construction loans. Government is then asked to sub-charter the same ships back to the same carriers for operation.

With assured financing, incentive to maintain shipbuilding reserves would diminish, if not disappear.

Sub-charters may be of one or more years' duration thus eliminating any incentive to insure future vessel employment; leaves Government holding the bag.

Charter proposals let Government recover costs through profit-sharing only. If no profits, no recovery; if meager profits, meager recovery; thus a perfect insulation from normal shipping obligations—a realistic dilution of incentive.

The charter advocates ask, in addition, that all Government aid and military cargo be reserved for them. This would insure massive cargo allocation with minimum effort or incentive.

They also seek Government-established premium freight rates sufficient to guarantee a profit with minimum service.

Under such a formula, little incentive remains.

The carrot in front of the donkey is dwarfed indeed.

LOSS OF BERTH LINE SERVICES—EFFECTS UPON FOREIGN TRADE

Berth line trade is a most vital and irreplaceable segment of our foreign commerce. Its abandonment would reset the entire general cargo movement. Smaller ports would suffer.

Lower volume trades would appreciably decline; those to South America, Africa and Australia.

Heavy volume trades would expand; those to Europe and Asia.

More profitable trade designations would be sought, eliminating those of lesser financial gain.

Some trade services would tend toward diminution or abandonment; those to underdeveloped areas of the world.

On the American side, some services would

substantially diminish due to lower revenues generated; those from the Gulf and South Atlantic ports.

Any demise of the berth service would transform liner operations into tramp services. Like the call of the wild goose, shipping services in the common carriage would tend to follow a straight course to the most rewarding financial feeding ground.

Foreign commerce outside the berth trade orbit moves under a broad canopy of commercial transport freedom.

With no mandated regularity of sailings or destinations, the nature of services may be more directly controlled by the carrier than the customer.

Such carriers may normally abandon a given service at will; may leave any given service for more lucrative trade; may delay sailings until ships are fully loaded; may choose any ports of call or embarkation; may concentrate on high rate cargo; and may otherwise maximize vessel utilization.

Non-berth line carriers have no mandated responsibility for the steady and regular flow of commerce, nor the commercial transport protection of given trading areas.

Berth line service under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 operates effectively to promote such objectives.

Any loss of the service would leave general cargo shipping irreparably impaired.

FAYETTE COUNTY LEADERS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, two of my close friends passed away during the recess and I am compelled to honor and applaud their contributions to good government. Both men were among the natural leaders in La Grange and Fayette Counties, Tex.; both were young, and both died on the same tragic day.

I refer to County Judge Ike Petras and Frank Kana, first vice president of the La Grange State Bank. Both men died on Tuesday, August 19, 1969.

We had no warning. The public could not have been more shocked, or grievously saddened.

Judge Petras was in the hospital with minor surgery when complications set in. He was 49. Frank Kana was making excellent recovery of a mild heart attack when a second attack struck him. He was 42.

Judge Petras was long a leader in La Grange; he had served the county for the past 22 years. He rose from a deputy in the tax office, to district clerk to county judge. He knew his business from the ground up. He loved people; and people loved and respected Ike.

Since the day Ike Petras first grabbed the reins, he was a busy man for his people. Among his most visible projects are the beautification of the courthouse and the grounds, and the addition of an annex building in nearby Schulenburg.

The intangibles are not visible, but you can feel them. Judge Petras breathed a spirit and vigor into his central Texas home. He would not let problems sit around unsolved. I remember well his many visits to Washington. Often, he and I would visit with another close friend, President Lyndon Johnson. Once, the judge carried his fight directly to

the Presidential Commission on Poverty, making a skilled presentation.

One of the most recent projects that Ike was working on was a proposed outdoor theater in La Grange. Ike wanted to present in an art form, the cultural heritage left by Czechs and Germans in Texas.

I visited with his wife Amanda during the recess and found her a woman of courage. His son and his daughter will be a close comfort; they are all strong people.

Ike died that Tuesday morning and while the town was still dazed, they received word of yet another loss. Frank Kana died that same night. He was coming back strong from a mild heart attack and no one expected anything but full, complete recovery.

I remember Frank as a young man—he was an outstanding athlete at the University of Texas. Twice he played on national championship teams and he continued to support all of the university athletic programs during his adult life.

Frank demonstrated the same competitive drive in the business world. While many would have found contentment and security as a banker, Frank moved out into active civic work. He was president of the La Grange Lions and served with other organizations such as the Knights of Columbus and the chamber of commerce.

These men were good and they were good for their community. We will close the ranks somehow and continue, but we can never forget them, because, Mr. Speaker, these two men were genuine, progressive leaders who did things for their people.

PERSONAL LIBERTY IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which was printed in the August 20, 1969, edition of the Star of Johannesburg, South Africa. The society which is able to conceive and execute the apartheid system is a society which is insensitive to issues of personal liberty. Certainly it is heartening to see a South African newspaper raising its editorial voice against this violation of human rights.

TEN MONTHS' DETENTION

There is an indifference to personal liberty which is doing the South African judicial system no credit.

In the Pretoria Supreme Court on Monday six Bakwena from Hebron, north of Pretoria, were found not guilty of sabotage and were discharged.

It is not relevant to our complaint that this serious charge appeared to have evolved from a relatively commonplace incident—some hut-burning in protest against the appointment of an allegedly unpopular headman. The thing might have turned out to be a conspiracy of some real importance to public security.

Nor is it relevant that the evidence eventually presented to the court against these men was slight, conflicting and valueless. The court lost no time in finding that out.

No. The trouble is that these six men, together with others, were detained as long ago as last October. Since then they had, presumably, been undergoing interrogation. Judging by the experience of other detainees they were quite likely in solitary confinement. During their detention two of them died, and at the inquest on one, Nicodemus Kgawathe, allegations of a very serious nature were made, though not proved, against the police. Even when the men were at last indicted, bail was refused. All this time their families, have presumably, been without breadwinners under a situation which holds out little hope of redress.

Even allowing for the difficulties this kind of case presents, it ought not to have taken 10 months to bring some alleged hut-burners to trial or, alternatively, to discover that the case against them was a flimsy one.

STATE INITIATIVE IN MANPOWER PLANNING

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important reasons why I have introduced the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969 is my firm conviction that a number of States now possess the talent and know-how to develop and implement more effective and efficient manpower programs. In my own State of Wisconsin, a number of manpower officials were talking in terms of a comprehensive manpower council long before the idea became fashionable. California, Oregon, Utah, and New York have already taken steps in this direction.

The State of Iowa, as early as last July, took significant steps to improve and coordinate its delivery of manpower services. The following excerpt is from a report prepared by the Iowa State CAMPS Staff Committee and written up by Mr. Allen Jensen, administrative assistant to the committee. Mr. Jensen is now a staff member of the National Governors' Conference. I would like to introduce this report as an example of what one State has done to develop a workable interagency manpower planning system in spite of the current chaos and confusion which characterizes our manpower programs. I am also including the excellent statement of manpower goals which the Iowa State CAMPS Staff Committee has drawn up:

REPORT OF THE IOWA STATE CAMPS STAFF COMMITTEE

The following report which has been prepared by the Iowa State CAMPS Staff Committee is presented in a rough form and can only give an indication of the effort being made in the State of Iowa to develop a truly interagency manpower planning system.

EMPHASIS ON AREA OR LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING

The planning system which is being developed emphasizes the involvement of 16 Area CAMPS committees whose formal membership includes representatives from 15 Area Vocational Schools, 21 Community Action Agencies, 8 district offices of the Division of Rehabilitation Education Services, 34 local Employment Service offices, 8 area offices of the State Department of Social Services and 5 Area offices of the Statewide On-the-Job Training project.

PLANS FOR PLANNING

The regional CAMPS Committee should evaluate the following document as a "Plan for Planning" and not a final Plan that spells out the planned allocation of resources of the many federal, state and local programs according to priorities of needs. Such a sophisticated Plan and the various elements of such a Plan will be submitted to the Regional CAMPS Committee as the procedures and tools of an interagency manpower Planning system are developed. It is the feeling of the State CAMPS Staff Committee that CAMPS is an ongoing planning process and cannot be effective if limited to a single one-time report to be completed annually.

The Regional CAMPS Committee can expect to be continually receiving additions and changes in the Iowa State CAMPS report until it will eventually be called an Iowa State CAMPS Plan.

IOWA APPROACHES CONTRARY TO NATIONAL CAMPS ISSUANCES

There are a number of approaches that were taken to the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System in Iowa this past year that were not in agreement with the suggestions set forth in the National CAMPS Issuances. I will comment on them briefly anticipating that there will be an opportunity to discuss them in more detail personally with representatives of the National and Regional CAMPS Committees at a later date.

A. Sixteen Area CAMPS Committees were established in contrast to the one for the Des Moines metropolitan area that was recommended.

B. The State CAMPS Executive and Staff committees in Iowa are made up only of State government personnel and did not include representatives of the Federal manpower agencies.

C. The Planning system that is being developed is being developed on the premise that federally funded manpower programs cannot be planned or realistic plans developed without the involvement of the relevant decision makers concerned with State and locally financed programs. This is in contrast to what is projected as the primary focus of the National and Regional CAMPS planning activities, that is, built around federally financed manpower programs.

PRIMARY PROBLEMS CONFRONTED

The total and comprehensive approach which is being attempted in Iowa has meant that there were many people to get involved, many of whom have never been required to do any realistic planning before. It also meant that the present lack of uniformity in the boundaries of the geographic areas that are the service areas for the agencies participating in CAMPS created logistics problems and problems in data gathering for the area CAMPS committees. Just these two problems alone would be enough to require additional time to develop a realistic plan even though the Iowa State CAMPS Staff has averaged at least one meeting a week since the middle of December of last year. This again emphasized the fact that there is the need to develop a manpower planning system which is continuous in nature and that adequate and specialized planning staff be organized within each of the agencies participating in CAMPS.

INFORMATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS

As is explained in more detail in the report the State CAMPS Staff Committee is developing an interagency data or information system for use in the planning process. These efforts were primarily in the following three areas:

A. The development of categories and definitions of the manpower service activities that are a part of an interagency manpower service effort in a multi-county area or State. This provided the common language between

the agencies as to their services so that they can compare and analyze and plan their activities, in such a way that will minimize the duplication of effort that sometimes may occur and likewise attempt to ensure that manpower services of particular types are not absent in other areas.

B. The needs of the job market is probably the most complete part of the report at this time and is in large part the result of the Skilled Needs Surveys that were financed and coordinated in large part by the State Department of Public Instruction through the Area Vocational Schools. Data available through the local Employment Service offices was also utilized.

C. The employability development needs of the people of the State of Iowa is in the process of being determined through a combination of a review of agency case records plus surveys and other relevant information in order to determine the mix and incidence of the needs of all of the people of the State of Iowa. One thing is unmistakably clear and that is, that a priority item in the development of a viable and accurate manpower planning system is the development and the funding of research and survey activities and data storage and retrieval systems that will provide a more adequate measure of the relative needs between the geographic areas to be served and the priorities as to the manpower service activities needs of the people in an area.

INVOLVEMENT BY THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

The Office of the Governor has been providing the overall leadership to the development of the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System in Iowa this year through a subdivision of the Governor's office, the Office for Planning and Programming. I would urge the members of the Regional CAMPS Committee to read the introduction to this report found in Chapter I. This introduction gives the rationale for the type and nature of the involvement of the Office of the Governor of Iowa in CAMPS.

I wish to point out again that the document which follows is not a final draft of an Iowa State CAMPS plan but is only a tool that is being used by the State CAMPS Staff Committee to present some idea of the nature of the interagency manpower planning system that is being developed in Iowa.

In summary the manpower planning system being developed emphasizes:

1. local or area level involvement in the planning process
2. comprehensiveness in scope as to the service activities being planned, and
3. is cognizant of the interdependencies of Federal, State and locally financed and administered manpower programs.

GOALS FOR AREA CAMPS COMMITTEES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969

1. Develop and implement a systematic approach to defining the role of each agency in the provision of each specific and commonly defined type of service activity.
2. Develop and implement a planning system which can for a given population determine the amount and ratios between the identified and estimated employability development and employer relations and community service needs and relate these to optimum amounts and ratios between service activities required.
3. Develop and implement an interagency service delivery system which includes (a) an interagency individual case planning system and (b) an interagency case tracking system during the process of providing services to an individual by more than one agency.
4. Develop a plan for organizing a manpower development service delivery system on a common multi-county area basis taking into account levels of specialization needed

and needed location of services within the area.

TYPES OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES CHANGES THROUGH THE COOPERATIVE AREA MANPOWER PLANNING SYSTEM

1. Increase or decrease total amount of a service activity based on identified population and/or job market needs.
2. Specialization or concentration of a service activity in fewer agencies to increase efficiency and effectiveness.
3. Shifting responsibilities between agencies to achieve intra agency coupling of service activities needed to ensure continuity between services.
4. Create balance between the amounts of service activities to fit ratio between needs identified.
5. Shift to use of different type of service activity to serve some needs of population and/or job market.

RETREAT ON CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 15 years after the U.S. Supreme Court desegregation decision, 5 years after the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, the power of the Federal Government is not being fully used to achieve equality for all of our citizens—in education, in housing, in jobs, and in other areas of our national life. Not only have legislative acts and Executive orders against discrimination not been fully implemented, but civil rights protections have been undermined by administrative failures and retreats.

The latest blow to civil rights was the action of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in asking for a postponement of public school desegregation in 33 Mississippi counties—as though 15 years was not enough time in which to comply with the Supreme Court decision.

Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, in a column published in the New York Post of September 6, commented upon the latest failure of the Nixon administration to enforce equal rights. Mr. Wilkins observed:

Everyone familiar with government operations has known for months that the Nixon Administration has been playing patty-cake with civil rights . . . The law is there for the law and order regime to enforce. Or does law and order mean only containment and control of the Negro population?

I urge my colleagues to read Roy Wilkins' article, "An Unmistakable Retreat," and I urge the administration to enforce law and order for the protection of the civil rights of all Americans—black and white.

The article follows:

AN UNMISTAKABLE RETREAT

(By Roy Wilkins)

Even those who have bent over backwards trying to find some good in the civil rights policies of the Nixon Administration have been taken aback by recent developments.

The real blow came with the unprecedented letter of HEW Secretary Finch to federal court judges withdrawing the school desegregation suit against 33 Mississippi counties.

The letter said the action, prepared after analyses by HEW experts, would bring "chaos" to the school districts. It implied clearly that the districts had special problems and would not have time enough to effect desegregation. Secretary Finch asked a delay until December 1.

There might have been only the cynical (and expected) reaction from Negro citizens had not lawyers in the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Dept. held a protest meeting. The men present, reportedly as many as one-half of those employed, broadened their criticism from that on schools to include the alleged "slowdown" on the whole civil rights issue.

Nothing in these events is new—certainly not the general downward civil rights trend—except the letter of Mr. Finch and the protest meeting of the attorneys. Everyone familiar with government operations has known for months that the Nixon Administration has been playing patty-cake with civil rights. It has asserted that it is merely being "more businesslike," "more efficient" and is "streamlining" a vast confusion.

These phrases have fooled no one. They have not deceived those Southern whites who invented racial doubletalk long before President Nixon was born. They have not deceived Negroes.

Mr. Finch (whom I believe—perhaps naively—acted under pressure) stripped away uncertainty. Withdrawing a law suit is an unmistakable retreat. It is a confession of error, if not in judgment, then in timing. No matter how it is explained, it remains a backdown. The segregationists win another round.

With a hard-fisted and knowledgeable Texan in the White House, their victories were few and never in the open. With a Californian-New Yorker there, heading a party hungry for jobs and power, the going has been easier. In the background, always, has been the insatiable group of professional white Southerners whose followers are the emotional, unperceptive opponents of the idea that government should do anything for blacks.

The basic racial struggle in this country since 1865 has been to persuade the central government to protect the constitutional rights of black citizens against the subtle and overt onslaughts of the states. The racial practices imposed by whites upon blacks, while cruel and often spectacular and revolting, have been secondary.

Whenever legislation and the courts have bolstered these rights, as in the period, 1954-1968, discrimination has been beaten back. Until recently, the screams of the militants against government have been mostly heated rhetoric. But the Nixonites, by actively aiding the erosion of rights, are giving substance to stridency.

It cannot be repeated too often that the school districts in and outside the South have been on notice since May 17, 1954, to desegregate. Those communities that resisted a court decision for a decade ran finally into the Civil Rights Act of 1964. They chose still to stand pat. Under these circumstances, the "chaos" and "special problems" excuses of the Nixon Administration mean little.

The law is there for the law and order regime to enforce. Or does law and order mean only containment and control of the Negro population?

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Barratt O'Hara the United

States has lost one of its great political figures. Barratt O'Hara was one of the few truly unique public men of our age.

For Barratt O'Hara's story is not the story of a single career, but of several careers, any one of which would have proven more than a match for the capabilities of an ordinary man. Barratt O'Hara was not an ordinary man.

His life and public career spanned generations and included his participation in events that most of us have only read about in history books. Barratt O'Hara was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and was the Congress' last direct link with that historic conflict.

He was a historic figure in his own right—serving nearly 20 years in this body. His integrity, his conscientiousness, and understanding of the issues were noted and admired by his colleagues. Those of us who knew him well were not surprised at all to hear him stand in this Chamber at the age of 84 and articulate a policy for Africa and the emerging third world that was a model of foresight, humanity, and commonsense. He brought to his work on African affairs more energy and insight than men half his age.

Barratt O'Hara lived his life fully. He was a man never content to stand still. He was out in front on the important issues of his day, whether the day was in 1925 or 1965. He was a constant source of inspiration and amazement to all those who knew him. Barratt's career was legendary. It has been duplicated and matched by very few, and I doubt that many in future years will be able to achieve as much. He was truly "The Happy Warrior."

MRS. MATTIE MEISNER, CITIZEN
EXTRAORDINAIRE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the generous act of Mrs. Mattie Meisner of Sabetha, Kans., in willing more than \$55,000 to the Federal Government to apply on the national debt, has attracted widespread attention. I recently received the editorial page of the Painesville, Ohio, Telegraph and had my attention directed to an editorial in which the editor suggested that Mrs. Meisner be given the title of "Citizen Extraordinaire."

I heartily subscribe to this recognition for Mrs. Meisner, and insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN EXTRAORDINAIRE

U.S. Rep. Chester L. Mize the other day was telling the House floor how he was performing "one of the most unusual chores to befall me."

Continuing in the same tone of emphasized amazement, he said, "I have been requested to serve as the middleman in a transaction, the likes of which I have not heard about before. . ."

His mission in short was to relay a check in the amount of \$55,657.79 to the government. That sum represented what a constituent had left in her will to the U.S. government. She left a similar amount to the

state of Kansas. Both sums, according to the deceased one's will, are to be used "for the payment of the federal debt and the debts of the State of Kansas."

So many do their utmost to be good American citizens. They have to for this nation to succeed. But this contribution by a citizen in dollars and cents is truly beyond the realm of norm.

We suggest this person, a widow, in Kansas, be remembered as more than a good citizen. Perhaps she may be given the title:

Mrs. Mattie Meisner, Citizen Extraordinaire.

MARS, THE EARTH, AND COMMITMENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the September, 1969, issue of Nation's Cities, the official publication of the National League of Cities, ran a front cover editorial on the need to provide adequate funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Entitled "Mars, the Earth, and Commitment" the editorial expresses the frustrations of local government in their efforts to meet the Nation's clean water needs.

The Clean Water Restoration Act was enacted by Congress in 1966 as a "cooperative" effort between the Federal Government, the States and local communities to get on with the necessary job of building municipal sewage treatment plants. Federal funding, however, has never been adequate and as the editorial evidences, we are reaping a harvest of frustration and bitterness from the Nation's cities. I recommend this important reading to our colleagues:

MARS, THE EARTH, AND COMMITMENT

So now they want to send men to Mars. NASA director Dr. Thomas Paine says we have the technical knowledge to do the job by 1981. All we need is the will and commitment. Well, we have the technical knowledge to correct most of our urban pollution problems—now. All we need is the will and commitment.

We feel the will and commitment to battle pollution have been evident in most of our municipal governments. But we can't say that about the federal government. Take, for example, the shameful way it has failed to meet its obligations under the 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act. A total of \$1.3 billion was authorized under the act from fiscal 1967 through 1969. But now much actually was appropriated to help states and local governments build wastewater treatment facilities? Only \$567 million, or roughly 44 per cent. The remaining unappropriated 56 per cent is an outrageous funding gap. But during that same period, a total of \$4.1 billion in wastewater treatment facilities somehow were built. Where, then, did the money come from? It came, of course, from local governments (and, in a few cases, from states), placed under the gun to meet new federal/state water quality standards set by the 1965 Water Quality Act. Now these water quality standard deadlines are fast approaching and many cities will be able to meet them only by overextending themselves financially, thus taking already limited funds away from other vital urban needs such as education, poverty, and housing.

Will Congress continue to renege on its

obligation to fully fund the 1966 act? Not if the National League of Cities and the other concerned groups joined together in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water have anything to say about it. And not if the growing congressional support for a full \$1-billion 1970 appropriation continues to gain momentum. City officials and concerned citizens throughout the nation can join this fight for full federal funding by immediately bombarding their congressmen with requests to support the \$1-billion 1970 appropriation. Success in gaining increased funding is not only necessary to meet our water pollution control needs in the years ahead, but to restore local and state government confidence in the federal government's credibility. National goals for an unfouled urban environment have been enunciated by Congress many times during the past decade. But, unlike the space program, the will and commitment to achieve these goals often have not been present.

Mars can wait. Our environmental pollution control needs here on Earth cannot.

NEED NEW NATIONAL POLICY FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues, and all who are interested in water pollution control, a speech I delivered at the Downtown Rotary Club in Portland, Oreg.:

THE NEED FOR DRAMATIC NEW NATIONAL POLICY FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

One of the programs hit hardest by the current money pinch is one which we can least afford to delay—the nation's water pollution control program. Many other problems we face will be irrelevant if we so foul our environment that it becomes an unfit place in which to live.

The pollution of our nation's waterways with municipal and industrial wastes is a problem of ever-growing magnitude. The Federal government long ago saw the grave impact on our environment of these wastes if nothing was done to halt the pollution flood. As a result we have today in Washington the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and a variety of programs in not only that agency, but many others, designed to combat this cancerous disease of our rivers, lakes, streams, and coastal waters.

This country will have an estimated population of 400,000,000 people by the year 2,020 . . . just fifty years from now. Pollution problems will increase proportionately; they will certainly not simply disappear.

The Federal government has been channeling millions upon millions of dollars into pollution control and abatement programs, yet at best we have done little more than hold even. Many of our rivers and lakes are no cleaner today than they were when the Federal programs were begun.

The Great Lakes, once magnificent bodies of water—useful for fishing and recreation, are steadily being degraded in quality to the point where their recreational value is becoming more and more limited. Recreation on many stretches of lakefront is forgotten. Pollution has made the water unsafe for swimmers. Successful efforts to plant Oregon Coho salmon in Lake Michigan have been negated by pollution which makes them unsafe to eat.

Many of our rivers are no better. The Hudson flows to the sea as a ribbon of filth. The Potomac is occasionally lovely to look at, but swimming is a real health risk. All over the nation our great natural water resources are being despoiled by an ever-growing glut of filth.

What has happened to the millions and millions of dollars we have expended in trying to combat this disease that has cost us one of our greatest national assets? It has been spent in a scatter-shot approach to the problem, using outmoded methods, and, as a result, pollution has increased at a greater rate than our efforts to clean it up.

In 1966 we in Congress authorized 3.4 billion dollars to be spent through the year 1971 on pollution abatement. This money was to be spent primarily to increase secondary sewage treatment facilities. Yet testimony has shown that to keep up with increasing needs at least \$20 billion would be needed by 1972 in order to achieve this goal.

The New York Times estimated in 1966 that we must spend 75 billion dollars in the next twenty-five years if we are to conquer water pollution with the conventional approach now being used. This is an average of 3 billion dollars per year for 25 years. Yet only \$200 million in federal funds is available for the current fiscal year. The pollution funding gap now stands at three quarters of a billion dollars. But even at this reduced rate of funding, there is serious question as to whether we are getting anywhere near our money's worth.

Municipal and industrial wastes dumped into rivers and lakes is the single and prime cause of pollution. It is in the treatment of these wastes that we must take our stand against pollution. These facts are well known. This is the reason so much federal emphasis has been placed on the secondary treatment of sewage wastes. You should realize, however, that 45 per cent of all United States population is still not served by secondary sewage treatment plants.

We are not failing in achieving our water pollution abatement goals for lack of will. The people in the United States overwhelmingly desire to save our environment. The fancy funding promises of the last few years by the Federal government have resulted in amazing responses from American voters, this in spite of the predictable inability of the Federal government to come up with its matching share.

The strong desire of our citizens for adequate pollution control programs is reflected by the great margins by which very large pollution control bond issues have recently been carried, in the face of general tax revulsion.

For example, the voters of the State of New York approved a one billion dollar bond issue in 1968 by a margin of 4 to 1. The people of St. Louis, Missouri, recently approved a \$95,000,000 bond issue by a 5 to 1 margin. These results reflect the intense desire to improve our environment. Unfortunately, the public's desire is running ahead of the government's abilities to provide a suitable program.

Our present approach toward control of pollution is both outmoded and ineffective. Our dollars are being spent and our entire abatement program is based on a concept that cannot work, and has not worked.

This concept calls for secondary treatment of all wastes. These secondary facilities are being designed around technology 40 years old and are intended to serve for 20–30 years in the future. This results in some serious inconsistencies in national policy. By designing facilities sized for the distant future, we are imposing a tremendous financial burden on today's economy. In many cases, taking a bite this big causes us to choke and

take no immediate action to alleviate today's problems. The technology commonly used as a basis for design is largely outmoded today and results in inefficient use of dollars. We are spending sizable amounts of Federal money in financing research efforts to develop improved technology making such long range projects even a more inefficient use of today's dollars.

In effect we are spending money to design facilities for the future, and at the same time are striving to make sure they are obsolete before they are built. In addition, the now-outmoded 1963 standards for pollution control are based on the concept of unlimited funding. This is fallacious to the extreme in light of the tremendous fiscal burden that the Congress and the nation must face this year and in years to come. We have too many areas that require Federal aid, and too few dollars to go around. In addition, the spiral of inflation has created further spurs for Federal thrift.

So we cannot toss the needed billions into the fray against pollution and get the results we want and need. But we continue to plan as though these billions were available.

An overall master plan for meeting our needs in the year 2000 is fine, but it does not meet today's needs and it does not give us pollution abatement today. Even more, planning and building plants for that far in the future is almost impossible to finance today. Trying to meet the waste treatment needs of the next generation with today's dollars is a very heavy burden; so, in many cases, only half measures are undertaken, and pollution continues to grow.

Another weakness is that waste treatment plants built today are assumed to operate at 90% efficiency all of the time when in fact they may operate at this efficiency only 80% of the time. During the other 20% of the time the plant may be 100% ineffective to the boy wanting to swim downstream from the plant discharge pipe. A realistic evaluation of the reliability of today's treatment processes indicates that many pollution programs may fail considerably short of hoped for effectiveness and reliability.

Is the situation hopeless? Must we accept the continuing blight of pollution as inevitable? The answer is a strong and resounding NO!!!

I propose that our efforts be concentrated on altering the time accepted approaches to this problem so that reasonable dollars expended wisely will allow us to make immediate progress yet take full advantage of new technology in effectively gaining the upper hand in the pollution control problems of tomorrow.

It is time to discard outmoded, often impossible 20 year plans. It is time to stop our scattergun approach to fighting pollution. It is time to meet the needs and wishes of our people today, not on a "maybe" basis 20 years from now or at the end of the century.

I suggest today that the Federal government undertake a complete revision of its concept of pollution abatement. A new national policy must be adopted. I suggest new priorities be drawn. And, most of all, I suggest we use our limited funds in the most effective possible way to fight the filth in our lakes and rivers, so that we will begin to harvest the results today, instead of hoping for results in the far future.

This is not an impossibility. This is not a pipe dream. It can and should be done. And it can be done by allocating our funds under a priority system that gives the most pounds of pollution removed per dollar spent. As it is now most of the funds are distributed on a first come, first served basis, without regard to obtaining maximum returns.

To do this we must utilize the advanced technology available. We must invest, not in

old-fashioned plants that are already outmoded, but in the newest and most productive areas of waste treatment.

Our goal must be immediate high-yield pollution abatement. We must be able to see results from our efforts. It costs far less, for example, to use this technology to improve existing waste treatment plants to where they can handle waste materials at 90% efficiency 100% of the time than to build plants for twenty years in the future. And technology can keep pace. Updating existing facilities through modern methods every five years, instead of making one great expense on the basis of twenty years will give pollution abatement results now, and will cost less, is more easily financed and offers more flexibility for incorporating future advances in technology.

Technology developed in Oregon offers one means of achieving these intermediate goals. We have developed techniques for increasing the capacity and performance of existing primary or secondary sewage clarifiers without the need for new construction. Plastic modules of high-rate sedimentation devices can be installed in existing clarifier structures to greatly increase their capacity and efficiency. This concept has already been proven in plants as large as 45 MGD. Pollution caused by overloaded primary and secondary clarifiers can be greatly reduced by use of this concept until new plant construction can take place. Incorporation of this settling concept in new plant design will reduce the cost of new facilities when they are built. Space and capital costs of industrial waste treatment system can be reduced. The treatment of storm-water overflows can be carried out in systems much smaller and cheaper than those currently being considered. A preliminary design of a stormwater treatment system utilizing this settling concept has been laid out in which the treatment could be accomplished beneath existing city streets within existing city rights-of-way.

At the same time, our research efforts need to be given a sharper focus and more clearly defined objectives. As it is now, our federally financed research projects largely are originated by field researchers and are conceived with the primary objective of getting a Federal grant. In many instances the research makes little or no contribution to technology and provides answers to which there are no practical questions.

Pollution abatement should be a national goal of the same priority as the moon program. Neil Armstrong would never have set foot on the moon if the Apollo program had no more central direction than the pollution research program. There is only one NASA but there are 15 Federal agencies conducting pollution control research and 50 state agencies which must first review and approve new concepts before they can be put into practice. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration should set specific goals and make specific research assignments instead of merely handing out the money to projects that often are unrelated to practical solutions.

We should make a national commitment to deal with water pollution of the same magnitude that we made a decade ago to place a man on the moon.

Waste treatment and pollution abatement must be financed on today's dollars, and it should meet today's needs. Pollution does not operate on 20 year projections. It is here and now. We must meet it here and now or it will be with us 20 years from now, after we have spent our money in vain.

For if we do not start getting results in cleaning up our waterways soon, it may be too late. It may already be too late for Lake Erie. We must demand a dollar's worth of abatement for a dollar spent. We must meet today's needs. We must utilize technology now available to lower finance costs and to

create results now. We need central direction of a national research effort to develop still more advanced technology. And we must revise our Federal outlook to adopt this high-yield pollution abatement concept immediately if we are not to perish in our own wastes.

Our needs are great today. They will be greater tomorrow. We must begin to meet them today by expecting and getting immediate results from our efforts at pollution control.

The logic of the programs of the immediate past would have led the legendary Dutch boy to refuse to put his finger in the hole in the dike because he felt the optimum solution was to build a new dike. Let's plug the hole in the pollution control dike until we can afford the new dike lest we drown in a flood of pollution in the interim.

COVINGTON MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1969, Cpl. Michael A. Dwyer, a 20-year-old marine from Covington, became another of the valiant youths who has given his life while serving his country and protecting the free world.

The sympathy of thousands of other families who have paid this sacrifice goes out to the Dwyer family and to them also goes the gratitude of those of us whom Mike died protecting.

The Kentucky Post article of August 12, written by Sigman Byrd, which reports the loss of the 101st Upper Bluegrass young man to the war in Vietnam, follows:

MIKE WAS WONDERFUL (By Sigman Byrd)

When word got around on July 20 that Mike Dwyer was on the hospital ship Sanctuary, folks around Scott and Martin streets, Covington, starting praying for the young Marine.

Those who didn't pray, and some who did, had masses said for Cpl. Michael A. Dwyer, USMC, who was wounded accidentally while on combat duty in Vietnam.

Mike was only 20. Up until the time he enlisted in the Marine Corps last December he neither drank nor smoked.

But at Suttmiller's Saloon, 1358 Scott, Paul Suttmiller started a fund to buy Mike a gift.

Everybody loved Mike Dwyer. He had no enemies except the enemies of his country.

Today corporal Dwyer lies in a casket covered with the national ensign at the Linne-mann Funeral Home, Covington. The money collected at the neighborhood saloon went for some of the flowers beside the casket, and for a mass to be offered for the repose of his soul.

He is the 101st northern Kentucky serviceman killed in Vietnam, and Kenton County's 40th.

Visitation is 3 to 9 p.m. today. A Requiem High Mass will be sung for Corporal Dwyer at the Cathedral Basilica of the Assumption at 9 a.m. Wednesday.

Burial with military honors will be at Mother of God Cemetery.

Today at the Dwyer home, 1412 Scott, the Stars and Stripes hangs from a flagstaff bracketed to a front-porch pillar.

A mood of sadness haunts the whole neigh-

borhood. Inside the house where the flag hangs, this sadness is particularly acute because Mike's parents, brother, sisters and grandmother don't know exactly how death came to the young Marine.

This anguish is heightened by a newspaper report about the accidental shooting and by telephone calls to newspapers.

"There's no basis for the newspaper report about how the shooting occurred," said the corporal's father, Joseph Dwyer, a machine operator for Union Light. "No details have been reported by the Marine Corps."

Yesterday, while preparing to attend the funeral of Joseph Dwyer's uncle, John Murphy of 118 Martin street, the family paused to speak of Michael.

His mother, Mrs. Alpha Dwyer, a keypunch operator at Shillito's, said:

"He was a wonderful boy. You don't find his like any more. It would be nice if there were more young men like Mike."

His sister Patricia, 18:

"To me, Mike was a kind of second Christ. He had such kind feelings toward everybody. I never heard him say anything against anybody—even if he hated something about them."

His sister Deborah, 15:

"Oh, Mike was wonderful! He was such a nice big brother!"

His father:

"I don't know. You got me stumped. I don't know how to say it."

His brother Rickey:

"Mike and I used to wrestle. The only way I could beat him was to take him by surprise. He could have let me win, but he didn't. He wanted to make a man of me."

Michael Dwyer dropped out of Holy Cross High School to enlist in the Marine Corps. He died of an accidental gunshot wound aboard the hospital ship on July 25.

His cousin, A2c Jack Huenefeld of Ft. Thomas, stationed in Vietnam, accompanied Corporal Dwyer's body as escort.

The airman said his cousin had received a Purple Heart in Vietnam but had never told his family he had been wounded.

BARRATT O'HARA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a true leader with the passing of our former colleague, Barratt O'Hara.

He lived a full and meaningful life and as a result future generations will remember him with the same admiration once so eloquently expressed by Clarence Darrow who said:

I am envious of only one thing in this world. I wish I had Barratt O'Hara's courage.

First elected to the House in 1948 at the age of 66, Barratt O'Hara arrived in Washington with the well-earned reputation of one of the Nation's leading criminal attorneys. He had defended literally hundreds of persons and never lost a defendant to the death penalty.

He had been the youngest Lieutenant Governor of Illinois—age 30—and his congressional career was to be just as outstanding as his legal career.

After serving his initial few terms on the House Banking and Currency Committee, Barratt O'Hara was appointed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs where

he became chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs.

He led the fight to establish the National Science Foundation and was a vigorous advocate of civil rights legislation—one of the early sponsors of anti-poll tax legislation.

We have lost a courageous colleague and our consolation lies in the legacy which he left to us—a career filled with excitement, achievements, and recognition.

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA—IS PERMISSIVENESS PROGRESSIVE?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the extent of the existing confusion of our institutions and precepts is capably described by former Ambassador to Zambia, Robert C. Good, in an article appearing recently in the Washington Sunday Post. Ambassador Good's reactions to life and affairs in America upon his return after more than a 3-year absence furnish a concise synthesis of conditions resulting from a permissiveness syndrome since 1950.

Has this American permissiveness been progressive? Perhaps the answer to this must depend on how one views progress, but I cannot help but feel that somehow it is not progress to demand reparations from the church, or blink at the widespread use of drugs such as at the recent mass jam session at Bethel, or break criminal laws indiscriminately in the so-called cause of student expression on campus by blocking streets or throwing out deans or what have you. The list can go on and on to say nothing of outright license in print and photograph called freedom of speech but actually licentious material unbridled.

What puzzles me—if this sort of thing is felt to be progress—is the answer to the further question of where it all leads to? Where are we heading as a society, as a people, if the coming generation is to simply throw away the rule book and dance along the road of life as a little brown leaf in the wind?

It seems to me that the basic principles of honor, integrity, restraint, prudence, thrift, respect, hope, faith, charity, and courage, upon which this Nation rose to its present position of material wealth are still the best base upon which to forge the character of those who will lead us in tomorrow's world. It is difficult to see much of this in the America viewed by the Ambassador on his return, or for that matter, in the America as it exists at this hour. It is there, nevertheless, if one looks far enough below the surface and into the American home; yet, if there be any cause of urgent meaningfulness in terms of the ultimate national will, it is to restore these basic principles to the lives and times of those who so loudly proclaim that there is a generation gap incapable of transition.

I commend Ambassador Good's article to all reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1969]

A FLAWED DREAM HURTS UNITED STATES

(By Robert C. Good)

(NOTE.—Good resigned as ambassador to Zambia in January and returned to Washington to write a book. He found "a deeply changed America" after 3½ years abroad, and in an address to the Council on Religion and International Affairs at Denver, he took "an intensely personal, almost private, look at this restless America . . . It is the searing experience of re-entry (for which available heat shields are really quite inadequate) . . ." The following is excerpted from his speech.)

It hits you at first in innumerable trivial encounters, each inconsequential, but the cumulative impact is undeniable. It takes perceptibly longer to drive from point to point on congested streets. Spring comes and you notice more sick trees than there used to be.

An armed guard admits you to the local savings and loan, locking the door after you enter. The manager explains that they were robbed five times last year. Next to the bank there is a row of loan offices, each with an identical sign in the window: "There is no cash kept in this office; we pay all loans by check." Buses accept only tokens or exact change.

A real estate developer is advertising luxurious homes in a "maximum security" area. A friend, before you depart his home in downtown Washington at night, quotes the city's crime statistics: 1500 persons shot last year, 132 fatally.

You attend meetings bringing together white and Negro. The latter now call themselves blacks and there is healthy candor in that word, as there is assertive candor in their comment. It is all very new. White complacency and Negro reticence have disappeared.

It is easier, you discover, to define the new Negro mood than that of the white. "Telling it like it is" often means "telling it not quite like it is" as internalized anger at long last can be expressed freely, and sometimes acted out.

You listen to a Negro sociologist assert that there has been no progress but a dangerous retrogression in recent years. You are told by a Negro minister speaking from one of Washington's most eminent pulpits that in America "the fabric of justice is woven on the loom of hypocrisy." A brilliant young Negro congressman thinks aloud some unthinkable thoughts about the option of political separation for American blacks. And you wonder if you haven't been bamboozled for four long years by all those U.S. Information Agency statistics about Negro advancement.

So you double-check and discover that the advancement was real all right, but, like they say, it's become a part of the problem, not of the solution—or, more accurately, it becomes a part of the problem before it becomes a part of the solution.

So you conclude that there has been striking advance and that there remains striking inequities. And the inequities seem the more unjust because the advance proves that the situation is not immutable. Change excites expectations faster than they can be fulfilled.

Paradoxically, we are at that point where the amelioration of the problem makes it worse. Prestigious universities recruit ghetto students, federal funds promote local community action and the numbers of smart, highly vocal activists expand. With that comes new self-confidence, pride, a "renaissance of the psyche," someone has called it. And long suppressed feelings can now be expressed—in words and in action.

You spend an evening with a black doctor and his wife. She talks frankly of her vicari-

ous enjoyment—and the almost irresistible urge to join in—when it was "Burn, baby, burn" time in Washington a year ago.

Why, you wonder—why so terribly bitter? In Denver, there is a school board election, and it provides part of the frighteningly obvious answer. The issue is school integration. A liberal board has devised techniques for achieving genuine mixing despite largely segregated neighborhoods. It involves busing some students.

Negro leaders fight hard to maintain it, giving the lie to the notion that Negroes now want only separation. But liberal candidates are defeated by 2½ to 1. A black leader sums it up: "We now see. The dream is over. The white community is not willing to take on the commitment and make our country one and bring us together."

RAGE WITH VARIATION

Anger accumulates. It can now break surface. That is the difference four years have made.

You attend a conference at Cornell. The president—it was what you might call a command performance—explains the university's investment policy from a stage presided over by two black students wearing black gloves and carrying clubs sawed from a new 2x4. One of them impatiently seizes "Perkins," as he is addressed by the radicals—courtesy, you discover, having quite disappeared from revolutionary rhetoric—and in the ensuing uproar you express shock to an SDS leader with lots of hair sitting near you.

He says, referring to the feelings of the blacks, "Now you know what real rage is." And you hear yourself reply, "Yes, my friends. I have just experienced it myself."

You are struck by the hyperbole which infuses our speech—full of nihilism, reeking of destruction and threatening always escalation into the real thing. The vice chairman of the National Conference on Black Power, in a letter to the editor of the "racist" Washington Post, rhapsodizes about the burning ghettos and visualizes "the flames licking the side of the Washington Post building" when the fires burn next time.

There is Ginsburg's "humane anarchy" and the celebration of "creative destruction" as war protesters burn draft records on the south side of Chicago. Ghetto spokesmen condemn social repression as "educational, institutional and psychological genocide." And a Panther tells Methodist Sunday morning worshippers in New York that "you can wait-in or sing-in all you want but . . . you put a .38 on your hip and you get respect."

Verbal extravagance seems self-fulfilling. University buildings are seized and academic men are mauled in what is euphemistically called "confrontation politics"—probably the only understatements in our contemporary lexicon. Students emerge from Willard Straight Hall carrying a small arsenal. On campuses in North Carolina and Missouri, there is actual sniping. In a California police action against student radicals, a bystander is killed. And a law officer explains with peculiar irrelevance that "we used buck shot because we ran out of bird shot."

MOMENT OF TRUTH?

So your thoughts run to the coming backlash. The most poignant warning came the other day from a black judge in Brooklyn who remonstrated with 35 white students after they had been sentenced to five days in jail for trespass of a college registrar's office:

"I don't know who appointed you to defend the cause of the Negro," he told them. "What you are doing is helping racism. You know this country is in a worse spot today than it was a year ago—because you have polarized the whole situation."

But one ought not load too much blame on the students as the law and order theme becomes the leit motif in one city after an-

other. And you wonder how America will respond as black majorities in our inner cities get on with the task of organizing themselves politically, as slum dwelling minorities always have in the past, and begin pushing their demands with added political muscle—and whether this will not be the moment of truth when the success or failure of the American experiment in non-racial democracy will be decided.

The reasons for our domestic disorientation need not detain us. I find that even the most cursory reading is filled with answers. More central to our concern is to measure the impact of our domestic problems on our national will, on our capacity to act and on our priorities.

As a nation, we are in danger of being gripped by a kind of spiritual crisis. No other word can describe it adequately because it arises from doubts about values and premises around which we have ordered our civic life and defined our national destiny.

A small minority of radicalized students promote an unprogrammed revolution. It is total protest and its net impact is destructive. Militant blacks, working out the insufferable depredations and frustrations of past generations, seek a renewal of their community and a larger share of American affluence, leaving neither time to examine or inclination to serve the larger national purpose.

Young people in general seem to perceive America very differently from their elders. The mood is not one of pride and patriotism, but criticism, even condemnation. For the moment, antipatriotism is one of the symbols of this alienation—students marching to the chant: "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh; only the NLF can win."

THE AMERICAN DREAM

These particular disaffections are serious enough. But I wonder if the core of the problem will not emerge among the mass of middle-aged, middle-class Americans for whom the times seem so badly disjointed. There is a palpable lack of certainty about self and society. The questions and doubts are slowly taking shape.

What has happened to the American dream? We knew things weren't perfect, but according to our doctrine, they were getting better. The democratic process might falter or throw up the occasional rascal. But the process was self-correcting and, like the idea of God in a theistic age, a premise beyond question. America might make a mistake now and then, but its essential disposition was right and progress in the longer run assured. We might momentarily be overwhelmed by forces beyond our control, but the individual by his own effort could master his fate if he tried hard enough.

Well, the trauma and the accompanying spiritual crisis arise because all of these assumptions are at least open to question if not subject to serious doubt. What Paul Valéry has said of the French, we have tended to think was true of us, too: "Our special quality is to believe and feel that we are universal." Now we are not so sure. We sense we may be more or less out of control. Will, purpose, the capacity to act are in some degree crippled by doubt, apprehension, guilt and even fear.

Nothing perhaps epitomizes this condition so vividly as the new administration with its cautious probings, its endless studies, trying to determine how far it can go in this direction or in that, balancing conflicting priorities, building backfires against possible overreactions here and there—doing everything, in short, but taking the lead. The sense of unease deepens when one wonders whether at the moment, given the national mood, it can be otherwise.

Our confusion and disorientation arise from what is going on abroad as well as at home. More than anything else, I think it is

our awareness in recent years of our relative powerlessness that vexes us. This is a paradox, for we have been told (rightly) that no nation in history has mobilized power equal to ours, and it was after all not many years ago that on every occasion such as this one we were telling ourselves how important it was to exercise our great power with restrained responsibility and warning of "the illusion of American omnipotence."

We are now no less powerful, but our power seems less relevant. It is not just Vietnam, where the adversary's willingness to die exceeds our capacity to kill despite the most awesome deployment of power. Almost nowhere do we seem to be able to translate power, whether physical or moral, into influence, or to link our power to the engines of change in predictable and compatible ways.

It must come to the American people as something of a psychological kick in the teeth that eight years after the inception of the Alliance for Progress, the President's special emissary is virtually barred from entering three Latin countries and 21 Latin governments tell us there is a "deep crisis" in hemispheric relations and a "growing and harmful resentment" against U.S. policies throughout the region.

In the Middle East, the combined efforts of the great powers seem unavailing and peace remains as fragile as ever. (It has been observed that in the last decade there have been in fact only two great powers, Israel and North Vietnam, both of which have been more influential in directing the course of international affairs than either the United States or the Soviet Union.)

Hannah Arendt speaks of the pervasive impotence of power. "I feel like we're living in a fairy tale," she says. "The country seems to have fallen under a spell and nothing seems to work any more . . . I believe all the large West European governments suffer the same power loss. It is very characteristic of our time that only small governments still can rely on the support of their citizens and still can solve problems because their problems are still manageable."

MUTUAL TOLERANCE

All of these revelations ought to do us some good, since unrealistic expectations about the world we are dealing with and, even more, about ourselves are unsteady foundations for policy. Also, our domestic problems should make us somewhat more tolerant of the stresses and strains in other societies.

For it is now evident that here at home we are dealing with our own "revolution of rising expectations," with the instabilities created by the "development process" and the dislocations consequent on a massive migration from rural areas to our cities, not to mention our hangovers from an essentially colonial psychology. In short, it should be apparent to us that the line between developed and developing, between stable and unstable societies is not all that distinct.

Incidentally, these realizations should work the other way, too. Heady expectations about the United States on the part of many emerging societies are probably being adulterated. That too is basically healthy.

It is by no means sure, however, that we will absorb these lessons, proceeding thereafter from new levels of wisdom. For disillusionment creates a receptivity for new illusions, and as a people we are not beyond the danger of replacing one oversimplification for another. In fact, in our present mood of self-doubt and perplexity, stereotyped answers to complex issues are again elbowing their way to the forefront of national debate.

They present themselves in now familiar evocative phrases: "military-industrial complex," "policeman to the world," "containment in passe," "overcommitment" and "get out of Vietnam." It is not that these words

are meaningless. It is rather that they become symbols, fixing blame or exciting expectations rather than demanding analysis.

Take Vietnam, for example. The war has become a source of unrest so deep in our national life that we are probably expecting too much from ultimate disengagement. We have told ourselves over and over again that it has distorted our priorities, played havoc with our image abroad, radicalized our students, enflamed black militants and given rise to feelings of national guilt in sensitive sectors of our population.

All these things are in a measure true. The domestic consequences have overwhelmed the foreign—and we must withdraw. But the method and the terms of our disengagement from Vietnam will also deeply affect both our policy problems and our national life. This is why we should be patient while this administration attempts an honorable compromise.

A FURTHER TRAUMA

The danger remains very real, however, that options now being sought by our government will not be made available by Hanoi. In that case, we shall finally have to choose between continued engagement at levels that imposes a great and probably intolerable strain at home or virtual abandonment of South Vietnam under conditions that will tax the credibility of our steadfastness in many parts of the world and create a backwash of uneasiness here at home.

We are familiar with the national trauma of prosecuting this ambiguous war. We should not underestimate the national trauma which will follow hard on the realization that we have "lost" that war, particularly if our withdrawal is shortly followed by Vietcong ascendancy in the South and a blood bath as the new regime is consolidated. These developments might only serve to deepen the spiritual crisis I have alluded to, further distorting our national life and crippling our national will, with quite unpredictable effects on policy.

Even under the best of circumstances, the resolution of the Vietnam conflict will not be a cure-all. We will still face tough decisions in allocating essentially scarce resources. Perhaps the toughest of these decisions will be what weight to give to domestic as against foreign programs.

The administration has now made clear that even following the end of the Vietnam war, our savings will not be very substantial if we maintain force levels consistent with the full range of our present military commitments. My own view is that military commitments (which is to say military spending) must be selectively reduced in favor of vitally needed domestic programs.

This is not an isolationist option. It does not represent withdrawal, which, I suspect, given the character of our involvement in the world, is virtually impossible anyway. Rather it signifies that domestic and foreign policies have become, perhaps more than ever before, an integral part of one another.

Our leaders cannot pursue coherent policies and take significant initiatives abroad without a larger measure of social stability, consensus and, above all, collective self-confidence than would seem likely to obtain in America if present trends depends in part on our giving evidence at home of a people resolutely meeting the challenges of change in developing a viable and humane community.

I say all this not unmindful of our continuing and unpredictable confrontation with the Soviet Union, and the uncertainties that surround Chinese intentions in Asia; nor am I suddenly oblivious of the importance of maintaining and increasing our commitment to economic aid for the developing countries. I do not question the continuance of strategic parity, even as we seek negotiated control mechanisms with the Soviet Union. It is the sine qua non of whatever

stability remains in the international system.

But at lesser levels, the experience of the last decade would indicate that neither side is easily able to gain decisive advantage in exploiting the instability of the in-between world. Once again, this does not argue for American withdrawal. But it does suggest that our commitments (and corresponding force levels) can selectively be pared back with tolerable risks once they are analyzed rigorously in terms of interest rather than premised on some universalist doctrine of maintaining maximum stability everywhere—which is hardly a tenable objective in any event in an inherently unstable, even revolutionary, world.

A FEW FRESHETS

I must not leave this unwieldy subject without one or two concluding observations to set straight my own mood. I find myself worried but not unto distraction. The shape of the crisis I have alluded to is there for all to see. But the evidence, while presently trending badly, is not all negative. The operative adjective is "restless," not "rigid."

Here and there into the turgid mainstream of our life you find a freshet forcing its way, revealing a capacity for experimentation and newness—whether individual variations in men's sideburns (it must be accepted as a forward step that the graying sideburn is replacing the gray flannel suit in business circles) or some remarkably uninhibited forms, for example in church worship. You visit an Episcopal church in Washington where the mass is a true celebration of life, complete with drums, instrumentalists and sometimes impromptu dancing; above are psychedelic banners declaring, "Let the Risen Lord Turn You On," or "Love is a Damned Good Thing."

You learn that the counterpoint to your hangups is "doing your thing." It is often done with worrisome abandon, calculated to shock, and to dramatize and ridicule contemporary nonsense. But there is buried underneath the ridiculousness and the strident protest a thrust for self-expression which, harnessed, can be turned to enormously creative account—or, unbridled, can do a good deal of harm.

You read the polls on student attitudes and wonder if these don't reveal more than the bizarre happenings that dominated our evening television fare all spring. Eighty-four per cent of college kids place themselves in the middle ground categories of moderately conservative (19 per cent), middle-of-the-road (24 per cent) and moderately liberal (41 per cent).

Still more important, the surveys find this college generation self-motivated, deeply sensitive to injustice, service-oriented and (needless to say) anticonformist. There is an enormous potential for constructive change in all of this; it is, in truth, a little disconcerting that students should profess such splendid motivations as they go around occupying buildings, roughing up the deans and defiling the established generation.

THE CHANGING SUBURBS

Residential trends in and around Northern cities remain ominous. Yet an expert in Washington tells you that the outflow of whites to the suburbs has in the past year, and for the first time, almost been equaled by the outflow of blacks. Residential integration is still essentially a fleeting transitional phase as city neighborhoods move from white to black occupancy.

Then you go to the graduation ceremonies of the local junior high school. The integrated glee club (not as many whites as before, but still some) sings, "We Shall Overcome." It sounds as if they mean it.

Attitudes on both sides of the color line remain more malleable than perhaps we realize. You come across a CBS public opinion poll

from 1968 which found 49 per cent of its Negro respondents willing to give active support to the successor of Martin Luther King, as opposed to 1 per cent to Ron Karenga, 2 per cent to Rap Brown and 4 per cent to Stokely Carmichael. Mohammed Ali tells a television interviewer: "For black people to start shooting in their fight against American society would be as silly as for you to get up and start hitting me."

Bradley loses in Los Angeles; that is bad. But 47 per cent of the population votes for a black candidate in a city where only 18 per cent of the community is Negro; that is good. In fact it is almost unprecedented. And in the New Yorker, you read Charles Evers' speech after being elected mayor of Fayette, Miss.: "All of us have won a victory in Mississippi. All the poor blacks, and all the concerned, scared whites. I'm not going to belittle the whites, because they need help, just as we need help."

So the returns are not all in, not yet. This much at least can be said. We are talking about our problems. Before returning home, I had heard that there was in this country a perilous communications gap. But never before have I been exposed to such a flood-tide of communications as have swept over me since our return.

It is true that much of what is said is not being heard. The decibel level is too high, or the message too strident, or we are simply not turned on. But talking we are. With extraordinary frankness. I read that Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst has even urged police to invite militants to lecture at police academies!

No other society exposes itself to analysis, criticism and debate with the abandon practiced here. That is why we cannot yet take seriously the glib comparison between modern America and ancient Rome, by those who talk of a "decline and fall" syndrome.

OIL DEPLETION CONTROVERSY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the recent debate on the tax reform bill in the House, many of the Members enthusiastically applauded the action of the Ways and Means Committee in cutting the rate of the oil and gas percentage depletion allowance. I believe their endorsement of the provisions of H.R. 13270 that adversely affected America's natural resource industry was unwise.

Over the past several months, it has been clear to me that the critics of percentage depletion have not been willing to consider the factual considerations that fully justify the retention of the present tax incentives designed to encourage the search for oil and gas. Many things that an individual does in this life are greatly influenced by the emotions of the times, but my concern in this particular case is that the emotional appeal of eliminating a symbol may blind us to reality with the result that hasty action may produce irreparable harm. In my judgment, the action taken with regard to percentage depletion, if allowed to stand, could and would have a serious effect on the economic strength and military security of this great Nation.

In this regard, I would like to call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on July 30, 1969, which presents a factual point of view that must be considered in reaching an informed attitude on this important subject. I would like to insert a copy of this editorial in the RECORD at this time and urge all the Members of this body and our colleagues in the other body to evaluate objectively and dispassionately the logic and thoughts of the editorial. The editors of the Globe-Democrat have rendered an outstanding public service by publishing this thoughtful and timely editorial comment.

The editorial follows:

OIL DEPLETION CONTROVERSY

The House Ways and Means Committee, dedicated to mapping out a tough tax reform bill, has moved against the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance for income taxes. The committee has decided to recommend slashing this allowance to 20 percent.

Something of a public clamor has been drummed up against the oil depletion exemption—designed to help oil companies develop new wells. It has been a provision in the law for at least four decades.

This is a complex issue. Many feel the allowance is simply a loophole favoritism, giving huge oil corporations special tax consideration.

There is a tub-thumping drive to persuade the public they are getting gigged by big-power interests.

The assault on the depletion allowance, however, could prove a danger to national security and the United States economy.

The oil companies have offered a plausible case for retaining the allowance. Unless a better case can be made by opponents, it seems to us the 27½ percent depletion credit should be continued.

Whether imperative development of essential oil reserves could result without the full depletion program is very doubtful.

In conjunction with existing import quotas, to bar cheap foreign oil from our markets in heavy quantity, the depletion can aid the oil industry to keep the United States relatively self-sufficient in basic fuel supply.

Petroleum and gas now supply 75 percent of America's required energy. Studies indicate that by 1980 the industry will have to find virtually as much oil as has been produced since the first well was drilled in 1859. This means a drastic need for developing new resources in buried oil.

The United States Geological Survey has estimated there is still plenty of oil to be discovered in the United States. But exploratory drilling has declined sharply because of a cost-price squeeze.

The nation's security, its very operation, depends on oil. Our self-sufficiency in petroleum—certainly as far as possible—should not be imperiled through dependence on Arab or other foreign oil, which could be suddenly cut off. It was, in 1967, when the Middle East crisis stopped the flow of Arabian oil to the United States.

This is a basic reason for the depletion allowance, plus the fact that all reserves are part of the industry's capital assets. Why should oil be heavily taxed on its capital, without some means of restoring that capital through new exploration. Other industry and business are not assessed income taxes on capital.

The idea that the oil industry is a profit mammoth, sucking special privilege through tax laws, is in our opinion a bugaboo. Certainly there must be profits or the industry would erode and fail.

The 21 large companies, according to a recent survey by Price Waterhouse and Co., paid a direct tax bill of \$9.5 billion in 1967. This equalled 64.2 percent of these corporations' net profits before income taxes.

The total tax load of the petroleum industry has been put at 5.43 percent of gross revenues; all other corporations were taxed 4.62 percent of gross revenues.

Oil does not appear rolling up vast profits and seeking unfair tax loopholes through the depletion route. Actually return on oil's net assets was a bit less than on manufacturing companies generally.

High living standards in the United States mean we consume the most energy of any other country, and correspondingly need more reserves. Otherwise the future will find us power-crippled. It should also be remembered the depletion provision applies to some 100 other mineral products, imperative to the economy.

Not for benefit of the oil industry, but in the necessity for national security, a prospering economy and self-sufficiency in a critically essential product. It seems the 27½ percent depletion allowance should be retained by Congress.

CHARLES "CHUCK" JOELSON

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to join with my colleagues and the many friends of CHARLES S. "CHUCK" JOELSON in wishing him all the best upon assuming his new duties as a judge on the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Before being elected to the 87th Congress, "CHUCK" already had a distinguished career behind him. He attained his B.A. in 1937 from Cornell University, and in his junior year was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa, and received his LL.B. in 1939. He began his practice in law in his hometown of Paterson, N.J. In 1942 he enlisted in the Navy and served with distinction in the Far Eastern Branch of the Division of Naval Intelligence. Upon his release from the Navy and return to civilian life, he became counsel to the city of Paterson, then deputy attorney general, and in turn acting prosecutor of Passaic County. For 2 years he was director of criminal investigation for the entire State of New Jersey, until his election to the Congress in 1960.

He served first as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and subsequently on the House Committee on Appropriations. In his duties as a legislator, he showed fair and impartial treatment in his approach to legislation before his committee and the House.

Mr. Speaker, now that "CHUCK" is returning to his chosen profession, the field of law, I am sure that he will bring to the superior court the same sense of fairness and impartial justice that he used as a Member of the House of Representatives, and extend heartiest congratulations to him for a most rewarding career on the bench.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the history of our country, we have amended our Constitution four times to enlarge or protect the exercise of the voting franchise. On each of these historic occasions, great issues confronted the Republic. The issues involved questions of sex, race, and equality of representation. Our decisions in those moments of stress and change have been wise, serving to strengthen our political process, our form of government and our people.

Today we again confront such an issue. That issue is whether full participation in the Nation's political affairs should be extended to those under 21 years of age. While four States have moved to grant the franchise to those under 21, the balance of the States have not up to this point made such a change. But I think it is clear that more and more attention is being given to this issue. In Wisconsin, the State assembly had passed a constitutional amendment which would lower the voting age to 18.

During my 6 years in the Wisconsin Legislature, I opposed lowering the voting age. I did so for many of the reasons which are stated today by those who oppose this proposition. I will not take the time, Mr. Speaker, at this point to detail either my reasons for opposition in the past or all of my reasons for having decided that it was appropriate to extend the voting franchise to those 18 and over.

There are, it seems to me, some very basic considerations which need to be considered by the House as we pursue this matter. There are two primary considerations as one examines the question of who should or should not vote. One is the need for awareness of the issues facing this Nation and the world. The other is a matter of judgment in terms of how one goes about making a decision before casting a vote. It is my considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, that there never has been a generation better informed than the current young generation. Our exceptional educational system coupled with rapid developments in communications have produced a competitive atmosphere and a body of information that combined has educated today's students far more than ever before. The interest of students today is increasingly directed into public affairs by means both of courses taught in high school and of the opportunity to view the world being shaped through the media. The young men and women in this country today are not only better informed but their opportunity to view a wider range of topics is greater. Our society has produced a consciousness and an incisive questioning of issues that are to me, astounding. Those of us who were a part of the campus task force group found across the country

some common identifiable major concerns of young people. These related to our society and its priorities to world affairs and to the kind of government and people we are.

This concern is not superficial. The kind of probing attitude revealed by young people across this land is based on candor and honesty. Thus, they are, I believe, more attuned to and knowledgeable about the political issues which face us as a people.

This argument is compelling insofar as lowering the voting age is concerned. There are some who will argue that those between 21 and 29 who now enjoy the right to vote, vote in lesser numbers than any other age group. This is, of course, true but one of the problems, I believe, is that we do not tap the knowledge that exists in those between 18 and 21 immediately upon their graduation from high school when their interest is at a peak.

The 3 years which I had at one time felt was needed for maturation today apparently serves as a time when people so seriously question the world about them that as they reach 21 they are no longer sure they want to be involved.

The tremendous enthusiasm, drive, interest, and concern our young people are exhibiting today is in danger of being directed against so many of the institutions that have served the country well in periods of past stress. The honest, forthright student of today's politics is increasingly faced with frustration when he is denied access to the process of affecting the world around him. The genuine dedication of many of today's young people to solving our Nation's problems deserves full recognition. We cannot turn a deaf ear to their suggestions, deny them their place in the political process, force them into affecting a system from without with ineffective means.

The age of 21 has since days of the Magna Carta in England been considered the time at which a person became mature and responsible. I question today whether that is, in fact, still valid. From my experiences on the college campus and in high school assemblies across the Sixth District of Wisconsin I find young people today older, more mature, more capable of asking perceptive questions and fully capable of exercising sound political judgment.

Judgment is not something that is reached magically at 21. There are those over 21 who lack judgment and yet we extend to them the franchise without qualification. I believe the vast majority of those under 21 to whom House Joint Resolution 865 would apply for Federal elections are capable of the kind of judgment which is needed to cast an intelligent vote.

To the extent that our political processes can foster trust, participation, and involvement, I believe the danger of violent confrontation can be reduced. To the extent that this Nation can foster an enhancement of quality and excellence throughout its political system, I believe creative leadership can be developed.

As in the past we have the opportunity

to extend the voting franchise to those who ought to be a part of our political system. As an increasing number of young people pay taxes, raise families, work hard for their community, State, and Nation, then they too must be recognized as full citizens. We have acted wisely in the past in recognizing ideas whose times have come. Today we have such an opportunity once again.

It is for that reason that I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK), in cosponsoring the resolution which would extend the right to vote to those 18 and over in Federal elections.

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the recess the New York Times magazine carried the text of a remarkable interview with that great American statesman, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, on the Vietnam war, the Paris talks, and the road we should follow to move toward peace. I include herewith the article as it appeared in the August 24 issue of the Times magazine and commend it to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PARIS TALKS STARTED 471 DAYS AGO:
HARRIMAN SUGGESTS A WAY OUT OF VIETNAM

(By Hedrick Smith)

The lanky profile of W. Averell Harriman has been a familiar sight in the highest councils of the nation since the days of the New Deal. Under four Democratic Presidents he has become a superdiplomat, a man who has dealt with Trotsky, Stalin, Khrushchev and Kossygin. His latest mission took him to Paris last year as the Johnson Administration's chief negotiator in the Vietnam peace talks.

Even at 77 and in retirement, the former New York Governor has been lobbying publicly and privately at the White House and with members of Congress and the press corps for faster and more flexible American initiatives to end the war.

I reported on Harriman in action last year in Paris and recently talked with him about his ideas on Vietnam and dealing with the Russians. In this interview Harriman is careful not to give away official secrets, but he does make some interesting disclosures—for example, that he and his deputy in Paris, Cyrus R. Vance, arranged for secret four-party talks but the agreement fell through, and that the Americans won Hanoi's approval for a roundtable only to have Saigon object. And he suggests ways of breaking the negotiating deadlock and scaling down the combat.

Harriman's comments reveal his grave doubt that the South Vietnamese President, Nguyen Van Thieu, can survive a settlement unless many more non-Communist elements are drawn into the regime, and his view of a likely settlement of the war: a share of political power for the National Liberation Front, a gradual reunification of North and South and long-term U.S. aid for Hanoi.

Governor, you've talked many times about

the idea of a Southern solution in Vietnam. Is this just a polite way of saying that in the end we're going to have to settle for a coalition which includes both Saigon elements and the National Liberation Front?

HARRIMAN. I don't know what's going to come out of it. I'd always hoped we could get the people from Saigon together with the N.L.F. and put them in a room and lock the doors and throw away the key until they came out with a decision.

We had arranged—or at least we thought we had, Cy Vance and I—that we would have private talks, the four of us together, right after the first open meeting.

This was last November in Paris?

HARRIMAN. Yes, after the end of the bombing and after we had agreed on the procedures for four-party talks with the South Vietnamese Government represented. In fact, it was so clear that we would have four-party private talks that the North Vietnamese asked if it would be possible for us to continue sometimes to have bilateral talks. I said: "Well, of course it would be, because we must have many subjects of mutual interest."

It hasn't worked out that way; both sides have been rather cautious about being unwilling to talk to each other, and it shows that each side is a bit afraid of the other. But one of the things that's absolutely essential is that the Saigon Government must broaden its base. It's not a very good negotiating team for the future of the South Vietnamese people when it represents such a narrow group.

You mean it should include many other elements, even progressives like the leftist Buddhists?

HARRIMAN. Yes. There are a number of different groups. I'm quite convinced that by far the majority of the people don't want to be taken over by the Vietcong or Hanoi; they want to be independent. The trouble is they're split a dozen different ways, and no one has been able to bring them together.

President Diem was not able to do so. That was the reason for his fall. And he got too arbitrary, put too many people in jail. And this Government is putting a lot of people in jail. I was rather startled when I heard President Thieu, coming back from meeting President Nixon at Midway, announce that he was going to punish severely anyone who suggested a coalition government.

Well, our position has been that we're not opposed to a coalition government. You remember I said in Paris a number of times that we would not impose it. We were not against it, but we would not impose it. We were against a government's being imposed either by Hanoi or by Washington.

How do you distinguish between broadening the base of the Thieu Government and what Hanoi and the N.L.F. call forming a "peace cabinet"? Are you suggesting we have to dispense with the Thieu regime?

HARRIMAN. No, I'm not. We've been urging Thieu to broaden the base, and he did to some extent when he brought in Tran Van Huong last year as Premier, and then others, but he didn't really bring together a coalition of all the anti-Vietcong forces. There are different groups, different sects, religious groups. There are two techniques, and both should be used. One is to bring in ministers that are representative of different groups, get a coalition that way. Another, possibly better technique, is to have what they once had, which is a council of notables. They could get some fellow who had great popular appeal—Big Minh,¹ for instance—to be chair-

¹ Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh, a leader of the 1963 coup that overthrew the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Minh was in exile in Thailand until last fall and since then has been living quietly in Saigon.

man, and have it a consultative group, bring in everybody. Now, it couldn't be just a front; it would have to be consulted. Thieu would have to give up some of his arbitrary positions; he would have to really consult these people as to the kind of settlement they wanted to have.

We've been trying to persuade Thieu to broaden the base, but we've never really put heat on him, and I think that is something that ought to be done; I say put the heat on him and make him understand that this is essential for our support. I think he'd do it then.

I'm afraid that I would disagree with what the Embassy people think is enough. Some people think it's enough that he reshuffle the Cabinet and bring in two or three people who belong to certain different groups. I think he's got to bring them all into something like this council of notables, all the non-Communist groups.

There'd be some very vigorous differences of opinion between these groups, of course. But if Thieu cannot dominate the non-Communist groups, there's not much hope—is there?—for his surviving as a leader in his country, because the other side has no use for him. Thieu has been a very shrewd operator, but he hasn't got the appeal that a fellow like Big Minh has.

Do you think that broadening the base of the Saigon Government would break the present stalemate in the Paris talks, or do you think other steps are necessary?

HARRIMAN. I don't think that we'll ever come to serious negotiations until we're ready to accept the status quo, militarily and politically. The other side made it quite plain to us that they'd continue fighting as long as we continued fighting. This seems rather natural to me. If you're going to try to make a settlement you've got to accept the status quo.

I think that we ought to abandon our efforts to expand the pacification program into new areas. That's an attempt by the Saigon Government, with our support, to improve their position, to get control of more villages which were rather doubtful or were under V.C. control. As I recall it, in December, half of our combat forces were engaged in that operation. So it was a quite important activity.

But the principal object would be for our forces to go into more defensive positions, to be available if the other side attacked, but not to try, at the last minute, either to "win the war" militarily or to pacify the people. You know, there's great hope in the Embassy in Saigon that in a few more months they can do a good deal in pacification. I have grave doubts about the permanent value of this procedure.

What's more important is to consolidate our position in the areas clearly controlled by the Government, and that means getting more of the people back of the Government in the manner that I described. That has to be done or the future elections will be quite unfortunate.

You seem to imply that recognizing the political realities means recognizing that the other side is going to have a share of the political power in the South as part of any settlement. Otherwise, they won't have any interest to stop fighting.

HARRIMAN. That's right. How it can be achieved is very hard. There are certain countries that have survived with an active, vigorous Communist party. In France and Italy, for instance, you have strong Communist parties in opposition to the Government. In Finland, the Communist party is participating in the Government. There are others that were not successful in withstanding this. In the Western European countries, a number of them had Communist participation in government for a short period but

the non-Communist forces were strong enough to throw them out.

Let's look at the military side for a moment. We've had 16 months in Paris now, and we've had a battlefield lull this summer, as we had last summer and at other periods. Do you think that the first order of business now should be getting a cease-fire in order to set the conditions for political talks?

HARRIMAN. A cease-fire is a difficult thing. We had hoped in January to—well, as a matter of fact, in November, it was very clear there was not only a lull in the fighting, but there was a disengagement in the northern two provinces of South Vietnam. Ninety per cent of the North Vietnamese troops there were taken out. Half of them went as far north as the 20th Parallel, nearly 200 miles north; the others were kept closer by, either just north of the DMZ or in Laos. There was little or no fighting, and that had been one of the most active battlefronts. But General Abrams, our commander, was able to take advantage of their pullback to move the First Cavalry Division out of that area, the I Corps, and into the III Corps area to increase our pressure on the enemy there.

Did you feel that Hanoi was ready to proceed with some kind of formal disengagement?

HARRIMAN. We weren't sure what we could do. Our trouble was that we never could talk about military settlements with the North Vietnamese alone because they maintained that they weren't fighting; it was the N.L.F. or the V.C. that was fighting. They wanted to talk to us about a political settlement and we wouldn't talk about a political settlement without the Saigon Government represented.

So we only talked around subjects. But their act of disengagement in the North convinced us in Paris that they were ready to move further in the reduction of the level of violence, working toward a cease-fire.

Now, you have to have a cease-fire if there is to be a political settlement. We thought perhaps we could feel our way into a cease-fire by specific actions; in other words, areas of disengagement—no fighting in the I Corps area, for instance—and see how it worked.

Then we did have a very important negotiating weapon, the B-52 raids. They were extremely unhappy about the B-52 raids. They never told us how effective they were in terms of the damage they did, but the effect on the morale of the V.C., N.L.F., North Vietnamese was terrific. Suddenly out of the sky would come the most tremendous explosions, and they wanted to get rid of that.

Now, I think in return for stopping the B-52's we might well have come to an understanding that they would stop a great deal of their violence, or all of their violence in Saigon and the other cities—stop ambushing some of the highways.

This was what we hoped to achieve if the Saigon Government representation had come to Paris and been ready to negotiate. This is what we hoped to achieve right away in November, and I think it would have made a basis for us to withdraw troops even last year because they had taken troops north. This is after all, one of the ways to come to an understanding. One way is by specific agreement, the other by mutual example. And both are effective.

Now a cease-fire should be our objective, but how we can reach it is a matter that has never been fully worked out. The military have never liked it, you know, because to some extent, what President Nixon said the other day is their view: "We cease and the other side fires." That's a little bit too facetious on a serious subject. And there is a feeling that the conventional armies are at a disadvantage with the guerrillas because you can see an army move, whereas the guerrillas can move around in the jungle without much difficulty.

On the other hand, there are certain things we can tell, such as whether there

are terrorist acts in the villages. If they did that sort of thing, we'd know about it.

Did you object last fall to our maintaining unceasing pressure on the enemy—building up the pressure in III Corps, for instance, when the action fell off in I Corps?

HARRIMAN. No. Well, we in Paris were for a change in the orders for all-out pressure, but we were not pressing it because we always thought that the Saigon representatives would appear in Paris and then we would negotiate.

Were there actual proposals being discussed within our Government at that time for a mutual reduction of violence?

HARRIMAN. No—I came back at the end of November, you know, and made our views known here in Washington. But by that time the Saigon Government had agreed to come to Paris. We thought any moment we would start the discussions, so we were going to try to come forward with specific proposals on the mutual reduction of violence. But that never came about because we had this ridiculous performance of Saigon objecting to the shape of the table. I kept telling these Saigon representatives it didn't make the slightest difference what the shape of the table was. We had suggested a round table in October, and the other side had accepted it. The fact the other side accepted it made the Saigon people opposed to it. The round table historically has been a method of ending all dispute as to who has seniority; no one knows where the head of a round table is.

I remember your suggesting—and Secretary of Defense Clifford's suggesting—during this period that if Saigon dragged its feet we'd just go right ahead and talk with the North Vietnamese about this question of military disengagement, de-escalation. Why wasn't that tried?

HARRIMAN. Well, that was not accepted by the President. I was entirely willing to go ahead. I think if we had the Saigon Government would have come along pretty rapidly. But I think that probably our officials in Saigon felt that it would be too much of a blow to the prestige and position of the Saigon Government and would tend to undermine it too much.

On this summer now: Do you think the other side has been trying to signal us with the latest lull that they're willing once again to go into military disengagement?

HARRIMAN. I'm not sufficiently au courant with the details. They reduced the fighting, undoubtedly because they ran out of steam. They have these offensives and they carry them on as long as they can. Then they run out of steam and they wait and re-equip and replace their losses and start again. The military are quite right in saying that.

But in almost all the cases in the last year, I think, there was a political intent in connection with it. In fact, they stated it to me once in private talks. They said: "Whenever we attack, you say that this attack is not conducive to an atmosphere which furthers the peace negotiations. But when we stop, Saigon announces we are defeated and forced to end the attack."

They never said—they never will say—"We have stopped for a political purpose." They think that it would be considered by many people in the United States, both the military and other hawks, that they'd been beaten if they were to say, "We've stopped because we wanted to negotiate."

The way to freeze this is to take parallel action, announce that you're taking parallel action; we can afford to announce it. That's one trouble with the present situation. Nobody knows whether we really have stopped offensive action.

Do you take Secretary of Defense Laird's announcement that we're now following a strategy of "protective reaction" as a step in the right direction?

HARRIMAN. I would say it's a step in the right direction, but I don't think it's enough so far because I still see the B-52 raids. Maybe there are discussions going on in Paris that I don't know about. But we have to be very precise about what we're going to do and demand what we expect them to do in return.

I was very much disturbed by these recent terrorist attacks, one at Camranh and one in Saigon. They undoubtedly did this to show that they were not completely impotent, not defeated. They attacked the two supposedly most well-protected areas. Now, this is unfortunate, and one of the things that I certainly would have recommended is that we would make a deal with them that we stop our B-52 raids in return for their agreeing not to take this kind of terrorist action. Unfortunately, fighting has recently increased.

Then you are advocating that we move toward a kind of a territorial accommodation, where they have areas that we really don't go into much, and we have large sanctuaries that they don't hit so forcefully?

HARRIMAN. Well, all I can say is that our program in January was to do what Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford said publicly: "Our first objective should be the reduction of the level of combat," were the words he used. We can't have it both ways—expect the enemy to end their attacks while we keep up a "little" offensive action, "some" B-52 raids and "somewhat fewer" offensive sweeps. There was a plan to avoid contact. In other words, have our probes to avoid contact rather than to get contact. Now Cy Vance, my partner in Paris, has joined the group calling for a cease-fire in place. If the Administration undertook to go that route, I'd support it.

The position I've been taking is for a step-by-step reduction in violence. There may be a more practical way to get at it, but I do feel that one thing is absolutely vital: that the President of the United States take the lead in ending the fighting, ending the killing.

So you take issue with the idea that, in offering a mixed election commission and an election open to all, we have gone as far as we can go, to use Nixon's words.

HARRIMAN. I don't understand what's been offered. I don't know why they take this position. It never occurred to me that the Communists would enter an election on the basis of the winner taking all. There has to be some prior understanding on other issues. You've got to go through the N.L.F.'s points.² You can't pick just one aspect of settlement. You've got to go through each one of those 10 points and see how much of it you can give in to and how much you won't. The Saigon Government has its objectives, its eight points; these have to be molded.

I don't think it's a reasonable proposition to just pick one thing in the election, particularly as the Government continues to put people in jail. They give no indication so far that anybody's going to have any freedom in South Vietnam to have a free discussion or free campaigning.

So you have to have some understandings. For instance, you would want to be sure that

² The National Liberation Front put forward in Paris last May a 10-point proposal that is still the basis of its negotiating position. The plan called for the establishment of a provisional coalition government to hold national elections, the implementation of agreements on the withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces, the achievement of "national concord" as the basis for a post-war coalition government, the "step-by-step" reunification of North and South and the payment of war reparations to both North and South Vietnam by the United States. The 10 points are considered to be more up to date than a more detailed though generally similar political program published on Sept. 1, 1967.

there would be no reprisals against anyone for their past political actions. If there is to be a political settlement, it must provide for the personal safety of people on both sides. In addition, there might be an understanding about postponing reunification. My own feeling has been that the N.L.F. has been rather keen to see South Vietnam independent of the North for some years. They may want to delay reunification until the South is as strong as the North. I would have thought they'd agree to postponing any merger for a period of five to ten years.

Another point that could be discussed is the character of the postwar society. The N.L.F.'s 1967 program included a provision that the social-economic structure would seem to be a mixed socialist and capitalist society. Peasants would own their own farms. Private capital, both domestic and foreign, would be encouraged in many activities. These are things which might be talked out, and if you could get an arrangement which had some lasting qualities about it, then there'd be a chance for it to succeed.

Doesn't the mixed election commission that Nixon and Thieu have talked about open the way to this sort of thing?

HARRIMAN. It's an important step from Thieu's standpoint, but it isn't enough. What's going to come out of that election? A new constitution isn't provided for—the character of the regime, the manner in which it's to operate.

And, of course, I have the very strong feeling that we have to come to an agreement with Hanoi ourselves—the United States. It's very vivid in my mind that Hanoi didn't abide by the 1962 Laos agreement for a single day. So, no matter what is agreed to in the South, it isn't going to be of any value unless we come to an understanding with Hanoi which makes it in their interest to keep the agreement.

North Vietnam is fiercely nationalistic. It doesn't want to be dominated by China. It doesn't want to be beholden to Moscow. Now, we have every reason to believe that Moscow wants to see Southeast Asia independent, so we have some basis to start to work out some kind of an agreement. This would be of the most vital importance.

The North Vietnamese are very anxious, you know, to get economic and technical assistance. Miracle rice is one of the most important things to them. They've had a 300,000-ton food deficit which they're getting from China. The don't like that. If they could get miracle rice and the techniques of growing it from us, I think they would hope to be independent of China.

Do you think that this kind of economic enticement is going to be a sufficient safeguard?

HARRIMAN. Well, there's something to their desire to be independent of China and to have normal relations with us, the desire to have technical assistance, to have loans to buy equipment from us and other ways to rebuild and develop their country. These are all things that are a basis for coming to an agreement.

What other kinds of safeguards ought to be put into an agreement?

HARRIMAN. Of course, we should consider international guarantees and an international police force. They're all very difficult. The International Control Commission set up in '54 has worked badly. The old procedures would not be acceptable; they would have to be improved. But there'd have to be real guarantees that would have a reasonable chance of being effective.

Isn't there going to be inevitable tension after any agreement between the desire of the North Vietnamese—and many other Vietnamese, for that matter—to have the country reunified and our desire that it not be immediately reunified?

HARRIMAN. Actually there's a good deal of evidence to indicate that the N.L.F. wants to have independence for South Vietnam for a period of years. That is hinted at in the 10 points and in their program published Sept. 1, 1967. And a number of your reporter friends have reported that they spoke about reunification being a long-delayed matter—10 to 15 years.

These men are Southerners. They don't want to be taken over by the North. My guess is that it would not be too hard to come to an agreement that a merger with the North would be done only after a popular vote in the South, but it would be postponed for several years.

Some people maintain that the other side has sensed the tremendous urge in this country to wind up the war, and that they're content to sit tight and just let American impatience finally drive us and Saigon to accept their terms.

HARRIMAN. It's very hard to tell. They had a very good young researcher. They got the Congressional Record. They could quote speeches of some of our distinguished members of the Senate in detail and sometimes rather embarrassingly to me, but how far they believe that represented the main body of American opinion I don't know.

My own feeling about this is that they want to come to a settlement rather than have a military takeover; there's an advantage to them in having the stability that comes from some sort of a settlement. They had a lot of difficulties from the political opposition when they took over the North. It wasn't an easy thing, and it would be much more difficult to take over the South. I think they'd much rather move into a situation where there's a political agreement.

What has bothered me very much is that very little progress seems to have been made since January. And I'm more concerned about the United States, really, than I am about North Vietnam. The demand for a settlement, the demand for the end of the fighting, may become very real in this country. One hears and talks about student movements next October if there's no settlement by then or if the fighting goes on as it is now.

I'm very much opposed to a cut-and-run strategy, and I'm afraid that if this Administration doesn't make more progress, there will be more and more pressure on the Government.

That can expand, and I would hate to see that. I think it's very important to have an orderly settlement of this, and I believe it can be done if we stick to our limited objectives.

I think we could rally public opinion, world opinion, to us if the President would announce that he was for an end to the fighting, for taking steps for a cease-fire, and that should be the first order of business. I think you'd get a good reaction everywhere. The North Vietnamese pay a lot of attention to world opinion.

What about the Soviet Union, how much can it help achieve a settlement?

HARRIMAN. I want to first say what they won't do. I saw Premier Kosygin just about four years ago and had two long talks with him. He made it very plain that they were going to support Hanoi militarily, both with equipment and with volunteers—any number of volunteers they wished. The great Soviet Union, as leader of the Communist movement, had an obligation to support a "sister Socialist state." I assume the North Vietnamese have some kind of an understanding with China because China has been helping them, too.

But the Russians are not going to come to Washington and say, "What kind of a settlement do you want?" and then try to impose it on Hanoi. They're going to take Hanoi's side in these negotiations. If we

can come to some basic agreement with Hanoi, I think they'll be very helpful in smoothing out some of the rough parts of the road. That happened in October and also in January.

They will, I think, add some confidence to Hanoi in its negotiations. Hanoi felt it had an agreement with the French in '46, you remember, and that petered out, and they don't think the '54 agreement worked out as it was intended to. And I think the Soviet Union can be of a good deal of help to them in giving them a sense of confidence and in urging them to give in on some of the less-important details. But they won't take our side in supporting the Thieu Government, for instance.

You mentioned that they had helped before. How did this actually work out before the bombing halt and when you were trying to get four-sided talks started?

HARRIMAN. Well, we made certain progress and then we came to some roadblocks. I kept in touch with the Soviet Embassy in Paris and the State Department kept in touch with the Embassy here. They wouldn't tell us just what they did or how they did it, but in any event, the roadblocks were removed.

Now, in January, the procedures were settled in Paris. A member of the Soviet Embassy talked it over with Hanoi's representatives and persuaded them, I think, that they had more to gain by starting negotiations than they had to lose by this argument over the shape of the table—they were being as stubborn as Saigon, you know.

It's very hard to say just where they would be helpful. We found ourselves in a parallel position with the Soviet Union in India and Pakistan. We supported Mr. Kosygin's initiative in bringing the leaders of the two countries together in Tashkent to arrange for a cease-fire. We are both helping India and Pakistan economically. They are helping them both militarily, and it's quite clear that they want to see a subcontinent strong enough, independent enough, to check China's advance.

You think they have the same common interest with us in Southeast Asia as there?

HARRIMAN. They have parallel interests, not the same, because eventually I think they'd like to see the whole world communized. But in the meantime an immediate objective is to see these countries strong enough to check Chinese expansion. We're not going to come to an agreement, but we will find ourselves in a parallel position. There's no reason to believe they won't act in Southeast Asia as they acted in India.

What sort of things do you think they'll nudge Hanoi on? Are they really going to push Hanoi to do something it wouldn't do anyway?

HARRIMAN. I think they will encourage them to abandon positions which are very difficult for us to accept, and they'll give them a sense of confidence. If they saw us withdrawing and reducing the fighting, I think they'd encourage the other side to agree to stop the fighting and the violence. If we were doing something and expecting Hanoi to take parallel action, I think they'd encourage it.

Some of President Nixon's advisers have spoken rather loosely of the idea that you might be able to link such issues as Vietnam, the Middle East, Berlin, arms talks—this sort of thing—with the Soviet Union. You've been negotiating off and on with the Russians for 40 years. Do you think that this is the way they operate?

HARRIMAN. I would say that this is a most unwise notion. Each situation stands on its own feet. The idea that we could ask the Soviet Union to abandon some of their political positions in one part of the world in order to bribe us to come to an agreement with them about nuclear restraint is just

September 9, 1969

unreal, it isn't so. They have exactly the same interests in nuclear restraint as we have. They want a secure situation; they want to reduce the danger of nuclear war, and we cannot combine these negotiations. This is an absolutely erroneous conception.

Any thought that they will pay us something to come into negotiations for nuclear restraint, I just don't understand. We wouldn't do it. They wouldn't sacrifice their personal security any more than we would, and it only complicates a situation.

Now, the Russians are very much affected by what we do, and I would assume that we are affected by what they do. President Kennedy was successful in the nuclear test ban, which, as you remember, he appointed me to go to Moscow and negotiate, because of his American University speech. It was a conciliatory speech. He didn't give anything away, but it indicated a real desire on his part to come to an understanding. Also, he announced that we would stop testing as long as the other side stopped testing. This persuaded Premier Khrushchev that he was serious and jarred those prolonged negotiations off dead center. When we went to Moscow, we settled it within two weeks.

If today the President would announce that we would not go on testing multiple warheads (we'd of course go ahead with research and development but not test) provided the Soviet Union would abandon any further tests in this field, I think it would expedite the negotiations and carry them forward.

One can say that this can't be all one-sided. I'm very much influenced by a conciliatory speech Foreign Minister Gromyko made. I'm affected by the manner in which Mr. Kosygin called in the senior American who happened to be in Moscow at that time, Hubert Humphrey, and spoke very glowingly in congratulating the United States on the moon achievement. That was an unusual thing to do. This must have been particularly difficult because of the failure of their moonshot, whatever it was supposed to do.

These are gestures on their part, in spite of the lack of progress in both the Middle East and Vietnam. Now we want to watch what they do with the greatest of care and see whether the atmosphere is right. But this idea of saying, "Well now, you force Hanoi to do this and so and we'll come to Moscow and trade you," just doesn't work.

In the first place, they can't dominate Hanoi. Number two, they're competing with Peking for the goodwill of Hanoi. They can only go so far.

I gather that Gromyko went to see President Nasser the other day and came back empty-handed. Now, how much pressure the Soviet Union's ready to put on Egypt to get a Middle East settlement I don't know, but it was unsuccessful. I'm still hopeful that something can be done. Events in the Middle East are heading on a collision course, and the only way we can hope to come to a settlement before that happens again is through the influence of the Soviet Union and ourselves.

They are publicly demanding that Israel accept the Nasser terms, which, of course, Israel isn't going to do and we're not going to ask Israel to do. But it's unrealistic to think that you can link a settlement in Vietnam with a settlement in the Middle East. They are not within the Soviet Union's ability to deliver.

You said they would be impressed by what we do. Do you think Moscow and Hanoi were impressed by the theme of President Nixon's trip to Asia, "Asia for the Asians; we're not going to get involved in internal wars in the future?"

HARRIMAN. Well, I would think that they were probably just about as much puzzled as to what President Nixon has in mind as

we are puzzled by what Moscow has in mind when they speak about collective security for Asia. If you understand what collective security on the part of Moscow means, why then I think you can explain to me what President Nixon means.

Wasn't that Soviet idea directed primarily against Communist China? What's the possibility of war between the Soviet Union and China in the next few years?

HARRIMAN. I wouldn't want to predict it. We have to remember that the Soviets are used to having minor border conflicts. They had them with Japan before World War II along the Amur River. We may see some minor conflicts.

Something like the Chinese border war against India in 1962?

HARRIMAN. Well, that's a little bit more vigorous than I would think. The Chinese tried to show up the weakness of India. I'm not sure that the Russians will want to go that far; they might. There may be border skirmishes. There may be an attempt by the Soviet Union to teach China a lesson. But I don't think it will develop into a major conflict.

What impact do you think President Nixon's visit to Rumania had on Soviet-American relations?

HARRIMAN. Frankly, I was very glad to see President Nixon go to Rumania. Obviously, the Russians object to it a bit. They don't want to see Rumania become too independent. But it's a move in a healthy direction for the President of the United States to try to develop better relations with the Eastern European countries. And I hope that this Administration explained to the Soviets that this was his objective and in a sense that it will help further some things which the Soviets would like to see accomplished—better trade relations, which they're very much interested in.

And I would hope the talks in Bucharest would lead to President Nixon's recommending legislation to permit us to engage in more trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We are denying ourselves of very profitable trade. Western Europe and Japan do about \$8-billion in trade with them each year, whereas we have only a few hundred million dollars.

Are you optimistic about the over-all prospects for detente between the United States and the Soviet Union?

HARRIMAN. Not over-all detente. There are still too many subjects on which agreements cannot be reached. They still want to promote Communism to a point where it will dominate the world. We want to see nations of the world free, people free.

There are certain areas, however, in which I think we can come to an agreement. Nuclear restraint is the one which I think is the most important. Despite the discouragement so far, I hope we can work together in finding a solution to the Middle East, and I do expect the Soviets to help us in Vietnam if we can make more progress with Hanoi than we have so far.

You give more over-all importance to the arms talks than the Vietnam negotiations?

HARRIMAN. Yes. Vietnam is the most immediate problem, but—looking at the long term—ending the nuclear arms race is of vital importance. It's important not only to save reckless additional expenditures on both sides but also, as Mr. Kosygin said to me, while the Soviet Union and the United States have the preponderant control of nuclear weapons, it is our obligation to attempt to come to an understanding, which will reduce the risk of nuclear war. I'm satisfied that the Soviets are sincere in that and if we meet them halfway, I think we can come to an understanding.

AMERICAN LEGION CONFIRMS ABSENCE OF CREDIBLE EVIDENCE OF MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CONSPIRACY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have become concerned by unfounded claims that some sort of a "conspiracy" exists between our great scientific-industrial community and the Defense Establishment, and that this is not in the public interest.

While it is true that there have been instances of unjustified waste and extravagance in the Department of Defense, it is equally true that there has been waste and extravagance in other branches of the Government.

These problems must be dealt with as they arise, but in striving to cope with them let us not lose our perspective and downgrade the important role that a powerful Military Establishment plays in terms of our national security and survival. If the critics have their way, in this highly competitive world, our great potential may be weakened to the point that we will become a second-rate power. Who wants that to happen?

Now let us examine for a moment what this military-industrial complex has done by way of positive accomplishment. Not only have we become preeminent as a military power, but other evidences of results that flow from this combination become apparent.

Let me cite an example. A few weeks ago all Americans were thrilled by the performance of the astronauts on their trip to the moon. We marveled at the discipline displayed by these heroic Americans. This magnificent achievement was by no means an accidental thing. What about the machine which took the astronauts to the moon and brought them back?

The discipline displayed by these three Americans, who will take their place among the heroes of all times, left nothing to be desired. Although the trip to the moon was under civilian control, the disciplines displayed had their roots in the development of the air arm of the Navy and the Air Force. The machine was itself incomparable in its perfection.

The building of this machine utilized all of the best in the industry of our great country. It involved private capital, efficient management, loyalty of workers, the latest in technical science, all blended together in building the perfect product which we have come to expect as routine from our superior free enterprise industry. In plain terms, let us not lose sight of the fact that this team of superbly disciplined men and a machine perfect beyond human understanding was the product of our military-industrial complex.

Yet, today, there are those who malign and question the fact that we do have a great military tradition. The presence of this concept has indeed been the bul-

wark of our defense throughout this century.

Let us listen to those who know whereof they speak, those who can speak with authority on this subject of how industry and the military have worked together. One of the most knowledgeable and respected authorities on this subject has been Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, retired, who, incidentally, hails from my district. As a part of my remarks I will include a letter written by him to the Washington Post, and also a column which he writes regularly for a number of daily newspapers.

Scores of others have shown their concern and have spoken out. Their warning should be heeded. Only recently an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal contained this:

For the foreseeable future an effective military force will remain absolutely essential to national survival. An effective force depends on generals who think and act like generals. If they worry about funds for defense and Communist advances in Asia, it is because that is what we pay them to worry about.

It is my belief that the voices of these patriotic citizens are beginning to be heard. The American Legion, which speaks authoritatively for millions of war veterans, has sounded a timely warning. The voice of the Legion is in fact the composite voice of all Americans who understand the rewards of peace, the meaning of war and the need for an adequate national defense.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the American Legion. I will also include a copy of a letter written to the Washington Post by General Eaker, and a column written by him which appeared in the San Angelo, Tex., Standard-Times. In addition, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. I urge careful reading of each of these.

These items follow:

RESOLUTION 527—COMMITTEE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Whereas, the strength of the nation depends not only on the number and quality of the men available to fight for it but also upon the scientific, technological and productive capacity of the nation's industries; and

Whereas, a harmonious relationship must exist between the military and industrial organizations to design, develop and deploy necessary weapons systems in support of our national security; and

Whereas, in two world wars the United States helped bring victory to the free nations by serving as the "arsenal of democracy" because management and labor united in a vital contribution to the effectiveness of our gallant comrades in arms; and

Whereas, many statements regarding the "military-industrial complex" have been made to the citizens of our country in biased or undocumented form in the attempt to downgrade our national military posture; and

Whereas, no modern military power can be created or maintained without sophisticated and vast industrial productive capabilities; and

Whereas, through the investment of private capital, efficient management and loyal workers, the great industrial corporations of America doing research, development and production for our aerospace, naval and

ground forces as well as for our space program, are an indispensable national resource which would have to be created if it did not already exist; and

Whereas, the maligned military-industrial complex is composed of workers, technicians, scientists and managers, united in support of their brothers and sons serving our country in all our military forces; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, August 26, 27, 28, 1969, that we cannot accept any philosophy that would downgrade or destroy the private enterprise relationship between the military and industry that has made this nation great and has kept it free; and we express our unending gratitude to all who have contributed to the industrial efforts which have supported our armed forces in war and at times of international tension; and, be it

Further resolved, that we urge the press, radio and television media as well as others who attract public attention and help mould public opinion to make every reasonable effort to present to the American people a fair and undistorted picture of the essentiality of cooperative efforts between our military forces and private enterprise so necessary to the survival of the nation and the protection of freedom throughout the world.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1969]

ANTI-MILITARY EMPHASIS

The Outlook Section of the Washington Post of Sunday, May 25, contained four anti-military articles under the headings:

1. Leashing Military Complex.
2. Defense Budget and the Nation's Future.
3. Formula for Harnessing the High Riding Military.
4. Toward a Society Dominated by the Military.

There were also four large defamatory cartoons highlighting the same theme, "Get rid of the military."

Your extraordinary emphasis upon destruction of the confidence of our citizens in their defense establishment, leadership and forces perplexes me. I can think of only two reasons why a rational U.S. citizen would want to destroy the military. One, the belief that we now live in a peaceful world and no longer need defense forces. The other, of course, is the knowledge that if U.S. military power is destroyed there will be no further bar to a world dominated by the USSR. Anyone sympathetic with or hopeful for a Red-dominated world could be most effective toward that end by enlisting in the campaign to destroy U.S. military forces.

I have always thought that a great newspaper should give its readers both sides of the principal issues affecting the security and welfare of our people. Is there any hope that the Washington Post will return to such a policy?

IRA C. EAKER,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Air Force,
retired.
WASHINGTON.

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, Apr. 26, 1969]

NO CREDIBLE EVIDENCE SUPPORTS CLAIM OF MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CONSPIRACY

President Eisenhower in January 1961, warned against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Recently, this admonition has been quoted a thousand times by far left columnists and commentators and by the pacifist press to support their contention that all generals are bomb-happy maniacs who love war and that all defense contractors are greedy robbers who build weapons at unconscionable profits.

One of the strangest anomalies of our times is the fact that a statement of the late Gen.

Eisenhower, who proudly devoted a major part of his life to a military career, should be used to support the charge that military men are warmongers and defense arsenals are unnecessary burdens.

In the last years of his life Gen. Eisenhower expressed regret at the reaction to his military-industrial complex warning, when temporarily exasperated by the false charge of a missile gap. He was disturbed that this statement had been taken out of context and made the rallying cry of the disarmament crowd. He wondered why no one seemed to remember another warning in his farewell address: "We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in methods. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no fanatical aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

In an address in Washington on March 17, Sen. Henry M. Jackson labeled the military-industrial complex charge as a myth. He put it in proper perspective in these terms: "Patently, this view (the industry-military complex theory) ignores the three great factors which have compelled the United States, for the first time in its history, to create and maintain a large permanent military establishment—the expansionist drive of Soviet and Red Chinese communism, the historic shift of world power westward to the United States and eastward to the Soviet Union, and the continuing scientific revolution."

The charge that weapons makers reap fantastic profits is clearly a myth. These corporations now making the principal weapons systems average 6 per cent profit on their government business while making more than 10 per cent on their non-government sales. For this reason all present weapons makers are now struggling to increase the percentage of their commercial sales over government business.

If the generals have striven to seize the power of decision over armaments, they have been singularly unsuccessful. At no time in our history has civilian control over the military been more positive than during the past eight years, as a few typical examples will indicate.

The \$8 billion TFX and the \$1 billion McNamara Line were approved by the secretary of defense against all military advice.

Civilian political leaders decided to engage in a massive land war in Asia against the counsel of military advisers. They also decided to create sanctuaries for the enemy and refrain from the normal use of sea and air power, contrary to military counsel.

Military leaders, disturbed by the rapid growth of Russian strategic power and our own unilateral disarmament, frequently have urged the replacement of aging ships and bombers. These requests have been repeatedly denied or deferred by the civilian leadership.

The 1970 budget initially submitted by the Johnson administration called for \$79 billion for defense although the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed an expenditure of \$93 billion. As proof that the Nixon administration has not surrendered to the military, it reduced the Johnson budget nearly \$2 billion.

Any concerned citizen who assembles and assesses all the facts will be reassured that there is no credible evidence to support the charges of a sinister military-industrial conspiracy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 1969]
REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—FOUR-STAR SCAPEGOATS

The "military-industrial complex" has become an increasingly fashionable bogeyman, and indeed the notion is spreading that the generals have created nearly all our national ills by running up defense spending and in-

volving us in Vietnam. These problems are certainly serious, but making the generals scapegoats for them obscures the actual lessons to be learned.

The international climate being what it is, the garrison state remains a real enough long-term danger, though it ought to be plain that at the moment military influence is not burgeoning but plummeting. This long-run danger surely will not be solved by turning military officers into a pariah class, as much as that would please those intolerant whose personality clashes with the military one. The danger requires a far more sober diagnosis, and this would find that many of the present complaints should be directed not at the generals but at their civilian superiors.

We tend to agree, for example, with the complaints that the Pentagon budget is swollen. But it tells us nothing to observe that the officers press for more funds for their department; in this they are no different from any bureaucrat anywhere. Indeed, the same people who think the generals malicious for requesting large funds would find it quite remiss if, say, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare failed to make similar demands for his concerns.

Choosing among competing budget demands is the responsibility of civilians, in the Pentagon, at the White House and in Congress. Part of the current problem seems to be that in the ballyhoo about "scientific" management of the Pentagon, the old-fashioned unscientific Budget Bureau review was relaxed. More generally, it needs to be recognized that the problem of fat in the budget is due less to the generals' greed than to a want of competence or will in civilian review.

Much the same thing is true in Vietnam. There is plenty of room to criticize the generals' incoherent answer to the problems of limited war, but many of the most decisive mistakes were made by civilians.

Take the failure to understand the escalation of our commitment implicit in supporting the coup against Ngo Dinh Diem. After we had implicated ourselves in overthrowing the established anti-Communist government, we could not with any grace walk away without a real effort to salvage the resulting chaos. Reasons of both honor and international credibility left us vastly more committed than before, and it was almost solely the work of civilians.

Or take the fateful decision to have both guns and butter, made in 1965 when the U.S. part of the ground fighting started in earnest. It was a civilian—and in no small part political—decision to avoid mobilization, to build the armed forces gradually, to expand the bombing of North Vietnam at a measured rate, to commit the ground units piecemeal. All of this is in direct contradiction to the thrust of military wisdom. And if the generals did favor defeating the Communists, the little public record available also suggests they favored means more commensurate with that goal.

The point is not that the generals necessarily should have been given everything they wanted. The point is that the civilians decided to do the job on the cheap. They would have been wiser to listen when the generals told them what means their goal required, then to face the choice between allocating the necessary means or cutting the goal to fit more modest means. This discord between means and goals is in a phrase the source of our misery in Vietnam, and primary responsibility for it rests not on military shoulders but civilian ones.

Blaming the generals for these problems maligns a dedicated and upstanding group of public servants. More than that, it obscures the actual problem with the military-industrial complex itself. For the real long-term danger is that the garrison state will evolve through precisely the type of failing

that led to fat in the budget and trouble in Vietnam.

For the foreseeable future an effective military force will remain absolutely essential to national survival. An effective force depends on generals who think and act like generals. If they worry about funds for defense and Communist advances in Asia, it is because that is what we pay them to worry about.

That the nation needs people to worry about such things certainly does release potentially dangerous forces that need to be controlled. The military's responsibility for controlling them is passive, to avoid political involvement, and our officer corps has a splendid tradition in that regard. The more difficult task of active control is essentially a civilian responsibility and the modern world makes it a terrible responsibility. But make no mistake, civilian control depends squarely on the will and wisdom of civilian leaders.

This simple but crucial understanding gets lost in the emotional anti-militarism growing increasingly prevalent. What gets lost, that is, is the first truth about the actual menace of a military-industrial complex—the danger is not that the generals will grab but that the civilians will default.

AMBASSADOR FAY OF IRELAND PASSES

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during this last week, which was marked by the death of several great Americans, the Diplomatic Corps of our Nation's Capital suffered a tragic loss of a great diplomat and gracious gentleman, Ambassador William P. Fay of Ireland.

His sudden death while visiting his home capital of Dublin ended an illustrious career in the diplomatic service of the Emerald Isle. His assignment to head the Irish Embassy in 1964 complemented a distinguished tenure of service that included assignments in Canada and France and other European nations.

Wherever he served, Bill Fay represented all that was the finest in a gentleman and diplomat—the scholarly human approach with a classic finesse for making friends for Ireland and winning the hearts of his legion of friends throughout the world.

Both he, and his likewise charming wife, Lillian, brought to the Washington diplomatic community a breath of fresh air and warmth that is so characteristic of the Irish people—something new and pleasant which made them among the most gracious and likable hosts this city has known.

It was my pleasure to know him, and call him my friend, and we in the United States shall miss him deeply.

William P. Fay was a great man, and was known as a great lover of Shakespeare, and I know he would love me to bring down his curtain with these lines from Hamlet:

Now cracks a noble heart.

Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest!

UNITED STATES MUST DIVORCE ISRAEL AGGRESSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as men of good will the world over talk of achieving peace, the world community opinion is shocked by today's news that Israel troops, tanks, and aircraft had executed an aggressive attack against Egyptian forces in the troubled northeast Africa region. In the days and weeks ahead there will be charges and countercharges offered by both sides, and the watching world can expect a counter-retaliation by the Egyptian forces to avenge their people.

The American people, weary of fighting communism—in Vietnam in a war their leaders have not permitted them to win—have been told repeatedly that world opinion would react against attacks across sovereign borders or bombing a hostile force supplying guerrilla infiltrators. To the American people there can be only one major concern with this new international crisis. Why did the United States supply the Israel forces with jet fighter planes and train their pilots just days before this Israel attack? How can our Government say that our position is neutral when we supplied the implements of aggression? How can our Government hope to escape censure from the world community for our involvement? Under such circumstances, we fall victim to damaging propaganda that we are supporting the Israelis in a religious war.

Someone must tell the world that the American people will not send their sons into another war created by diplomatic blundering, treaty, or by executive order. If our foreign policy is one of neutrality in the Middle East, then it is time our President announce it to the world and prove our credibility by forbidding any more armaments to be supplied in areas of world tension. Of what value are nuclear test ban agreements or nonproliferation treaties, when we allow ourselves to become drawn into a potential holocaust.

The American people want no U.S. role in bringing about Armageddon.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 9, 1969]
ISRAELIS STRIKE EGYPT BELOW SUEZ; 30-MILE SWATH CUT IN 10-HOUR TANK ASSAULT

TEL AVIV.—Israeli planes, tanks and ships struck Egypt today in the heaviest raid since the 1967 six-day war. Tanks were landed in Egypt by assault craft and cut a 30-mile swath through military installations, radar and rocket sites.

An Israeli military spokesman said the 10-hour punitive raid cost the Egyptians "dozens" of killed and wounded and that the only Israeli casualty was a slightly wounded soldier who was withdrawn safely with the entire attacking force.

An Israeli plane, reported to be an American-built Skyhawk, was shot down by anti-aircraft fire and the pilot parachuted into the Gulf of Suez. He was officially listed as missing.

Intense naval activity preceded the landing which a spokesman said began last night,

when Israel reported its motor torpedo boats destroyed two Egyptian PT boats in the Gulf of Suez. Cairo reported sinking an Israeli patrol boat today with the loss of its crew. These were the first naval engagements since 1967.

CALLED RESPONSE TO "AGGRESSION"

An Israeli communique said the raid was in response to Egyptian "aggression."

(This was believed to include not only heavy Egyptian artillery attacks along the Suez Canal but Arab terrorists attacks on Israeli installations in Europe and various attacks against Israeli airlines, spokesmen said in Washington.)

(Despite the obvious warning, the leftwing extremist Arab guerrilla group known as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine warned today in Amman, Jordan, it would escalate its terrorism campaign against Israeli organizations abroad with "more dangerous, possibly fatal" attacks.)

(Cairo Radio had no immediate reaction to the Israeli raid, but it broadcast communiques reporting heavy Israeli shelling of Egyptian installations in the Suez area at the southern end of the Suez Canal and reported dogfights over the canal between Egyptian and Israeli planes today.)

24 MILES BELOW SUEZ

The Israeli forces hit the Egyptian coast from El Hafayer, 24 miles below Suez City, south to Ras Zafrana, 54 miles below Suez. The Gulf of Suez ranges from 30 to 50 miles wide at this area across the Israeli-occupied Sinai desert.

Israelis in Tel Aviv said they struck to punish the Egyptians for what they called increasing fire at Israel's troops posted on the east bank of the canal. Nine Israelis have been killed and 11 wounded there in the past week. Observers said Egyptian artillery may have been the prime target.

There was no official word on oil installations being hit. The biggest producer of Egypt's offshore oil works lies about 100 miles south of the Suez and in the general area of today's raid.

The center of that oil works is the offshore Morgan oilfield where about 100 Americans are employed. The field is exploited by GUPCO, owned half by Egypt and half by the Pan American Oil Co.

There was no sign of general war preparations, and no sign of any callup of reserves. The Israeli spokesmen, when they finally gave details, stressed that the raid was punitive.

It apparently was aimed at drawing Egyptian troops and artillery away from the Suez Canal zone to ease up on the constant Egyptian bombardment.

Israeli sources in Washington said it was unlikely that the first of the U.S. F-4 Phantoms delivered to Israel took part in today's raids but that they were thought to be in combat readiness. For the purpose of air support slower planes would be more useful.

The raid followed a series of Israeli warnings to Egypt and the other Arab nations. Israeli Transport Minister Moshe Carmel said in Tel Aviv yesterday Israel was considering new retaliation against Arab guerrilla attacks.

The Israeli army spokesman said Egyptian jets and troops made no effort to interfere with the armored raid's progress although the operation was reported to have lasted 10 hours.

Israeli officials did not announce the action until it was over in midafternoon.

Ras Zafrana, southern limit of today's raiding, lies 50 miles across the gulf from Abu Zemina in the Sinai which Israel occupied in 1967. It is the center of American-owned oil installations in the gulf.

Unofficial reports said tanks went ashore from landing craft and that Israeli troops

plunged ashore from craft protected by the tanks that went ahead of them. Jets swooped overhead to give fire cover and to attack targets ahead of the advancing Israelis.

"Warnings are not enough," said one Israeli source. "More drastic action is needed to put an end to these attacks."

Strict control was maintained on all information of military activities.

(Israeli sources in Washington confirmed that the area chosen for the raid is where the Egyptian armed forces are thinnest.)

(The aim, according to these sources, was to show the Egyptians, who are said to have concentrated as high as 100,000 men along the northern reaches of the canal, that their southern flank is vulnerable to Israeli attack.)

PHANTOM'S FLYOVER DELIGHTS TEL AVIV

TEL AVIV, September 7.—A U.S.-supplied Phantom fighter-bomber streaked over this Israeli metropolis today, watched by thousands of delighted Israelis.

The warplane was one of a long-awaited batch of Phantoms which the army said yesterday had arrived from the United States. The flight was obviously demonstrative, observers said. Israeli military aircraft are very rarely seen over Tel Aviv.

"Even now we will not ignore our security worries, but we can anticipate the future with a more relaxed feeling," said the influential newspaper Haaretz.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 11, 1969]

UNITED STATES TO DELIVER ISRAELI JETS

WASHINGTON.—The United States plans to deliver four supersonic F-4 Phantom jets to Israel next month and will complete delivery of a shipment of 50 of the high-performance fighter-bombers within a year, according to authoritative sources here.

At the same time, it was reported, Israel has lodged a tentative request for about 100 additional aircraft—including another 25 F-4's—to meet its defense needs.

The State Department declined comment on the report, but reliable sources said the request had come through the Israeli Embassy.

It appeared that disclosure of the Israeli bid for extra aircraft was deliberately leaked here well in advance of Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir's planned visit Sept. 25 for talks with President Nixon.

Israel first turned to the United States Government for new fighter planes after the June, 1967, Arab-Israeli war when France clamped an embargo on an order for 50 Mirage jets for the Jewish state.

In December, long after Israel sought Phantoms from the United States, the outgoing Johnson administration announced approval of the sale of 50 of the sophisticated jets, capable of twice the speed of sound.

Authoritative sources said it was the delivery of that order that would begin next month. About 12 Israeli pilots have completed training in the United States to fly the Phantoms.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1969]

ISRAELIS REPORTED SEEKING TO BUY MORE U.S. PLANES

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, August 6.—Israel is reported to have approached the Nixon Administration with a request for nearly \$150-million worth of aircraft, including F-4 Phantom jets, to maintain long-term air superiority over her Arab neighbors.

Reliable informants said today that the Israeli Ambassador, Itzhak Rabin, had asked the United States to agree to sell about 80 more Skyhawk A-4 fighter-bombers and about 25 more supersonic Phantoms.

Under previous deals the United States is

already selling both types of aircraft to Israel. The Phantoms are estimated to cost \$3-million to \$4-million each and the Skyhawks about \$1-million with the exact cost depending on the equipment included.

The informants said the request was made last month, shortly before the flare-up in the air war between the United Arab Republic and Israel in the Suez Canal area. This was also about the time that President Pompidou indicated publicly that France would maintain her 1967 embargo on the delivery of the supersonic Mirage jets previously bought by Israel.

NO U.S. RESPONSE REPORTED

The Nixon Administration was reported to have given no response to the Israeli request, but to have taken it under consideration. If past patterns are followed, the request marks the first step in a lengthy process of negotiations in which the Israeli figures may be revised before the United States considers that it has a final and formal request. Detailed talks are expected to begin this fall, the informants said.

Israeli officials are reported to have renewed their earlier expressions of interest in having the Phantoms equipped for carrying atomic weapons. The United States has rejected such pleas and has insisted that Israel agree not to use American-supplied jets to carry such weapons.

The United States became the principal supplier of the Israeli Air Force after the Arab-Israeli war of June, 1967.

Under an agreement signed in 1966 and expanded in January, 1968, during the Johnson Administration the United States has delivered more than half of 80 promised Skyhawks. Israeli officials acknowledge that some of the planes have been used in the recent fighting.

In a more publicized deal, announced last Dec. 27, the United States agreed to sell Israel 50 Phantoms. The 1,200-mile-an-hour aircraft was then the most advanced American fighter-bomber in operation. About a dozen Israeli pilots have completed training in this country, and Israel is scheduled to begin receiving a squadron of 16 Phantoms next month, at the rate of four planes a month.

WILL PUBLIC WORKS CUTBACKS CURE INFLATION?

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, with regard to recent statements by President Richard M. Nixon to halt construction on 75 percent of public works projects, I should just like to add my voice to the increasing chorus of critics on this issue.

Although the President has stated that his curb on Federal construction projects will also serve to curb inflation, I must wholeheartedly disagree. Although economists have various and sundry ideas on what will serve to halt the present inflationary spiral, it is generally agreed that the main cause of the present problem is defense spending.

I cannot see where it would serve the public interest to halt projects already in various stages of completion. It would seem to me that such methods would only cost the public more in the long run. These projects will be taken up at some future time for completion, when

construction costs may be much increased. Additionally, unemployment would certainly ensue were projects under construction to be halted midway. To increase the number of unemployed workers is certainly not an efficient solution to the problem of rising prices.

I urge the administration to more thoroughly investigate the matter of inflation, so as to arrive at an answer that will not throw the baby out with the bath water.

NEW U.S. AMBASSADOR TO PANAMA MUST BE OBJECTIVE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there has been widespread discussion in the press of the Nation during recent weeks quoting from a letter by me to the President of the United States in opposition to the appointment of Robert M. Sayre, now U.S. Ambassador to Uruguay, as our Ambassador to Panama.

My information is to the effect that Mr. Sayre was an active participant with Walt W. Rostow in the formulation of the three proposed new Panama Canal treaties, which were never signed after completion of negotiations in 1967, because of strong opposition in both Panama and the United States.

What is needed as our Ambassador in Panama is someone who will defend the indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory and Panama Canal and not one who has been active toward subverting them, and who cannot be objective because of his previous commitments.

Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, unfortunate that the President has surrounded himself with advisers whose records have, in effect, been unsound as regards the best interests of our country. It is fortunate that we do have able and well-informed men in the United States, with the proper qualifications for appointment as our Ambassador to Panama, and they should be appointed.

In order that the Congress and the Nation at large may know precisely what I have stated regarding the proposed appointment, I include the entire correspondence with the White House; also, an article in a recent issue of Human Events that quotes me correctly:

JULY 28, 1969.

The President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent Spanish language press news from Panama is to the effect that the Panamanian Government hopes to reopen the negotiations for new Panama Canal Treaties. This news, coupled with current reports that Foreign Service Officer Robert M. Sayre is being seriously considered for appointment as U.S. Ambassador to Panama, is ominous.

According to my information, Mr. Sayre was an active participant with Walt W. Rostow in the formulation of the discredited

1967 proposed new Panama Canal treaties, which proposed treaties aroused strenuous public opposition in both Panama and the United States. In the latter, some 150 members of the Congress introduced resolutions opposing ratification. Many speeches in opposition were made in both the House and Senate.

As those proposed treaties were not only weak and unrealistic, but also perilous to the security of both the United States and the Western Hemisphere, including Panama, I trust that you will not appoint anyone associated with the preparation or negotiation of the proposed 1967 treaties as Ambassador to that country, but someone who can be depended upon to protect the indispensable sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone territory and canal. Except for our presence in Panama today, Soviet power would be dominant there, and would absolutely control the Panama Canal in which project the United States has made a net investment, including defense, from 1904 to June 30, 1968, of more than \$5,000,000,000, all supplied by the American taxpayer.

The situation affecting the Panama Canal is of such grave character that it should not be dictated by shabby sentimentalities. We have enough trouble on our hands with Cuba which was permitted to pass into the Soviet orbit; we do not wish to have another like, and even more grave, situation at Panama.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., July 30, 1969.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This will acknowledge your letter of July 28 to the President regarding Mr. Robert M. Sayre, a Foreign Service Officer, and the proposed Panama Canal treaties which were submitted to the 90th Congress.

I know the President will appreciate having this frank expression of your views which will be called to his attention upon his return. At that time we will be in further touch with you.

With cordial regard,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 14, 1969.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: With further reference to your letter of July 28 regarding Panama, you will have noted that on August 9 the President announced his decision to nominate Mr. Robert M. Sayre, present Ambassador to Uruguay, as Ambassador to Panama. The President wants to assure you that this decision was taken only after the most careful consideration, and that Mr. Sayre is a very able career officer who can be depended upon to protect the interests of the United States and to implement faithfully the policy of this Administration.

With respect to reports that Panama hopes to re-open negotiations for a new canal treaty, such a suggestion has not formally been made by the Panamanian Government. We do not know if it will be, but again the President wishes to assure you that our policy toward this question will be carefully reviewed within the National Security Council mechanism.

With cordial regard,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

"GIVEAWAY" AMBASSADOR FOR PANAMA ATTACKED

(From the Allen-Goldsmith Report)

President Nixon faces a bruising fight if he appoints Robert M. Sayre as ambassador to Panama.

Rep. Daniel Flood (D.-Pa.), a House Appropriations subcommittee chairman, has served blunt notice of this in a letter to the President. A 25-year congressional veteran, Flood has long been closely interested in Panamanian affairs.

Basis of his emphatic opposition to Sayre is that he was an active participant in the drafting of the 1967 proposed Panama Canal treaties.

These treaties evoked such a storm of disapproval in Congress that they were never signed. Some 150 House members sponsored denunciatory resolutions. They made three charges: That the agreements ceded sovereignty over the canal to Panama; made that country a "partner" in canal management, and would share its defense with Panama; authorized the U.S. to construct a new canal in Panama.

The uproar over these treaties were so massive and vehement that the Johnson Administration shelved them. No effort has ever been made to revive them. The House Foreign Affairs Committee did hold hearings, but for some unexplained reason they were not published.

Sayre, 45, a career foreign service officer, is now ambassador to Uruguay. Authoritative reports have been current for some time that he was to be shifted to the U.S. Embassy in Panama.

One of the State Department's leading experts on Latin America, Sayre has served in a number of countries there—including Mexico, Peru and Cuba. For several years he was deputy assistant secretary of state with the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. In formulating the discarded Panamanian treaties, he worked with Walt W. Rostow, controversial special assistant on foreign affairs to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

In assailing Sayre's reported contemplated appointment as ambassador to Panama, Rep. Flood sharply challenged his fitness and qualifications.

"I emphatically trust," the influential legislator wrote the President, "that you will not appoint anyone as ambassador to Panama who was associated with the preparation of the abortive 1967 giveaway treaties, but someone who can be depended upon to protect the indispensable sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over Canal Zone territory and the canal. Those treaties not only were weak and unrealistic, but also perilous to the security of both the United States and the Western Hemisphere, including Panama."

"Except for our presence in Panama today, Soviet power would be dominant there, and would absolutely control the Panama Canal in which the United States had made net investment, including defense, from 1904 to June 30, 1968, of more than \$5 billion, all supplied by the American taxpayer."

Citing the recent visit to Havana of a powerful Russian fleet and authoritative reports of the establishment of a Soviet naval base there, Flood stressed the crucial necessity of preserving the security of the Panama Canal.

"The situation affecting the canal is of such grave character," Flood declared in his unpublished letter, "that it should not be dictated by shabby sentimentalities. We have enough trouble on our hands with Cuba, which was permitted to pass into the Communist orbit, without having another similar, and even more grave, situation at Panama."

Flood has long strongly advocated removal of State Department control of Panama Canal policy. He wants that placed in the Defense Department.

"Panama is still a land of endemic revolution and political turmoil," Flood maintains. "For the U.S. to surrender its full sovereign powers over the Panama Canal is not only unrealistic, but fraught with the greatest peril for the security of all the Americas. That's why it is of such urgent importance for us to have an ambassador there who understands that fully and clearly, and not one who would acquiesce in the surrender and subversion of such powers."

BILL WESCOAT OF THE REYNOLDSVILLE, PA., STAR COMMENTS ON GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on the subject of gun control legislation, my friend and colleague, one of the outstanding Members of this body, JOHN P. SAYLOR, who represents the 22d District of Pennsylvania with great credit and distinction, made a number of particularly hard-hitting comments on the real intent of the report of the President's Violence Commission. In brief, Congressman SAYLOR, like myself, opposes the gun confiscation proposals of the Commission. Further, we believe that the concern of Congress should be on controlling the criminal rather than the law-abiding citizen. One response to that speech has come to my attention which I want to share with you and our colleagues. An article by Bill Wescoat in the Reynoldsville, Pa., Star, succinctly captures the concern I share along with Congressman SAYLOR about attempts to confiscate the guns owned by law-abiding citizens and sportsmen in the United States. The article follows:

[From the Reynoldsville (Pa.) Star,
Sept. 4, 1969]
GUN CONTROL
(By Bill Wescoat)

In the long and continuing fight about gun control in the United States, this district's representative, Congressman John P. Saylor, has been an outspoken opponent of any attempt on the part of the government to deprive citizens of the right to own firearms. In his opposition he has performed admirably as a watchdog guarding the rights of all citizens, not just those of his own district, and doing what he can to prevent further intrusion into our private lives by the Federal Government.

Now he has quite correctly recognized the ultimate goal of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence for what it is—complete gun confiscation by the U.S. Government. He brought this forcibly to the attention of his colleagues in a speech in the House of Representatives the other day. The Commission, with many fancy phrases and statistics, has tried to convince any who would listen that the way to control crime in the United States is by making it against the law to own or possess a gun, and that the Government should, by law, call upon all citizens to surrender their arms.

This is gun confiscation pure and simple, of course, and Mr. Saylor delights in the fact that the real issue is now out in the open, and expresses confidence that the

American people will now begin to "fight these unnecessary, unwarranted, and unworkable recommendations that would destroy their right to self-protection." He said, "I believe . . . the turning point has been reached. The direction now is toward realism. The sob sisters and do-gooders have had their day, now the voice of reason—the voice of the American people, the voice of the American sportsman—will prevail."

There are many of us who couldn't agree more about the sob sisters and do-gooders, not only in regard to gun control, but many other things as well. If the bleeding hearts in this country continue to have their way much longer, our society is most certainly doomed. We must begin to face realism about many things, and take the hard, tough stands where it is necessary to take them. The Treasury Department and the Justice Department have already discovered that the Gun Control Act of 1968 is basically an unworkable law. Spokesmen from those two departments have recognized a couple of important facts. First, Federal control of sporting firearms constitutes an unwarranted invasion into the province of State and local governments. Second, each state and each section of the United States faces different problems in regard to gun control. Problems peculiar to the populous urban areas are certainly not the same as those of the sparsely populated plains and mountain areas.

It is indeed encouraging to learn that there are those in high places who realize that it is impossible, in many, many instances, for Ivory Tower thinkers to prescribe one remedy for all ills everywhere—whether they be at a local, state or Federal level. The Washington Post recently ran an editorial entitled "More Gun Control Nonsense," in which it pointed out the obvious—that the Violence Commission's proposal that all Americans surrender their hand guns (there are an estimated 24 million in the country) is rather ridiculous for the criminals most certainly are not going to surrender theirs, and this would leave the law-abiding citizens more than ever at a disadvantage.

Congressman Saylor has long advocated attacking the problem of guns and crime the way it should be attacked—on the criminal, not a broadside against the law-abiding citizen who owns a gun. He recommends that anyone committing a crime while armed be mandatorily sentenced to prison, and that there be no authority for any judge to suspend this sentence, or to have it run concurrently with any other sentence. The purpose of this bill is to attempt to convince the person who sets forth on a criminal venture to think twice about being armed.

There are many arguments for and against gun control, and to the average citizen any control that would hamper the criminal element in the country, or any law that would bring swift punishment for the illegal use of a firearm, would be a good one. What we must watch, and what Mr. Saylor is watching, is that under the guise of protecting us, the do-gooders would actually strip us of a cherished right and place us even more at the mercy of any criminals who would threaten our homes or our families.

PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATION

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House on yesterday, but had I been present I would

have voted for H.R. 11039, the authorization bill for the operation of the Peace Corps for fiscal 1970. As the RECORD indicates, I had requested that I be paired for passage and against recommitment of the bill.

The bill authorizes \$101.1 million for fiscal 1970. This is \$900,000 less than for fiscal 1969, and I believe it reflects the desire and effort of the Peace Corps to conform to budgetary restraints, as well as to place more emphasis on quality, rather than quantity of Peace Corps volunteers. The Peace Corps is a large and important operation, and I believe all of us agree that since its beginning in 1961 the Corps has made a major contribution, not only in the foreign countries where we have volunteers serving, but also in the United States. Under the authorization which the House passed yesterday, the Peace Corps intends to recruit 7,500 new volunteers for 1970 and these people will come from communities throughout the country. The Peace Corps is not increasing in size and cost, but its work and stature have grown in scope and importance. It is anticipated that as of June 30, 1970, the number of volunteers overseas will be 2,525 in Africa; 1,800 in North Africa-Near East-South Asia; 2,100 in East Asia-Pacific; and 2,825 in Latin America. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Peace Corps continued success.

AN OPEN ELECTION IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Ho Chi Minh is dead. Imminent political events in North Vietnam may give us some perspective about some facets of the settlement of the war in South Vietnam.

I am suggesting that our Government urge the North Vietnamese to select a successor to Ho Chi Minh in the same manner in which they would propose that the South Vietnamese select their political leaders. I would also urge that the election be open to uninhibited international observation.

The Communists demand free, open elections in the south. So they can show the way in the north, now that they have this made-to-order chance.

The manner of selecting a successor to Ho Chi Minh may just separate the true nationalists from the Communist demagogues there and their sympathizers here.

I predict that the successor to Ho Chi Minh will be selected in the conventional Communist manner—the sham election will be rigged and closed—and there will be little public outcry there, or here, by those who crassly demeaned the 1967 elections of Thieu and Ky.

Think about this—Communist power and authority is force and treachery—not the open ballot box, no matter what they proclaim at the negotiating table.

"CHUCK" JOELSON

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, among all the Members of this body, it is probably true that a relative handful can feel certain of commanding full attention of the House when they rise to speak.

"CHUCK" JOELSON has been one of these—a man of incisive wit, always superbly prepared to make his point with a minimum of words—words which colleagues knew would be worth hearing.

He is, moreover, a kind and gentle man whose gay spirit will be sorely missed in this Chamber. When he takes

the judicial bench, surely, justice in New Jersey will be tempered with wit, as well as with mercy.

RETIREMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES S. JOELSON

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker it is with a very real pleasure that I join in the host of tributes to our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES S. "CHUCK" JOELSON, on his retirement from this House to take his seat on the bench in New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON's 9 years in the House have been distinguished ones and he has served well on the House Committee on Appropriations. His legal training and distinguished legal career before his election to the House suited him well for his calm and judicial work here.

I think, perhaps, the finest tribute to Mr. JOELSON will be the record he leaves behind, a record marked by his brilliant efforts in behalf of education. Young people throughout the Nation have much to thank him for and their future achievements will reflect his achievements.

For us in the House, our memories of Mr. JOELSON will be of his humor, his wit, his calm and his wisdom. He has been a most valuable Member of this House and a good friend to all of us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 10, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul.—Psalm 25: 1.

O God, our Father, who art the truth that keeps men free and the love that makes them good, give to us the faith to see life as it is, the strength to change for good what we can change for good, and the serenity to accept calmly and courageously what we cannot change at this time.

We pass through this world but once. Any good we can do, any kindness we can show, any help we can give do Thou help us to do it now, for we shall not pass this way nor live through this day again.

May we the representatives of our people in loyalty to Thee and our country keep our lives committed to goals great enough for free men.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the unanimous consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and the bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House meets.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the

Assistant Attorney General, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1969.

HON. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, pursuant to House Resolutions 673, 674 and 675, dated June 27, 1967, and subsequent resolutions, certain documents and records of the House of Representatives were made available to a District of Columbia grand jury in connection with an investigation involving Congressman Adam Clayton Powell.

The Department of Justice has received a request from the Internal Revenue Service to review evidence developed before the grand jury relevant to an official investigation of Congressman Powell by the Internal Revenue Service. In order to comply with this request, it will be necessary to obtain a court order authorizing access to grand jury records.

Since the information of interest to the Internal Revenue Service involves records furnished to the grand jury by the House of Representatives, it is requested that the House of Representatives authorize the Department of Justice to include relevant House records and materials in our application for a court order granting the Internal Revenue Service access to grand jury information.

Sincerely,

WILL WILSON,
Assistant Attorney General.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970 UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Thursday, September 11, to file a privileged report on the legislative branch appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 681) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 681), with Mr. MILLS in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) will be recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 681 contains the provisions for a proposed new article to the Constitution which shall be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years after it has been submitted to them by the Congress.

The purpose of the article of amendment is to abolish primarily the electoral college and to substitute the direct popular election of President and Vice President. It provides for a runoff election between two pairs of candidates who receive the highest number of votes if none of the candidates receives at least 40 percent of the popular vote.

Second, the proposed amendment provides that the President and Vice President shall be voted for jointly only as