

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THOUGHTFULNESS ACROSS PARTY LINES

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nation witnessed a significant display of national unity, transcending partisan political lines, in the gracious meeting between President and Mrs. Nixon and former President and Mrs. Johnson.

Editorials pointing out the merits of this symbolic joining of hands appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on August 25 and the Atlanta Constitution on August 29, and I would like to include these editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 25, 1969]

PRESIDENT TO PRESIDENT

Everyone wins, when simple human graciousness is manifested. It was gracious of President Nixon to invite former President Lyndon Johnson and his wife, Lady Bird, to a birthday party in LBJ's honor at Redwood National Park. And it is gracious to dedicate there a stretch of majestic trees as Lady Bird Johnson Grove. It was also gracious of the Johnsons to accept the invitation.

In her years in the White House, Mrs. Johnson devoted herself most effectively to the beautification and conservation of the American environment.

There has been a worthy tendency lately of White House occupants to stretch hands across the political divide. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson consulted with General Eisenhower. President Nixon stopped off at Independence, Missouri, to see former President Truman, and presented him with a White House piano. In a different milieu, President Nixon was on hand to honor Chief Justice Warren when he retired.

There is little enough reason, at any time, for the politics of acrimony and scorn. Perhaps the respect which recent presidents, when not on the campaign trail, have shown for each other stems from understanding of the heavy burdens borne. At any rate, if there are any hatchets lying around, it is fitting to bury them in a forest of these majestic trees. Just so long as they are not used against the redwoods!

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Aug. 29, 1969]

THOUGHTFULNESS ACROSS PARTY LINES

The South, noted for hospitality, probably paid special attention to the visit by the Lyndon Johnson family of Texas to the residence of the Richard Nixon family in California.

A band greeted the former President at the airport, and there was singing of "Happy Birthday to You" for Mr. Johnson, 61 that day. Mrs. Nixon presented Lady Bird Johnson a bouquet of yellow roses, and the band launched into the song of that name identified with Texas.

After lunch, the Nixon and Johnson families flew into Northern California where a grove in the Redwood National Forest was dedicated to Mrs. Johnson, "who," said President Nixon, "has done so much to stir in the American conscience a deepened sense of unity with our national environment."

Mrs. Johnson's husband declared, "I don't know of any of my 61 birthdays that has been happier or one where people have tried to make me happier."

This doesn't mean the end of the two-party system in America, of course, but it was a nice thing for Mr. and Mrs. Nixon, Republicans, to do for Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, Democrats.

Good manners and thoughtfulness indeed can cross party lines.

A SIGNIFICANT COURT DECISION AGAINST SEX DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the decision recently issued by Federal District Judge Frank Johnson in *Cheatwood v. South Central Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.* (C.A. 2796-N, Dist. Ct., M.D., Ala., N.D.) is an important precedent in the ever-growing list of judicial decisions which are slowly, but surely, helping to eliminate sex discrimination in our country. I think that Members of Congress, and the general public will be interested in knowing about that case. The telephone company had rejected applications by its women employees for jobs as "commercial representatives" solely because they were women. The company resorted to the customary argument used by employers who discriminate against women; namely, that title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting sex discrimination in employment has an exception for jobs "where sex is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise," and that the job of commercial representative for the telephone company came within that exception.

First, the company said that the employee would at times travel in rural areas where she would have to change tires on her automobile or not find restroom facilities. This, said Judge Johnson, is a "makeweight" and "no proof that all or nearly all women would be unable to cope with these difficulties."

Second, the company said that the job might expose women to harassment and danger when collecting overdue bills, or collecting from telephone coinboxes in bars or poolrooms. Judge Johnson pithily dismissed that suggestion by pointing out that these possibilities are not "functionally related to sex" and "mean nothing more than that some women, and some men, might not wish to perform such tasks."

Third, the company said that the job requires occasional lifting of coinboxes in cases weighing from 45 to 80, and sometimes 90 pounds. On this point Judge Johnson accepted the judgment of an experienced obstetrician-gynecologist who testified that between 25 and 50 percent of all women could perform such tasks. Judge Johnson therefore decided that although these weight lifting tasks "begin to approach the outer limits of what women should undertake, this court

firmly concludes that employer has not satisfied its burden of proof," established by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co.*, 408 F. 2d 228 (1969); namely, that the employer must have "a factual basis for believing, that all or substantially all women would be unable to perform safely and efficiently the duties of the job involved."

Most significant is Judge Johnson's observation that the employer ought "to determine on an individual basis whether a person is qualified for the position," rather than using a "class distinction" which "deprives some women of what they regard as a lucrative and otherwise desirable position."

Certainly, I commend Judge Johnson on his enlightened approach to the great problem of sex discrimination in employment; and I include the full text of his order and judgment, and the ensuing writ of injunction against the South Central Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., at this point in the RECORD:

[In the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, northern division]

CLAUDINE B. CHEATWOOD, PLAINTIFF, v. SOUTH CENTRAL BELL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO., DEFENDANT

(Civil action No. 2796-N)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT

In this action Mrs. Claudine B. Cheatwood charges her employer, South Central Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company, with discrimination on the basis of sex in filling a vacancy for the job classification of commercial representative in Montgomery, Alabama, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e.

It is admitted that the plaintiff and two other female employees submitted timely bids for the vacancy, that Employer declined to consider the bids of the female employees without considering their individual qualifications, and that the job was awarded to the only male applicant.

It is also undisputed that on or about May 12, 1967, within 90 days following Employer's failure to consider her application, plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The charge was amended on or about July 20, 1967, and was served upon the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company (Employer's corporate predecessor) on or about July 24, 1967. On July 26, 1968, the Commission issued its decision finding that reasonable cause existed to believe that Employer had committed an unlawful employment practice in violation of Title VII. On October 29, 1968, the Commission issued a letter to plaintiff advising that its effort to conciliate plaintiff's charge of discrimination had failed to achieve voluntary compliance and notifying her that she could institute a civil action within 30 days.

Employer has, in effect, admitted a prima facie violation of § 703(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000c-2(a) which provides in pertinent part:

"(a) Employer Practices: It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's . . . sex . . . ; or

"(2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely

affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's . . . sex."

Employer has consistently contended, however, that the position of commercial representative fits within the exception to the general prohibition of discrimination against women set forth in § 703(e)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 2000e2(e)(1) which provides in pertinent part:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, (1) it shall not be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to hire and employ employees, . . . on the basis of his . . . sex, . . . in those certain instances where . . . sex, . . . is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise, . . ." (Emphasis added.)

In a recent case quite similar to the one *sub judice*, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit made clear that the burden of proof is on the employer to demonstrate that a given position fits within the bona fide occupational qualification exception. *Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.*, 408 F. 2d 228 (5th Cir. 1969). The court in *Weeks* went on to explain the extent of the showing required to satisfy that burden:

"In order to rely on the bona fide occupational qualification exception, an employer has the burden of proving that he had reasonable cause to believe, that is, a factual basis for believing, that all or substantially all women would be unable to perform safely and efficiently the duties of the job involved."

The only issues in this case, then, are determining the duties of a commercial representative and determining whether or not all or substantially all women would be unable to perform those duties safely and efficiently.

The official job description in effect at the time this dispute arose provides:

"Commercial representative—(9/49) Handles commercial matters primarily outside the Company's office, such as visits to customers' premises in connection with criticisms, facilities, securing signed applications where required, credit information, deposits, advance payments, coin telephone inspections, and visits in connection with live and final account treatment work. May also be assigned to work inside the office pertaining to service and collections."

The testimony at trial produced more specific descriptions of these duties and revealed certain additional duties that go with the job in Montgomery, Alabama:

1. Rural canvassing for new customers and mileage checks for billing purposes.
2. Relief of the coin telephone collector on an average of about two days per week.
3. Destroying certain of employer's records on a monthly and annual basis.
4. Handling current records of billing stubs and handling supply requisitions in the office.
5. Performing the biennial furniture inventory.

Defendant contends that several features of these duties make them inappropriate for performance by women. With respect to the rural canvassing, it suggests the possibilities that tires will need to be changed¹ and that restroom facilities are occasionally inaccessible. These contentions can be regarded as little more than makeweights. There is no proof that all or nearly all women would be unable to cope with these difficulties. They do, of course, render the position somewhat unromantic. But as was said in *Weeks*, Title VII "vests individual women with the power to decide whether or not to take on unromantic tasks."

¹ A former commercial representative testified that he had to change tires on the job 11 times in 13 years.

Employer also contends that the duties of commercial representative would subject a female employee to harassment and danger. This is based partly on problems arising from the collection of over due bills and partly on the fact that when acting as a substitute coin collector, the employee must make collections in bars, poolrooms, and other such locations. Again, however, there is nothing in the record to indicate that these features of the position are functionally related to sex. They mean nothing more than that some women, and some men, might not wish to perform such tasks. Here, however, the record is clear that one obtains this position by bidding for it and that if one is dissatisfied it is possible to request a transfer or a return to the former position.

Employer has consistently placed principal reliance on the fact that certain aspects of the job as performed in Montgomery require lifting of weights. Although other aspects of the job require occasional lifting, the alleged strenuousness of the position relates primarily to the work involved in relieving the coin collector. The evidence reflects that other commercial representatives in Montgomery have spent an average of two days per week on this relief work. In a normal day of this work a commercial representative would collect approximately 45 coin boxes from pay stations on his route. As they are collected, these coin boxes are placed in a small metal case which is compact and relatively easy to handle. Each case will hold up to nine coin boxes. A case weights approximately 6 pounds empty, and the estimates of its weight when full varied from 45 to 80 pounds. An actual random sample indicated that the average on a particular day in Montgomery was 60½ pounds. Occasionally, a case will weight over 90 pounds. In a given day, from five to nine cases must be handled, and each case must be lifted and/or carried full in, out or around the collection truck four times a day.

In an effort to generate the desired inferences from these facts, the parties engaged in a battle of experts. Defendant produced Dr. Wood Herren, a doctor who, subsequent to the complained-of events, was appointed defendant's medical director.² Dr. Herren is an internal medicine specialist which, according to his testimony, is a modern-day general practitioner. He did not purport to be an expert on either industrial medicine or the care and treatment of women, and his observations were based largely on his experience in 16 years of private practice. Plaintiff produced Dr. Nace R. Cohen, an obstetrician and gynecologist for more than 20 years.

These medical experts agreed, and, through their testimony, enlightened this Court to the effect that there were certain genetic and musculo-skeletal differences between the sexes: Males tend to have a heavier muscular and ligamentous structure; males tend to have a higher aerobic metabolism rate; females tend to have greater lordosis, or curvature of the spine; females only are susceptible to osteoporosis, a softening of the bones from hormonal changes associated with menopause; and females only are subject to pregnancy.

The doctors did not agree, however, on all the effects of these differences. Both doctors agreed that the differences in muscular and ligamentous structure and in aerobic metabolism meant that men can perform greater amounts of work than women, i.e., men can lift more, more often, for longer periods of time than women. Dr. Herren testified that

² It was thus not upon his advice that the male sex was made an occupational qualification for the position of commercial representative.

the lordosis makes the low back of the female more prone to stress and strain from lifting; Dr. Cohen testified that he knew of no such tendency and suggested that the greater curvature makes it easier for women to bend forward and pick up objects.³

Dr. Herren seemed to feel that osteoporosis would be quite significant in preventing women from safely performing this job; Dr. Cohen, with considerable experience in this particular subject, testified that only about 5 percent of the female population has a significant degree of osteoporosis prior to age 65. The doctors agreed that in most cases osteoporosis can be modified or avoided altogether with hormonal treatment. The doctors also agreed that little lifting should be done during pregnancy. Finally, Dr. Cohen testified that in his opinion between 25 and 50 percent of the female population could perform the coin collector relief work; Dr. Herren, while not asked by Employer whether all or substantially all women could perform the job, admitted on cross examination that some women, depending upon the individual, could perform the lifting without hazards.

A thorough consideration of the evidence makes clear that it is "rational," rather than merely capricious, for the employer to discriminate against women as a class in filling this position, i.e., on the average, men can perform these tasks somewhat more efficiently and perhaps somewhat more safely than women. Employer relies upon a statement in *Bowe v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 332, 365 (S.D. Ind. 1967), for the proposition that such a showing is sufficient to rely upon the bona fide occupational qualification exception:

"Generally recognized physical capabilities and physical limitations of the sexes may be made the basis for occupational qualifications in generic terms."

As indicated above, however, Employer faces a more substantial burden. The language quoted from *Bowe* was specifically rejected in *Weeks* for the Fifth Circuit and the Commission is urging on appeal that it be rejected by the Seventh Circuit—in both instances for the very good reason that if it were followed the bona fide occupational exception would swallow the rule against discrimination.

Weeks requires Employer to show that all or substantially all women would be unable to perform safely and efficiently the duties of the position involved. While it may be that, in terms of lifting weights, the duties of this position begin to approach the outer limits of what women should undertake, this Court firmly concludes that Employer has not satisfied its burden of proof. Dr. Cohen's testimony that 25 to 50 percent of the female sex could perform the job, while not standing alone, is accepted by this Court and fully rebuts Employer's contention. Nor is the fact that pregnant women should not perform the job of crucial importance. Employer can have a rule against pregnant women being considered for this position, but Title VII surely means that all women cannot be excluded from consideration because some of them may become pregnant.

It is not inappropriate to observe in conclusion that it appears to this Court that it will not impose a hardship on this Employer to determine on an individual basis whether a person is qualified for the position of commercial representative. On the other hand, it is manifest that the use of this class distinction deprives some women of what they re-

³ Here, and in other instances where the testimony of the doctors conflict, this Court finds that the experience of Dr. Cohen is more specifically related to the problem at hand, that his testimony tends to be more detailed and relevant, and that his conclusions are more persuasive.

gard as a lucrative and otherwise desirable position.

Accordingly, this Court now specifically finds and concludes that the male sex is not a bona fide occupational qualification for the position of commercial representative in Montgomery, Alabama.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that defendant South Central Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company, its agents, officers, employees, successors, and all those in active concert or participation with it, be and each is hereby enjoined from failing and refusing to make, within 30 days from the date of this order, a new determination of entitlement to the position of commercial representative in Montgomery, Alabama, previously awarded to William E. Noble, in which plaintiff and all other employees bidding on the job shall be considered on the basis of their individual qualifications and without regard to their sex.

It is further ordered that counsel for plaintiff, Mr. J. R. Goldthwaite, Jr., be awarded a reasonable attorney's fee, in an amount to be agreed upon by the parties or to be determined by this Court upon the basis of written evidence submitted within 15 days from the date of this order.

It is further ordered that the costs incurred in this proceeding be and they are hereby taxed against defendant South Central Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company.

Done this 31st day of July, 1969.

FRANK M. JOHNSON, Jr.,
U.S. District Judge.

[In the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, northern division]

CLAUDINE B. CHEATWOOD, PLAINTIFF, v. SOUTH CENTRAL BELL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO., DEFENDANT

(Civil action No. 2796-N)

WRIT OF INJUNCTION

To the above-named defendant:

Take notice that you, your agents, officers, employees, successors, and all those in active concert or participation with you, who shall receive notice of this order, be and you are hereby enjoined as more particularly set out in the order and judgment made and entered by this Court in this cause and filed with the Clerk of this Court on the 31st day of July, 1969, a copy of which is herewith served upon you.

This writ of injunction is issued in accordance with said order and judgment.

Witness my hand and the seal of this Court, at Montgomery, Alabama, on this the 1st day of August, 1969.

R. C. DOBSON,
Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Alabama.

A MAN SPEAKS OUT

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that there is great waste of money by the Federal Government. I am pleased that this administration is thoroughly reviewing programs in order to insure that the most effective, efficient programs are kept, and that the others be phased out as necessary. Certainly, a reordering of priorities has long been overdue.

The letter following details one area where this examination of Federal funding should lead to some changes:

AUGUST 15, 1969.

Representative SAM STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.

DEAR Mr. STEIGER: Several months ago I paid IRS some \$100 for my son's income taxes, because he and his wife simply didn't have the money. I was dismayed to find that some 14% of their gross income had gone to pay federal income taxes in 1968. Consider their situation: working nights, going to college, taking help from both sets of parents, borrowing \$1,000 a year from the Valley Bank to pay tuition. The results? They'll be exhausted and \$4,000 in debt when he graduates—and 60% of the debt will have been borrowed to pay income taxes. There is something very wrong in such a set-up, and especially so if the argument for the GI Bill (that money spent on college is recovered by higher earnings and higher taxes) is valid.

By an odd co-incidence, almost exactly what they paid in taxes was given me to attend an EPDA "Institute" for Latin teachers this summer. (HEW will be crowing to you about this, I'm told.) Now I'm curious. Please tell me why the U.S. taxpayer spent over \$80,000 this summer to "improve" the teaching of Latin? Almost nobody seems to want Latin. The experts—even the friendly experts—predict its demise as a high school subject within 5 years; Phoenix Union system has four or five of us who no longer have any students. Yet in the last four years certain universities (Minnesota and Illinois principally) have gotten hundreds of thousands of tax dollars. . . . For what?

Whatever the rationale, the results have been to push the careers of certain glib fellows who can write gobbledygook "proposals"—Gerald Erickson at Minnesota and Richard Scanlan at Illinois. The whole circus at Illinois was a snow job for their "Method"—the so-called multi-sensory approach.

Now Latin is small stuff and who gets excited about a few hundred grand of the taxpayers' money? But what about the Modern Foreign Languages? Almost every MFL teacher I know has had one to three paid institutes and thousands have had paid vacations abroad. Has MFL teaching improved? Not according to the studies and the MFL Journals. Is the audio-lingual method that has been pushed by these Institutes a great improvement? Again not by the studies. Or how about Math? There were 250 Math teachers at Illinois and that was only one of pages of Institutes listed for this summer. Are the kiddies learning more Math? Has anyone taken a look at results? What are we getting for these programs?

Now I sort of hate to complain about the high school teachers' little rackets because the real cumshaw is being held tightly to the college types' bosoms. We are developing a class of grantees whose arrogance makes Marie Antoinette look like Patient Griselda. They were at Illinois wholesale with their histories of one grant after another. Tell me, why should the taxpayer (as an example) shell out for a Concordance of Livy? As a classicist, I see its value to a few classicists, but as a national concern . . . ? And, if it is vital to the national objectives, why hasn't it been finished? The bird has been at the gravy train long enough! Does he scramble his computer tapes every evening to prevent piracy? Or to hide failure?

Well, after this summer, it seems obvious that you people in the Congress are permitting some pretty odd uses of the taxpayers' money. The Congress may not be capable of cutting expenses, but they obviously could be cut back without hurting the country. And if they were some young people in college might not have to go in hook to pay the taxes that permit some others such sinecures.

Let's get behind the tax reforms, but let's also get behind some spending reform.

Sincerely yours,

MINNESOTA NEWSWOMAN ADDS SPARK

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans can take overwhelming pride in President Nixon's appointment of Mary J. Kyle—Mrs. Earle Kyle, Sr.—of Minneapolis to serve on the National Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women. We can be confident that this Republican dynamo will serve with great distinction and real concern for the improvement of job opportunities available to women.

By way of introduction, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a feature story about her which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch, St. Paul, Minn., on September 1:

MARY KYLE SPEAKS MIND: CRUSADING WOMAN EDITOR TO ADD SPARK TO NIXON COMMITTEE

(By Dorothy Lewis)

Anyone touched by the electric personality of Mary Kyle is forever impressed. Like a lightning rod, she attracts everyone she meets, and emits a small aura of electricity wherever she happens to be.

Intelligent and gracious (when she wants to be) she can charm her strongest opponents with her warmth and honesty. Or she can send sparks flying in all directions.

Whether he knows it or not, when President Richard Nixon named her last week to his national Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women, he gained himself a crusader—and a very vocal one.

The dynamic editor-publisher of the Twin Cities Courier, weekly Negro newspaper, has been crusading for one thing or another since she was in her teens.

At 14, she gave a talk on youth to her mother's social club and told the ladies they were a "bunch of old fogies" and were "driving themselves over a cliff" for not trying to understand teenagers.

Now she carries on her crusades in her newspaper column or in her broadcast as editorial commentator on the KMSP television news program.

In her television role, she is the only woman editorialist in the Twin Cities, and perhaps the only one in the nation.

She is probably best known for her stand against black militant extremists. "The American culture is amalgamated—if it isn't a meltingpot. Each race and nationality has contributed toward that culture, and the Negro culture is an integral part of our nation."

"Both races are caught in historical circumstances. We have to work the way out together. Neither can do it alone."

"The black radicals preaching separatism are only letting the white man off the hook, which is just what white racists want," she reasons.

Mrs. Kyle says she and "the silent and unseen majority" of Minneapolis Negroes—according to her figures, there are 35 to 50 "trouble makers" among the city's 15,000 Negroes—do not share the extremists' views and are "shocked" at the amount of trouble they can stir up and the publicity they get.

The election of Minneapolis Mayor Charles Setnavig this year on his "law and order" campaign shows how the public feels. "The voters hit the extremists," she said, "right in the ballot box. And they're doing it all over the country."

A certain amount of the reaction may be

the white backlash, but for the most part, it expresses the opinion of that vast unseen majority—black and white, she contends.

The "opinionated" Mrs. Kyle has views on practically every controversial topic. For example she favors Nixon's proposed "workfare" welfare program which she feels fosters incentive and independence. She thinks the present system just hasn't worked. "The poor are just as poor," she points out.

She feels the same way about the Economic Opportunity Act. "The poor are still poor, except for the few earning the salaries on programs," she said.

As to her own background, Mary Kyle came up the hard way, hurdling discrimination and "hard times" along the road.

Born in St. Paul, she has lived most of her life in Minneapolis, and majored in chemical engineering at the University of Minnesota.

Her writing career began later, after she had married and was the mother of four children. She began writing for the St. Paul Sun weekly newspaper, and studied journalism through the University of Minnesota extension school.

Now a grandmother of six, she launched her own newspaper two years ago, fired by an ambition to create a newsworthy paper, "something different to make weekly journalism dynamic."

She is now active in many professional organizations not to mention civic groups such as United Fund, Urban League, Council of Churches and so on.

Her interest in politics was sparked soon after her marriage when a friend challenged her to "clean up" what Mary Kyle saw as "dirty politics." She began at the precinct level and has been active in Republican politics ever since.

"I liked the Republican party because it's orderly and businesslike. How I think life should be," she explained.

She's all set for action on the Status of Women Council, and accepted the role only after she was assured she would see some real work done. "If it's a window dressing role," she told a White House representative, "forget it."

Women, as she sees it, have been discriminated against almost as much as the Negro, and being both, "I have some ideas on what we need," she says with conviction.

And as she has proved throughout her life, when Mary Kyle sets her mind to do something—she does it.

PRESERVING CLARK COUNTY'S SPOT IN HISTORY HAS BEEN A 40-YEAR FIGHT FOR JEFF MAN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent article, depicting one man's untiring efforts to preserve the falls of the Ohio, an irreplaceable fossil reef situated in the Louisville, Ky., and Jeffersonville-New Albany, Ind., metropolitan areas.

As one who also is concerned for the preservation of this unique geological phenomenon, I can vouch for the dedication of Dr. Munich in his efforts to protect the area.

The article, by the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times staff writer, Jack Schneider, reads as follows:

PRESERVING CLARK COUNTY'S SPOT IN HISTORY HAS BEEN A 40-YEAR FIGHT FOR JEFF MAN

(By Jack Schneider)

For most of his 40 years Don Munich has been carrying on a love affair.

It's one in which Mrs. Munich heartily concurs.

The object of Munich's unabashed affection is Clark County.

"I've been from one coast to the other," Munich says, "and as far as I know, Clark County is one of the finest counties in the country to live in. It has everything."

Then, after a brief pause, he adds, "Or at least it HAD everything."

The emphasis on the "had"—and the tone of disdain with which it was uttered—is a tipoff to Munich's attitude toward what he considers a needless squandering and mismanagement of Clark County's resources and heritage.

"I have the utmost appreciation for Clark County's history, and I have faith in its future," Munich says. "But it's nothing short of tragic that we haven't done a better job of protecting our priceless resources and heritage."

"The way we have been abusing the county, I'm afraid we are going to have to put up a lot of markers saying here's where something had been."

HAS TWO DEGREES

Munich is a Jeffersonville dentist who prefers not to be called or referred to as "doctor." Besides, his degree in dentistry, he also has a degree in geology. He worked as a geologist before becoming a dentist 10 years ago.

It's not surprising that one career wouldn't be enough for this ubiquitous man of far-reaching interests.

Munich is perhaps most closely associated with his efforts to have a park established at the Falls of the Ohio. He formed the Falls Area Preservation Committee, and he is chairman of the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission that will work toward creation of a park.

For many years Munich has championed the Falls area as potentially one of Clark County's greatest assets. He has made countless speeches urging the area's preservation and establishment of a park there.

But Munich, who grew up in the Falls area, can become just as eloquent and enthusiastic about virtually any other subject affecting Clark County.

This is particularly true of the county's history as it relates to George Rogers Clark and his brother William Clark.

"I think what happened in Clark County had more to do with America becoming what it is today than what happened in Boston," Munich says. "Plymouth Rock was simply one of the places where one of the groups carrying the charter from the king of England got off on this continent. None of those people came to America with any idea of doing what America has done since."

"It was George Rogers Clark and William Clark who took the nation from the Appalachian Mountains to the Pacific Ocean in a single generation. They lived in Clark County and made most of their plans here."

"When George Rogers Clark stepped across the river here at the Falls that was the first time we left the land that the king had given us. He established Clarksville as the first American settlement in the Northwest Territory. He eventually took a hunk of land bigger than the whole United States then, going to the Mississippi.

"Later William Clark, who was living with George Rogers Clark in Clark County, met Meriwether Lewis at the Falls here, and together they carried the nation to the Pacific Ocean. All that happened from here."

SADDENED BY DIGGING

Munich bemoans the fact that several years ago much of the area at the original site of Clarksville was dug up.

"We allowed all the artifacts from the first toehold out of the land the king gave us in this country to be hauled to Louisville to make the fill for the Riverside expressway," Munich says.

"I think it would be better to dig up Plymouth Rock and the land around it and haul it to New York to make a fill."

Adding insult to injury, as far as Munich is concerned, is the fact that a dump is now being operated in the area that was dug up.

"We got a circuit court order to close the dump, but it was never closed, and it is now being operated seven days a week in contempt of court," Munich says.

"When you holler to the Plan Commission or the Zoning Board that you are desecrating something priceless here they claim they are unaware of it. You tell them again, and they still claim they are unaware of it. You have to learn something like this as children, apparently, to have a deep subconscious feeling for it."

DUMP IS IN PROPOSED PARK AREA

The dump is on a gravel and dirt road that is an extension of Harrison Avenue in Clarksville and winds through the Falls area. It is in the 1,400-acre area that Munich hopes to have included in the proposed park at the Falls.

"I want to do what we can to preserve the Falls area and to make our next generation aware of its importance in history—not just to this country but to the world," he says.

The chief significance of the area to the world is the presence of the fossil beds from the Devonian Age, which was a period about 350 million years ago when animals first emerged from the sea and began living on land.

Munich feels there should be a monument erected at the Falls like the one to be placed at Cape Kennedy marking that as the point on earth from which Americans first ventured safely into space.

"At the Falls we should have a monument saying that from this point in the Middle Devonian animals first ventured onto dry land," Munich says.

"We are custodians of these pieces of rock for the world, just as we are custodians of the ancient site of Clarksville for America."

Munich recalls that when he played in the Falls area as a boy there were fossils lying loose in the pot holes of the rock.

"They were picked up and carried away by souvenir-hunters, and companies shipped them all over the world," he says. "This was carried on to a point where today there are no loose fossils left."

In addition, Munich says that even while his group was in the process of preserving the Falls area about half the rock in which the fossils are imbedded "has been lost."

The rock was buried when a modification was made in McAlpine Dam about three years ago.

Another result of the modification, according to Munich, was to virtually eliminate a flock of egrets that used to live in the Falls area. He points out that there were 42 egrets living there before the dam was changed. The next year there were 16, and this year there are only 2.

"The reason the egrets left was because we wiped out what they came to eat. The water no longer runs over the rocks, making it impossible for the egrets to fish there," he says.

SYMPTOMATIC OF GENERAL FEELING

Munich feels this is symptomatic of man's general disregard for the natural order of things in his environment.

"Man can't live without animals and plants, and yet when the Corps of Engineers builds something like a dam there is no regard for the ecology of the area," he says. "We have destroyed whole species of animals, and I don't think we can do that sort of things and survive."

"We teach a kid to have a balanced aquarium, but we don't seem to be con-

cerned whether the environment we live in remains balanced and perpetually running.

"The same lack of forethought can be found in the way we are squandering our oil and mineral supplies, even the air we breathe. The cockroach has been on this earth 200 million years. We have been here one million years. We are a new species with our whole future ahead of us. But at the rate we're going our natural resources will be all used up before long."

Munich blames our educational system for much of our problems.

"Our educational values are out of date," he says. "Our schools are still pointed toward making money instead of preparing a person to be of value to his community and feeling like he has done something worthwhile when he dies."

"No matter how rich somebody is, he can't keep from being affected by this thing if we run short of oxygen or if we have to see trash scattered all around. The richest man in the United States has to look at the eyesores that the poorest man has to look at. So just money won't save us from the things we are creating here."

MAKING A CONVICT RELIABLE— PRISON'S IMPOSSIBLE TASK?

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, the Detroit News carried an article entitled "Making a Convict Reliable—Prison's Impossible Task?" in which the author, Al Sandner, related a recent interview he had with Mr. Gus Harrison, Michigan State corrections director, concerning the role the corrections system plays in our criminal justice system. I urgently request my colleagues to read this article which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the view that too little attention has been focused on the impact of corrections on our society. However, the real answer to the problem is that we must do more to prevent crime in the first place.

[From the Detroit News, Sept. 9, 1969]

MAKING A CONVICT RELIABLE—PRISON'S
IMPOSSIBLE TASK?

(By Al Sandner)

LANSING.—"Everybody has his favorite panacea in the search for solutions to crime," says State Corrections Director Gus Harrison.

One of them is: "Just give a man a skill he can use and he'll go out and get a job and become a model citizen."

It just doesn't work that way.

In fact, Harrison said, although nearly half the men paroled in Michigan leave prison with job skills, this kind of training is one of the least worries of the prospective employer.

"We have offers from all sorts of firms of jobs for parolees," he said. "They don't ask for trained men; they're willing to do the training themselves."

"They just ask," he said with a touch of irony, "that the men be reliable."

This quality, Harrison feels, is at—or near—the very heart of some of the social problems that make a prison system necessary in the first place.

If corrections people could make prisoners reliable, they probably would also have discovered the formula to change basic attitudes, develop work habits and incentives or overcome the bad attitudes and hostilities developed over a lifetime.

One man in 10 enters prison with a job skill; one in two leaves with one.

Some 2,067 prisoners are now being trained in such areas as blueprint reading, food services, machine shop, auto service and mechanics, garage trades, welding, basic electricity and electronics, carpentry and data processing and computer programming.

Each major vocational area is served by a committee of professionals which meets several times a year.

They "review the curriculum and make suggestions" for bringing the program up to date and relating it to actual job needs on the outside.

"And we take their suggestions seriously," Harrison said.

Still, a yearlong study financed by the Levin Foundation of Detroit and soon to be published, will show that "one in 10, perhaps one in eight, parolees stay in the job area for which they were trained for any significant length of time."

The reasons are many, Harrison said. Among them:

In times of plenty, it's easy to get a non-skilled job in the auto industry.

Even a sweeper in a factory frequently makes more than an apprentice in a skilled trade area . . . many of these men are simply not geared to such long-range thinking (taking a lower wage today in order to make more money tomorrow).

The parolee may feel more comfortable falling back into the old job patterns once he gets on the outside . . . applying for a new job in a new setting can be intimidating for one who doesn't know what to expect or what's expected of him.

Nor do we want to fault the man who isn't using his prison-taught skills; he may well be doing something better.

The corrections system is now providing prejob counseling for men about to leave prison, bringing in outsiders—including ex-convicts—to tell them what they can expect on the outside and what's expected of them.

To look to vocational training as anything more than a small element in the fight against crime is like using a piece of tape on a fractured skull, prison officials say.

"Like any disease, the best way to combat it is to get at its cause," Harrison said.

"We're not doing this. We ride a lot of hobby horses, turn to panaceas, whereas this problem is one that needs a massive attack and a heavy outlay of money at the outset."

"For example, we bring in 400 illiterates a year, a lot of high school dropouts. Many learn to read, get high school diplomas, receive medical and dental attention, perhaps for the first time; receive counseling, develop some work habits."

"Then we drop them right back into the ghetto."

"Crime flourishes under certain conditions," he said. The ghetto is one of those conditions.

"People often say to us: 'Why don't you do more rehabilitation?' I wish we knew the answers. Often we get a man when it's too late to change him."

"On the average he's 24 years old, has a sixth-grade education, no skills or well-developed sense of responsibility; he's often got a lot of bad habits—including drugs and alcohol—and is loaded down with a sense of hostility toward anyone who represents authority."

"We don't claim wild success, but we think we do well in rehabilitation, considering the odds."

Michigan's prison population is soaring as courts react to the public's concern over crime in the streets.

Eighteen months ago the average prison sentence in Michigan was 2½ years; now it's four years.

Michigan's prison population has jumped from 6,700 to 8,558 in two years and Harri-

son predicts it will reach 10,000 in another two.

"We're down to our last 200 beds now," he says, "and we've got a request in for two abandoned Job Corps facilities."

And then he adds the corrections officials' oft-repeated plaint:

"The cost (of maintaining prisons) is staggering. The cheapest route is to prevent crime in the first place."

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 13TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MONTANA AFL-CIO

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following letter from the executive secretary of the Montana State AFL-CIO, Mr. James Murry, and the set of resolutions adopted at the 13th Annual Convention of the Montana AFL-CIO inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HELENA, MONT.,
September 9, 1969.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OLSEN: I want to take this opportunity to thank you for taking time out from your busy schedule to be with us and address the 13th Annual Montana State AFL-CIO Convention. It's always a pleasure to have you address Labor functions, Arnold, because we know you will "tell it like it is".

Following are a few resolutions that were passed by our convention. I urge your favorable consideration of these measures:

RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas: The federal law now permits railroads to work their employees for a period of 16 continuous hours or for 16 hours in an aggregate in a 24 hour period, and

Whereas: Certain employees are now required to work alone or short crewed, and

Whereas: The high speed operation of modern railroad trains impose undue strain upon the employees who are required to work long hours thus endangering the health and safety of the traveling public and the employees, and

Now therefore be it resolved: That the Montana State AFL-CIO Convention, convening in Helena, Montana, on August 21 through 23, 1969, go on record favoring a change or amendment to the federal law that now permits the railroads to require their employees to work 16 hours and to support H.R. 8449, a bill which would reduce the hours from 16 to 12 hours.

Adopted by convention action, August 23, 1969.

RESOLUTION No. 4

Whereas: The matter of extension of the 10% surtax is now before the United States Senate, and

Whereas: a great many injustices have crept into the income tax structure over the years as special interest groups managed to gain special concessions year by year, and

Whereas: a surtax based on a percentage merely compounds these injustices, and

Whereas: it is vital that the entire income tax structure be reformed broadly to eliminate the special situations which cause the government to lose an estimated 20 billion dollars per year, and

Whereas: this 20 billion dollars must be made up by the working man who has his taxes deducted from his pay check every week,

Now therefore be it resolved: that the 54th Annual Convention of the Montana State Council of Carpenters assembled in Anaconda, Montana, on the 18th day of July, 1969, go on record as being unalterably opposed to extension of the 10% surtax until such time as far reaching and meaningful tax reforms are instituted.

And be it further resolved this resolution be sent to the entire Montana delegation in Congress urging them to oppose any extension of the surtax until such times as meaningful reform is made a part of the package.

And be it further resolved that this resolution be adopted by the 13th Annual Convention of the Montana AFL-CIO and the Montana AFL-CIO also send copies of this resolution to the entire Montana delegation in Congress.

Adopted by convention action August 23, 1969

RESOLUTION No. 5

Whereas: we are told by the economists advising government and representing the corporate interests that the only way to control inflation is to manipulate business so as to cause greatly increased unemployment, and

Whereas: the resulting sacrifice is deliberately arranged to fall upon the wage earner, family farmer, and small businessman whose only countervailing resource lies in the amount of available unemployment insurance and

Whereas: down through the years the corporate lobby has successfully induced state legislative assemblies to weaken and curtail the application of unemployment insurance benefits, destroying it as a source of security for the afflicted worker and rendering it ineffective as an economic stabilizing force in the community and,

Whereas: the cause of unemployment is largely national in origin,

Now therefore be it resolved: that this 13th Annual Convention of the Montana AFL-CIO institute a movement calling for federal regulation of unemployment compensation benefit standards and eligibility provisions based upon minimum requirements for decent living by the individual and thereby greater replacement revenue accruing to the local business and agricultural communities:

And be it further resolved: that as a necessary reform for the present static system the principle of cyclically graduated compensation be instituted in which weekly benefits increase in direct ratio to increased unemployment and diminishing back to minimum standard as full employment is approached.

RESOLUTION No. 6

Whereas: it is heartening to note that some attention has been turned toward the Great tax swindle of the politically and financially elite which is the primary cause of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer and

Whereas: these members of the socially elite comprising only 1% of the population own and control 70% of the income from productive property are paying only 14% of the taxes while the rest of us being 99% of the populace and owning or receiving only 30% of the income from productive property are paying 86% of the taxes and,

Whereas: almost with its inception as a constitutional amendment in 1913 the income tax has been under attack by the wealthy and affluent rulers of our economy in order to destroy it as a progressive and equitable form of securing revenue and,

Whereas: almost every Congress and administration since 1913 has under pressure from the corporate overlords given the rich more and more loopholes and methods for avoiding taxation,

Now therefore be it resolved: that this 13th Annual Convention of the Montana AFL-CIO go on record and use every available tactic and strategy to campaign for tax reform both in the National Congress and in the State Legislature,

And be it further resolved: that special emphasis be placed on the elimination of tax exemption on income from Governmental Bonds, depletion allowances on minerals and royalties, dividend credits, stock dividends and options, family corporations and foundations, private charities, private trusts, and fraternal and religious businesses operating in competition with private enterprise.

RESOLUTION No. 7

Whereas: the world as a rock with a limited amount of productive soil and varying from a foot to a few inches together with some oceans, lakes and rivers and a thin blanket of air is being subjected to an ever increasing rate of pollution by man; and,

Whereas: the evidence of Lake Erie, now a gigantic cesspool, and lost as a fresh water body while some token effort is being made to save the other Great Lakes, is an example of the progressive destruction being duplicated throughout the country; and

Whereas: it is now an established fact that DDT is found in the tissues of all living creatures on Earth, and if its use were stopped now, it will take 50 years to cleanse the biosphere of it contamination; and

Whereas: with our expanding population and the rapid shrinking of only mildly or unpolluted living space, the time will soon arrive when man will become, at best, only a sickly specimen of animal life;

Now therefore be it resolved: that this 13th Annual Convention of the Montana AFL-CIO establish its opposition to the continued use of DDT and work for prohibitive legislation such as introduced by Representative Schoonover, during the 41st session of the Montana Legislature, and that we support all anti-pollution measures, and

Be it further resolved: that the Montana AFL-CIO urge that our congressional delegation insist on top national priority for programs designed to curtail further pollution of our land, air, and water, and restoration thereof wherever possible.

The previous resolutions were all adopted by convention action August 23, 1969.

More resolutions, acted upon at our convention, will be sent to you at a later date.

Thank you, again, for participating in our convention. With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. MURRY,
Executive Secretary, Montana State
AFL-CIO.

REPRESENTATIVE KOCH EXPLAINS RIGHT TO PRIVACY BILL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is little that is dearer to the hearts of Americans than their right to privacy. And yet this right remains today a right without a remedy except in a few limited situations. One of the greatest threats to the individual citizen's privacy is government, simply because of its massive size and the diversity of information which it collects for various purposes. But against the government's enormous accumulation of information about each of us, the citizen has little recourse if inaccurate, distorted, or even malicious information is on file.

To remedy this frightening situation, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Koch), has introduced a bill, H.R. 7214, the Federal Privacy Act. In a recent article in the

New York Law Journal, Congressman Koch explained the need for such legislation and how his bill would meet the requirement that private citizens have a remedy for false or misleading information which may be on file in various agencies of the Government. I believe that as more citizens and more Members of this body become aware of the need for protection from unverified information on file with the Government, support for Congressman Koch's bill will grow. For this reason, I am happy to insert at this point in the RECORD the article from the August 22 edition of the New York Law Journal entitled "An Argument for Bill To Safeguard Privacy."

The article referred to follows:

AN ARGUMENT FOR BILL TO SAFEGUARD PRIVACY

(By Edward I. Koch)

(NOTE.—Representative Edward I. Koch of the 17th Congressional District of New York, formerly was a member of the New York City Council. He is a member of the New York Bar who resigned as senior partner of the firm of Koch, Lankenau, Schwartz & Kovner at the outset of his Congressional term in January to avoid possible conflict of interest as a practicing attorney and legislator.)

For each of us there is probably a dossier in some government office. The dossier may not be a sinister folder crammed with secret reports compiled by the CIA and FBI. It is more likely to be an innocent looking computer card, a census return, a series of tax returns, a passport questionnaire, a record of military service, an application for a government job, a security clearance for work in a defense industry, a scholarship application, or several of these spread throughout various departments, agencies and bureaus.

In today's technologically advanced and administratively complex world it is no doubt necessary that some of this kind of information be obtained, coordinated and kept available for proper use. Yet there is likewise no doubt that the collection and accumulation of data about each one of us is a fearsome threat to our individual liberty and to our privacy.

Our traditional legal structure arose in a free-wheeling laissez-faire sort of world. Most people did not seriously rub against governmental authority very often, and when they did it was usually in the context of the criminal law. The restraints imposed by the law on government are consequently for the most part directed to protecting the individual agent against an overt attempt by government to punish him.

Thus, if the authorities want to punish a person, they must obtain an indictment or meet a test of reasonable cause, they must provide a jury, the right to counsel, protection against self-incrimination and safeguards against the use of improperly collected evidence.

Protecting the individual against administrative overreaching in a noncriminal context has proven to be more difficult—although for most of us it is today perhaps a more important need. Although a number of significant improvements have been made through legislation, such as the Administrative Procedure Act and the Freedom of Information Act, and by decisions of our courts, it remains a fact that the ordinary citizen is at a tremendous disadvantage—often in a position of total helplessness—when he attempts to preserve his privacy against unreasonable bureaucratic collection and use of personal information. Equally dangerous is the fact that secrecy prevents the individual from correcting or explaining misleading information which may vitally concern him and decisions made about him.

Earlier this year I introduced in the Congress a proposed Federal Privacy Act, H.R. 7214, which is designed to give the ordinary

citizen a workable—and effective—means to protect his privacy without impeding the necessary work of government. Under the bill I proposed each government agency maintaining records about anyone which contain material collected from sources other than from the individual directly, must do the following:

Notify the individual that such a record exists.

Disclose the information to others only with his permission or as otherwise required by law.

Notify the individual of all transfers of information to other government agencies.

Maintain a record of the names of all persons inspecting his records.

Permit the individual to inspect his own records and have copies made at his expense.

Permit him to supplement the records with information he believes pertinent.

This is the basic outline of the bill although it contains some refinements and some important exceptions—such as those dealing with material affecting national security, investigatory files prepared for purposes of criminal prosecutions, and names of informants.

Recent books and articles on the subject of privacy, such as Vance Packard's "The Naked Society," and the revelations of the extent of government wire-tapping and bugging, have made the issue of privacy one of widespread concern. In the next few paragraphs I will outline briefly the dimensions of the problem and the reasons why this legislation is needed.

Data collection is a tremendous enterprise. In the Federal government alone some twenty agencies accumulate information about individuals; the Defense Department maintains some 14 million records; Social Security keeps 160 million files on persons living and dead. This does not include the files of state and municipal governments or of private organizations. The rate of data accumulation, and the sophistication of the methods of collection and the use to which the information is put, is increasing ominously with the proliferation of governmental functions and with growing reliance on sociological and economic research.

Modern data collection is made possible by the computer. There is now literally no limit to the material that can be fed into giant computers and sorted and spewed out to whomever is at the console. For several years now proposals have been made to establish a centralized data bank. To the extent that we move in this direction—and I am not in favor of doing so—it is essential that we provide commensurate protection to our citizenry.

Not only is the government collecting more and more information about each of us, but the effect of its accumulation is compounded by the growing intensity with which it is transferred and exchanged among governmental agencies. Tax returns, for example, can be scrutinized by officials and certain Congressional staff members who have no responsibilities to enforce our revenue laws. Information about criminals and suspects is collected by the FBI and distributed to law enforcement agencies throughout the country.

The exchange of information is not limited to intergovernmental transfers. The increasing use of data about individuals outside government by credit bureaus, large corporations, banks, research organizations and others is all too well known. Recent hearings before congressional committees dealing with credit bureaus have revealed the extent of their power to destroy a man's standing in his community and his opportunities to earn a living.

The availability to stored data in government agencies to outsiders is something about which we unfortunately do not have very much information. We do know that all too often confidential government data

find their way into unauthorized hands. The legislation I have proposed would certainly restrict this improper outflow, and give us some concrete facts about this type of abuse. It would also help to improve the quality and fairness of the records that are kept.

This bill should receive widespread support for a number of reasons. In fact, it is difficult for me to see any serious objection to its enactment.

First, its goal is the better effectuation of one of our nations most cherished ideas—privacy and the maintenance of one's individuality and self-respect.

Second, its method is not one of destruction or prohibition upon the valid work of government. It does not call for the elimination of files. It merely relies on a well-tried technique of American law—disclosure and due notice as a method of ensuring responsibility. By requiring government agencies to allow an individual to see his file, and to supplement it, Officials will doubtless treat this material with more respect, will be less likely to include irrelevant and dubious hearsay, and will think twice before permitting outsiders to gain access to it.

Third, it will give the citizen more confidence in this government. Many Americans today are frightened of their government and of what it knows about them. This applies not only to those who violate the law; it applies as well to thousands of honest businessmen who fear the intricacies of our tax and regulatory apparatus, to outspoken critics of official policies who fear that government agencies maintain files on dissenting opinions, to students and blacks who believe that their anti-establishment activities today may be made the basis for future persecution. Why shouldn't these people—and that includes all of us—know what information is contained about them in government files?

Fourth, what the bill does basically is to give a new remedy for a right which we now largely possess but which we cannot enforce. Our laws presently contain strictures on libel and slander; our laws forbid the misuse of government information; the law of privacy has developed significantly since 1890 when Warren and Brandeis wrote "The Right to Privacy" in *The Harvard Law Review*. In spite of these strictures, the ordinary citizen can do little to enforce his rights under them in the area we are talking about today—if only because he doesn't know when and by whom his rights are being violated. This bill then is preventive, for it makes it less likely that government officials will do what they already are supposed not to do.

Many issues that come before the Congress affect only a small segment of our national community. The right to privacy concerns everyone in a direct way. It concerns our right to express ourselves, our relationships with family and friends, our right to go through life without the uncomfortable feeling that someone is always looking over our shoulder. Orwell's 1984 is only fifteen years away. To preserve our privacy requires action now—before his fantasy becomes our reality.

REGARDLESS OF ODDS AGAINST OIL SLICKS, THEY DO OCCUR

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, even as memories of the disastrous oil damage to the coast of California from offshore wells is fresh in our minds, the State of New York continues to be sympathetic to letting speculators dig wells in Lake

Erie—a body of water already suffering from serious pollution.

To back up their claims that modern techniques make the possibility of leakage very remote, they have cited the fact that the Province of Ontario has allowed oil drilling in its part of the lake for some years. Backers claim the leakage problem has been nil and odds are a million to one against leaks.

Except that the odds mean nothing when leakage does occur—as it did recently on the Canadian side of Lake Erie. There were three oil slicks discovered in the lake, at one point measuring about 2,000 yards each in width.

Lake Erie is a serious enough problem today and it is going to take much coordination and effort over a period of years to reduce the pollution in the lake waters.

This is essentially a State matter because the State controls the waters. But they are international waters, too, and neither the Federal Governments of the United States or Canada can afford to ignore the problem that exists and the increased potential if offshore drilling is also permitted on the American side.

Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo, N.Y., *Courier-Express* had an excellent editorial on this matter in its August 10 edition and I include the text with my remarks:

"MILLION-TO-ONE" AGAINST OIL SLICK?

Discovery of three oil slicks—at one point measuring about 2,000 yards each in width—in Lake Erie off Point Pelee, Ont., should provide the clincher against the New York State Oil and Gas Division's plans to permit leasing of underwater tracts for the purpose of drilling.

Although Ontario Resources Management Department officials claim there is no absolute proof that the oil slicks came from an oil or gas well, the evidence seems overwhelming. The U.S. Coast Guard reported oil bubbling to the surface in an area where wells are located; samples taken from the water showed it to be crude oil. The oil-slick area was very close to an area where leakages occurred during drilling operations back in 1959.

Certainly Ontario provincial agencies and Canadian federal officials should press a full investigation to find out what happened and why. And the International Joint Commission and the U.S. Federal Water Pollution Control Administration should make their own determinations.

The odds were a million to one against any oil pollution of the lake, Ontario petroleum officials told *The Courier-Express* a month ago. State Conservation Department officials in their arguments on behalf of drilling have cited Ontario's allegedly "accident-free" record. They also claimed on June 27 that the chance of striking oil was "extremely remote" and that the risk of pollution of our source of drinking water was nil.

We are somewhat gratified that the U.S. Department of the Interior is going to launch a federal probe into the oil-slick mystery because we have been urging for some time that the federal government do something about this offshore drilling problem. The department recently had solicited comment from major oil firms in regard to the tightening of safety regulations. Most of the companies who replied not only opposed the new rules but also challenged federal plans to insist on full public hearings before any more offshore leases are granted.

Fortunately for New York State residents, the public hearings held by the Conservation Department did provide an opportunity for all to see how flimsy were the assumptions and claims put forth by advocates of lake drilling.

FIREMEN DESERVE PROTECTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a pair of bills which I believe fulfill an obligation we have to the many dedicated members of our communities who offer their time and energy to maintaining the vital services of firefighting and ambulance and rescue services.

One of the bills provides long overdue compensation for volunteer and regularly employed firemen who risk injury during civil disturbances or while protecting Federal property. This is an area which we have sorely neglected in the past, I would like to point out.

According to a research and education department survey taken in 1967 pertaining to the deaths and injuries suffered by the Nation's firemen, it was learned that 82.5 percent of the firemen suffered some form of injury during the course of their duties. But more significantly, they found that "there seems to be little doubt that this stems in large part from the riots which raged in several metropolitan areas during the summer of 1967 and subsequent harassment."

Although these figures are 2 years old, we are all well aware that this situation has not substantially improved. Obviously, in light of such events as the Chicago riots and the riots precipitated by the death of Dr. King, it seems fair to conclude that our firemen and policemen have been exposed to ever-increasing difficulties in the line of duty.

Yet, until the introduction of this bill, we have not afforded these dedicated men any insurance that while protecting our communities during civil disturbances, that they in turn would be protected from financial hardship should they sustain injuries in the line of duty. I have introduced this bill in order to make it clear that we do recognize the invaluable service that they offer us and that we in turn will offer them the Federal protection they certainly deserve.

In further recognition of the efforts of our firemen as well as the outstanding work of volunteer ambulance and rescue groups and police benevolent leagues, I have also introduced legislation which would extend to these persons second and third class mail rates preferred for certain nonprofit organizations.

These particular groups, as you well know, exert their energies not only during the emergencies which confront every community, but also during the vast amount of other community needs which arise. Their fundraising drives for various charities, their programs for children which demonstrate patience and concern, and their other activities certainly underline their right to exercise these special mailing rights.

I think it is also important to note that very often their projects are undertaken with considerable financial expense to themselves, expenses which tend to limit the scope of these worthwhile endeavors.

The bill which I have introduced would ameliorate a considerable number of these financial burdens; thus enabling our communities even greater benefits from these dedicated groups.

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the results of my 1969 legislative questionnaire which was sent throughout my district earlier this year.

The response this year was the best I have had over the past 5 years, and showed the people's concern with national and international problems. Completed questionnaires were received from 22,223 individuals of my Second District. The results follow:

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you favor continuing the 10 percent surcharge on income taxes for the duration of the Vietnam war?

Yes 33.9
No 63.8
No opinion 2.3

2. Do you favor deployment of an antiballistic missile system around our major defense sites as proposed by President Nixon?

Yes 74.4
No 23.1
No opinion 2.5

3. Do you favor abolishing the present military draft system for an all-volunteer army?

Yes 46.2
No 49.7
No opinion 4.1

4. Do you believe our Federal income tax laws are generally equitable for all people?

Yes 5.8
No 92.5
No opinion 1.7

5. Would you favor a Constitutional amendment to allow Congress to override a Supreme Court decision by a two-thirds vote?

Yes 78.9
No 19.3
No opinion 1.8

6. Are you pleased with the Paris peace talks?

Yes 9.6
No 86.3
No opinion 4.1

7. Would you favor an all-out bombing of North Vietnam if the enemy does not match U.S. troop withdrawals or continues to step up action during Paris talks?

Yes 80.4
No 14.3
No opinion 5.3

8. Do you think the nation's space program should continue at about the present rate (\$4 billion a year)?

Yes 48.8
No 44.3
No opinion 6.9

9. Would you favor a requirement for specific Congressional approval before the President could commit U.S. forces in the future to an undeclared war like that in Vietnam?

Yes 89.8
No 8.3
No opinion 1.9

10. Do you want to abolish the Electoral College and elect the President and the Vice President by direct popular vote?

Yes 68.1
No 27.7
No opinion 4.2

ADMINISTRATION SELLS OUT ON SMOG CASE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the action taken today by the Justice Department in agreeing to a consent decree in regard to the antitrust suit filed against the automobile manufacturers last January. As I stated in my letter to Attorney General Mitchell, I believe this to be one of the most vital cases ever instituted by the Antitrust Division. I am flying to Los Angeles this afternoon where I will continue my personal role in the outcome of this crucial issue.

The Nixon administration has sold out the rights of all Americans to have a clean and healthy atmosphere in favor of maintaining high profits for the auto industry. The magnitude of this setback is huge; indeed, all of the efforts by governments and private groups to control this major source of pollution in our air may now go, literally, up in smoke.

The automobile manufacturers have never shown any incentive or displayed the initiative needed to reduce smog sufficiently. The auto makers have been charged with conspiring to limit the development of effective pollution controls, over a 15-year period, and over that period the air of this Nation dropped in quality in many areas toward a point of causing irreversible damage. Even today the manufacturers are not fully complying with existing California emission standards.

This decision relieves the manufacturers from the responsibility of pushing ahead to find more viable means of controlling smog. If neither the manufacturers nor the administration will act in this regard, then Congress must. I plan to introduce new legislation next week amending the National Emissions Standards Act to force the manufacturers to adopt the most technically feasible pollution control standards without regard to economic costs.

Fortunately, the decision reached today is not final. The district court still has 30 days during which the Justice Department's move can be contested, and I am now in the process of coordinating a major statewide drive to impress the court with the necessity of refraining from approving the agreement reached

between the Justice Department and the auto manufacturers.

As main features of this drive, I have already written to every legislator in the State asking them, if they agree, to indicate their support for an open trial in this case. I am also asking various government units to show their interest in filing damage suits against the manufacturers if an open trial should eventually prove the Justice Department's charges to be valid.

In addition, a statewide petition is now being distributed in California to show mass citizen concern and support for an open public record and decision in this case.

CONDEMNATION OF IRAQI EXECUTIONS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and all our fellow citizens, the recent execution by the Government of Iraq of 15 alleged spies. Since the beginning of this year alone, 36 Iraqis have been executed by their government without even the rudimentary guarantees of due process that we take for granted in the United States.

Because of the present tragic situation in the Middle East, it is undoubtedly true that there are individuals actively engaged in spying and espionage activities. However, it is clear to me that the Iraqi Government is conducting this series of "trials" and executions primarily to distract public attention from its own inadequacies and failures.

Dictatorial and oligarchic regimes have always sought to find scapegoats to blame for their own oppression. In this way, they try to circumvent opposition and criticism by calling for national unity in the face of an imaginary threat. Adolf Hitler and his cohorts in Nazi Germany succeeded in persuading many of their countrymen that the source of Germany's economic and political problems after World War I was an "international Jewish conspiracy." There is no need for me to describe in detail the tragic consequences of this deception for the 6 million Jews who were murdered. The Soviet Union has for many years blamed its shortcomings on the remnants of "bourgeois deviation" rather than on its continued suppression of political freedom and civil liberties.

Nations, like individuals, tend to look for "fall guys." Democracies, like honest individuals, ultimately face up to their problems, and accept the responsibility for error and the necessity for change. Dictatorships find such integrity of purpose inconsistent with their continued existence, and would rather hang people than recognize their inadequacies and act to correct them.

I condemn the reprehensible conduct of the Government of Iraq and urge my colleagues to join me in pressing for a peaceful and mutually satisfactory settlement to the tragic and self-defeating conflict in the Middle East.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE U.S. NAVY

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, I had the privilege of participating in a press seminar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, on "The Future Role of the U.S. Navy." This seminar, moderated by the distinguished columnist Mr. Robert D. Novak, dealt primarily with the role of our Navy as it pertains to first, the political and national security environment; second, conditions of peace and conventional war; and third, general war and deterrents of general war.

Discussion of the subject dealt with some of the current issues which have been raised in Congress with regard to the role of the U.S. Navy, particularly its attack aircraft carriers. Because of the timely nature of this seminar, and the important observations it produced, I include at the close of these remarks, for the information of my colleagues, the text of the report on this seminar prepared by the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University:

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE U.S. NAVY POLITICAL AND NATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT AS IT AFFECTS THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE U.S. NAVY

The political and security environment of the world is undergoing significant change. There is in many areas increased instability, increases in the forces of nationalism, tendencies towards neutralism, a withdrawal of western military capabilities and insertion of Soviet military presence through the expanded global role of the Soviet navy, and broad programs of military, economic and political aid.

Caribbean Sea and Latin America

From the standpoint of examining the navy's role, at the moment political issues in the Western Hemisphere are the most significant. Looking at the area as a whole, there are three primary kinds of commitment, in regard to which we are facing a time of considerable change. First is the inescapable commitment of geography; the second, the longstanding historical commitment; and third, the most significantly at present, the pattern of commitments that are challenged by on-going change stemming within the structure of the Organization of American States. We have reached a kind of impasse as reflected in Governor Rockefeller's recent trip, preventing constructive, collaborative and cooperative action. There are two points of key concern: One, the Panama Canal, and the other, Cuba and the Florida Straits. In regard to the Panama Canal, negotiations are stalled with respect to the Canal Treaty revision, which may reduce U.S. rights. In Cuba, which lies across the Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, we may be at the threshold of a new Soviet naval entry into the area with the unprecedented visit of a naval flotilla to Cuba. A permanent Soviet presence there could pose major problems in regard to the political stability of the small unstable states in the Caribbean region.

In the Middle East, the naval interest is very high. We have had our Sixth Fleet there for twenty-one years, but perhaps for fifteen or sixteen, we had no competition. Now

the Soviet Navy has moved into the area, and its strength is at an all-time high in the Mediterranean. This has created all kinds of difficulties, both for the United States and the U.S.S.R. No longer do we have the Mediterranean exclusively to ourselves, therefore, we cannot do all the things we used to do with the freedom and flexibility that could be exercised until about 1965, possibly '67. For the Russians this is a new experience.

They have been trying for a long time to break out of their traditional confinement. They have never been as successful in this area until the present decade. The Soviet Navy has been able to get more and more money for the kind of expansion they would like to see in the coming decade. They have in mind establishing a global presence in support of Soviet World political and economic ambitions. They have unlocked the puzzle of breaking out of their traditional confinement by imitating our underway replenishment and repair techniques. This they would like to do in the Atlantic and in the Indian Oceans. Their presence in the Indian Ocean and the closing of the Suez Canal have posed major logistic problems. Nevertheless, they have been able to establish bases in the Mediterranean and now near the Bab-al-Mandeb at the south of the Red Sea. These may be used as jumping-off places for acquiring other bases. In that area and in the region of the Indian Ocean the British withdrawal presents a vacuum which the Russians are already attempting to fill.

NATO

NATO has provided reasonably acceptable responses to three major requirements: first, the justification of the U.S. presence in Europe in a way that is reasonably acceptable to American and European people and their governments; secondly, assistance in building and maintaining internal order in Western Europe, and this means especially reconciling the Germans to their neighbors; thirdly, the provision of forum in which current crises can be examined and, if necessary, dealt with prudence and sobriety and in which security aspects of alternative European futures can be explored. The latter has become difficult. NATO's vigorous past looks better if you stop around 1963. For the past four or five years, there has been considerable increase in tensions and differences, there has been an increase in disputes and backbiting. In spite of the modest rebirth of NATO following the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, the concrete effect inside of NATO has not been great. The prosperity of NATO appears somewhat superficial, the institution remains somewhat in the doldrums while the United States and European relations and East-West relations become a subject of great debate. We stand at the threshold of a lot of new events in Europe; for example, the forthcoming German election, Britain's domestic problems and the anticipated election in Great Britain, the new government in France, the new prospects for WEU, the possibility that Britain and Scandinavia and other countries may be admitted to the Common, the riddle of Greece, and the question of changed relations between countries like Spain and Turkey with the Soviet Union and other parts of Eastern Europe. While improvements in NATO may be the prudent course of policy, we may face the fact that NATO may have to be replaced some day.

The Far East

A key factor in the evolution of developments in the Far East is the Sino-Soviet conflict, which promises to perpetuate itself. It has caused the Soviets to go more to sea for the movement of their weapons to Vietnam. The Soviet Navy in the Far East is of considerable importance. Its presence in an area of conflict where our interests are involved can be a growing detriment. It can, through its presence, bring doubt among some of our allies as to U.S. will and action.

Even Red China, the exporter of revolution, in spite of its trouble in internal problems, is very capable of expanding with what is now a coastal navy. Of this there are some straws in the wind. The basis for our naval presence in the area is founded on commitments to many states. For example, the obligations to Taiwan still exist and for this our naval presence will be necessary. We would like to see Japan fill some role other than economic to supplement our forces in the Pacific but Japan so far has rejected this course. A number of developments in the area create a condition wherein opportunism is going to become more important as well as a turn toward neutralism and greater change. France and Pakistan have repudiated SEATO. Indonesia has rejected any potential alliance and is not leaning to the West. The French have withdrawn, the British are withdrawing, and we, too, hope to withdraw in a measure at least from Vietnam. This could increase the importance of U.S. naval capabilities in the Pacific.

DEFENSE VERSUS DOMESTIC PRIORITIES

Perhaps another factor in the political discussion ought to be what is happening here in regard to greater demand for spending on domestic affairs. A rather active debate on national priorities is already under way. It is going to continue for the next four years.

The view was advanced that both internal domestic programs and defenses are essential. In other words, we need what we need to defend the country, and we need what we need to have the country prosper and insure the welfare of its citizens. We need both. We cannot trade them off.

It has been said that you can take a particularly pressing social problem, the need for schools in a particular depressed area, and set it against what we are spending for chemical and biological warfare, and create a sophisticated tradeoff, which of course has no application to the generality of it. The definition of objectives raises many issues about adversaries.

Do we still believe that there is a drive by world Communism for domination? Is it going to be Chinese or Russian or a combination of both, or is it going to be a nationalistic approach by Russia? What is our answer to this and what will we do? And what do we want to do?

It is from these objectives that we will be able to determine what sort of an armed forces establishment we will have and what their role will be. And it will not be a direct argument between social progress and defense.

In this question of trading off one can well say that the greatest social service that a government can render to its people is to keep them alive and free, which is after all the business of the diplomats and soldiers.

As to what our national policy and our objectives for the future are going to be, military men of course await the civilian leadership.

What the decision will be we don't know. But when the decision does come on our future national policy, which is up for debate now, then it will be up to the military to come up with supporting strategies, naval strategies, that will be in support of the national strategy that is to be adopted. Until the United States really decides what its national objectives are, you can not equate aircraft carriers against education and things of this kind. First one must determine what are our national objectives.

The point was raised that the United States still has many friends around the world, and we still are the backbone of the free peoples of the world. We still want people to be able to determine their future. The view was strongly expressed that we are not about to come back to Fortress America. We cannot withdraw from the fact that we are a world power. Some felt our national objec-

tives are not going to be changed to a great extent.

The priority of national security was inferred from references to the Constitution. If you look at the six purposes in the preamble three are related to national security. And if you look at the 17 duties of the Congress, seven of them are related to national security. And if you look at the three duties of the President, two are related to national security. The first one mentioned is Commander in Chief. And the first function of a government is national defense; the protection from outside threats.

Giving priority to national defense, it was argued, worked in the past. In Korea we mobilized a little bit. We spent 18 percent of the GNP for national defense in that war. We not only appropriated enough money to fight the war but started rebuilding the Army, Navy and Air Force. In other words, we went to the war on a pay-as-you-go basis. We didn't do it in this last one. What we did was in effect keep the budget level, the \$50 billion level that Mr. McNamara programmed when he first came in. This represented a decrease in the amount of resources devoted to national defense in terms of the percentage of GNP. We just piled the war on top. So what we actually got was about a 1 percent increase over the rather level allocation of GNP to defense during the Eisenhower administration, where it ran about 8.3 percent plus or minus 2.

This reasoning concerning priorities was directly challenged. Reference was made to the "McNamara catechism" which was given to us all before we sat down to make a posture statement before the Vietnam war broke out, namely, the President told us to buy whatever we needed at the lowest possible price. And then the Vietnam war came along. Project after project was postponed, stretched out or canceled. We found out that for all the brave words of 1960-61 we couldn't hack it, we couldn't handle Vietnam and still do the rest of the things in the strategic budget and elsewhere.

It was maintained that domestic problems are more important even than national security to a lot of people. We have a very large segment of the population of two hundred million who haven't at this time the slightest interest in our national security problem because their domestic problems are more important to them. It is a very large segment of our people.

And then there is another large segment that we may be forgetting. There is a generation that is growing up that is totally disinterested in the Communist threat. They don't believe in it. They don't think that it exists. They did not live through the World War II or even the Korean War, or if they did, they were very young, and it doesn't mean anything to them. Nor did they live through a depression period which has an impact on the thinking of domestic problems. This group is a very large one. Its members are going to be our voters ten years and twenty years from now. We are talking about the future of the Navy—are these people really interested in whether a navy floats around the world protecting our national interests, since they don't know what those are. To them domestic problems are much more important. We ought to consider this, and not say that domestic requirements cannot be equated with or traded off with military needs. We are doing just exactly that. The federal budget is a determination of those priorities. These must be tradeoffs.

Use of the Korean War as an example of fighting on a pay-as-you-go basis was questioned on the grounds that other needs were not being met or were put off because of the military priority. It was further argued that one of the reasons for the limited objective in Viet Nam, according to McNamara, was that he was not going to be stuck with

\$12 billion worth of useless surplus equipment that the Eisenhower Administration ended up with.

It then was interjected that the Korean surplus was what saved Mr. McNamara from an embarrassing shortage of munitions during the first two years of Vietnam—that is until we belatedly got the production lines cranked up.

In further rejoinder it was opined that there has been no real orderly approach to many of domestic problems in our government. Spending for domestic purposes has grown extensively when you look at the total budget of \$57 billion in what might be called the HEW area. We could get a lot more for that money by employing modern technical systems. We will come to this.

It was further argued that it is incorrect to say that all of the people under 30 don't worry about the defense of their country or the security, because if you look at the number of people that have gone through the Southeast Asia business you will be surprised at the number of the young people who really see the requirements.

Concern was expressed about a move alleged to be afoot today where many people are suggesting that we should not change our fundamental basic commitments, but that we ought to attempt to control them by curtailing our capabilities either in terms of the size of our forces or the equipment that we provide for them. It was maintained that we should put first things first; ascertain what our commitments would be internationally, and what our commitment should be domestically, determine the priorities in each separately, and then—based on the amount of funds available—divide it up to do the best that we can in each area.

The need for a better definition of national objectives, however, was generally recognized. We are confronted with a two-fold security problem in this country: security from outside attacks and security from within. Priorities must be met to the extent our finances permit, in spite of the problem of inflation.

STATUS OF THE SOVIET NAVY

The Soviet Navy is no longer a "coastal" navy. It was 20 years ago following World War II. It was a coastal navy when it operated out of its own coast and its mission was strictly a defense mission. But the Soviet Navy today is entirely a different one. It is the most modern navy in the world, second only to that of the United States in size.

The Soviets are building a navy for their own needs. Their purpose basically is to deny use of the seas to us for our purposes, and then to use the seas for their purposes. Geography gives them an entirely different problem.

The Soviets, in classic fashion, are now engaged in the naval support of a worldwide political-economic offensive. They, unlike the U.S., have emphasized the historic role of the navy in support of foreign policy. The Soviet Navy is part of a total maritime challenge, not just a combatant one. When we think of the modern Soviet Navy we must also think of their modern merchant marine and maritime industrial base. They come hand in hand. The impressive thing about the Soviet effort is the tremendous momentum they have in their ship building capacity, their modernization, and their merchant marine, all of which can be turned to naval purposes. We cannot possibly have a modern navy without a modern merchant marine and a modern ship building industry. They have built up their merchant marine fleet much faster than they built their navy. They are delivering their goods, their arms and their influence throughout the world with their own bottoms. They are backing it up with their navy. And their fishing fleet is large and modern. All the ships that the Russians have today are designed, built and operated

and controlled by the Russian government. They move these ships tactically at sea as they move their navy ships. Their merchant tankers rendezvous with submarines in the middle of the Atlantic. One can imagine our problem if we tried to get an American Export line to rendezvous with a submarine without working it out months in advance?

Military tools are employed along with others: political, economic, psychological, and technical. All are being utilized in the furtherance of Soviet national objectives. And the Soviet Navy is being used in the cold war in novel ways that perhaps our government hasn't even thought about. The fact is that they have got these modern ships to do what they want to do, and they are doing it very capably, closely coordinated with their foreign economic policy at the government level.

The Soviets have indeed taken many long steps forward in their plans for their navy. Where 58 percent of our navy is 10 years or older, in their navy 58 percent of the ships are under 10 years old. This has been a tremendous development that has taken place since World War II. Almost their entire navy has been built since World War II. We still have many elements that were built during World War II.

At the same time that they have been carrying on these programs for their own nation, they have developed a submarine program which far outstrips anything we have ever dreamed of.

They have over 375 submarines. And Admiral Rickover estimates that within a year or two they will have the same number of nuclear-powered submarines that we have.

Their shipbuilding program, and particularly their submarine program, is the most dramatic thing of its kind in world history. Admiral Rickover recently mentioned that they had produced seven Polaris-type submarines this year so far, with the capability of producing one a month. They have a total capability of 20 nuclear submarines a year, and a total submarine capability building of 30 submarines a year. This is a remarkable exploit on their part, the technological case that they have been able to develop over the last two decades to do this.

When Admiral Rickover was asked whether he would rather lead the American submarine fleet or the Soviet submarine fleet he said he would rather lead the Soviet fleet. And it also gets to the testimony of the Admiral who is in charge of the ASW program this year before the House Armed Services Committee. Last year he was concerned, and this year he was frightened. And in testimony by Admiral Harfinger before this committee it was brought out very clearly that the whole development, submarines, ships, planes, missiles, radar, lasers, the whole Soviet development was based on a very sound technological basis, and it has been done under the direction of the highest command in the Soviet nation.

It is true that they do have diesel submarines that carry ballistic missiles. They are of the shorter range, however. Granted, too, diesel submarines are somewhat vulnerable, more vulnerable to our counter-measures. But when a torpedo hits a ship it gets no extra value by being fired from a nuclear submarine. We cannot disregard the 150-plus Soviet diesel submarines. The main thing that limits them is that their cruising range is limited. With diesel subs, however, they can cover the entire North Pacific and North Atlantic, where are by far the most important of our trade routes. One of the easiest ways the Soviets have of swamping us in shipping operations is to deploy a large number of submarines. It should be recalled that two years ago in the South Atlantic three Soviet submarines operated in the open sea for five and a half months with underway replenishment. This was an historical first. As a matter of fact, when diesel submarines are sub-

merged and operating on their batteries they are sometimes more difficult targets than are nuclear submarines because they can be quieter.

The Soviets also are building not only submarines, but surface ships that are sophisticated and capable, the Kresta class cruiser, the Kynda, which has the long range surface missile, and the Kashin, the fastest destroyer in the world with gas turbine engines. It is a very serious situation as far as the overall capability that they have developed in the last decade.

If we stop our ship building program now we leave the navy in very poor condition indeed. The Armed Services Committee has been bringing attention to this fact since 1962, when it held the hearings on block obsolescence.

Our maritime effort is fragmented. We have got the Navy in the Department of Defense. We have got the merchant marine in Commerce. We have got the Coast Guard in Transportation. We have got the fishing industry somewhere else. It is all fragmented. There is no government coordination and no availability at the highest level of government of the various naval and maritime options which the government should have at its disposal.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SOVIET NAVAL PRESENCE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

In their worldwide penetration we can generally say that the Soviet Union is not using its troops directly. That is one of the obvious things. Instead they are using their political and economic assets to penetrate these various parts of the world backed up by maritime power. This is a classic way that the world has been penetrated by a great power.

Now, to back up this economic and political penetration, first the spearhead of the penetration was the merchant marine which carried the people and carried the goods, developed and captured the markets. And then finally comes the navy, which follows along to provide protection and military presence in these areas of interest.

The Soviet Mediterranean strategy involves the Soviet Navy in the classic role in support of political and economic penetration—in support of the overall governmental effort. It is closely coordinated and has already brought the UAR, Algeria, Iraq and Syria into their sphere of influence, as in the Indian Ocean today, they are well on their way to bringing in Tanzania, the Sudan, and Yemen. In the Mediterranean, the Soviets have politically and economically been penetrating for a long time. But now they bring in their navy, and they establish positions of strength in the eastern Mediterranean, in Egypt, and so forth. And now for the United States to move in as we did, for example, in Lebanon in the late fifties—we would have the Soviet Navy there first, perhaps. And the question then is, do you move in or not? If you move in you confront the Soviets.

So here is an historic example of a fleet in being. It is not necessarily a bigger fleet than the United States, but a fleet which flies the Soviet flag. The message is: "If you want to exercise influence in here, you have got to deal with us." This is the way they are using the fleet in the Mediterranean.

And the Mediterranean—again it is geography—washes the shores of many free people in South Europe, and some in North Africa. If these people are to stay free and if freedom is to continue to flourish in these areas, it has to have a competitive presence to support it unless the United States makes a political decision to the contrary. Of course, it is recognized that it is very difficult to put a discrete value on a naval presence.

The significance of the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean, however, was questioned and the success of the Soviet penetration, assisted by sea power, was challenged.

The fact that they are spending a lot of

money on a lot of ships may be significant, but they may be wasting a lot of money. The Soviet Navy wants to penetrate the Mediterranean countries but they were in those countries before the naval presence was significantly established there. They are moving into Africa but they have had some failures there—for instance, sending snow plows to Ghana during the height of the summer. The very fact that we then put more ships to balance the British vacuum against the Russian Navy was therefore viewed as of questionable value.

Another critic offered the view that the chief thing the two navies are going to accomplish in the Mediterranean is to make it safe for small countries to fight. He said that both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. exercise disproportionate influence on client states—as a result, wars can break out there.

In an effort to clarify the challenge, it was stressed that—in the interest of precision—we ought to make a distinction between peacetime and wartime. There is a difference in the strategy; there is a difference in the forces you keep overseas; there is a difference in the methods that you use to make the most effective use of the facilities that you have. When we say "peacetime" we mean peacetime for us and not necessarily for others. In other words, when the "Six Days War" occurred in 1967 in the Mediterranean, this was a real war for Israel and the Arab States. There is no doubt about it, they were fighting with everything they had. In Vietnam we are directly involved.

In the case of Vietnam we are using the carrier as a roving force. And it has been used very effectively there for that purpose. In the Mediterranean, on the other hand, we are using it for political ends.

If you take a look at the Mediterranean today in peacetime, regardless as to what the size of the Soviet force is in the area—and it really is no match to the Sixth Fleet as yet—there are certain very major disabilities that the Russians face in the area. We ought to recognize that these are in our favor. There are other disabilities on our side that they have been able to play up and utilize to weaken our presence there. These should be explored more systematically, not merely in the Mediterranean but globally.

In the Mediterranean the Russian vulnerability is clear in peacetime. They cannot project their air power into the area. They have no air bases. Consequently, with a lack of air power, their naval power really isn't the threat that it might be. The fact that we still have very close control, or, if you will, strong influence over two of the choke points, Gibraltar and the Turkish Straits, means that they can't get a single sub into the Mediterranean that we are unaware of. We can keep close watch. These are matters that naturally bear on the equation. Nevertheless, their presence in the Mediterranean is sufficient to deter United States military forces from taking action in our interests—without a direct confrontation with the Soviet navy.

In wartime everything changes. They are much closer to the Middle East than we are. In wartime they can bring to bear all of the power that they have or that they can spare for this area.

On the other hand, they are not single-minded about this any more than we are. The more they become a naval power, the more problems they undertake. If the Soviets have got difficulties with China at the moment and have to worry about the Chinese, there is much less that they can do in other areas.

On our side, the weaknesses that arise in our position come from the kind of diplomacy that the Russians are able to conduct in peacetime. The diplomacy that they have conducted in the Arab area has definitely been disadvantageous to us. Our fleet has not been visiting Arab ports to the same degree that it used to before June of 1967. Perhaps

we are being deterred by the Soviet naval presence. These calculations should be borne in mind.

STATUS OF AND NEED FOR U.S. OVERSEAS BASES

The overseas bases which we once owned are being phased down. Those that we maintain are under increasing political restrictions. We lost nine bases in France. It was stated that if this government is to have a military capability to support its foreign policy and its overseas commitments, this overseas land-based strength that is now being phased out must be replaced by comparable strength at sea. The United States is coming home in many areas. We are going to have to have more flexibility and mobility in our armed services.

We have a revulsion in this country about being so handy with our infantry in foreign wars. The people are wise in the long run. They know from history that if a country habitually leads with its infantry option, the attrition of its potential young leaders and competitors is greater and it declines faster than a nation which uses other options. If we are not going to use our troops except when absolutely necessary, perhaps we can use our naval forces to take action earlier. We have got to have those naval forces in being and on the scene if we are going to take action when the roof first starts to leak. We must on occasion take action before the roof falls in and we no longer have any option but to land our infantry.

Soviet naval aviation has increased its capabilities. It is now capable of striking in a large area, specifically inside a line in the Atlantic that goes from the tip of Greenland to the Azores to Gibraltar through the Mediterranean, and then in the Pacific from Kodiak to Midway to the northern tip of the Philippines. Anything in there is inside their strike radius, including the land air bases. Almost one hundred percent of the Soviet air order of battle can reach the land bases that are occupied by American air forces overseas today.

The carriers can vary that by continuously changing the location of the air base, by moving in and out. So we need it for naval purposes, for strike, for defensive and offensive naval purposes.

It is also pretty hard to put a mortar shell into a carrier. Then there is guerrilla activity, rockets, bombs, fighter sweeps or night attack, etc. Land bases have major defensive problems, not that the carriers do not. Land bases are fixed. They can be pretargeted, and dealt with by an enemy in his own time and in his own way. But we still need land-based tactical aircraft. According to U.S. Naval spokesmen, the Navy view of the requirements for land-based tactical air is that every American doughboy deserves tactical air support that he needs. And that means we subscribe to the Marine Corps division-wing team concept, each division has its wing. And we think that is the bare minimum for land-based tactical air, at least a wing per division. There are other kinds of missions they can fly. Then there is the theory of the tactical wing based in the United States which relies on the air base overseas. We can not afford more than one or two of these.

The Navy spokesmen reported they were looking into the prospects of basing ground troops at sea, since foreign bases were becoming either less desirable or less available politically. What led the Navy to this was a look at the logistic problems involved in the Vietnamese war. In 1966 we were in effect building a Washington beltway every 60 days; we were laying enough asphalt to build a New Jersey turnpike every 30 days and digging and dredging fast enough to dig a Suez Canal every year and a half. We built some 90 odd bases, from very small ones on up. This was a fantastic investment. If we could have hauled the logistic structures to Viet-

nam in ships instead of constructing it in the country it might have been not only a saving in manpower and money but also a faster response time. When you look at the fact that the North Vietnamese regular army equalled our build-up rate in Vietnam, which in general was constrained by port capacity and that North Vietnamese troops walked down from the north as fast as we could get ourselves in, it may be that a sea base system would have a military advantage.

Ho Chi Minh might have been deterred more if we could have had the capability to move in by sea quickly with a hundred thousand troops. As it was, he had to believe that the U.S. would actually build those 90-odd bases at a cost of several billion dollars. The problem of course is that developing and producing new ships to base troops at sea for extended periods of time represents a large capital investment. To do it now would be to select a time when the Navy needs large capital investment to overcome the block obsolescence problem we have. It is also a time when building things to conduct war overseas—limited wars overseas—is not very popular anyway.

One of the big problems is how to keep troops combat ready during long periods at sea. Keeping the troops afloat is debilitating. We have done it up to six months in the Mediterranean, with the requirement to get them ashore about once a month and, if possible, to get some of their combatant equipment ashore. If we had to forego that, and were actually out in the mid-oceans, obviously we would have to have more modern craft. We have got to look at craft that will give us some elbow room. We can't stack troops up. We have got to think in terms of serious modernization. The ships would be equipped with heavy lift helicopters which would allow sea-based troops to be supported 100 miles or so inland without any requirement for boats or airports or over-the-beach landings. Such troops would include amphibious assault troops capable of making a forceable landing.

THE NEED FOR MAINTAINING AND MODERNIZING OUR FORCE OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS—NEED FOR 15 CVA/CVAN

The question was initially posed: Is there any good and valid reason why we should maintain a carrier force of the present size under conditions of peace and conventional warfare for the future? Should this force be reduced? Would a reduced force be adequate to cope with the present situation?

It was postulated by certain panelists that we can reduce our naval carrier force from 15 to 12 attack carriers. One participant even lowered the proposed total to 11 or 9. The argument was that the naval requirements around the world are limited in the future for flat-tops, for large carriers, if we reduce our foreign and overseas commitments and do not intend to become involved in any more Vietnams.

The necessity to maintain the old ratio of one out of three carriers on the line was also challenged.

BASIS FOR CALCULATING CARRIER REQUIREMENTS

The way in which 12 versus 15-16 carriers was calculated came up for discussion next. The formula advanced for 12 was alleged to be based on a past U.S. Navy formula: one in the Mediterranean, two or three in the Pacific, one in the Caribbean. These were multiplied by three.

A naval spokesman said that this deployment method of analysis, however, really is not what governs the size of the carrier force.

We have today a new formula, he reported. It is not simply that we need so many deployed in peacetime and multiply this number by three.

First, he pointed out that three-to-one is a planning factor which we hope we can achieve but, in fact, since 1940, we have av-

eraged 45 per cent forward because of various alarms and scares. There has only been one occasion where for a year we succeeded in having only one-third forward. So one-third forward is just a planning factor. And we never succeed in making it.

Another formula, he said, is to look at U.S. commitments to allies, particularly the harder ones, like NATO, the defense treaty with Japan, et cetera. Then ask: what if we have a war in that area, what will be required in the way of naval forces? The number of carriers to emerge from this kind of analysis depends very much on how many simultaneous situations you consider. It generally comes out that we need on the order of 18 to 21.

The third method, which is new, is based on matching the Soviet deployment. For example, in 1975 the U.S. Navy expects the Soviets will be able to field about 10 naval units, either singly or in combination, like the one that was in the Gulf of Mexico recently and the ones that were sent into the Indian Ocean. If they have 10 units deployed, the Indian Ocean requirement might total two U.S. attack carriers, the South Atlantic two, the South Pacific two, and the rest in the Mediterranean.

The result is a rather large requirement to match the Soviet Navy with a continuous presence. It is based on the assumption that the Soviets would be the initiator, the aggressor. By this calculation, in a very simplistic way, the total comes to 30 units, but this is an overstatement. The real range, all analytical methods considered, is about 12 to 24, depending on what kind of a situation you visualize in the world. Fifteen is actually a more realistic bottom. Many people say, why is there this minimum requirement? When you look at it, ships still cruise at about 25 knots, as they have for the last 20 years, and the world hasn't changed in dimensions.

Of course, technological innovation and progress might make 12 carriers as effective as 15, if we had 20 air wings.

COST OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Next, the question was raised as to the cost of running CVA task forces, including supporting ships, aircraft, etc. The answer offered was that the comparative task force now, including all the cruisers in the Navy, the missile frigates in the Navy and 60 per cent of the general purpose destroyers, and 70 per cent of the support supply ships, runs to about 39 per cent of the Navy's budget. That is for a 15-carrier navy. We presently have 16 operating and 16 wings. If you want a 30-carrier navy, you double the 39 per cent. That would add up to about six to seven billion dollars a year. This buys them, mans them, runs them and scraps them.

OPERATING FACTORS

It was suggested to U.S. Navy representatives that the 45 per cent operating factor would allow maintaining four or five carriers on the line with a smaller total carrier force.

The reply was that as a planning factor 45 per cent would not work. The reason for the one-third is for people. The ships can operate on the order of a maximum of 85 per cent. For instance, we kept 85 per cent of our 24 attack carriers operating forward during World War II. For several years some carriers during World War II did not make a port that you could call a liberty port or get any repairs from the shore side for a year and a half. They averaged 10 knots for a year and a half. The reason the people accepted it then was because there was a war on and everybody went to war, including the civilians at home. The Navy could demand that kind of separation and sacrifice from the people. In a cold war demands for that kind of performance cannot be made. There was an end to the war in sight in 1944. There does not appear to be any end to the cold war. People cannot be asked to live that

way indefinitely. Therefore, the Navy plans on the basis of the one-third cycle.

Going to "the blue and gold" concept which is used for the Polaris force will not work for carriers or any other conventional general purpose forces. It only works for forces deployed. It would deny the value of the fleets back home, the Second Fleet and the First Fleet. These, in a matter of days or weeks—depending on the emergency—can get forward. So the plan for a 45 per cent deployment is, in the face of other requirements for carriers, the combat requirements.

NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

The proposition that we can get along with only one aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean was opposed. If a carrier is removed, the attending ships are also removed, or some of them. This reduces the size of the American Navy in that area, the area of operations of the Sixth Fleet, at a time when there is a Soviet naval buildup. U.S. policy is to have political influence on the riverine states, then we are stuck with the need for not reducing our force but for keeping it at its present size. Otherwise, we are going to weaken our influence prematurely by reducing our naval presence. We may weaken it anyway. We may not be able to maintain the same political stance with the force that we have in being, because of factors that have nothing at all to do with the navies but with regional politics. But to weaken the U.S. position even further by this kind of withdrawal does not make any sense in this area.

There was a further challenge to the effect that no proof had been offered that one can equate the presence of a naval force with political influence.

These replies followed. If one carrier is withdrawn from the Mediterranean, this signals the fact that we are giving reduced significance to the Mediterranean. This signal reaches every single country in the Mediterranean area. In peacetime the political mix is more significant than the strategic mix.

A Navy spokesman picked up the argument. Withdrawing one of the carriers at this particular point in time, when the Soviets are on their buildup, would be read by NATO as a step toward withdrawal on the part of the United States.

It was brought out that to an army general who was there as the Supreme Allied Commander of Europe for many years, just the mere mention, the thought of withdrawing one of those carriers had him up in arms. He depended on the Sixth Fleet in all of his NATO planning, both cold war and hot war. Originally, the carriers in the Mediterranean did have the primary mission of nuclear strike. Over the years they shifted to conventional. But they always had the conventional mission as secondary. Now it has become primary because of other weapons being introduced.

Another critic took up the case. He wondered if we were to take a carrier out of the Mediterranean, why would that be interpreted as placing decreasing emphasis on the Mediterranean rather than as placing decreasing emphasis on carriers? He felt there was a very strong implication in much of what had been said of the possibility of non-nuclear war between the United States and Russia, or at least a confrontation of that type. He questioned how much such an estimate is worth. The theory seemed to him to be that if we get into a confrontation situation by having strong conventional strength, we would be able to avoid the choice between either having to back down or else going to a nuclear war. But if we have this conventional strength we put the Russians in the position of having either to back down or go into nuclear war. He could not see that this was very much better.

A non-naval advocate of maintaining our carrier strength continued his reasoning, first by saying he did not happen to favor every policy that the Navy proposes. In this particular instance, however, he felt strongly on the issue. It seemed very clear to him that what was being advocated was a unilateral withdrawal of force from this area at a time when we are trying to negotiate with the Russians on the ground rules for naval behavior in the Mediterranean. That weakened our bargaining position. He felt that whatever withdrawals were made from this area should be negotiated withdrawals. They ought to be negotiated from strength not from weakness. He believed that a premature withdrawal would weaken our negotiating posture. He said he was in favor of cutting back on the need for forces in various parts of the world. But he did not see any easy way of reaching that particular goal. He thought that we were in it up to our necks and that we had to recognize that our maneuverability in the political sense is not as simple as implied.

In the Six Day War in the Middle East, by unwritten convention, with all understanding after the hot line exchange, we were 300 miles away from the scene of fighting and so were the Russians, as far as the navies were concerned. The difference between their navy and ours was this. We were half an hour away and they were a half a day away from the scene of fighting. And that is the difference between the presence of aircraft carriers and their absence. This had considerable political effect.

Furthermore, when employing cost-effectiveness analysis, political considerations cannot be left out. After all, policies can cause a multiplication of costs or reduce the costs, depending on how effectively policy is conducted. If we manage through political means to prevent disputants from resorting to war, then it is going to be a lot less costly to us in the end if we are somehow or other indirectly involved in these developments.

Another naval spokesman tried a different approach. He said one thing about navies is that when we build them we must not only look at cold war, but at general war, or any kind of war the United States might get into. In the first place, it takes several years to build a carrier and man it and train it. In the second place, unless our cold warships, our units, are credible, and the enemy believes we have certain capabilities in war, our political influence is zero. So credibility in war is absolutely the most essential element in determining what forces are deployed. A paper tiger can not adequately serve political purposes.

How much air power does the United States need for military purposes? And then, based on our own geography, the number of U.S.-controlled land bases overseas, and the Navy requirement for offensive power, how much of the total U.S. air power should be land-based and how much should be sea-based? That is the main question. It is not the number of carriers or land bases.

Now, if certain military aircraft are needed in an area and nobody disagrees, where are they to be located? They cannot be put on overseas land bases for then we would not have complete U.S. control. If they are all crowded into the United States they can't go anywhere or be anywhere in an emergency. Every land base in the world is within 15 to 20 minutes of destruction, because it can be pretargeted. In NATO the only air power that we can count on if the balloon goes up, or any kind of attack occurs, if we can count on beyond five minutes, is mobile air power that cannot be pretargeted.

A non-naval student of the Mediterranean area and NATO agreed that this is not the time to reduce the carrier strength in the Mediterranean.

He said he also was not opposed to the position that the future strength of the U.S.

Navy in the Mediterranean should possibly be subject to some kind of negotiations. However, he thought that this gets us into a very messy situation to try to imagine what would come out of such negotiations. This question, he felt, can be legitimately separated from the question of how many carriers the United States needs in the future.

The question in the Mediterranean is air power. He didn't agree with the view that the Russians have no air bases in the Mediterranean. He was very much concerned about the possibility in the future that they may have a great many more air bases.

He offered a very simple scenario. Suppose the Israelis get to the point where they take over Jordan. As a result of that action, the Arab countries form an alliance and the Soviet Union becomes a member of that alliance. Although this is not very likely to happen, it could happen. In that case all the existing airports in Arab states in the Mediterranean region would be open to Soviet planes. Furthermore, the Soviets would be free to build temporary flight strips anywhere they wanted to. They could have hundreds of airfields in the Mediterranean within a matter of months. This is the problem. He submitted that the position of the carrier in the Mediterranean in this situation might well be impossible.

The idea of hundreds of Soviet airfields in the Mediterranean, however, was quickly challenged as mythical. So far, they don't exist. If they did exist they would be unusable, because our people, all the NATO countries, are between Russia and those airfields. The only way to support them is either through the Strait of Gibraltar or through the Dardanelles. These are friendly areas and we want to keep them friendly. The airfields are mythical, the airplane carriers are not. Thus he didn't see the problem of two airplane carriers being overwhelmed by hundreds of airfields. Rather, he expressed the view that airplane carriers are going to be necessary to support the armies which are holding the Dardanelles and keeping the Russians in the Black Sea and in their neighborhood where they belong and not out in the Mediterranean where we don't want them.

As long as NATO works together there really is no problem. The Mediterranean is and can be controlled by land-based air from the NATO side. But if one thinks about a unilateral U.S. contingency in which the United States' neck might be out, then a really tough problem arises. It can not be solved simply by bouncing around questions about whether we need 12, 19 or 30 carriers. This is a much more complex problem than that.

The carrier is a very important political symbol. But the U.S. symbolic position has already been weakened by the fact that we are already not alone in the Mediterranean as we were. It is true that if you pull a carrier out for budgetary reasons you would probably hurt our symbol that much more. And this is a gratuitous act that would be inexcusable at this time. But if we are going to make reasonable mid-range plans about what we do about our presence in the future, then we ought to start thinking about the function of that presence, the best way of manifesting that presence. And it would be a lot more important, for example, to have access to some of the ports from which we are now excluded than simply to have a carrier now. A pretty good show can be made with a visiting fleet. There are lots of ways of doing this.

Turning first to NATO it was also pointed out by another panelist that NATO is now split with a penetrable wedge right down the middle. The southern territory of NATO, consisting primarily of Turkey, Greece, Italy and Portugal, is very largely dependent upon sea power. There are 1500 ships a day in the Mediterranean supplying Italy, Greece and

September 11, 1969

Turkey. And we have to be able to protect that shipping against any possible incursion. The military presence there would prevent any Russian attempt to dominate the Mediterranean and cut off the flow of sea power.

Secondly, there should be mention of the problems of overflight rights. These problems are minimal with carriers but they were maximum with land based planes. Recently we tried to negotiate emergency passage of three planes from the United States to the East Coast of Africa. It took two weeks to negotiate that for a one-way trip. This problem really needs to be focused on, too.

Another view offered was that in anything short of war, the Soviets would also have overflight problems to get from where they are to some other place. They would have to overfly Turkey or Yugoslavia or Greece or some other place. And these countries may be friendly to the Russians, or they may not.

Some of the critics remained unconvinced. It was maintained that the original point of having two carriers was that we had a strategic nuclear requirement at one time for that extra carrier. This situation had changed. We can have additional forces in the Mediterranean that have other purposes, but it was stated that no proof was advanced that a carrier in the West Mediterranean is needed.

Another critic questioned the assertion that carriers are needed on the grounds that the Russians might achieve air superiority in the Mediterranean if they weren't there. He pointed out that the Mediterranean can be covered at present with land bases. We have a good margin of air superiority, since the Russians aren't operating off the southern shores of the Mediterranean.

If we are talking about a peacetime situation, he said, what added value is there in having two instead of one carrier in the Mediterranean?

Secondly, if now is not the time to take out a carrier, but if sometime in the future such objectives could be achieved as easily by a cruiser or a squadron of destroyers in somewhat the same way that the Russians are now achieving it, why wait around? What is so particularly delicate about the situation now? Now is as good a time as any. It is not ever going to be a very easy situation there. And the political argument, the show of force argument for having two carriers, is a way of saying it is a historical necessity. But that it still is a historical necessity or a peacetime military necessity remains to be shown.

One thing to be mentioned about having two carriers in the Mediterranean is that we lose one of the virtues of the carrier, its mobility. We have got it confined in a little area. Not only that, but this is an area which it is said can be covered from the Northern shore by aircraft under present political conditions. Thus it seemed that we waste a carrier, at least one and maybe two, by keeping them in the Mediterranean.

The same reasoning can be applied in the Far Eastern situation. Certainly the Seventh Fleet is required in the Taiwan Straits but are all three carriers required? There is Taiwan for land-based air. In the Korean region we have bases in Korea. In the Southeast area we have bases in Thailand. Despite the talk of our withdrawing he felt it is doubtful that we are about to give up our air bases in Thailand and Laos, the way it is talked about concerning Korea or Taiwan.

So we come back to the question, why do we need the carriers in peacetime? To the extent that we need them for a show of force, a case has to be made that that big and expensive a piece of equipment is really the only way that we can achieve the purposes of the show of force.

Now, when we are talking about wartime, if we need to get extra air into the Mediterranean for a conventional war, this occurs

with a period of warning. Consider the carriers in the Mediterranean. If the Russians close off the Straits of Gibraltar, the carriers inside are lost anyway.

Navy representatives returned to the many challenges posed. There are no tactical aircraft, tactical wings of the U.S. Air Force based on the northern shores of the Mediterranean, unless a base that is way up at the north end of the Adriatic is included.

We are being pestered with the idea that we might have to get out of Okinawa, and possibly Japan.

The Korean bases are there but a military airbase is a far cry from a strip of asphalt. And we have tested that and found it wanting.

Our base rights in the Philippines are certainly not a certainty.

Our base rights in Thailand also may not be a certainty down the road.

We have lost our bases in the Middle East. The situation at Wheelus, which is the last base we have on the continent of Africa, is questionable. Wheelus Field in Tripoli is under various restrictions. Its viability is very questionable.

The Spanish have not been interested in our using their territory as a staging area.

Mention should also be made of the withdrawal of the French bases. We have one base in Sicily, which is a naval base, as it turns out. It is for maritime patrol aircraft. This is the only base that we have there.

As a result we are left with a base structure that is abysmally vulnerable in Europe. All the bases on which the majority of our tactical air in Europe is based are within 120 to 140 miles of the East German frontier. An unguided rocket can take those out cheaply. The political vulnerability of overseas bases is just something that is not matched by the carrier.

Although the Mediterranean is not large—it is 1500 nautical miles from one end to the other—it is still a good operating area. We can manage the carriers in there. If the other side attacks first, however, we are going to have a very bloody time regardless of the amount of warning.

Another naval spokesman continued the argument. He said, in reference to NATO bases in Southern Europe, that we also have to remember that we have to be able to operate these unilaterally as well as under the alliance flag. In a situation in the Middle East, NATO may not want to respond. The United States might want to respond. The fact is that in the Mediterranean NATO has never really been a factor. It has not worked there. Since 1956 it has been only our Sixth Fleet. We would have to have the capability to do so. If we were not allowed to use the NATO bases we would have practically nothing to respond with except our aircraft from our carriers.

We are very, very limited, from a unilateral operation viewpoint, in the Mediterranean if we don't have our carriers.

Reference was also made to this problem of getting through to the East African Coast. The problem of bases there for the strike command, in the Indian Ocean area, is a real one. Wheelus is essential to the strike command getting through.

AIRCRAFT O. B. ON AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

The view was expressed by a critic that an aircraft carrier has possibly 50 planes which can fly tactical or supply missions. This number might vary according to the particular carrier from 50 to 60. So you can count on 50 to 60 sorties which could be flown in any way today from any one carrier.

This statement was said to be inaccurate by spokesmen of the Navy. You have a wing on each carrier. A land-based wing equals a carrier wing. You have the equality. We fly more sorties a day more than others do with land-based aircraft. About 1.2 versus 1.1. A carrier would have available 75 planes, the

same number for a land-based wing. There are another 15 on a carrier that are the "cats" and "dogs", as they are called. We have 75 fighters and attack aircraft capable of defense missions in our wings. The number of aircraft available for attack sorties thus would be 75. You can turn the F-4 into a fighter or bomber.

OTHER COMMENTS ON THE ROLE OF AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The aircraft carrier, according to naval spokesmen, is a pretty flexible multi-purpose weapons system. It is a base for practical air power of any kind that you want. Land-based air power has gone through the same changes. Therefore, there is nothing strange or odd about the fact that the air base doesn't necessarily dictate the mission of the airplane. It is strategic if it needs to be and it still needs to be.

For the sea-based tactical air, there are two basic missions. One is for the striking power and the air defense of the fleet, and the things that the fleet is trying to do, including protecting convoys—if we get into that business. Because of the increased radius of action of tactical aircraft, both land and sea based, the capability of carriers pays off but not in the ability of the aircraft to fly overseas and occupy a base. It pays off in the ability of aircraft flying from sea bases being able to cover almost the entire world. And this means that today we have a bonus from our attack carriers in that we can perform tactical air power in almost any situation that might arise without any requirement of perfect intelligence on our part. It can happen 10 years from now, and we can be there, because we have the radius of action.

Another naval representative, while not challenging the stated needs of the U.S. Navy for carriers, inserted a word of caution about equating carriers with naval power. The real question is, given a fixed budget, how much should be allocated to protect x number of carriers. In this decision, the rest of naval power should not be sacrificed. Naval power must be balanced. Naval power has to have many types and degrees of application for tactical aviation. Another senior military officer with a different service background added that the balance referred to applies to and between all the military services.

Concerning means of reducing defense costs, a participant declared that we have today in service three and a half million to four million men. Tomorrow we are going to have two million or two million, five hundred thousand. There is no way to save money by deferring a Nimitz class carrier for a year. More money is spent that way.

VULNERABILITY OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER

It was pointed out that there is a school of thought in the Congress, in the Air Force and among certain scientists that Surveyor satellites, missiles, etc., make the carriers comparatively easy to locate. If it can be located, it can be sunk, either by the new nuclear submarine or by either a seaborne or land-based missile.

In reply, a naval advocate said that again we must not confuse war and peace. We have used the carrier ever since World War II. We haven't lost any. We used it all over to enforce our policies, our politics. It has been a very cost-effective machine. This invulnerability argument has been going on in Washington since 1945. Anything that is hit with modern weapons today is vulnerable, whether it is an airplane, an airbase, an aircraft carrier or a submarine. As far as the satellite is concerned, it must communicate this back to the submarine, and in spite of what you hear, the submarine only goes 30 knots an hour, and that isn't very fast.

A representative of a point of view hardly to be identified with defense priorities closed the discussion with a brief unexpected testimonial. He said that nobody had mentioned

the extremely undesirable political aspects of many of our foreign land air bases. He viewed this as a tremendous point in favor of the carrier. Okinawa has become a major political liability and Taiwan may become a worse one. He went on to say that if we must have a tactical airforce overseas—he was not sure that we do—he would feel much more comfortable with carriers than on land bases.

PROBLEM OF BLOCK OBSOLESCENCE IN THE U.S. NAVY

The question was asked if block obsolescence of naval ships is a priority problem or a minor one.

A naval official replied. He said that we have built about 1.5 million tons of naval vessels since 1945. The Soviets have built about 1.7. Our ships average larger tonnage per ship, not only because we have carriers, but in the other types as well. So we have built a lot fewer. On a tonnage or number basis, they have built more naval ships since the war than we have. That means that if we assume a 30 year life for a combatant naval vessel—unless we increase markedly the rate of ship construction between now and 1975—the Soviets are going to have a bigger navy than we have. It is inevitable. Overcoming block obsolescence is a top priority.

The ship construction budget of the Navy has run about 19 per cent of the total. One way to get a really brand new navy is, of course, to retire all the old ships. That can get the average age down really fast. But this is not the answer. We are in a very bad situation. The Navy is going to have to spend more than 19 per cent, at least for about 10 years.

An official from Congress continued the case. He said there is one other point that needs to be raised on the ship building problem. In addition to the problem of age, the ships that we have are in such condition that the casualty reports on them are increasing in severity. This means that they are off the line more and it takes an awful lot more manpower to put them back on the line. This means the personnel have to be involved in maintenance more than in operations. In addition, the old ships are very poor in regard to habitability.

At a time when many people are urging that the armed services go to a professional kind of service, we are not going to draw many people into the Navy if the Navy consists of old ships that they spend all their time just keeping on the line.

ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW)

Discussion was initiated with a somewhat loaded question: Has the Navy made a serious mistake in starving the ASW program, considering particularly the growth of the Soviet submarine fleet? A subquestion was whether or not ASW simply can not keep up with the offense, considering the declared invulnerability of the Polaris fleet.

Representatives of the U.S. Navy replied. One said he did not think that one can say that the Navy has starved the ASW forces for the Polaris. Budget-wise Polaris is part of the strategic offensive capability. The Polaris program runs only 6.8 per cent of the Navy budget.

Another spokesman said it is certainly not throwing good money after bad trying to perfect ASW. We are moving forward in the ASW field. The problem is a terrific one technologically. We have different weapons systems coming along that are going to be very helpful—the P3C, the S3A aircraft, and various other systems.

There is another problem. Whereas we used to think in terms of trying to bottle up the Soviet Navy years ago, with the naval strategy that they have adopted they are now out in blue water. To the extent the Soviets gain access to the open seas and operate from bases overseas without our

interference, our ASW problems are compounded. They used to stay relatively close to home waters, which made it possible for us to bottle them up. This is no longer true. The problem has been intensified now because they are out in the oceans of the world.

When talking about ASW, one has to differentiate between the defense of the United States against the submarine-launched ballistic missile and the classic navy ASW role to defend convoys and to defend the fleet. The threat against the United States itself is increasing. When one talks about ASW in this vein, one has to look at what we are spending for defense of the United States. A few years ago when the Navy came in with a program to increase its ASW to deal with the submarine-launched Polaris missile, the rationale for rejecting that increase was that we were not spending anything for land-based ballistic missile defense of the country, therefore we could not have our ASW slice of this.

The situation has changed. The threat has increased very rapidly. The country has now made a decision to go for some ballistic missile defense. The next logical thing to do is to look at the budgeting for ASW. This country needs more ASW today, not at the expense of offense but as the sea-based part of the effort the country is going to allocate for defense.

A challenge came from one of the participants. He asserted that the Navy has not been able to track its own Polaris submarines leaving port and we surmise that the Russians are not able to track our Polaris submarines. If both the American and the Soviet submarine forces are very hard to find and to track, what kind of a threat, then, do the submarines pose to the carriers?

In answer a Navy representative said the questioner was talking about two different things. A Polaris submarine is extremely difficult because it does not have the three tasks that the attack submarine has. It does not have to detect targets. That was done for him by a satellite or a reconnaissance aircraft. It does not have to identify its targets. That was done for it by a photointerpreter. It does not have to chase its targets, because once it gets on station it has a very wide radius in which it can operate. It has only the last two tasks of a submarine, which is to survive long enough to fire its weapon. It has one load of weapons, and it has 15 minutes to get them off. If it knows when the war starts, the opponent has 15 minutes to get it. If it does not the submarine's only job during its entire patrol is to be quiet and undetected. This is very different from a submarine that is trying to bag an aircraft carrier. That submarine has to run over the ocean and get the information on where the carrier is initially, track it down, identify it, and then finally get in close enough position for a shot, make the shot work, and then after a hit cause enough damage so that the carrier is out of action.

Relatively speaking ASW is a feasible art against an anti-ship submarine but is an extremely different, more difficult art against a Polaris submarine. The Navy representative felt strongly that for the next 5-10 years the enemy can not destroy the viability of the Polaris. Follow on systems may be the least vulnerable of all our systems for 50 years. We are going to have to start replacing the Polaris/Posidon boats within the next 10 years.

Then the question was raised: Should the money be apportioned on the basis of which is the most feasible rather than which is of greater strategic importance?

The answer offered was that we have to look at both of them. If we ever found some way to really get a grasp on the submarine-launched ballistic missile system within any reasonable range of funding—and by reasonable the speaker was talking about a pretty big range—we should go after it.

Another participant said that the \$3 billion a year that we are spending on ASW seemed to him to be pretty adequate. He did not know of any real argument that ASW was being starved. He questioned the view that larger additional expenditures for ASW were justified on the grounds that we are starting an ABM deployment. He said an ABM system is being offered largely to defend our Minuteman capability, our strategic deterrent. The ASW protection in this area would be primarily to protect some bomber fields which have a relatively low rating in our strategic nuclear offensive capability.

The reply was that we do not know exactly how the Soviets are going to use their strategic offensive capability. They could target bombers, they could target key command control centers, they could target key ballistic missile defense centers or key control centers for your offensive missile. One cannot foresee in advance what they are going to do.

He said that our analysis of defense indicates that the only feasible defense of known positions particularly is a defense in depth. We have got to start whittling them down way off. If we put all the defense we have in the target area, this gives the offense a great advantage. As we go into ABM, whether it is against sea-based missiles or land-based missiles, we are going to have to go out and put defenses in depth. On the sea ASW is the forward, the first phase of defense in depth. And this phase can begin when the enemy vessels leave port.

ASW, of course, is not the whole answer. If we are serious about defense we are going to have to employ ASW and then perhaps later a sea-based intercept system, to supplement a terminal ABM system in the United States.

Another participant said it was not clear to him what the value of ASW is in dealing with a Polaris type submarine, if we have to know that a war has started before we can shoot at him, even if you are sitting right there watching him. Will we have a chance to use this capability, even if we can find them, after spending whatever it costs to be able to do that?

In reply, the following was offered. Assuming that the submarine carries more than one missile, even if the first one gets away and we can get the 15 left in the silos in the submarine, we will have done quite a useful task. Even if we can not precisely locate the submarine, we can be in the general area. We hope to be able to get at least part of the missiles on board before they are fired. There are many, many other cold war options we can use if we can discover submarines in a position to attack the United States. We may not have to sink a submarine to get a message across.

Concern was then expressed by one of the participants about the danger—dependent as we are on sophisticated sensors—of misinterpreting enemy action as an actual attack in the future if we have one U.S. attack submarine monitoring one Soviet submarine.

In reply the complexity of analyzing naval warfare was pointed up. It is a problem of measure and countermeasure. It is more difficult for the system analyst than some other types of problems. Naval warfare consists of an infinite succession of moves and countermoves. We have to analyze each move and countermove in each series, and integrate them to get this kind of an answer. This is going to be the pattern in the future, as both sides get more sophisticated. It is the fellow who has the best weapons and uses them the most wisely and effectively who will prevail.

One of the problems is the priority given to naval R & D. What is possible to develop in the way of sensors for land can, in principle, have its counterpart for the sea. New developments usually take place on land

and are transmitted to the sea. But about 80 percent of our government's research and development budget today is directed to land oriented efforts. Perhaps we will need more research in the sea. This is entirely feasible.

In later discussion a panelist returned to ASW operations, to ASW R & D and to the relationship of ASW to deterrence. He said that the ASW operation is not a single operation by a submarine. It is not a single operation by a plane. It is not a single operation by a destroyer. It is not a single operation by any sensor device. It is a combination. When you say that our attack submarines have not been able to track our Polaris submarines, this does not mean that there are not other ways in which we can find and detect submarines at sea. There are many ways to provide some effectiveness against the submarine threat: surveying them when they leave Soviet ports, surveying them when they are at sea, surveying them during travel time, and providing a defense in depth at sea. Even if we do not know exactly where a submarine is, as soon as a missile comes up you will be able to know where it is and then perhaps deal with a missile in a number of ways and deal with the submarine. It is a many sided problem. We are capable of making a many-sided approach. There are ways which need to be taken into consideration in our research and development program.

One of the things that has happened this year is that the research and development program for ASW—at a time when the Soviet submarines are becoming more quiet than we had expected—has been written at about \$120 million. But all of this goes into one airplane which, under the regular rules of the game, would come out of airplane development, not out of ASW development.

We need to put in a lot more in ASW R & D. There have been some panels that have been studying the problem and think that we should really double our ASW R & D in order to develop sensors and mixes of equipment that can begin to counter the ASW threat.

Obviously Admiral Rickover and a number of other people are concerned, facing the contingency of a large number of relatively high speed, relatively quiet Soviet hunter-killer subs. One would always worry that some later breakthrough in tracking and detection or kill capability might permit that force in being to become an immediate or short term threat to the Polaris boats, shortly after the discovery was made.

The main thing to remember is that the Polaris boats are not invulnerable by any law of nature. We have a technological competition underway in this area as in many others.

He thought it might be useful if we stood back from specific weapons systems for a moment and looked at ASW in the context of a strategy of mutual deterrence and the forthcoming SALT talks. There are technological pressures that are on different types of deterrents, ASW with regard to the Polaris class boat, MIRV with regard to fixed land-based missiles and ABM defenses, and ABM with regard to the penetration capability of any missile. Obviously MIRV and ABM and ASW—though it has not been talked about—have to become central elements in the proposed negotiations because all of them point toward the capability to erode the basis for mutual deterrence. All of these technologies—MIRV, ABM and ASW—are very troublesome if our goal in the next decade is a stable mutual deterrence system through agreements.

A Navy spokesman replied that he agreed with the premise that there is a dynamic situation. Technology is going to make everything vulnerable sooner or later. Although MIRV is a great threat to the Minuteman system as a viable system and also to the ABM system, he did not think that one can

apply ASW, even with a fantastic increase in capability in ASW on the part of the Soviets, as that kind of threat to the Polaris, Poseidon, and later ULMS, because we have such a dynamic technology and will have dynamic tactics through mobility. The thing that makes the cases nonparallel is the fact that in the Polaris, Poseidon, ULMS case the platforms are mobile. And in the other case they are fixed. Once the targeting is done properly, the accuracy is achieved and the numbers fielded, there is not any question about the outcome.

The civilian panelist countered with a statement that he agreed that the mobility of the force makes it the most invulnerable system we have at the moment. Aircraft are mobile but they have to put in at a base once in a while. Subs have to put in at a base once in a while. One can conceive of a situation in which a Soviet force of, let us say, two to three to one hunter-killers in ratio to the Polaris—given a breakthrough in detection on tracking capability—could pick up, follow and stay with every boat.

A Navy official disagreed. To show what kind of game and countergame it really is, he hypothesized putting in a dandy, high-powered, shore-based acoustic jammer off a port that would prevent the picking up of a U.S. nuclear-powered submarine.

Another senior Naval officer concluded the discussion. He said we have got to quit worrying about the service politics and the service rivalry that we have indulged in over the last 20 years when we were smart and powerful and the enemy was weak and dumb. We must make the best use of the techniques we have available and the optimum use of the geography of this country, if we are going to survive.

DETERRENCE DEFINED

A Naval spokesman said that there is another kind of deterrence besides deterrence by means of threat. He called it a checkmate. Since our common purpose is to preserve the United States from nuclear destruction, and our common concern is to prevent a nuclear first strike on the United States, we must make it impossible for an enemy to gain a decisive military advantage by hitting the United States first.

To do this best, he said, we are going to have to distribute more of our offensive weapons based at sea around more areas of the Soviet defense perimeter, to take the heat off the United States (with its limited land area) as the primary, time-urgent military target of the Soviet Union. If we really intend to provide an ABM defense, we must think in terms of a defense-in-depth. For this, we have to use adjacent sea areas to find the needed space to provide a viable defense-in-depth of the United States.

Another Navy spokesman added that when we talk about deterrence, the question is, what is it we seek to deter? Do we seek to deter war in general, or do we seek to deter particular weapons systems, particular ways of fighting a war? Should we try to draw a line and neutralize one means of combat so that no one can use it? Our approach to deterrence, he maintained, has very often been the latter. We find that one particular means of combat which is particularly destructive and we see what we can do about putting the "genie back in the bottle."

A critic acknowledged that eventually we may have to race, too. But in view of the existence of certain technologies—and MIRV is one—before we enter upon a race that is going to be very difficult to reverse, and before we enter upon a race which predictably will not only be costly in dollar terms but costly in terms of national security because of the instability which it creates in this strategic balance, we ought at least to make this effort to explain our position more directly to the Soviets in the SALT talks. We should supply them an answer to the ques-

tion: Do you agree that our relationship should be built around the concept of mutual deterrence?

If the Soviet Union agrees to that as their stated policy in such negotiations, there are some things that follow. They cannot have an unlimited ABM system around their cities. That is incompatible with this. They can not have, nor can we, a large-scale MIRV deployment that points to disarming the land-based forces, nor can they have heavy ASW. We have to be prepared. When we get answers to this question of the fundamental concept of the strategic relationship, we have to come at that point to an understanding that these subsystem decisions will be made in a very different context from the one in which we are trying to debate them here.

A Navy spokesman then explained some fundamental operational aspects of deterrence. He said our land geography occupies about nine percent of the Soviet defense perimeter, as seen from Moscow. In that nine percent is the great majority of the weapons systems that can hurt the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the Soviets build ICBMs, FOBS, etc., and aim them at the United States. And some day, they may have a capability of destroying the United States.

The Soviets have great momentum in the buildup of strategic weapons. The highest defense people in the United States have said that by the mid-seventies, they are going to have a capability to destroy 95 percent of our land-based ICBMs.

He then raised the question: With the Soviets going ahead with this buildup, why are they delaying SALT negotiations?

For the preservation of the United States, he recommended that we take steps right now—and perhaps the time is already very late—to optimize our deployment so that we can survive if they do not stop their buildup. Deterrence is more than just threatening to retaliate. It is to make it impossible for the enemy to gain a decisive military advantage by hitting the U.S. with a nuclear first strike. We have got to deploy the majority of our nuclear offensive weapons outside the U.S., at sea, deployed around the remaining 91 percent of his defense perimeter to achieve this kind of deterrence.

Concerning mutual deterrence another participant said that it can only come through an act of political will on the part of the Soviet government and the American government, because the development of these weapons is not really going to stop. If we do not have, for example, an ABM this time around, we are going to have one next time around.

He stressed that we are not going to do it by passing Senate resolutions. We are going to have mutual deterrence by declaring it as an act of political will in the international arena. And it is probably going to be almost impossible.

It seemed to him that, if we are going to have mutual deterrence, we are not going to do it simply by having gigantic ICBM and Polaris forces. We are going to have deterrence from the bottom up or the top down (meaning at all levels of conflict up to and including general nuclear war) excluding insurgency warfare. We have tried our hand at that. But anything worse than that we had better be able to deter. If we are going to want to do that, he asked, had we not best be equipped with the best things?

He offered the opinion that the gentlemen who introduce resolutions to have the General Accounting Office evaluate naval strategy and to stop building the best carriers are approaching it backwards.

Another participant stressed that the decision to go for mutual deterrence is one that cannot be made unilaterally. It is a decision that the Russians have to have made at the same time. He said we have to consider

the evidence as to whether they have really made that decision, if that is what they are going to decide to live with.

Turning to our sea-based deterrent, he commented, seemingly facetiously, that if its great advantage is its invulnerability and its likelihood of not being taken out in case of an attack—and we get a very high percentage of our deterrent force based at sea—then he would feel a little more comfortable if we did not try to get them to run so deep and run so quiet. He would like to have a little more visibility to attract some more of the enemy's fire.

This comment provoked the reply from a Naval representative that the option to put these missiles on surface ships for the first time would be a good way to attract some of the enemy fire that might otherwise be directed at the United States. He felt some agreement from DOD might be obtained to go ahead with the program by the mid-1970's if we have to.

He pointed out that the ballistic missile ship is not the invulnerable system that the submarine is but it is the second most survivable and least costly of all the options available to us. It is still available. He continued that the Navy is not "beating the drum" for a big ballistic missile ship force. But it is available to the United States if we need more missiles at sea in the shortest possible time, before 1975, for example.

He went on to say that the idea of aiming missiles permanently at one another is not the kind of mutual deterrence that was being talked about. One of them might go off. Then the other fellow is going to have to fire quickly thereafter. The balloon goes up. If one wants more stable mutual deterrence, perhaps one might like two survivable systems which do not need to strike first or instantly to survive and be effective.

LLMS—THE FOLLOW-ON TO POLARIS AND POSEIDON

The Navy is developing an underwater long-range missile system that is called the ULMS. The submarine itself will be more advanced and it will incorporate new technologies. It will be more efficient. The missile in the submarine will be of longer range, so that we will eliminate travel time to and from target. We will quadruple the space in which to operate, which will at least quadruple the enemy's ASW problem, or at least force him to spend many, many more times as much on ASW as he does now. He would be forced to expend resources for this purpose which he might otherwise use to build ICBMs and aim them at our country.

MISSILE DEFENSE AT SEA AND MUTUAL DETERRENCE

Naval analyses revealed that the further forward the incoming weapons in the trajectory of an aircraft weapon or missile are intercepted, the greater the payoff. For instance, in the case of MIRV, it was found that if intercepted in early midcourse, we could get the MIRV cloud while it was still small. It could be caught with one or two weapons while it would take 20 or 30 based in the United States. But in order to provide such a defense in depth we had to use the seas to get additional buffer areas we needed. In developing the concept for sea-based ABM, we took ABM technology that was already developed under the Nike X program. We took a ship of a type we have been building for years. We adopted the present ABM technology to shipboard use. We used radar technology that was already at sea but made it a little more powerful. This is how we developed the SABMIS concept for a sea-based mid-course intercept system. In conjunction with a Safeguard ABM system, it would provide a very viable defense-in-depth for the United States. SABMIS could be deployed against the ICBM threat as well as the SLBM threat. It also is capable of being moved overseas to assist in the defense of our allies,

if our policy called for that. And if we changed our minds and did not want to do that any more, we could bring SABMIS ships home, always having them under the American flag and 100 percent under U.S. control.

This explanation gave rise to the question of whether the Naval officer was suggesting that the United States is making a mistake in not placing greater emphasis on the ABM.

He replied negatively. He said if the country is going to go beyond the present approved first phase of the ABM, it should seriously consider the sea-based option as one of the candidates. In a defense-in-depth we must also have something terminal; we must have always a last ditch whether it is land or sea warfare.

A panelist then opined that obviously SABMIS—the proposed seabased ABM system under discussion—had greater ambiguity with regard to the strategic function, as a concept. It could be a population defense as opposed to a terminal defense. He thought that if mutual deterrence does not appear to be in the cards and we appear to be facing stern competition in which population defense becomes a priority task in our national strategy, maybe SABMIS will yet see the light of day.

Mutual deterrence, he pointed out, takes two. He thought that those of us who argue for negotiations first have a great burden in trying to explain some of the things the Soviets have been doing. It is very difficult to rationalize the Soviet FOBS and some of the depressed trajectory tests that are rumored with respect to the SLBMs. And even more, the particular pattern of their SS-9 ICBM technology, which, he said, probably now can be admitted in public at least to be something more than a simple cluster, is not exactly the kind of flexible MIRV system we have been talking about.

He went on to say it was extremely difficult for any of those who are for negotiations first to understand why these uniquely incompatible systems, incompatible with mutual deterrence, are in process in the Soviet Union. He thought that one plausible explanation is that the Soviets have not yet seen the probability of a successful negotiation. In the meantime, they are going ahead with new systems which is perfectly reasonable, until we have an agreement.

CONTRIBUTION OF DEEP OCEAN OPERATIONS TO THE NAVY'S MISSION

The importance of modern oceanography to the U.S. Navy was also brought up but in a context which suggested that military bases under the sea could be a substitute for fleet mobility.

A Navy spokesman replied, saying that while military based under the seas are coming, it must be recognized that anything that is stationary—even under the sea—can be located and pretargeted. They can be dealt with by the enemy in his own time and in his own way. In order to get the most out of the available money, the U.S. Navy presently prefers to go to a mobile system which cannot be pretargeted and which can go where it is needed, when it is needed.

Looking ahead, the deep submergence technique offers great promise. Just like the aircraft industry wants to get on top, to get higher, to produce a superior plane with better operational capability and altitude, in the deep oceans the side which can descend farthest and maneuver and operate and fight at a lower level is going to have the advantage over the side that can not descend as far. So this is the technology of the future.

A spokesman for maritime interests argued that multi-purpose programs are the key to budget support and further stressed advantages and benefits possible to both merchant and naval sectors of sea power through cooperation and coordination.

Towards the end of the discussion a panel-

ist presented a provocative challenge to the propriety of conventional channels of decision-making concerning military postures. He said that he thought that there will be a consensus in the Congress in the next several years that the usefulness of an undersea deterrent and the usefulness of undersea forces in general is quite high. He thought that there will be some Congressional sentiment for phasing out the manned bombers and part of Minuteman, to replace them with more Polaris-type undersea forces, one of the most promising of which seemed to be ULMS.

He went on to say that the real questions concerning the role of the Navy revolve around its role in limited war, and then the technological efficiency or obsolescence of surface fleet. First, the CVA's and the CVAN's; and secondly, surface and part underseas, the antisubmarine warfare forces.

He pointed out that particularly CVA forces and antisubmarine warfare carriers have come under attack not only in the Congress and in the Bureau of the Budget, but also in the Defense Department. Really hard questions are also going to be asked increasingly in public about the cost-effectiveness of the antisubmarine warfare carriers. He informed the meeting that one of the proposals that is being brought forward is to mothball them or keep them back here in the United States until the probability that we lose our overseas ASW bases starts increasing. When that probability starts increasing, then we can send them back up.

While professing not to be an expert on technology or an experienced expert on the carriers, he said he had done a good deal of research on some of the behavior reactions or the institutional reactions of bureaucracies and of organizations to changes in technology. He said that was one of the reasons he thought he was invited.

Technologies produce strategies, and strategies then require combat units and combat staff, he added. They then produce certain kinds of combat units such as carrier attack forces and these tend to become institutionalized. And when they become institutionalized, the institutions develop bias against new technologies and against new strategies. He referred to such a technology as that of a surface fleet and the question of the protectability of a surface fleet when it starts to obsolesce. (And here he pointed out that some people are charging that they are becoming too vulnerable and that they are obsolescing). The institution, he felt, would tend not to admit this and would not change strategies as a result. Only outside the institutions or in very small groups inside the institution would groups urge changes in technology: changes in strategy. And among the inside groups, it might be the submarine groups, the submarine captains, the submarine admirals, who would challenge the role of the surface navy. Outside it might be pressures such as the mayors in the United States looking for the resources that were being spent on an obsolescent technology. If the surface navy is obsolescing as some people allege and if a decreasing amount of the Navy's budget is spent on surface fleets, then an increasing amount of the Navy's budget (and possibly of the prestige of the promotions to captains and admirals) would go to the submarines. This, he said, creates a kind of institutional crisis in a way.

He went on to say that the purpose of Air Force crews sitting at the bottom of missile silos and the Navy crews sitting in the Polaris submarines is only to keep those forces ready and to fire them, not to plan for the use of those weapons. If, for example, the Navy was composed of submariners only, it would lose credibility when it is said that it should also help target those weapons, or it should also help decide on the policy or how the weapons are going to be used. The services tend thus to become custodians of unmanned weapons rather than the users

of weapons, involving grand strategy: fleets of bombers, task forces of carriers, etc.

And so if or when technologies are alleged to be obsolescing, whether they are in fact or not, the institutions would tend to react very defensively. This phenomenon, he added, we will see during the course of the next several years in the United States, and maybe in the next several decades in the United States.

He said he thought that these questions of how vulnerable surface fleets are, how vulnerable the carriers are, how useful they are in limited war (since they do not have to be as useful in strategic wars as they might have been one time) will have to be argued out. He maintained that this will not be done on the floor of the Congress as some people seem to think it will be, nor in conferences like this. He quickly added he nevertheless did not gainsay the usefulness of conferences like this or argument on the floor. They will be argued out in very technical or very detailed papers. And there are plenty of papers floating around on system analysis in the Pentagon, and probably during the course of the next year more will be generated at MIT and at the Brookings Institution. These will debate the Navy's case for the vulnerability or the security of surface fleets. He thought that it would be a long time before this debate is really worked out, and a lot more will have to be put into it than what has been put in so far.

A representative of the U.S. Navy, in reply, stated that the Department of Defense has made studies, the JCS have made studies and the Navy has made a number of studies of the survivability of surface systems. The invariable conclusion is that, undefended and operating at random at sea, without any defense, that the survivability of surface ships is measurable in hours. There is no study that he knew of by which it can be proved that these surface ships are as vulnerable as alleged. Military experience also is just the opposite. Navies were invented back in the days of the Medes and the Persians, or before. And the primary purpose of navies is to provide security for ships and for performance of important functions at sea. Navies have been very successful in that, and they will continue to work at this task by using similar technologies to those used to threaten them. The main consideration is that all of us are in the business of providing for the survivability of our country. Of course, ships are vulnerable, but vulnerability is relative. The news from Viet Nam reminds us almost daily that men, too, are vulnerable. But this does not mean we can do without armies. Viet Nam also reminds us that aircraft and fixed bases are also vulnerable. But we still must have military aircraft and fixed bases.

The major concern today, he pointed out, is the survivability of the fixed weapon systems in the United States that can be targeted by ICBMs, SLBMs, and so forth. Whether we like it or not, our limited U.S. land geography compels us as never before to utilize the seas to a greater extent for deployment of our nuclear offensive and defensive weapons and to provide them with sufficient survivability to do their jobs if called upon. The United States is as land deficient with respect to today's nuclear weapons as England was with respect to the weapons of World War II. We have no other choice. We are compelled to deploy more of our weapons at sea, to make it impossible for an aggressor to gain a decisive military advantage by striking the United States first.

Another participant added that there had not been a single Essex class carrier or subsequent class, from World War II on, that has ever been lost to enemy action or by any other cause. And they have been through three wars. He thought that on the basis of that record, since World War II, the usability of naval forces is extremely clear.

The moderator closed with one final opinion. He said he thought that those in the Navy and others who feel that the world is going to be divided into domestic spending and military spending have to be deluding themselves. It is not going to work that way. The Navy and its advocates are going to have to fight for the dollar with the domestic programs, even though it may be mixing apples and oranges. That is the way it is going to be. He ended his statement by saying that if the Navy is one-half as convincing with the country as it was today, it will do pretty well.

APPENDIX

Robert A. Kilmarx, seminar director.
Robert D. Novak, moderator.

PANELISTS

Panel I—Political and national security environment

U.S. Navy

Vice Admiral Richard Colbert, USN, President, Naval War College.
Rear Admiral George Miller, USN, Director, Strategic Defensive and Offensive Systems.
Rear Admiral Even P. Aurand, USN, Director, Long Range Objectives Group.
Major General John Chaisson, USMC, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff (Plans).
Admiral J. T. Hayward, USN, (Ret.), Vice President, General Dynamics.

Congress

Mr. George Norris, Counsel to the House Committee on Armed Services.

Area Specialists

Caribbean and Latin America

Dr. Howard Davis, School of International Service, American University.

Middle East

Dr. J. C. Hurewitz, Middle East Institute, Columbia University.

Europe and NATO

Dr. James King, Institute for Defense Analysis.

Far East and South Asia

Colonel Robert Rigg.

Media

Mr. Robert Debs Heintz, Detroit News.
Mr. Howard Stringer, CBS News.

Panel II—Conditions of peace and conventional war

U.S. Navy

Vice Admiral Richard Colbert, USN.
Rear Admiral Evan P. Aurand, USN.
Major General John Chaisson, USMC.
Admiral J. T. Hayward, USN (Ret.).

U.S. Army

General Robert Wood, USA, (Ret.), Research Analysis Corporation.

Congress

Representative David E. Satterfield (D.-Va.), Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. George Norris, Counsel, House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Sam Black, Democratic Study Group.
Mr. Robert Sherman, Legislative Assistant and Speech Writer to Senator McGovern.

Media

Mr. Lloyd Norman, Newsweek.

Panel III—General war and deterrence of general war

U.S. Navy

Rear Admiral George Miller, USN.
Admiral J. T. Hayward, USN, (Ret.).

Congress

Mr. George Norris, Counsel, House Committee on Armed Services.

Dr. Alton Frye, Legislative Assistant to Senator Edward W. Brooke.

Media

Mr. Charles Corddry, Baltimore Sun.

OBSERVERS

Lieutenant Steve Abbot, USN, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Systems Analysis.

Mr. James Adams, AP.

Mr. Holmes Alexander, McNaught Syndicate.

Captain L. D. Caney, USN, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Deputy Program Coordinator, New Construction Destroyer Program.

Mr. Ralph Casey, American Institute of Merchant Shipping.

Captain John Counihan, USN (Ret.), Systems Research Corporation.

Mr. Bonner Day, U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. William Downs, ABC News.

Mr. John M. Elliott, Republican House Conference.

Mr. Steven Engelberg, Legislative Assistant to Senator Walter Mondale.

Admiral Paul Foster, USN (Ret.), General Dynamics.

Mr. Hoyt Haddock, Executive Director, AFL-CIO, Maritime Committee.

Lieutenant Edgar Hawkins, USN, Assistant to Vice Admiral Colbert.

Mr. Edwin Hood, President, Shipbuilders Council of America.

Mr. Orr Kelly, Evening Star.

Mr. William A. Korn, Executive Assistant to Senator Clifford P. Case.

Mr. Les Ledbetter, The New York Times.

Mr. John Loosbrock, Air Force & Space Digest.

Mr. James Lucas, Scripps Howard.

Captain Lindsay McCarty, USN.

Mr. James McKinney, Office of Program Appraisal (Navy).

Mr. Wes Michaelson, Executive Assistant to Senator Mark Hatfield.

Mr. Crosby Noyes, Evening Star.

Mr. Robert Paarlberg, Legislative Aid to Senator Vance Hartke.

Mr. Edgar Prina, Copley Press.

Dr. Howard Reese, Systems Research Corporation.

Mr. James Robinson, Legislative Assistant to Congressman William Anderson.

Captain Gil Slonim, USN (Ret.) Special Assistant to the President, Navy League.

Mr. W. R. Teele, Assistant Project Manager, Ship Computability Branch, Advanced Systems Concepts Division, Naval Air Systems Command.

Mr. Frank Uhlig, U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.

Mr. Steve Vossmeier, Legislative Assistant to Senator Thomas Eagleton.

The Honorable Richard Ware, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, ISA.

Mr. Desmond Wilson, Center for Naval Analyses.

Mr. George Wilson, Washington Post.

Mr. William Young, Legislative Assistant to Senator Claiborne Pell.

NEED FOR INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS IN 1969

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, because of the grave concern on the part of the elderly with the possibility that the U.S. Government will not grant an increase in social security benefits this year, a tremendous rally will be held by the senior citizens of Massachusetts in October 1969. As one of those who has

been urging the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, to schedule action on social security legislation this year, I can appreciate the dire need for an increase in social security benefits in 1969.

The details of the rally follow:

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS AND COUNCIL OF ELDERS INC. PROCLAIM: SENIOR CITIZENS MOBILIZATION DAY FOR FREEDOM FROM WANT THROUGH ADEQUATE SOCIAL SECURITY AND DECENT HOUSING SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1969

With our co-Sponsors, the Golden Age Council of Greater Boston, and others to be named later, we announced: Senior Citizen Rally at War Memorial Auditorium (on Boylston Street, Boston, Near Prudential Center), Saturday, October 18th, 1:30 p.m. (Doors open 12:30), (Orchestra and Entertainment Until 1:30).

INVITED SPEAKERS

U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, U.S. Senator Edward Brooke, Speaker of the House, Hon. John W. McCormack, Congressman James A. Burke, Congressman Silvio O. Conte, and the entire Massachusetts Congressional Delegation.

This is a call to action to assemble the greatest show of senior power in the history of Massachusetts. We want to exert pressure on our entire delegation in Washington to become the driving force to get social security legislation on the floor of the House.

This year—not 1970 or 1971—We need financial aid of a substantial nature now. Let's show our political muscle at War Memorial Auditorium on Saturday, October 18th.

We are demanding a substantial increase in social security this year, decent housing and the right to live as first-class citizens of America.

REAR ADM. JOHN HARLEE RESIGNS AS CHAIRMAN OF FMC

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. John Harlee, retired, resigned the chairmanship of the Federal Maritime Commission recently, and so closed another chapter in a long record of service to this country.

During 37½ years of naval and civilian duty, Admiral Harlee performed a great many tasks well.

The motor torpedo boat squadron he commanded during World War II received the Presidential Unit Citation for its service during the time he headed it. A destroyer he commanded in post-war years won its division competition. The attack cargo ship he skippered in the 1950's won more awards than any other naval vessel during 1957-58.

Admiral Harlee served as chief staff officer of the PT organization in the Southwest Pacific; executive officer of the cruiser *Manchester*; commander of Destroyer Division 152; commander of surface ships on Formosa patrol; chief of staff of Flotilla 3. As a private citizen he was chairman of Citizens for Kennedy and Johnson of Northern California, and until his retirement from the Federal Maritime Commission he

was a member of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

These are the kind of jobs a man holds who possesses the gift of being able to make those around him work together in harmony and with singleness of purpose. It is the gift of the group leader, the team captain, and Admiral Harlee held it to a great degree.

The late President John F. Kennedy appointed Admiral Harlee to the Federal Maritime Commission in 1961 and 2 years later made him chairman. President Johnson reappointed him in 1965. His decision to retire at this time will transfer to other hands duties which he has performed well and many of us are sorry to see him go.

THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, our country, our Government, indeed the entire world find themselves faced today with many serious problems: the arms race, campus unrest, racism, environmental pollution, world peace, to name only a few. These problems must and can be tackled head on but only through the concerted efforts of all citizens working individually and through various organizations. One of the most important of these organizations is the church because it is based on solid doctrines of brotherhood, peace, and understanding. It is to our Nation's benefit that the various religious organizations have more and more come to see their role in terms of broad social responsibility. Acting as an intermediary between their members and the Government, they can often serve as the spokesmen for large groups of people who want to be heard, who have suggestions for improvement or change.

One such organization is the Unitarian Universalist Association which has long been concerned with ways in which to solve our often complicated problems. Recognizing their social responsibility, this association recently met in Boston at the eighth general assembly and adopted several important resolutions stating their views on issues of immediate and national concern, views which I feel are well reasoned and of high validity and should be considered by the Members of this body. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I include the following resolutions in the Record:

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

(Text of general resolutions adopted by the Eighth General Assembly of Unitarian Universalist Association, held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass., on July 14-18, 1969)

I. ENVIRONMENT

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association promote environmental quality control by supporting at every level applicable, and encouraging members to support, programs and legislation that would:

Protect natural vegetative cover on land through government purchase of land and acquisition of easements on a greatly expanded scale, particularly in river basin watersheds; ensure effective soil conservation laws in areas already under development; require complete restoration of land that has been subjected to stripping for coal mining or any other purpose; establish a tax structure that would encourage the preservation of open space.

Implement recent Federal legislation by establishing stringent standards and enforceable regulations at State and Federal levels to prevent contamination of all water—atmospheric, surface, and subsurface (thermal pollution must be considered a contaminant in this context).

Amend the Air Pollution Act of 1967 to include effective Federal air shed standards; strengthen local and regional air pollution regulations; further the study and implementation of ways to circumvent mass use of the internal combustion engine.

Create standards for use of pesticides and defoliating chemicals, reducing their use to amounts deemed safe by latest scientific findings, banning their use entirely where ecological control methods can be established.

Broaden and intensify studies of the effects of population congestion in terms of what noise, confusion, and ugliness may do to the human spirit; prepare to act on the result of these studies in ways that could include rebuilding existing cities and creating new planned ones; planning highway and transportation systems with concern for beauty and utility; setting restrictions on airport locations and on the types of planes that may be flown.

Stop the manufacture, transport, and testing of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons and their use against human beings.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

II. ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association opposes the development, construction, and deployment of any anti-ballistic missile system, and urges the United States Senate and House of Representatives to oppose the funding of the *Safeguard* program.

The 1968 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association urged that the United States terminate its multi-billion dollar anti-ballistic missile program. The anti-ballistic missile program may continue, despite increasing opposition throughout the country and in the Congress. Such a program can intensify the arms race, provide a false sense of security since it is only marginally effective as a defensive weapon, and involves a large expenditure of funds which can better be employed elsewhere.

The General Assembly also opposes the further development, construction, and deployment of multi-warhead offensive missiles, including the so-called MIRV.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

III. CAMPUS FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association affirms its adherence to the following principles:

1. The unrestricted search for truth requires freedom to examine all questions, to seek ideas and evidence from all sources, to listen to any speaker for information or inspiration.

2. The university community has a responsibility and needs the freedom to function as a total social institution—including both itself and the world around it.

3. The university's prime function is the education of the students. Education is a mutual responsibility of students and fac-

September 11, 1969

ulty and should involve participation of both groups in the decision-making process.

4. Freedom to speak includes the right to express dissent in diverse ways, but does not encompass action to prevent full, open, and orderly debate or to restrict or restrain the freedom of others to speak or to learn. On the contrary, such use of physical disruptions or force is destructive of the pursuit of learning and of a free society.

5. Use of oppression, repression, or blind force by institutions, administrations, faculties, or students, is not the answer to any move by students to gain their place in the educational community.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

IV. SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association urges that the President and Congress take immediate steps to abolish the Selective Service System and establish a volunteer military service with the financial, educational, and professional incentives necessary to attract personnel.

We do not believe that military service should be interpreted as annulling such constitutionally guaranteed rights as freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and the right to petition for redress of grievance, and whereas such actions as the court martial and administrative harassment of the eight organizers of GIs United Against The War In Vietnam at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, the pending court martial of Pvt. Joe Miles, organizer of the Fort Bragg GIs United, and the punishments meted out to the Presidio 27 are in contradiction to the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution,

Be It Further Resolved: That the 1969 UUA General Assembly calls upon the President of the United States to grant amnesty to all servicemen and women who have been victimized for exercising their rights of free speech, assembly, association, etc.;

That the 1969 UUA General Assembly urges the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff publicly to affirm Adjutant General Wickham's letter of May 28, 1969, instructing all commanding Generals that "the question of soldier's dissent is linked with the constitutional right of free speech" and to make copies of this statement of GI liberties available to all military personnel in order that they may have knowledge of their rights.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

V. GRAPE BOYCOTT

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association:

1. Supports the rights of farm workers to organize and bargain collectively, without fear of discharge, intimidation, or coercion for their involvement in union activity.

2. Urges Unitarian Universalists throughout the continent to boycott all American table grapes and request their local store managers to remove them from their shelves.

3. Affirms the right of dignity and justice for all men, and supports Mexican-Americans, chicanos, and Spanish-speaking Americans in their fight to secure their inalienable human rights.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

VI. SUPPORT FOR MINISTERS INVOLVED IN COUNSELING SERVICES FOR PROBLEM PREGNANCIES

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association expresses its support for and encouragement of ministers who are participants in counseling services for women with problem pregnancies.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

BUSINESS ITEMS

I. PROJECT EQUALITY

Be It Be Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly:

1. Urges the Unitarian Universalist Association to continue and intensify its relation with the Project Equality Council, and further,

2. Urges its local societies to participate in Project Equality wherever it is operating in their local community.

3. Urges the Unitarian Universalist Association to join Project Equality.
(Adopted unanimously.)

II. COUNTERACTING INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

Be It Resolved: That the 1969 General Assembly:

1. Instruct the Unitarian Universalist Association administration to conduct a careful investigation of the hiring practices of hotels proposed as sites for General Assemblies and other denomination-wide meetings, said investigations to include data on (a) comparative numbers of white and minority employees in each job category, (b) comparative numbers of white and minority employees in each salary level, (c) training and promotion opportunities offered minority employees by the hotel, and (d) human relations program designed by the hotel to help employees relate to minority employees and hotel guests as people with human dignity; and that this information be made available to delegates 60 days in advance of General Assemblies.

2. Request the Unitarian Universalist Association administration to schedule General Assemblies only in hotels where, in its judgment, based on the above investigation, equal employment practices prevail; or, if such hotels are not available, to proceed with negotiations to obtain from a hotel a firm commitment to an affirmative action plan of its own, specifying short and long-range goals in the areas of (a) recruitment, training, and upgrading of minority employees; (b) human relations training for all employees; and (c) an ongoing evaluation program for assessing how well the plan is implemented; and that the results of this negotiation be made available to delegates 60 days in advance of the General Assemblies.

3. Urge that the Unitarian Universalist Association administration similarly look carefully at our other corporate practices to identify and develop methods of counteracting other instances of compliance with institutional racism.

(Adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote.)

STATEMENT OF CONSENSUS ON THE UNITED NATIONS

This important statement was adopted "virtually unanimously" by the General Assembly. Copies are available in pamphlet form.

NOTE

These resolutions were adopted by the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association, consisting of a broadly representative group of laymen and ministers. They reflect a substantial preponderance of opinion, although not necessarily unanimity on all points, of the majority of individuals present at the General Assembly. They may or may not represent a substantial majority of members of our local churches and fellowships. Since the Unitarian Universalist Association cherishes and recognizes both congregational policy and the freedom of individual members, these resolutions do not presume to speak for all delegates to the Eighth General Assembly or certainly not all members of Unitarian Universalist churches and fellowships. We recognize that strong differences of opinion may exist on specific questions among sincere and thoughtful

Unitarian Universalists notwithstanding our underlying unity and common religious affiliation.

DIVISION OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

COMMENDATION FOR FAA HEAD

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize and commend an outstanding public servant, Mr. Henry L. Newman, of Fort Worth, Tex. Since June 1, 1965, Mr. Newman has served as director of the Southwest region of the Federal Aviation Administration. As director, Mr. Newman is responsible for the activities of the FAA and its 5,100 employees in the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

In the 4 years that he has held his current position, Mr. Newman has earned widespread respect and admiration. At this point in time, as the Dallas-Fort Worth community undertakes development of a regional airport, we are especially fortunate to have a man available with such talents and energy.

Eminently qualified and with much experience, Mr. Newman came to the Southwest with an acute awareness of the potential and problems facing air transportation. He has to his credit 24 years' service with the Civil Aeronautics Administration and its successor, the Federal Aviation Administration. Following 4 years of service in the Army Air Corps, Mr. Newman joined the CAA in 1946.

After working briefly in Washington, he spent 10 years in the Alaskan region as executive officer and, later, as Deputy Regional Administrator. His competence was readily apparent, and he was promoted to Assistant Regional Administrator of the eastern region. In 1958, Mr. Newman assumed the position of Assistant Regional Manager for the central region, and subsequently moved up the ladder to regional manager and then Deputy Director.

On June 1, 1965, Mr. Newman became director of the Southwest region of the FAA. He arrived in our area immediately after the decision to build a regional airport to serve Dallas and Fort Worth had been made. With the foresight that has become one of his outstanding qualities, Mr. Newman saw the need to get the regional airport project underway.

He immediately launched efforts to promote the cooperation among the various groups involved with the project, encouraging them not only to plan but to act. As he traversed the area, telling about the future of air transportation, Mr. Newman made many friends.

Mr. Newman's vision of land use compatible with airport development should also be commended. Familiar with the problems generated by poor land planning for areas adjacent to airports in other areas of our Nation, Mr. Newman is determined the same mistakes shall not recur in the Southwest. He is a tire-

less advocate of compatible land use, and to that end, has offered his insights to all interested local planners. Mr. Newman's vision of a better environment will certainly prove invaluable as the 18,000-acre regional airport site is developed.

In addition to his experience, expertise, and vision, Mr. Newman brings to his job an unwavering dedication to public service. For this dedication, I congratulate him. Hiring out as a public servant, in Mr. Newman's view, necessarily means placing a premium on service to the people. His efforts are characterized by this attitude, and the efforts of his coworkers are similarly directed by his inspiration and example.

The emphasis Mr. Newman places on public service is indicated by the fact that he and his personnel go to the people, rather than waiting for the people to come to him. Instead of relying on fear and punitive action, Mr. Newman chooses the positive approach of offering advice and counsel.

His attitude toward public service makes him an effective public administrator. To enhance the effectiveness of government, Mr. Newman has participated in the steering group for Federal Assistance Review, designed to simplify procedures for assistance to communities and States. He is also serving as chairman of the Dallas-Fort Worth Federal Executive Board, an organization which encourages more cooperation among governmental units.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Southwest are well served by Mr. Newman. His vision and dedication to public service will insure that more and better air transportation will be provided to our region. I salute Mr. Newman for his efforts, and encourage him to continue his outstanding service, as I know he will.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROTC

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Stanley Resor, Secretary of the Army, has sent a memorandum to all Members of Congress pointing out the fact that this is the 150th anniversary of the ROTC program. This communique also served to remind me of the vital importance of ROTC to our national defense and the concept of the citizen-soldier. I would urge my colleagues to join in the celebration of this anniversary in any manner they feel fitting.

As a reminder to my colleagues of this event, I would like to insert the memorandum from Secretary Resor. It is as follows:

OBSERVATION OF 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROTC

The Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, has announced plans for a four-month observation of the 150th anniversary of military instruction on civilian college campuses.

The opening of the new school year this month marks the anniversary of an American tradition—the tradition of combining the development of officers for national de-

fense with education for a degree in civilian institutions of higher learning.

The tradition began in 1819 with the founding of the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy at Northfield, Vermont—now Norwich University. The anniversary also marks the beginning of what is now the ROTC (Reserve Officers Training Corps) program.

In launching the anniversary observation, Secretary Resor said, "The idea of educating officers for national defense on the campuses of civilian colleges and universities is in keeping with the American concept of the citizen-soldier and civilian control over our military forces. The ROTC program combines the outstanding resources and sound traditions of our colleges and universities with play of civilian university and military training of the military service. This vital intermingling is the essence of the ROTC program. Observation of the anniversary throughout the Army will provide opportunities to reaffirm the thinking of the civilians and national leaders who established this concept and tradition."

The Army plan includes a wide variety of ceremonies, open houses, homecomings and other activities on campuses where Army ROTC is offered and in communities throughout the country to give the American public a better understanding of the ROTC program.

MR. NIXON'S NONCRUSADE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's approach to a multitude of serious national problems has been one of realism and determination, rather than the sloganeering which has characterized so many recent Federal attempts in the field of social progress. The following editorial from the September 4 Wall Street Journal is a well-balanced evaluation of the administration's efforts to effect meaningful solutions and I would like to take this opportunity to share this editorial with my House colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 4, 1969]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: MR. NIXON'S NONCRUSADE

The Nixon Administration's "New Federalism" does not make an especially convincing crusade, which is just as well. For Nixon's message is that the crusading, sloganeering approach has not solved our problems but aggravated them.

In his speech to the state governors the other night, the President ticked off some of the problems his Administration has inherited. Inflation out of control. State and local governments caught in a fiscal squeeze. The Federal Government over-centralized and over-bureaucratized. Its spending on social programs reaching \$250 billion over five years, but its reward "a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division."

Perhaps more important than any of these individual problems is their cumulative result—"a collapse of confidence in Government itself, a mounting distrust of all authority that stemmed in large measure from the increasing inability of Government to deliver its services or to keep its promises."

So much of this legacy results from the crusading approach. The impatience and directness that mark the American character have also marked the American Government's

attack on social problems. Any problem that raises its head must be struck down immediately, or at least that "commitment" must be made. The way to solve any problem is by frontal assault—appropriate some money and hire some hands to man the bureaucracy. The result has been long on promises and short on performance.

The most pertinent criticism of the "New Federalism," indeed, is that it sounds suspiciously like nothing more than the latest in the series of crusades. Certainly, we will accomplish little merely by deciding that the newest and latest panacea is to turn everything over to the states. Yet the sloganeered title is perhaps unfortunate, for Mr. Nixon's suggestions do seem set apart from the standard Federal approach by both more farsighted planning and more modest promises.

The Nixon Administration's almost startling preoccupation with the machinery of Government, for example, is certainly a departure. Such often-dreary detail has generally been overlooked amid crusading fervor. In many areas the result has been to pile programs and agencies into an incomprehensible jumble—one of the most notorious being the various manpower training programs Mr. Nixon has set out to pull together and put under state control.

The Administration's planning can also be commended for trying to discern first principles rather than to design written-in-Washington blueprints. Its proposals for welfare reform are a case in point. A national floor is put under state welfare payments, but at a level low enough to be manageable. Beyond that, the principle is work—a requirement that the able-bodied accept employment, increased rewards for those who do work, training and day-care facilities where they will help put people to work.

Despite the instant outcry from some quarters about being mean to the poor, it should be clear that the only real solution to their problems is to help them work their own way out of dependency. Whatever actual effects the reforms may have, it is this principle Mr. Nixon is trying to put into operation.

Also commendably, Mr. Nixon offers his reforms more as sensible things to do than as the magic remedies for anything. The promises are modest, especially gauged against those to which the nation has become accustomed. In explaining the New Federalism to the governors the other night, the President remarked, "We can only toss the ball; the states and localities have to catch and carry it."

The thrust of the Nixon approach then, seems to be cutting national expectations into line with reality, insuring that a few first principles are established, putting Government machinery in working order, and letting subsequent events take their course. Given the American character and recent American experience, it all seems a little odd.

Yet considering where the instinctive crusades have taken us in recent years, it does seem time for Americans to start trying to understand that real remedies to social problems may require a bit more longheadedness and patience.

THE RETIREMENT OF THE ROCHES-TER CITY SEALER

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the many friends and colleagues of Anthony Samenfink, who was formerly the city

sealer of Rochester, N.Y., are paying tribute to him tonight for his 48 years of service to the community. Mr. Samenfink resides at 60 Cheltenham Road in my congressional district and I would like to take note of this special occasion.

Mr. Samenfink was the city sealer for more than 30 years and served well the people of the city. He was active in the professional associations of officials of similar responsibility at both the State and National level. He served as president of the New York State Association of Weights and Measures, spent 5 years on the executive committee of the group, and also was a member of the legislative and resolutions committees. At the national level he was a vice president of the National Conference on Weights and Measures.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have sound government, we must have responsible officials at all levels. We must have people who fill their office with integrity, interest, and competence. These qualities are equally important at the local level as they are at the State and National levels, and I am pleased to join in the recognition being given to one such official.

BUREAUCRATIC SCLEROSIS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the prominent residents of Washington wrote a thought-provoking "editorial" in the Evening Star which expresses a point of view of many millions of Americans on the subject of our recent space program.

And as we all contemplate the future role of our space program in the light of all the demands made upon our taxpayers, I commend Mr. Dixon's remarks to you for reading. He has titled them "Bureaucratic Sclerosis":

BUREAUCRATIC-SCLEROSIS

The reason the men of the NASA-Space-Agency have been able to generate more mileage—(results)—per each dollar used than by men of other agencies of the government is simply because NASA is still young, strong and vibrant and has, therefore not yet become afflicted with that dread disease known as Bureaucratic-Sclerosis. Spending 24 billion dollars to put a man on the moon is peanuts compared to the staggering waste of other once-proud and productive agencies of our government—agencies now withering away under a bureaucratic sun—withering like a once-productive vine now severed from its roots.

The \$24 billion spent by NASA has not been wasted: unlike the untold billions doled out in foreign aid—the \$24 billion spent by NASA is still in circulation right here in the United States: Nell Armstrong didn't leave it up there on the moon and if every man and woman of every agency of our governments, federal, state and local, across the nation, would each perform their duties, respectively, with the same dedication as the men and women of NASA have performed in the past eight years—America, with God's help, will be able to put men on Mars and other Stars, erase equalor, and at the same

time enable the government to reduce taxes and, in time, pay off the national debt—to boot! Why not?

NEW METHODS OF SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced the Resource Recovery Act of 1969. The principle provisions of this bill would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies and report to the President and the Congress on the most economical means of recovering useful materials from solid wastes, recommend uses of such materials for national and international welfare and the market of such recovery, and to recommend incentive programs—including tax incentives—to assist in solving the problems of solid waste disposal.

I was heartened to read in this Monday's edition, September 8, of the Boston Herald Traveler, of an attempt being made by a firm in Cambridge, Mass., Reclamation Systems, Inc., to deal with this problem in an effective and economical way. In the article, it was noted that this new firm "will package waste material for disposal, converting garbage and rubbish into profits." The chief executive officer of Reclamation Systems, Inc., Mr. Saul Siagel, is well aware of man's need to adjust to his environment. Of the many threats to civilization, deteriorating environmental quality must be placed among the major concerns of civilized man.

Also associated with this firm is Mr. Richard Flavin, of Boston, who has long shown an acute awareness of the problems surrounding the disposal of solid wastes.

It has been noted that we are a nation of users, not consumers, and that in our efforts to cope with these problems we must recognize that we can neither create nor destroy matter. The mere existence of Reclamation Systems, Inc., which plans to convert solid waste material into land fill, is an encouraging step in this process.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the newspaper article for the benefit of my colleagues:

NEW FIRM SET TO BUNDLE RUBBISH FOR PROFIT

(By Robert L. Hassett)

Ground will be broken in early September for a new business which will package waste material for disposal, converting garbage and rubbish into profits.

Reclamation Systems, Inc., was organized last October, and last May it sold 200,000 shares of stock at \$10 a share.

Its net proceeds total about \$1,937,600, and it is expected that it will become operational during the first quarter of 1970.

The company says its basic concept is "that of compacting solid waste into high density bales through the use of heavy duty hydraulically operated presses."

To do this it has leased 167,750 square feet of land off Msgr. O'Brien Highway in East

Cambridge from the Boston and Maine Railroad.

Reclamation Systems, Inc., will build a receiving terminal there and install two hydraulic presses capable of compacting 2000 tons of refuse in a 16-hour work day.

Waste will be received from collection trucks and deposited on heavy duty conveyors for transfer to the compaction chambers of the presses.

After the material has been converted into bales weighing between 4000 and 6000 pounds each, the bales will be strapped with metal banding and conveyed to a loading platform for transportation to a land fill site.

The company's facility in East Cambridge will be adjacent to a railroad siding.

A spokesman for the company said it expects to use a land fill site within 100 miles of the receiving terminal. Two communities are being studied.

Saul Siagel owns 28 per cent of the stock of Reclamation Systems, Inc., and is the chief executive officer of the new company.

He is also president of Bay State Machinery Corp. of Cambridge, dealers in new and used machinery, and Bay State International, Inc., of Cambridge, importers of machinery.

Although the company will not begin operations until next year it is already seeking customers.

It is negotiating with the cities of Houston and Cleveland to engage in reclamation work there.

It is also carrying on discussions with the cities of Quincy and Norwich, Conn., about establishing receiving terminal facilities in those communities.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON HEARINGS ON EXCHANGE VISITORS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on September 15, 1969, in room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, at 10:30 a.m.

These will be the second hearings held to examine the operations of the immigration aspects of the Mutual Cultural and Educational Exchange Act, particularly the effect these provisions have on the immigration of doctors, nurses, and other members of the medical professions. Witnesses will be Dr. C. H. William Ruhe, director, Medical Education Division, American Medical Association, and Dr. Harold Margulies who until recently served as secretary of the Council on Health Manpower of the American Medical Association. Dr. Margulies has authored a number of articles in medical journals and a book dealing with foreign medical graduates.

The hearings will examine the entire problem of foreign and other medical personnel in the United States including the quality of medical services rendered by foreign doctors, the need of our country for foreign doctors, the misuse of foreign doctors on training programs to fill permanent hospital staff needs, and the efforts of the AMA to assure high-quality medical services in the United States.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, at the convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, held in New Haven, September 3-5, several resolutions were adopted calling for action by the U.S. Congress on postal reform and improvement of the postal service and the status of postal employees. These resolutions were submitted by Connecticut branches of the National Association of Letter Carriers and the United Federation of Postal Clerks and were adopted unanimously at the convention of the State labor council.

While the resolutions speak for themselves, I feel that the views of the Connecticut State Labor Council, as expressed in these resolutions, should be brought to the attention of all of our colleagues and the public generally. All of us are vitally interested in improvement of the postal service and its establishment on an efficient basis. I feel certain that we can and will achieve that goal, but I am not so certain that the postal corporation idea advocated in H.R. 11750 is the proper vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the following three resolutions on the subject and I invite our colleagues to read them:

RESOLUTION No. 3—POSTAL CORPORATION

Whereas: Various bills have been introduced in the Congress to create a Postal Service Corporation known as "The Postal Service Act of 1969", this bill, H.R. 11750 would eliminate the postal employees as Civil Service employees; and

Whereas: The Postal Corporation idea considers the postal service a business and not a service to the American people; and

Whereas: Despite testimony to the contrary before the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee, there are no improvements in negotiations under this bill, nor is there machinery set up for the positive handling of disputes between Labor and Management; and

Whereas: In the all-important field of negotiating for wages, when an impasse is reached this bill does not provide for any equitable solutions; and

Whereas: The Corporation bill, H.R. 11750, Section 807, places the postal employees under the Taft-Hartley bill, and the Landrum-Griffin bill, in all phases of these laws except granting postal employees the right to withhold their services when an impasse on wages, or any Agenda Item has been reached; and

Whereas: We would relinquish our rights of petitioning Congress—a right we have enjoyed and have been successful with for many years; and

Therefore, be it resolved: That in Convention assembled in New Haven, Connecticut, September 3-5, 1969; the AFL-CIO of the State of Connecticut, go on record as opposing the bill, H.R. 11750, and any other bills having for their purpose the forming of a Postal Corporation; and

Be it further resolved: That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Congressional Delegation of the State of Connecticut.

Submitted by: Branch 19, National Association of Letter Carriers, Local 147, United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Referred to: Resolutions Committee.

Committee Action: Concurrence.

Convention Action: Adopted Unanimously.

RESOLUTION No. 5—POSTAL REFORM

Whereas: Due to the huge increase in mail volume caused by the increase in population, and new delivery territory necessitating new routes; and

Whereas: Post offices have become antiquated and too small to handle the ever-increasing mail volume; and

Whereas: Additional building of mechanized post offices, and mechanization of existing installations must be continued to handle mail volumes, improve working conditions, eliminate overcrowded buildings; and

Whereas: H.R. 4, introduced by Congressman Dulski, Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will, by law, provide for modernization of the Postal Service, thereby improving postal service to the public, but continuing it as a regular government agency with the Postmaster General a Cabinet Member—

Establish a better transportation system for handling mail

Establish a building program

Establish a Commission on Postal Finance, and

Set up Employee Labor-Management Procedures;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Connecticut AFL-CIO assembled in Convention, September 3-5, 1969 at New Haven, Connecticut, endorses H.R. 4 in its entirety; and

Be it further resolved: That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Congressional Delegation from the State of Connecticut.

Submitted by: Branch 19, National Association of Letter Carriers, Local 147, United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Referred to: Resolutions Committee.

Committee Action: Concurrence.

Convention Action: Adopted Unanimously.

RESOLUTION No. 11—LEGISLATION PROGRAM

Be it resolved: That the convention of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, meeting in New Haven, September 3, 4 and 5, 1969, fully endorse and support actively the legislation program of the AFL-CIO Postal Employees Unions, which program includes:

(a) H.R. 4803 which gives the right of Postal Employees to bargain collectively;

(b) The improvement of Retirement Benefits as provided in H.R. 9825;

(c) To equalize the cost of Health benefits as provided in H.R. 767;

(d) H.R. 13000 which will provide:

1. An emergency pay raise;

2. Reduction in years of service to reach the top pay step;

3. Establishment of a Federal Wage Commission to negotiate pay raises;

4. Establishment of a Wage Arbitration Board to Resolve Pay Negotiations disputes;

5. Insistence that Postal Employees be restored to "First Class" citizenship and be given complete unrestricted political freedom. We want to be "unhatched" from the Hatch Act of August 2, 1939.

An be it further resolved: That copies of this Resolution be sent to all Connecticut Congressional Representatives and two U.S. Senators and that publicity be given in press, radio and T.V. and a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Postal Employees International Unions.

Submitted by: Branch 19, National Association of Letter Carriers, Local 147, United Federation of Postal Clerks.

Convention Action: Adopted Unanimously.

THE DEATH OF HO CHI MINH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of reading a very fine article in the September 10 edition of the Washington Daily News. It was written by Mr. Ray Cromley and clearly conveys my feelings and those of many other Americans about the late Ho Chi Minh. For that reason, it is only fitting that the entire article be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

HO CHI MINH

Most astounding have been the series of editorials in a number of leading American newspapers praising the late Ho Chi Minh as an ardent nationalist and Vietnamese patriot.

By no standards was Ho a patriotic nationalist.

Ho began his career as a paid agent of the Comintern in the employ of the Russian Embassy in Canton. He continued this career for years in South China, later in Thailand and then at various points in Southeast Asia. "In his early Canton days in the middle and late 1920's, he made considerable amounts of money selling out nationalist Vietnamese to the French police. Under the pretense of helping the nationalist cause, he acquired pictures of members of the Vietnamese underground studying in China, including those trained at the Whampoa Military Academy. Ho and his men would then contact these students. Those who became Communists were safe. Ho turned the pictures of the others over to the French along with information as to where and when each man was going to return across the border into Indo China.

One of Ho's most important betrayals was that of Phan Boi Chau, considered one of the greatest heroes of the Vietnamese nationalist movement. On the pretense of cooperation and through an old family friendship (Phan Boi Chau had once attempted to save the life of Ho's father) Ho lured Phan into a French police trap in the international settlement of Shanghai. Ho's argument was that the betrayal netted funds for the Communist Party.

In 1946, Ho made an agreement with the French. Under this agreement Ho would be furnished arms and would be free from prosecution. In return, Ho would cooperate with the French in exposing and destroying the nationalist groups in Indo China. Ho kept his part of the bargain. By October, 1946, the nationalist leadership was destroyed. As an example, of the approximately 70 nationalist non-Communist members of the coalition government legislature, only three were left by October. The others had been killed, arrested or kidnaped and never heard of again.

In the war with the French, Ho joined with another coalition. But as victory neared, he began to purge the nationalist non-Communists.

In the 1954 Geneva agreements with the French military, new material now available suggests that he agreed to let the South remain in the hands of the French on orders from Moscow. If Ho would allow the French a half victory, Moscow reportedly said the French would agree to stay out of the European Defense Community, thus effectively killing that project of John Foster Dulles. Ho obeyed Moscow. The French stayed out of EDC by a narrow margin.

After the 1954 agreement, Ho took over in the North. He immediately began an inten-

sive purge. High in the purge list were members of the various nationalist parties.

Ho's actions in the Tet offensive of 1968 show that he has not changed. It will be recalled that in the temporary occupation of some areas in Hue, Ho's men executed something over 3,000 victims earmarked in dossiers the Communist cadre carried into the city with them.

Numbers of these were leaders and members of some of South Vietnam's major nationalist political parties, leading Buddhist nationalists and others with a nationalist tinge.

This history makes it difficult to understand how Ho could be considered either a nationalist or a Vietnamese patriot. From all the facts available to this reporter Ho has, thru his entire adult life, given his first allegiance to a foreign totalitarian system, and with consistency sacrificed his own people and his own country's interests when those conflicted with the interests of International Communism.

CONCERN ABOUT INCREASING RATE OF IMPORTS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago my colleagues in the House joined with me in expressing great concern about the increasing rate of imports from countries whose wage rate is drastically lower than our own minimum wage. This concern was demonstrated by the passage of my bill, by the lop-sided vote of 340 to 29, which was designed to establish a new approach to the study of the damage done to American industries and labor by such imports. Unfortunately, the Senate did not consider this bill before the 90th Congress was concluded.

I have again submitted the same bill—H.R. 1044—for the consideration of the 91st Congress. It was with pleasure that I noted six Members of the Senate have shown a sincere interest in this matter by introducing the same measure.

I commend to my House colleagues the following letter that I have written to Senators HANSEN, CURTIS, ERVIN, FANNIN, THURMOND, and SMITH to express my appreciation for this action:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that you are a sponsor of a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas. As you may know, I sponsored this measure in the House during the last Congress when it passed by the vote of 340 to 29. I have again introduced it this year (H.R. 1044), but it is still pending in committee.

I think the overwhelming House approval of the bill certainly demonstrated an awakening to the adverse impact of foreign goods on the American market. The growing menace of foreign competition is being recognized in most areas of enterprise. My intention in advocating the bill was and is the protection of the American free enterprise system from devastation from inexpensive imports; imports of good quality, but manufactured with low cost labor and often subsidized by the foreign government.

By associating this proposal with the Minimum Wage Law, we place ourselves on sound

economic footing in that the Minimum Wage Law mandates a wage floor for American industry which, in many instances, is ten times higher than that of foreign competitors. It is hardly fair competition to allow these foreign products to pass through our channels of interstate commerce when we forbid the American goods produced with labor paid less than the Minimum Wage from doing so.

I notice that several Senate sponsors of the bill are from cotton areas. It is interesting to note that cotton production 52 years ago was 1.5 million bales larger than today's crop, and while our population has more than doubled in the intervening years, our consumption has only increased 1.4 million bales.

Our exports have fallen to one-half of what they were 52 years ago. World consumption is now 2½ times what it was then, verifying the world's need for cotton. In other words, world consumption increased 250% with world population increasing 85%, but U.S. consumption increased only 12% with twice the number of consumers.

Every plan proposed today, in the many bills before the Congress, is only stop-gap legislation introduced in a desperate attempt to slow down the flood of imports. While I have sponsored many such bills—quota bills in particular—and have done so in the hope of getting some action in Congress, I believe this type of legislation to be unsound. Previous quota laws have been ineffective and they do not serve the purpose for which they are intended. I fear they are only blinders to keep the American people from seeing the real dangers from low-cost imports.

Please accept my gratitude for supporting what I feel is the only sensible approach to the problem. If there is anything you believe I can do to help, please do not hesitate to contact me. I am prepared to do whatever I can including the scheduling of additional hearings on the subject.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

SGT. JOHN M. HILL DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 22, a 23-year-old Louisville marine sergeant was killed in action 11 miles south of Danang.

Sgt. John M. Hill thus becomes another of the valiant men who has given his life in defense of his country and in protecting the free world.

The sympathy of thousands of other families who have paid this sacrifice goes out to Mrs. Hill and the Hill family. To them also goes the sincere gratitude of those of us whom John died protecting.

The Louisville Times article which reports the loss of the Louisville marine to the war in Vietnam follows:

LOUISVILLE MARINE DIES IN VIETNAM

A 23-year-old Louisville Marine sergeant was killed Aug. 22 in Vietnam, the Defense Department has announced.

Sgt. John M. Hill, of 320 Merriman Road, was killed in action 11 miles south of Da Nang.

He was a 1963 graduate of St. Xavier High School, and was a member of St. Margaret Mary Catholic Church. He enlisted in the Marine Corps five years ago.

This was his second tour of duty in Vietnam. He had been there since June.

Survivors include his widow, the former Barbara Jean Zena, his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Hill and a grandmother, Mrs. John S. Hill, of New Boston, Ohio.

The body will be at Russman & Son Funeral Home, 1041 Goss.

Sgt. Hill's brother-in-law, Boatswain's Mate Robert B. Zena, stationed on the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Sabago, has been given leave to escort the body from Philadelphia to Louisville.

A PATH, NOT AN END

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the July 16, 1969, Washington Post analyzes the launch of the Apollo 11 flight on that historic date and discusses the past and future of our national space program. Because of the significance of this editorial I commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

A PATH, NOT AN END

The adventure that begins at Cape Kennedy this morning is bold, complex and costly beyond comparison with anything undertaken in the history of the world. It is a challenge to the fundamental laws of nature itself, an expression of man's arrogance and pride that he, alone among the creatures of his world, is capable of devising machines that help him break out of the limitations nature has placed upon him. It is another step in search of answers to those haunting questions—what and why is the universe? And finally, it is a step in search of questions, as well as answers—questions we are now incapable even of asking. The implications of this flight, combined with those of the other space probes, are staggering. Old truths are being demolished. Man's view of himself and his place in the universe is being altered. Religious faiths are being shaken. Perhaps even man's view of his own planet will be changed. Buckminster Fuller summed it up recently when he spoke of a television commentator's remark when we saw, from Apollo 8, the first pictures of the earth as it appears from the moon. "There she is," the commentator said, "floating there." "Floating," Fuller asked, "in what?"

Nevertheless, this great adventure is being met with less than universal approbation. Its cost—almost beyond comprehension in terms of money, manpower, energy and ingenuity—has been so great, and the Nation has changed so much since President Kennedy mapped the course, that the voices of the critics seem almost equal to those of the unabashed admirers. In view of the mess that man has made of the world that is already his, the poverty, the pollution, the blight, the basic inhumanity that surrounds us, the critics ask, was this manned voyage really necessary?

Thus, it is a good time—as Astronauts Armstrong, Collins and Aldrin embark upon the vastness that is space—to reflect on why they are going and why the United States has poured \$26 billion, give or take a little, into manned space flight.

There are many partial answers to why we have spent so much for what, to some, seems so little. There was, first of all, a race and a challenge to our national superiority. It is easy now that the race seems won to forget the gloom that settled over the Nation when Sputnik first flashed across the sky. And it is easy, too, to forget the sagging inter-

national prestige of a Nation that had held itself out as the greatest scientific and technological power the world had ever known.

President Kennedy's decision to drive for a landing on the moon in the 1960s was, no doubt, heavily influenced by such considerations. Americans, from Presidents on down, do not take kindly to being No. 2. And, although we do not know what would happen to the psychology of the American people if we were to be only second-best, we do know that history teaches that great nations, once nudged from their pedestal and incapable of regaining it, deteriorate rapidly.

These, however, are only partial reasons that explain why Armstrong, Collins and Aldrin are going to the moon this year instead of next or the year after that or the year after that. The fundamental reason why they are going and why space must be explored lies in that restless, inquiring spirit that has gripped mankind from the beginning, that desire to answer the unanswerable questions, that eagerness to push from one frontier to the next, that unquenchable spirit which has led men to brave uncharted seas, fly like birds, probe the recesses of the atom, challenge every dogma and every fact.

It was that restlessness that led Copernicus and Galileo to risk persecution and death by daring to believe that the earth is not the center of the universe, that led Marco Polo and Columbus to set out against unknowable dangers, that led Edison and Darwin and Einstein and Bohr and Curie and Fleming to the discoveries that have so revolutionized life, that led Plato and Locke and Marx to challenge the systems under which men lived.

Man's destiny is to pursue that which is just beyond his reach, to seek an understanding of the miracles of nature, to try to break that barrier which allows us to see, in St. Paul's words, "through a glass, darkly." And man's destiny is never to grasp but always to reach; as Charles Lindbergh wrote last week in *Life*, "scientific accomplishment (is) a path, not an end; a path leading to and disappearing in mystery."

It is in that sense that the space program, this moon trip and their cost must be judged. The question is not whether a landing on the moon has been worth \$26 billion. The question may be whether the creation of the capability of man to break free from the confines of his planet and take the first tentative steps toward exploring the universe has been worth \$26 billion. But more likely there has been no question at all, given man's fundamental spirit to accomplish whatever he can and to go where ever he can in his search for ultimate answers. Harold C. Urey caught that spirit when he said, in a recent interview with *Forbes*, "It is no more possible for man not to go to the moon than for Picasso not to paint."

Viktor Frankl, one of the world's great psychiatrists, put it another way: "Man goes beyond necessities to the very limits of possibilities because he wonders where those limits lie. And behold, they don't lie anywhere because, like the horizon, they expand with every step he takes toward them."

PRESIDENT NIXON KEEPS HIS PROMISE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to criticize a President when he fails—for any reason—to live up to a promise. And some even find it easy to criticize a President before he has a chance to live up to his word.

This was the case recently when some began charging the President was not living up to his promise to bring home 25,000 troops from Vietnam by August 31, long before August 31 arrived.

The criticism was obviously political and should have been beneath the dignity of those who stooped to it because they were playing politics with war and with men fighting in a war. They were trying to divide the Nation against the President on an issue where the Nation ought to be united.

Fortunately they failed then.

And fortunately, they have no issue today.

The President did bring home 25,000 American soldiers by August 31, reducing forces in Vietnam to 515,000 men.

Actually, today we are several thousand below that figure, but because of normal troop fluctuations we could reach it again.

But the important thing is that the ceiling on Americans in Vietnam is now 515,000 whereas once it was 549,500.

The Nation should be grateful that it has a President who not only seeks peace but also lives up to his commitments and stands by his word.

PRESIDIO—"THEY TRY TO TAKE AWAY YOUR MIND"

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared recently in the *Village Voice*, one of the great journals of opinion published in this country. Entitled, "Presidio—'They Try To Take Away Your Mind'" and written by Joe Pilati, a brilliant and perceptive writer, it should be of interest to those concerned about conditions in our Nation's military stockades and in particular the difficulties endured by the Presidio prisoners.

Mr. Pilati's piece follows:

PRESIDIO—"THEY TRY TO TAKE AWAY YOUR MIND"

(By Joe Pilati)

SAN FRANCISCO.—For Johnny Williams, 20-year-old Vietnam veteran from Reno, Nevada, the morning of August 8 was just like every other morning he'd greeted during the preceding 10 weeks in the Presidio stockade. "The guards aren't supposed to wake you up until 4.30, but between 3.30 and 4 they start banging on the doors until it's impossible to sleep any more."

It wouldn't be dawn for an hour or so, another dawn with its inevitable 30 minutes of strenuous physical exercise before breakfast. Johnny Williams stretched out in his bunk, tried to ignore the pounding on the walls and the shouts of "Get up, you bastards!" outside his cell. He was thinking about getting out of the Presidio, silently mulling over the plans he'd been making for the last two months. Standing on line for breakfast at 5 a.m., he knew that within a few hours he might be free—a fugitive once more, but free at least to seek help in San Francisco, where according to the scuttlebutt (reliantly confirmed by military spokesmen) some 5000 to 10,000 AWOL soldiers roam the

streets and try to elude the MPs every day of the week. But Johnny Williams knew that by lunchtime he might not be free. He might be dead.

"There was another guy in there," he said, recalling the stockade at the huge Army post occupying 1400 acres in the northwest corner of San Francisco, "another guy who was repeatedly AWOL. Everyone knew he was a heroin addict. As soon as they got him back inside, they'd send him to the hospital and shoot him up again. I remember having to hold him up while we were standing on line for chow—I'd grab him by the armpits and support him, otherwise he would have collapsed."

"I told this guy that I had to escape. I didn't care if I got shot. I just had to do something." Johnny Williams did something that morning. For more than two hours he crept through the underbrush, wearing only an undershirt and his Army fatigue trousers, eluding the eyes of sentries until finally he crossed the last barbed-wire barrier and found himself standing, dazed and exhausted, in one of San Francisco's public parks adjoining the Presidio complex.

There he befriended two of the city's ever-present "hippie mailmen"—guys his own age who had somehow avoided being impressed into the war machine, who had latched onto fairly decent jobs in the postal service through the simple expedient of passing exams with superb scores which preclude (under civil service regulations) discrimination based on hair length and off-duty social proclivities.

Johnny Williams had already resolved that once he got out of the Presidio, he would try to get out of the country. He had been AWOL "at least nine times" since he was shipped back from Vietnam in the fall of 1967, and each time he'd been recaptured—so that by now he'd been confined in stockades at Fort Lewis, Washington, at Oakland Army Base, and at the Presidio. "The Presidio is the worst by far," he told me later in the afternoon of his escape. "They try to take away your mind. When you're not working, you march. When you're not in some kind of formation, you can't talk to the other prisoners. It's next to impossible to get together. But if something doesn't happen real quick to make that place fit for human beings, there's going to be another mutiny."

"Another mutiny" could have even wider repercussions than the sit-down demonstration organized by Presidio prisoners last October after a guard had fatally shot in the back a mentally disturbed 18-year-old private, Richard Bunch, thereby triggering mutiny charges against 27 prisoners. More than half of the prisoners received sentences ranging up to 16 years; in June, 14 of them had their sentences reduced to between six and 12 months, in the wake of a publicity-defense campaign which enlisted support from Senators Alan Cranston (democrat, California), Charles Goodell (Republican, New York), and other legislators. Three of the "Presidio 27" have reportedly escaped to Canada.

After the slaying of Bunch, prisoners at the Presidio—including the 27—drew up a list of demands in hopes that some of the conditions which led to the shooting might be investigated by influential military and civilian agencies. These demands centered around living conditions (more toilets, wash basins and showers, and sufficient food to feed all prisoners a complete meal three times a day); complete psychological evaluations of all prisoners and guards, rotation of guards who are now working 12-hour shifts; and elimination of shotgun details. In a rambling, hour-long conversation with Johnny Williams on the day of his escape, it became clear that few if any of these grievances had been rectified or even seriously considered by authorities at the Presidio.

"There's a room behind a black door at the Presidio MP office," he said. "It's a little room, about four by eight feet, where they keep as many as 15 guys for days on end, while they're being processed. They keep the lights on all night, so you can't sleep. There's no heat, and it gets pretty cold at night."

"You have to beg the guards for a blanket, and lots of times you won't get one. They don't have enough jackets to go around, so they'll send you out to work in fatigues when the temperature is 40 or so. There were guys who caught a cold at least once a week because of this. If you refuse to work, they'll write you up and put you in the box (the maximum security cell block, in which cells have no toilet facilities and no furnishings on the concrete floors except for a cot). Or they'll put you on rabbit chow for 10 days at a time (a diet consisting of bread, water, and lettuce three times a day)."

Johnny Williams had been confined, along with virtually all of the other Presidio inmates, in Building 1213—a white stucco edifice built in 1912 to accommodate 43 persons, but which has a "normal" capacity of 88 today, according to Army spokesmen there. The building's population on the day of the "mutiny," last October 14, was 123 prisoners. According to Williams, at the time of his escape there were at least 100 prisoners—and that would be rock-bottom. Probably it was more like 130 or so. During the week immediately preceding his escape, he said, 10 or 15 guys had started a hunger strike and hadn't eaten for four days. Grinning, he claimed that "some of them looked much better for not eating the slop."

Williams was drafted in December, 1966, and completed basic training and AIT (advanced infantry training) at Fort Lewis. He was then shipped to the Da Nang region in Vietnam, where he saw combat with the First Infantry Division and received what he called "a superficial bullet wound in my leg" shortly before the end of his first six-month hitch. On his first 30-day leave, he returned to Fort Lewis and "split" (went AWOL) for the first of many times. "After that, it was just court-martial after court-martial and stockade after stockade." At the time of his escape, he said, "I was up for another court-martial because a sergeant asked for my name and I told him, but I didn't say my rank." At one time he had been "up for Spec-4 (Specialist Fourth Class)"; most recently, he had been busted from E-3 (PFC) to the lowliest rank of all, E-1.

Each time Williams went AWOL, he found himself with practically nowhere to turn. His father, a career Army man, offered no sympathy. He had a girl friend in Nevada, but she had no money. Bay Area draft counselors specializing in military work, whom he contacted after his escape, lost touch with him after he left San Francisco. He may have found his way, by now, to some relatively safe and hospitable environment. I hope so.

"Are there still beatings going on?" Williams repeated my question, then answered it: "Sure, but you don't see them. You hear guys screaming and guards cursing them out after they've peed on the floor, when the guards won't let them out to relieve themselves. I remember one guard in particular, a big beefy guy who'd make guys drink out of the toilet if they were thirsty." Williams eyes were bloodshot from lack of sleep and he'd keep rubbing them as he shifted about nervously, his voice a dull monotone, his fingers gripping the arm of the chair where he sat. "Some of these things that go on . . . you just can't believe them."

I shook hands with Johnny Williams after we'd finished talking, knowing full well that I'd probably never see him again, and that if he successfully avoided his pursuers, no one in San Francisco—or possibly in his and my native land—would ever see him again. It was still Friday afternoon. The day before, I'd

seen dozens of young men in green fatigues standing by a loading dock at the Oakland Army Base, across the bay. All of them had either returned from Nam or were about to be sent there; next to the loading dock was a spruced-up mess hall designated in stark black stencil lettering, "Returnees' Steak House—Open 24 Hours."

Oakland is one of the major debarkation points for the Southeast Asian front. When a unit is shipped there, civilian clothes and regular uniforms are taken away and only fatigues may be worn during the three or four-day period before most arrivals are shuttled to Travis Air Force Base, the last stop before Vietnam. I spoke to several men there who were carrying orders for Vietnam. All were 18 or 19, most were lower-middle-class or working-class kids who had no prospect of attending college, and all were highly skeptical of the "de-escalation." "All the guys being sent home are on short time—they would have been coming home in a matter of weeks, anyway," said one soldier bound for Vietnam. "They're shipping more guys out of here now than they were in June," another GI added.

Meanwhile, back at the Presidio, maybe the brass actually want "another mutiny." Maybe they'll get it. Johnny left a lot of friends behind.

HURRICANE GERDA

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this past week Hurricane Gerda did not hit New England. While we are all thankful for this, the circumstances surrounding this fortunate turn of events raises serious questions about our national hurricane tracking system.

For the fact that Gerda did not strike shore surprised everyone. All the experts had predicted that this storm would hit the coast. Hundreds had been evacuated; businesses and schools had shut down; civil defense units had been mobilized in all coastal areas.

Perhaps most directly in danger were scores of fishermen, out in the ocean with no idea of whether they were in dire danger or none at all. As Boston weatherman Don Kent told me:

Millions of dollars were lost to the New England economy.

All because they misplaced a hurricane. In this day and age, when we can put men on the moon and bring them back, it is incredible to me that we cannot follow a potentially disastrous hurricane up the east coast with enough accuracy to tell whether or not it is going to hit land.

I have investigated this situation, and have discovered that there is a clear and simple reason for this fatal lack of intelligence. As I understand it, the coastal radar used to track hurricanes cannot tell the precise location and direction of storms more than 150 miles offshore. In certain instances aircraft can be used to get to the center of the storm and follow it down the coast. But in the case of Hurricane Gerda, as in many others, the winds were of such force that no aircraft could take the buffeting long enough to accurately relay to land the position and direction of the storm.

So in this particular case, there were only two sightings within a 24-hour period before the storm was scheduled to hit New England. The course was plotted—and later turned out to be 7° off. But that 7° was enough to make the difference between devastating New England and leaving the area largely untouched.

All the experts whom I have consulted agree that we have the technological know-how to solve this problem. To a man, they say that a weather ship, located off the mid-Atlantic coast, would be able to track any such storm and give accurate data as to its velocity and direction. Dr. Robert White, Director of the Environmental Science Services Administration, agrees with this; Director of the U.S. Weather Bureau George Cressman agrees with this. But both point out that one thing is lacking—funds.

For a number of years before 1954, there was a weather ship on location, but it was removed for reasons of economy. Since then the radar has been improved, surveillance by aircraft has improved, and satellites have added an important new dimension to hurricane watching. But the lesson of Gerda shows clearly that these are not enough.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the cost of such a ship would be \$1.2 million, with perhaps half a million more each year to operate it. This is a small amount by any government standard, but especially so when we consider the savings in property and life that could be made if regular, accurate data were available for predicting the course of hurricanes and winter blizzards.

My colleague in the Senate, Ed Brooke, has introduced an amendment in the Senate Appropriations Committee to allow funding for this needed ship. I intend to support his efforts there in any way that I can, and urge others to do likewise.

EVERETT DIRKSEN

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at its meeting yesterday the House Republican Conference paid deep and sincere tribute to one of the great legislative leaders of our time, the late distinguished Senate minority leader, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois. With the concurrence of other Members of this House, I now insert in the RECORD the brief but heartfelt tribute which was offered at that time:

TRIBUTE TO HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Whereas the members of the House Republican Conference have been deeply saddened by the death of the distinguished Minority Leader of the United States Senate, the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois; and

Whereas the late Senator has served his state, his party and his nation with distinction and dedication unparalleled in the recent history of the United States Congress,

first as a member of the House of Representatives, than as a United States Senator, and most recently as Senate Minority Leader; and

Whereas the services he has rendered to party and nation will be remembered with that special mark of honor which is reserved for the ablest and greatest of this nation's lawmakers and political leaders:

Therefore be it resolved that the House Republican Conference now pays special tribute to the memory of a distinguished lawmaker, a peerless party leader, a statesman and Senator whom history will honor even as we honor him here today—the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois;

And be it further resolved that the House Republican Conference express to the late Senator's wife Louella and to all the members of his family, our most sincere sympathy in the great loss that has been theirs.

VA EMPLOYEES ARE TO BE COMMENDED

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, recently I accompanied several of my colleagues from the Public Works Committee to Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Virginia to view firsthand the damage caused by Hurricane Camille. It was by far the worst I have even seen.

Many more people would have died had not so many Federal, State, and local officials acted so wisely and promptly. I would like to recognize Dr. LeRoy B. Lamm, director of the combined Gulfport and Biloxi VA hospitals, his fine staff, and the patients for the way in which they handled themselves during this crisis. Under the very able leadership of Dr. Lamm, 729 patients were evacuated by air from the Gulfport hospital without the loss of a single life. They were flown by military aircraft to eight VA hospitals in six Southern States, including the hospital in Charleston, S.C. The credit for the success of this critical, emergency move must be widely shared. The patients demonstrated great courage and never complained.

The VA staff at the Gulfport hospital is deserving of the special thanks, not only for putting the safety of the patients first, but for doing their duty even after many of them had lost their own homes and all of their possessions. This, I submit, is true dedication.

Without the cooperation and extra effort of the staffs at the eight hospitals to which these patients were evacuated, this mission of mercy could not have been completed so successfully. Credit, too, must go to our Armed Forces for furnishing the planes and crews required to move these patients.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the prompt action of the Jackson, Miss., VA center, and the New Orleans VA Hospital in dispatching medical teams to the stricken area, and the voluntary efforts begun at many VA stations throughout the country to aid their fellow employees in Mississippi. Jackson VA center employees also donated cash, food, and clothing

for the relief of the hurricane victims in Mississippi.

Although damaged by the hurricane, the VA hospital in Biloxi continued in operation and the personnel there joined the VA medical teams from Jackson and New Orleans in establishing first aid stations in the Biloxi area and helping to immunize victims of the hurricane to prevent an epidemic.

Further north, in Richmond, Va., the VA hospital there set up a health center for victims of the flood damage Camille dealt to that part of the country.

The Veterans' Administration has always prided itself on being part of every community in which it has an installation. This community pride was evident during this disaster. Those in communities to which the Gulfport patients were evacuated welcomed them with open arms.

If the care and safety of hospitalized veterans in Gulfport are the most dramatic events in the great tragedy that is Hurricane Camille, they are not the last. For the VA has made available to flood victims and to relief agencies assisting these victims VA-owned homes. The charge is \$1 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in Mississippi and elsewhere, the Veterans' Administration is a great source of strength and assistance in times of national disaster. Its first mission remains, however, the care of our veterans. Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Donald E. Johnson has assured me that the Gulfport patients were receiving and would continue to receive the best of care, and that the needs of Mississippi veterans requiring hospital care would be met on a continuing basis.

We in the Congress have come to expect that the Veterans' Administration shall reflect concern and compassion for our Nation's needy veterans. But the firm and prompt demonstration of such concern and compassion in time of crisis merits special recognition and appreciation, which I am happy to express.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM HOLD CONVENTION

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 to 30, there occurred something which—although not as well covered as an SDS uprising or black militant tantrum—was nevertheless of more than fleeting significance. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the national convention of Young Americans for Freedom, held in St. Louis, Mo.

Since its formation in 1960, YAF has played an increasingly important role in the battle for recognition of traditional American values of patriotism, free-market economic principles, love of our Republic, and faith in God. This organization has produced and is producing men and women of high caliber and

character who represent, to me, the vanguard of hope for the revindication of America's true sense of history and virtue.

In its inchoate and formative years, YAF led the struggle on our campuses against the pervasive secularism in education. It provided a reasoned, responsible, and energetic voice from the campus against totalitarian communism and arrogant collectivism. This it continues to do.

Extending its activities in recent years, however, YAF has made of itself a potent force in the activist struggle against the so-called New Left in America's colleges and universities. Calling for action against, and in many cases physically obstructing, the fascist tactics of SDS and similar groups, YAF has thrust itself into the forefront of the ageless combat against totalitarianism and agnosticism.

Representatives of YAF have testified before Congress on numerous occasions as to the actual situation on the campus and in the community. This learned, capable, and perspicacious group of young men and women have borne scorn and have endured endless malignment and criticism in the cause of defending freedom and America. In doing so, however, they have gained the respect of millions of Americans as represented by the fact that they have on their advisory board over 60 Congressmen and Senators of the United States.

These young people represent the cream of this Nation's youthful product. They have a sense of responsibility lacking in the militant leftist groups and they have the commitment to a various cause which the unthinking and timed middle group lacks. Unlike many youthful political groups, YAF is not a resolution-passing neuter. It is virile and dynamic. It does not adhere strictly to one party line but stands for its principles whichever side of the partisan line they happen to be on.

YAF does not stand for the status quo. They do not let somebody else fight their battles for them. For instance, citing the failure of campus authorities and community leaders to take effective action against the storm trooper tactics of the New Left, YAF developed in St. Louis last month a comprehensive legal blueprint for frustrating the militants through hard-hitting tests in court. They have, in the past, mobilized campus majorities to oppose the left wherever it appears.

This it has accomplished, and far more. It is involved actively in political campaigns and community projects. This has been effected under the brilliant leadership of Mr. Alan Mackay, national chairman, and Mr. David Jones, executive director. The new leadership of YAF is just as promising. Backed by a newly elected and reconstituted national board of directors, Chairman David Keene, University of Wisconsin, and Randal Cornell Teague, executive director, have assembled a young, vibrant and full-time staff dedicated to continuation of the fine tradition of previous years. This national staff is supported by a vast 48,000-member

ber constituency and numerous volunteer State officers.

In light of its tremendous efforts in the past and because of its promising potential for the future struggle for freedom, God and country, I believe this body owes a debt of sincere gratitude to this courageous organization. We should each be thankful for the young people who comprise Young Americans for Freedom.

WILLIAM H. RENTSCHLER'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR DIRKSEN

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my long-time friend and constituent William H. Rentschler is a mighty man with the pen.

Several years ago Bill Rentschler composed a tribute to Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, our mutual friend. I am calling this article to the attention of the Members of the Congress and to all Americans throughout the land, as it seems most fitting to ponder the penetrating and illuminating words used by Bill Rentschler in describing our colleague.

TRIBUTE TO AN EARTHY PLAINSMAN
(By William H. Rentschler)

This essay, which dates back some three years, expressed then my affection and deep admiration for Everett McKinley Dirksen. It now becomes a tribute to the memory of a towering figure in the annals of America.

A tall man, now bent with the weight of years, walks with measured gait along the flat, fruited plains of Illinois toward the yellowed pages of history.

You know somehow where he is going.

And you know he senses and relishes his fated role as mover and philosopher, as one around whom legends will grow, as one whose memory will linger.

This man is Everett McKinley Dirksen, steadfast helmsman for that little crew of Republicans in the United States Senate.

They honored him in Chicago one late April evening in 1966, when the biting wind belled the promise of spring, at one of those big, glossy, often deadly dull \$100-a-plate dinners.

Without a note or scrap of paper before him, he "preached" for one solid hour and twenty-two minutes more, surely long enough to bore stiff most anyone except perhaps his forgiving family.

Yet from the moment Everett Dirksen set free from deep in his innards that first velvety syllable, those sated, affluent diners—1,800 in all—leaned toward him and strained to hear every word as if life itself depended on his next one.

Before Dirksen rose, the bony young minister from the little frame church in Pekin spoke reverently of the Senator as "one who stands among us, but towers above us."

That set the stage. Then Everett Dirksen shuffled, to the lectern, blinking in seeming surprise at the glare of TV lights he contends with almost daily.

The celebrated silvery locks were tangled and awry. A huge carnation made a white splotch on his black suit. The massive head, the sagging face were thrust forward, and tired, watery eyes peered over horn-rimmed spectacles into the sea of admirers. He looked for all the world like the fabled cowardly lion from cinema's Land of Oz.

There was in the great ballroom the perfect silence of expectancy, for most of them had savored the Dirksenian thunder before.

Then the words began to come, resonant, rolling, soft and almost inaudible at first. He told a gnarled old story about a grateful cow, one of his oft-repeated favorites. Half the crowd had heard him tell it before, yet they wandered almost gleefully alongside him to the punch-line, and then roared with laughter, feeling he had permitted them to share with him an intimate moment.

What he said was not new. Some would brand it corny or trite, the same old clichés about God and motherhood and freedom and all that. The empty sophisticates might dismiss him as out of touch with these frenetic times.

But you know somehow this man is not shallow or calculating or emotionless. You can see an incandescent glow in those tired eyes when he talks of freedom.

A medical curiosity with an impressive catalogue of ailments, he suffers not from the limiting myopia which afflicts and restricts so many of his colleagues and contemporaries. His mind scans the ages with a certain graceful sweep. It searches the archives and draws easily on the great books and fine minds of human history.

There is an element of grandeur, a certain homely wisdom about this righteous, earthy plainman. His is a dying breed, towering like the shaggy mammoths above the gray flannel prodigies who are guided by polls, surrounded by faceless aides, preoccupied with the cosmetics of image.

"No, you can't eat freedom," Dirksen purred, "or buy anything with it. You can't hock it downtown for the things you need. When a baby curls a chubby arm around your neck, you can't eat that feeling either, or buy anything with it. But what in this life means more to you than that feeling, or your freedom?"

He had much else to say that night in Chicago. Here are a few random wisps of his "conversation" with 1,800 dinner companions:

"We must glue our eyes on the cause of freedom. It's the one thing that counts. The quiet, insidious erosion of freedom is taking place constantly . . . They're trying to remake us from stem to stern, trying to subvert our principles . . . It is time for those citizens who believe in the durable values to stand up and be counted . . ."

"There would have been no civil rights bill without us Republicans. That bill was written in my office . . . The Negro should come back to the Party of Lincoln."

"Americans today are a prosperous but unhappy people . . . there is frightful turbulence and discontent and bewilderment . . . Not the least confused are those in Washington as they caterwaul and wander aimlessly about . . ."

"That burglar they call inflation is eating into every paycheck . . . When it gets out of control, then controls go on, and you don't have freedom . . ."

"Some of these kids think it's smart and fashionable to burn draft cards. But they only do it when the TV cameras are there. I think it's smart-aleck nonsense . . ."

"George Meany asked for my support on the repeal of 14-B. 'You fairly wrench my heartstrings,' I told him, 'but you'll never get my vote.'"

"The reapportionment fight is just beginning. If you know you're right, you're not discouraged by one lost battle. We'll fight it out to let the people decide . . ."

"We have a monster government . . . unmanageable . . . the individual gets lost."

"Many people don't care, but I will never let the freedom of these neutrals be impaired."

"We Republicans must invite all sorts of people to come over and help us: the rank-and-file of labor, housewives, Negroes, young men, those who believe in constitutional gov-

ernment, those who want victory in Viet Nam . . ."

"There are only three issues this year: peace, freedom, the preservation of our free-enterprise system . . ."

These are fragments. He said a good bit more in those fleeting eighty-two minutes. Then they stood up and cheered this man, who likely in 1968 would be the Republican nominee for President by acclamation if he were ten or a dozen years younger.

There is much of the Shakespearean "ham" in Everett Dirksen, and he is quick to admit it. But here, too, is a legend who still lives and works his legislative sorcery, the only one of his kind and stature and character in the Senate.

Some chide him for his flexibility, his ambiguity, his easy camaraderie with the White House. He baffles friend and foe alike, for there is in him none of the unbending rigidity of the man who opposes only for the sake of opposing. This rankles some fellow Republicans and confounds his opponents.

He chooses his fights, selects his battle sites with the care of a shrewd general. He has learned in four eventful decades of public all live to fight another day. So he rarely service that the effective warrior must above courts the bloody nose, seldom picks the fight he is bound to lose. But on all the big issues where peace or freedom are involved—civil rights, reapportionment, Viet Nam, Section 14-B, the nuclear test ban treaty—he is there at center stage, playing a lead role, making his stand.

They called him the Wizard of Ooze, and once they said it in derision, but now they recall it with affection and awe born of respect.

For Everett McKinley Dirksen will be around awhile, stalking the marble corridors with the ghosts of Clay and Webster, Taft and Borah, long after most of his colleagues—and we—are gone and forgotten.

TOWARD GREATER EXCHANGE RATE FLEXIBILITY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the international monetary system has become crisis prone in recent years, thereby undermining confidence in present exchange rate methods.

If nations are to reach a true state of fiscal equilibrium, it is imperative that some adjustments be made in the monetary policies and mechanisms which govern the flow of trade and capital.

The Christian Science Monitor of September 6 addresses itself to this problem, citing steps that have already been taken, and a third one—the crawling peg—which permits small, frequent changes in parity, which is expected to receive consideration later this month at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

The article is included herewith in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

DRIFT, NOT WRENCH

Washington has about decided to back a third step to steady the world monetary system. The two earlier steps were to create a two-tier gold price system in March 1968, and the decision this summer to create "paper gold." The two-tier gold system has worked better than was hoped; the free market gold price fluctuates now much as it will without threatening needed currency-

supporting reserves. And most experts expect the paper gold to provide the extra monetary resources demanded by the world's fast expanding trade.

Now the third step: United States representatives at the International Monetary Fund meeting later this month are expected to propose the IMF weigh a "crawling peg" system of regular, small changes in the exchange rates of national currencies against the dollar. The dollar's value would hold steady at its present \$35 an ounce.

Already, of course, there is a narrow band of 1 percent within which a nation's currency exchange rate can fluctuate from day to day. But when trade imbalances or inflation gets a nation's currency out of whack with its official exchange rate, that narrow band isn't near enough leeway to allow the currency to find its real value. The result is a demand for either a devaluation like France's a month ago, or an upvaluation such as is expected in West Germany after its September 28 election.

Such revaluations are always awkward for the party in power. In Germany, for example, no one wants to be tagged with a currency decision which will penalize that nation's healthy export position. Thus, nations whose currencies are out of line usually wait until disaster threatens.

One solution offered was to widen the price fluctuation band. But this has evidently lost out to the crawling peg idea. The latter system's advantages are that it permits a steady drift—not a wrench—upward or downward in a currency's exchange rate, and that it removes monetary adjustments from the vagaries of national politics.

The crawling peg proposal, to be sure, would benefit all nations engaged in international trade. It may help disembarass European nations which must bring their currencies into line with the dollar. It would also further strengthen the dollar's position as the dominant medium in world trade.

THE H.R. 12110, POSTAL EMPLOYEE LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1969

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital questions facing the American people today is the matter of strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages on the part of public employees.

The breakdown of public employee morale under the pressure of inflation has caused concern and outright havoc in many of our cities across the country. There is little evidence that this trend is diminishing in its intensity.

Although the general morale and dedication of postal employees have remained high and contributed substantially to the effectiveness of our American postal service, the time is fast approaching when we will have to implement a legislative program dealing with labor relations in the postal service.

Many local government employees doing less important work than our postal employees get substantially larger salaries. Postal employees see the gains made by city workers and many of them have reached the conclusion that work stoppages are the only answer to postal pay problems.

Last year a national postal strike was threatened because management refused to bargain with local postal unions. Local

postal managers declared thousands of items presented by local postal unions for negotiation as being nonnegotiable. The strike was averted only when the then Postmaster General Marvin Watson stated that during his remaining months in office all issues would be negotiated by postal management.

On June 12 of this year I introduced a bill which I believe will help substantially to solve many of our problems in the postal service. It provides for a postal labor-management relations panel which will provide fair procedures during negotiating sessions and rule on disputed issues as to negotiability, as well as on disputed terms of contracts.

Binding arbitration of grievances is provided, as well as standards of conduct for labor organizations and a code of fair labor practices.

By providing for action by disinterested third parties in disputes between postal management and postal labor unions, my bill would result in the settlement of disputes by persons respected by both sides. In cities where such arbitration and labor relations boards have been provided, public employee labor relations have stabilized.

We need peace and order in this country, and we cannot neglect our responsibilities to our public employees, particularly those whose jobs are as essential to the flow of information in this country. I believe that my bill, H.R. 12110, will set an example in the postal service that will be beneficial to agencies throughout the Federal Government, as well as local government.

THE LOUIS M. RABINOWITZ FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the increased activity in recent years of leftist organizations and movements, the question logically arises as to who foots the bill for the various undertakings. When one considers some of the types associated with the New Left, for instance, gainful employment seems to be low on the list of priorities of some of those above school age. Concerning the New Left in particular, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI commented on their various sources of funds when he testified before a House appropriations subcommittee earlier this year:

New Left funds are generally obtained from contributions, dues, sales of literature, benefits, advertisements, and its publications and fund drives. The main sources of revenue are contributions, and it is estimated that nearly 60 percent of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) funds, for example, come from this source.

Although the majority of gifts are in the \$10 to \$50 range, wealthy benefactors who have acquired their fortunes in the United States have contributed substantial amounts in support of the New Left movement and in support of the activities of the SDS in particular. Included among these, for example, are a Cleveland industrialist who has long been a Soviet apologist; the wife of an

attorney in Chicago who is a millionaire; an heiress in the New England area who is married to an individual prominent in the academic community who has been active in New Left activities; and a wealthy New York lecturer and writer who for years has been linked to more than a score of Communist-front organizations and has contributed liberally to many of them. These individuals alone have contributed more than \$100,000 in support of New Left activities.

The New Left has also received money from several foundations. A very prominent foundation in New York, for example, has contributed more than a quarter of a million dollars from 1961 to 1968 to various individuals and groups, most of which have been identified as either present or past members or sympathizers of the Communist Party-U.S.A. or New Left movement.

Demonstrations are frequently financed by fundraising and collections. For example more than \$25,000 was collected from participants and spectators by the organizing committee during the march on the Pentagon in 1967. The organizing committee raised \$10,000 from the sale of buttons during an anti-Vietnam war demonstration early in 1967 in New York City.

Funds for antidraft activity by the New Left also have been supplied by organizations such as that known as Resist, located in Cambridge, Mass. This group was formed in 1967 by approximately 300 professors, writers, ministers, and others who signed a statement pledging to raise funds to aid youths who resist the draft and denounce the Vietnam war.

Communist Party-U.S.A. leaders have recently urged party members to give time and money to "New Left demonstrations and causes."

Much of the nationwide travel engaged in by prominent New Left leaders is paid for by honorariums paid to them, generally out of student funds, for their guest speaker appearances on college campuses.

As Mr. Hoover indicates, various sources are responsible for the financial fuel that keeps the New Left disrupting: through the efforts of the individual organizations, from wealthy people here in the United States, from foundations, and to a lesser extent through honorariums paid to New Left speakers who appear on college campuses.

A short time after Mr. Hoover's statement quoted above, *Combat*, the new and responsible newsletter on subversive activities, published additional information on the financing of leftist endeavors of both the new and old stripe. The report, entitled "Left Bank—The Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation," appeared in the June 15, 1969, issue and was compiled by Lawrence V. Coit and Ruth I. Matthews. Its contents are indeed interesting.

For instance, those churchmen who have had demands made upon them for "reparations" by James Forman, author of the *Black Manifesto*, should be interested in knowing that Forman has received nearly \$37,000 from the Rabinowitz Foundation over several years. Forman must have showed early promise to receive this unusually large sum in comparison to other recipients, an appraisal which proved to be correct if the havoc he has created among various church denominations is any criterion.

Radical authors, professors, editors, and others of the leftist persuasion rode the Rabinowitz gravy train for lesser amounts.

It is not to be implied from the foregoing that all recipients of Rabinowitz

grants are in the left camp. However, in the recent past the records show that, in the words of the Combat report, "there seems to be a 'research project' waiting for any leftist who knocks at its door."

Combat has certainly provided a service in bringing to public view this compilation of leftist recipients of Rabinowitz Foundation grants, and for this reason I insert the report, "Left Bank—The Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation," in the RECORD at this point:

LEFT BANK—THE LOUIS M. RABINOWITZ FOUNDATION

(By Lawrence V. Cott and Ruth I. Matthews)

Where does the Left get its money? Speculation, not without merit, usually centers in two sources, Communist governments abroad or rich Red angels in this country. There are documented cases, some not yet on the public record, of funds flowing in from the Soviet Union, from Cuba, from Red China. Better known are the domestic fatcats, befuddled liberals as well as Communists, passing out their inheritance for the Cause.

There is another source increasingly important in funding the Left: Non-profit foundations. They often deal in politics, under the thin veneer of "community" projects or whatever; and often in enormous sums.

For several months, Combat has been examining the public records of a non-profit foundation which annually pours hundreds of thousands of dollars into the Left, to finance propaganda films glorifying Communist China and revolutionary activity in Berkeley, to finance socialist conferences, and in effect to subsidize Marxist and Communist publishing houses. This is the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation of 30 E. 42nd St., New York City. There seems to be a "research project" waiting for any Leftist who knocks at its door.

The Foundation was established in 1944 by a self-made New York industrialist (garment industry hooks and eyes), primarily to finance research into Jewish contributions to American life. So long as Louis Rabinowitz lived, his Foundation stayed close to its charter, funding libraries and museums, endowing chairs at major universities, equipping archeological expeditions—in short, financing a hundred projects in the tradition of philanthropy. Then in 1957 Louis Rabinowitz died and direction of the foundation bearing his name passed to the hands of his son, his daughter and his daughter-in-law. The son, New York lawyer Victor Rabinowitz, has over the years been defense counsel for scores of clients called before Congressional committees investigating Communist activities. For many years he was Fidel Castro's chief legal representative—and registered foreign agent—in the United States. Rabinowitz has invoked the 5th Amendment privilege against self-incrimination when questioned about Communist activities, before a Congressional committee. So has his wife, Marcia, Secretary-Treasurer of the Foundation. His sister, Mrs. Lucille Perlman, is Vice President.

Combat has examined the public tax statements of the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation for the years since the death of Louis M. Rabinowitz. The findings indicate the Foundation's original purpose has been all but abandoned. Most of its money is now going into the pockets of well-known leftists, generally for "research" on papers, articles and books on Marxist or Communist subjects.

Those on the take include some of the biggest names of the left: Frank Donner, Hunter Pitts O'Dell, Walter Lowenfels, Clinton Jencks, Marvin Gettleman, Morris Schappes, Joseph M. Morray, James Forman, William Worthy, William J. Pomeroy, Len de Caux, Paul M. Sweezy, Andre Gunder Frank, Sylvester Leaks, Philip Reno, Christopher Koch,

Frank Cieciorka, John Gerassi, Eugene Genovese, Waldo Frank, William Mandel, James Petras, John Howard Lawson, Todd Gitlin, Herbert Marcuse, Howard Zinn.

Combat's investigation of the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation reveals:

The Foundation formerly granted large funds to Jewish foundations but this has declined from 44% in 1960 to only 3% in 1967.

Several years ago Senator J. William Fulbright, Arab-oriented, investigated the sources of certain funds coming into the U.S. from the Jewish Agency for Israel and found out that some were going through the Rabinowitz Foundation to pro-Israel groups in the U.S. and to the American Jewish Congress to aid its investigation of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Victor Rabinowitz, challenged by Fulbright, was shocked, promised his foundation would stop being a conduit. What transpired was this: Fulbright had stopped an activity offensive to the Arabs, and Rabinowitz stopped one offensive to the Soviet Union.

The Foundation has over the years contributed funds for research for books on Marxism (in some cases disguised in the grant as "socialism") and these books have then been published by International Publishers, the Communist Party's publishing house in the United States. The other large identifiable group of authors has been associated with the "Independent" Marxist publishing house, Monthly Review Press, and its magazine, *Monthly Review*. Its stable of authors, some of them also identified as CP members in Congressional testimony, has received tens of thousands of tax-free dollars for "research," with the publisher providing only a pittance as royalty.

At least two other leftist magazines have received direct grants from the Foundation: the now-defunct *Studies on the Left* (as well as its three principal officers, individually), and *Science and Society*, a Marxist journal described by an official government committee as a Communist publication. (Four of the six members of *Science and Society's* editorial board have been identified as CP members at one time or another.)

It provided seed money for the financing of two propaganda films: "China," a transparently one-sided view of Mainland China by Englishman Felix Greene, who received \$1,500 in 1963 and \$7,500 in 1964. The film was produced, incidentally, by Lester Cole, named as a CP member and one of the original Hollywood Ten. The other film was "Days of Protest," a "documentary" of the Vietnam Day Committee protest marches in California. Producer Jerry Stoll, who has been named as a CP member and has spoken at CP street rallies, received \$700 in 1966.

It gave \$1,500 in 1967 to Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a pressure group organized chiefly to oppose U.S. policy in Southeast Asia.

The Foundation provided large sums to fund "research" for books and articles portraying Cheddi Jagan, who has said he wouldn't reject description as a Communist, as a popular hero of Guyana. One of the Rabinowitz Foundation's officers, Marcia Rabinowitz, was an officer of Friends of British Guiana, cited as a Communist front after Congressional investigation. Other research projects emphasize Cuba and Castro, Victor Rabinowitz's long-time benefactor.

It provided funds for operation of at least two of the Socialist Scholars Conferences, both held in New York City. The conferences are widely viewed as misnamed—the socialism discussed most frequently and with the greatest admiration is the socialism of Cuba, the Soviet Union and Red China. In the case of the second conference, in September 1966, 14 of the official participants who delivered papers (i.e., 25% of the speakers) have been identified as recipients of Rabinowitz Foundation funds, and the Foundation provided \$2,000 to help run the conference.

The Foundation's purposes are set forth in its charter, which repeats the Internal Rev-

enue Service statute on tax-exempt foundations, specifying its interests to include "research into Jewish law and history, contemporary Jewish affairs and scholarships, civil liberties, education specifically in areas of social work, etc." The "etc." is obviously most important. But nowadays one man's "civil liberties drive" is another man's "outside agitation," one man's "education" is another man's "propaganda"—thus the mischief is done.

In 1960 the Foundation disbursed about \$107,000, almost all to well-recognized and long-established charities, but there was a small amount for the *Civil Liberties Docket* (of Berkeley), \$1,500 to *Studies on the Left*, \$2,500 to Joseph Papp's New York Shakespeare Festival, and \$2,000 to the left-wing Pacifica Foundation. Stanford and the University of Wisconsin were down for tidy amounts. Jewish philanthropies received \$47,000, or about 44%. In 1962 nearly \$200,000 was distributed, again mostly to legitimate organizations. Grants and scholarships, unspecified by name or amount, came to \$144,619; recognizable Jewish philanthropies of one kind or another received \$38,825 (about 20% of the total). In that year the Shakespeare Festival went down to \$200, where it's stayed ever since. Pacifica Foundation got \$1,530, and Willard Uphaus' World Fellowship received \$500.

In 1963 the Foundation handed out \$182,000; it was the year of the major departure. Jewish philanthropies had dropped to just \$28,700 (about 15%), with a few minor contributions going to Columbia, Yale, Haverford College, and a few small charities. The bulk of the money went to leftists, some of it itemized below.

In 1964 the Rabinowitz Foundation disbursed \$177,000, so much that by the end of the year its net worth had been whittled down to just under \$71,000. As usual, the left got the lion's share behind the protective coloration of a few small gifts to recognized charities—a civic ballet group in Brooklyn, a guidance center in Rabinowitz's home town, New Rochelle. The Foundation also donated \$26,650 to Jewish groups (about 15%). The following year the Foundation, according to its tax records, made no contributions or grants (although there is some evidence it did). Its portfolio contained \$79,000 in government bonds, \$41,000 in nongovernment bonds, \$154,000 in corporate stock, and nearly \$10,000 in other assets. At year's end its net worth was \$286,000.

Finances were thus well enough off in 1966 for the officers to scatter \$114,000 to 53 recipients: a "legal rights" group in New Haven got \$1,500, a group helping retarded children \$200, the Freedom Information Center in Tougaloo, Miss., \$2,000. The left walked off with most of the money, though; Jewish charitable institutions received their by-now ritual 15%.

The last year for which tax records are available for study in 1967, and the figures show heavy plunging on the Marxist-Leninist-Castroite—"socialist" crowd. A few small university grants, the highest \$2,500 to University of Wisconsin, a small check to a Brooklyn youth center, and only \$3,000 (about 3%) to Jewish philanthropies. The rest went to the likes of Clinton Jencks (\$5,750) and Prof. Harvey Goldberg (\$5,000), James Aronson (\$3,000) and Mario Savio (\$1,500).

Here is a rundown of some of the lucky winners of the Big Sweepstakes of 42nd Street:

James Forman. Now chief fund-raiser for the National Black Economic Development Conference and author of its demand for \$500 million reparations from churches for centuries of alleged ill-treatment of Negroes. Forman received four grants from the Rabinowitz Foundation in 1963, totaling \$22,945.50. The next year Forman returned for \$13,835, a grand total of nearly \$37,000. Coincidentally, Forman is married to the former Anna Constancia Romilly, daughter of author Jessica Mitford, and stepdaughter of Oak-

land, Calif., attorney Robert Treuhaff, both of whom have been identified as CP members in the CP press. (In 1966 Victor Rabinowitz sent \$50 to help in Robert Treuhaff's campaign for district attorney.) In the years he received \$37,000 from the Foundation, Forman was an executive of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, later melded into and then out of the Black Panthers, where Forman was also named Minister of Foreign Affairs. It was in August, 1967 that SNCC, followed by the Panthers, adopted a stance which can only be described as anti-Semitic, as well as pro-Communist.

Albert E. Kahn. Now living at Glen Ellen, Calif., he received \$2,500 in 1964. Kahn has been named as a CP member, has turned out books like *Sabotage: the Secret War Against Soviet Russia*, and *High Treason: The Plot Against the People*. In his books the traitors and plotters are the anti-Communists.

Philip Stevenson. Received \$1,200 in 1963. Was identified as a CP member (Party name: Philip Sterling) in Queens, N.Y., later moved to California. An unfriendly witness before HUAC in 1951, he also used name Lars Lawrence, spoke at *People's World* celebrations. Deceased 1965.

Esther Jackson. A grant of \$2,000 in 1963. Wife of James E. Jackson, former editor of the *Worker* and now one of CP's National Committee.

Robert K. Machover. Received \$2,000 in 1966. One of the new breed of young radicals, Machover made illegal trip to Cuba in 1964. Last year moved to San Francisco area, where he exercises authority in leftist film company, San Francisco Newsreel.

Todd and Nanci Gitlin. Down for \$4,000 in 1966. Todd is former president of SDS, has written for *Monthly Review* and the *Guardian*, played major role in organizing SDS Radical Education Project, most recently in San Francisco with the Newsreel film company, and was active in strike agitation at San Francisco State. Nanci Gitlin was in delegation of U.S. leftist women who met with Viet Cong women in Indonesia in 1965.

Christopher Koch. Received \$2,100 in 1966. Koch is best known for his illegal trip to Hanoi, which cost him his job with Pacifica Foundation's New York station (WBAI). Once was president of Radio Toulaloo Association, spoke at meeting sponsored by National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Michael B. Folsom. Received \$2,500 in 1964. Folsom one of the original members of W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, has spent last four years putting together biography of Mike Gold, prominent Communist and long-time columnist for *Daily Worker* and *People's World*.

Paul M. Sweezy. Co-publisher, with late Leo Huberman, of the Marxist *Monthly Review*, whose authors are favored by the Rabinowitz Foundation. Sweezy is a long-time Marxist, his magazine especially enamored of the life-style of Castro, Jagan and Mao. Received \$685.56 in 1964, a curious amount. The Foundation records show Stanford University refunded \$685.56 that very same year, suggesting it covered Sweezy's expenses when Sweezy appeared on the Stanford campus April 2, 1964 to deliver remarks at the funeral service of the late Marxist professor Paul A. Baran.

Len de Caux. There's a name out of the past for you. Now living in Glendale, Calif., he was an *enfant terrible* of the leftist labor movement in the 1930's. An Oxford graduate, De Caux has lived in the U.S. since 1927, was one of CIO's chief radicals, edited the *March of Labor* (cited as a Communist publication), was identified as a CP member in 1953; invoked the 5th Amendment before HUAC. Received \$3,250 in 1964.

Richard Krooth. Recipient of \$2,500 in 1966. Krooth was in Madison, Wis., where he supervised economic research for the National Coordinating Committee to End the

War in Vietnam. A former member of the Georgia bar association, by 1967 he was described in *Minority of One* (for which he wrote an article, "Capital Export and Lending Monopoly") as a "free-lance writer specializing in the economics of imperialism." Has also written for *National Guardian*.

J. M. Budish. Recipient of \$3,000 in 1964. A well-known open member of the CP, whose critical articles are published in *Political Affairs*, the CP's theoretical journal.

Rose Russell. She received a lavish \$5,500 grant in 1964. A long-time CP member, Mrs. Russell was one of the leaders of New York State's Old Teachers Union, long noted for its Communist penetration. Now deceased.

William Marx Mandel. Received \$2,000 in 1966. Has appeared before three Congressional committees, invoking the 5th Amendment when questioned about CP membership. A "star" of film *Operation Abolition*. Author of several books on USSR, generally painting rosy picture. His few criticisms of Moscow have cooled off his previous warm relations, but he can still get an article published in *Political Affairs*.

Robert Kaufman. Listed by the Foundation as Robert B. Kaufman of Berkeley, this is undoubtedly Robert Paul Kaufman, a chief organizer of W.E.B. DuBois Clubs on Berkeley campus, one of Bettina Aptheker's closest allies, and now a staff reporter for *People's World*, CP newspaper. Received \$3,600 in 1966.

William J. Pomeroy. Received \$3,600 in 1963 and \$2,000 in 1964; Pomeroy was an American who joined up with the Communist-led Huk in the Philippines, was later captured, imprisoned and deported. Now lives in England and contributes to the *Guardian*. Editor of *Guerrilla Warfare & Marxism*, published by International Publishers.

Alexander Werth. Received \$3,000 in 1963 to help him complete his book, *Russia at War* (E. P. Dutton & Co., 1964). Werth thanks the Foundation in the introduction. Russian-born Werth spent 1941-48 in the USSR as correspondent for the London *Sunday Times*; later was European correspondent of the left-wing U.S. magazine, *Nation*. Werth's writings generally were favorable to Stalin until he was attacked by Khrushchev, then favorable to Khrushchev until K was deposed.

Joyce Lewis Kornbluh. Received \$1,000 in 1963. In her *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (Univ. of Michigan Press, 1964) she thanks the Foundation for "financial help at a critical time" which enabled her to complete her monumental work on the Industrial Workers of the World (the Wobblies, an almost-defunct early radical group which is on Attorney General's List).

Bertrand Russell. The nonagenarian British pacifist, later to spawn an "International War Crimes Tribunal" to blame the U.S. for crimes in Vietnam, received \$1,000 in 1963.

Ronald Radosh. Received \$1,000 in 1966. In early 1960's, while a history graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, Radosh was an associate of *Studies on the Left*. More recently at Kingsborough College in N.Y.

John Gerassi. Former *Newsweek* correspondent turned radical. Made an illegal trip to North Vietnam in late 1966, the same year the Rabinowitz Foundation gave him \$5,000. Made an illegal trip to Cuba in 1967. Author of *The Great Fear: the Reconquest of Latin America by Latin Americans* (MacMillan, 1963) and *North Vietnam: a documentary* (Bobbs-Merrill, 1968). When asked, in 1967, by *National Guardian* what white radicals should do in response to ghetto rebellion, answered, "Support them, and I mean militarily." Fired from San Francisco State College for leading students in breaking into administration building.

RUNDOWN OF THE 1967 GRANTS—THE LAST YEAR RECORDS ARE AVAILABLE

James Aronson, N.Y., \$3,000: Was editor of *National Guardian* (now *Guardian*) until staff revolted and took control; paper was

cited by HUAC as "virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia," but in recent years, with "polycentric" Communism, has shown fascination with Cuba and Red China. Like many other recipients, Aronson is luminary of (National) Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, cited by HUAC as Communist front, and edited "Bill of Rights Journal" of December, 1968, which curiously featured articles and advertisements by or about many other Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation recipients.

Richard J. Barnett, Washington, D.C., \$1,500: With left-wing think tank, Institute for Policy Studies, in Washington. Has written book (with Marcus Raskin) on Cold War alternatives in Europe, several others on disarmament. Active in get-out-of-Vietnam work, and a sponsor last year of New University Conference in Chicago, which called for "radical university reform."

Donald L. Barnett, Iowa City, Iowa, \$2,500: A Marxist professor, refused to provide university with students' grades in effort to help them escape draft; close to SDS. Author of book, *Mau Mau From Within*, published by Monthly Review Press. Has written for *Monthly Review* and *National Guardian*.

Cedric Belfrage, Cuernavaca, Mexico, \$3,000: Former editor of *National Guardian*; named as CP member (Party name: George Oakden) and deported to his native England. Now living in Mexico, he contributes occasionally to *Guardian*.

Norman Birnbaum, N.Y., \$1,625: Involved in anti-Vietnam War activity; participant in New University Conference; a prime mover in SDS Radical Education Project. Also received \$1,625 from Foundation in 1966.

Bernard Conal, La Jolla, Calif., \$3,000: Former official of Progressive Citizens of America, cited as CP front by California legislative committee, Conal was Stakhanovite in Henry Wallace's Progressive Party in 1948. (Conal's son, Robbie, was W.E.B. DuBois Club activist in San Francisco in 1964-5, where he was roommate of Steven Kahn, son of Albert E. Kahn, another Foundation recipient.)

Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, N.Y., \$1,500: A left-wing pressure group established to alter U.S. foreign policy in Southeast Asia; not a tax-exempt organization. "We act to influence public and legislative opinion—from our pulpits, in the courts, at draft boards, in the streets."

Frank Donner, N.Y., \$500: A N.Y. attorney; identified as a CP member by witnesses before Congressional committees; invoked 5th Amendment in declining to answer questions. Author of book, *The Un-Americans*, a thorough-going leftist smear of HUAC (Donner thanks Victor Rabinowitz, among others, for being "most helpful in furnishing information and suggesting leads").

Horace B. Davis, Jamaica Plain, Mass., \$1,900: Has been identified in testimony as a CP member; in his 1967 book, *Nationalism and Socialism: Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917* (Monthly Review Press, naturally) Davis thanks the L. M. Rabinowitz Foundation for making it possible for him to visit Holland in 1965 to do basic research. The Foundation tax statements do not record any grant to Davis until 1967. Davis has taught economics at major universities and at two schools cited by Congress as Communist enterprises.

Harvey Goldberg, Madison, Wis., \$5,000: Professor Goldberg earned his radical reputation at Ohio State; has been a member of the National Council of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (like many other Foundation favorites), has been involved in various anti-Vietnam War groups. His *American Radicals: Some Problems and Personalities* was published by Monthly Review Press in 1957.

Marvin Gettleman, N.Y., \$1,800: Active in Vietnam protest; was contributor to *Studies on the Left* in 1962, *Science and Society* in 1965. Persons attending the First Socialist

Scholars Conference in 1965 were instructed to make their checks payable to Marvin Gettleman.

Hashomer Hatzair, Inc., N.Y., \$500: A very minor, but also the most leftist, of the Zionist groups. Once received \$5,000 grant, but in recent years only \$500 annually.

Len Holt, Washington, D.C., \$2,000: Negro attorney and author of book on 1964 Mississippi voter registration drive launched with support of National Lawyers Guild, cited by HUAC as a Communist front. Board member of Southern Conference Educational Fund (also cited as CP front by HUAC); has written book reviews for *Guardian*, and was sponsor of 1966 Herbert Aptheker testimonial dinner.

Donald Jelinek, Selma, Ala., \$5,000: Attorney now in San Francisco area with Office of Economic Opportunity; a protege of SF attorney Aubrey Grossman, who leads legal panel assisting draft resisters (Grossman has been a paid functionary of CP).

Clinton Jencks, Denver, Colo., \$5,750: Was official of Communist-dominated Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, and was convicted of falsely denying CP membership in Taft-Hartley affidavit; Supreme Court overturned conviction (the Jencks Decision) on grounds his attorney could not see FBI reports. Now teaching economics at San Diego, Calif., university.

Gaylord Leroy, Philadelphia, Pa., \$2,000: Of Temple University, Philadelphia; one of main speakers at Second Socialist Scholars Conference.

Walter Lowenfels, New Jersey, \$1,500: Has been open CP member; convicted of Smith Act violation in Philadelphia. Regular literary contributor to CP newspaper, *Daily World*, and its predecessors. Book of poetry published by International Publishers, with acknowledgement of Rabinowitz Foundation help.

Julian Mayfield, N.Y., \$3,000: Was Fair Play for Cuba Committee activist; sponsored the Monroe Defense Committee to help Robert F. Williams, a fugitive now living in Red China.

Jack Minnis, New Orleans, La., \$1,500: A young white radical who was SNCC research director after most whites were persona non grata.

New York Shakespeare Festival, \$200: Foundation regularly supports this arts festival, which is directed by Joseph Papp, who has been identified as a CP member (also 5th Amendment before HUAC). In 1960 the festival received \$2,500, has received only \$200 annually in subsequent years.

Norman Rudich, Middletown, Conn., \$2,520: Wesleyan professor, associated with Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; was sponsor of Herbert Aptheker testimonial dinner; active in anti-Vietnam War activity; speaker at Second Socialist Scholars Conference. Also received \$2,200 in 1966.

Morris Schappes, N.Y., \$1,000: Editor of CP-line magazine, *Jewish Currents*; identified as CP member by several witnesses; invoked 5th Amendment privilege.

Jack O'Dell, N.Y., \$1,250: Jack O'Dell is J. H. O'Dell is Hunter Pitts O'Dell, former CP organizer in South. When New Orleans police raided his home they found it crammed with CP literature. Was closely associated with late Dr. Martin Luther King, who ritually fired him when questions were raised, would then re-hire him. Now lives NYC, write for CP-line magazine, *Freedomways*. O'Dell also received \$1,250 in 1966.

Daniel B. Schirmer, Cambridge, Mass., \$2,000: Daniel Boone Schirmer, a descendant of the famous frontiersman, was a leading figure of the Communist Party in New England.

Mario Savio, Berkeley, Calif., \$1,500: Born Robert Savio, alias Jose Marti. Leader of the Free Speech Movement at UC/Berkeley in 1964. Anyone who hasn't heard of Mario Savio is less than five years old.

Southern Students Organizing Committee,

Kenbridge, Va., \$1,000: Organized to radicalize students in South, SSOC operates in close liaison with Southern Conference Educational Fund, the cited Communist front run by Anne and Carl Braden, both identified as CP members. SSOC tried to be recognized as the SDS in the South, but was attacked by SDS hard-liners as not being revolutionary enough.

Thorne Sherwood, Jr., Hartford, Conn., \$1,000: Candidate for PhD at Stanford; grant was for book or priest killed in 1966 when Colombian military ambushed a guerrilla band.

Michael Tanzer, N.Y., \$7,200: An economic consultant (PhD, Harvard), who has written for the left-wing *Nation*, attended the Socialist Scholars Conferences. Received \$1,800 in 1966 (for total of \$9,000) to finish book, *The Political Economy of International Oil and the Underdeveloped Countries* (Beacon).

George Wiley, Washington, D.C., \$1,000: Is the national executive of the National Welfare Rights Organization, which agitates for larger grants, fewer restrictions on welfare recipients, and similar raids on the Treasury.

Other grants went to the Brooklyn Heights Youth Center, Brooklyn; Lillian Boehm Foundation, N.Y.; Judith Coburn, Washington, D.C.; Columbia Survey of Human Rights Law, N.Y.; Foreign Policy Roundtable, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.; Jill Hamburg, Hoboken, N.J.; Ivan Kovacs, Bronx, N.Y.; Jon Katz, N.Y.; Debbie Louis, Venice, Calif.; Law Students Civil Rights Research Council, N.Y.; Floyd McKissick, N.Y.; Samuel Rohdie, Oxford, England; Leon G. Summitt, N.Y.; Socialist Scholars Conference, N.Y.; United Jewish Appeal; Regents of UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.; University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

TRITIUM AND NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, tritium is a radioactive isotope of hydrogen on which attention is currently being focused because of its radiological characteristics and its appreciable production by an expanding nuclear power industry. This industry results in tritium releases to the environment as a consequence of normal operation of both nuclear power reactors and fuel reprocessing plants.

Because tritium has a long radioactive half life of approximately 12 years, this means that tritium discharged into the environment will accumulate over a relatively long period of time.

Tritium presents no radiological health hazard to humans if it is prevented from entering the body. However, introduction of tritium into the body in any form does constitute a potential hazard.

Thus, I was pleased to see a discussion of this tritium problem, as it relates to the Baltimore Gas & Electric nuclear powerplant under construction on the Chesapeake Bay in Calvert County, Md., appearing in a September 11 Washington Post article written by staff writer Hal Willard. I hope my colleagues will take the time to read this article and, also, an additional item from the September 11 Washington Post regarding the expensive

campaign waged by Baltimore Gas & Electric on advertising the Calvert plant.

Mr. Speaker, the hope for cheaper nuclear power must be weighed against long-range risks to all forms of life and we must take a very careful look at all the available facts before the country leaps into the nuclear power age.

The articles follow:

TRITIUM PROBLEM OUTLINED

(By Hal Willard)

The problem of radioactive tritium being released from nuclear plants is unresolved, despite utility company advertising and Atomic Energy Commission assurances, a Johns Hopkins University radiologist maintains.

The radiologist, Dr. Timothy Merz, says tritium from water, a byproduct of nuclear reactors, can enter the human body and stay in cells long enough to cause genetic mutations and possibly leukemia in descendants.

Dr. Merz cautions that two reactors, such as will power the electricity-generating station on the Chesapeake Bay at Calvert Cliffs, will not emit enough tritium to be a major danger. However, he says, the electric power industry must recognize tritium as a problem because of the cumulative effect if too much tritium escapes or too many nuclear stations are built.

There are 13 civilian nuclear stations operating in the United States; 46 are under construction, and nearly 50 more are planned. The greatest concentration of them, totaling all stages of development, is in the Middle Atlantic region, including the Chesapeake Bay. But, Dr. Merz says, scientists still don't know precisely how many plants could be built in a given area before tritium became an actual danger to human life.

The Atomic Energy Commission is well aware of the potential danger of tritium, according to Dr. John Totter, chief of the biology and medicine division, and has established strict standards on the amount of tritium that a reactor is allowed to release.

Furthermore, Dr. Totter says, the AEC has regulations controlling the total amount of tritium that can be released in a given body of water that isn't constantly circulating so that it does not become saturated.

Dr. Merz feels these regulations are not stringent enough. He and other, nonscientist, citizens continuously ask what would happen if the AEC was overoptimistic or there was an accident.

Dr. Totter explains that the possibility of accident exists in any industry and that the precautions required of utilities by the AEC make the chance of an accident remote.

Dr. Totter also said he felt that the AEC had not done a thorough job in explaining the facts about tritium to the public and that if it had there would be less concern about the substance.

Dr. Merz and Dr. Totter agreed that the advertising concerning tritium by the Baltimore Gas and Electric Co., builders of the Calvert Cliffs station, could be misleading to people unfamiliar with the scientific jargon employed.

The ads have appeared in several newspapers, including *The Washington Post*, and have caused the Public Service Commission to order an accounting to determine whether the expenditure for the ads is in the public interest. The money to pay for the ads, of course, comes from the regular utility rate, paid by the public. The PSC emphasized that it allows a certain amount of institutional advertising. (The least an advertiser must pay *The Washington Post* for a half-page ad is just under \$1450, according to Post rate listings.)

Money spent on advertising conceivably could affect the utility rates paid by the public and the PSC must decide whether the purpose of the advertising justifies the expense.

The uncontested facts about tritium are that it is radioactive and is an isotope of hydrogen and, therefore, is actually part of the water disgorged back into any body of water being used by a nuclear power station as coolant, as Chesapeake Bay water will be used. The chemical formula for water is two parts of hydrogen and one part of oxygen (H_2O). Tritium becomes one of the hydrogen parts, making the formula for water HTO .

Once the tritiated water is in the Bay, or any other body of water supplying a nuclear station, it is used by plant life to make carbohydrates through the process of photosynthesis. Thus, the tritium becomes part of the plant.

Any creature eating the plant, whether it be fish or man, is ingesting food that becomes structural protein and nucleic acid containing tritium. If a human being simply drank the water, the effect would be the same.

No one is expected to drink from the Bay, of course, because it is salt water.

The dialogue on tritium began at a public hearing conducted last May by an AEC reactor licensing and safety board in Prince Frederick, county seat of Calvert County.

An AEC statement used at the hearing said in part: "Water containing tritium acts chemically like ordinary water; most of it passes through the human body very rapidly. More than one-half of the tritium taken up by the body is passed on within three to 10 days; practically all remaining molecules of water containing tritium are gone within 60 days."

Dr. Merz contends that this statement oversimplifies the situation. He says the elimination of tritium is not rapid and says he places a different emphasis on the word "practically" than the AEC does.

Dr. Totter says the statement was accurate, but not nearly as precise as it should have been—and therefore is open to misinterpretation and misunderstanding. A construction permit for the plant has been issued.

Dr. Merz and six other Johns Hopkins scientists submitted testimony at the hearing, but at the time their views about it were merely theory. Since then, Dr. Merz has proven his views by independent laboratory experimentation, he says.

He learned what the AEC already knew, it turned out, but he places a different emphasis on it. The chief fact involved is that tests show a permanent incorporation of tritium in water creatures that eat plant life that had absorbed tritium from water.

Advertising by the Baltimore Gas and Electric Co. manages to convey a contrary opinion by the use of accurate, but imprecise and esoteric language, Dr. Merz feels.

An advertisement on page D12 of the Sept. 3 editions of The Washington Post says in part: "The Calvert Cliffs plant will include the most complete system available for removing radioactive 'impurities' from any water discharged from the plant to the Bay. However, this \$4,400,000 processing system will not completely remove everything from the water . . . Since tritium becomes a part of the water molecule itself, it is not removed. This is why there will be a large quantity of tritium discharged than any other radioactive isotope . . ."

"The major route to man of these radioactive liquids would be through seafood. For anyone eating normal amounts of seafood harvested in the immediate vicinity of the plant site, the radiation exposure from this seafood would be infinitesimal. In a single year, a real seafood lover would have to eat at least 30 tons of fish, crabs, clams, and oysters from the same plant area to receive as much radiation exposure as from an annual chest X-ray. These exposures consider the fact that some elements reconcentrate in the seafood chain to levels above the concentration in the Bay water. But there is no theoretical or experimental support for a conclusion that significant separation of tritium from

hydrogen can occur by natural chemical or biological means. These properties of tritium tend to prevent reconcentration of tritium in the food chain."

But, according to Drs. Totter and Merz, there is "permanent incorporation" of tritium by the person absorbing it. Therefore, all sides agree, the public must answer two questions: How much risk are humans willing to take that the standards set by the AEC are high enough; and how much are humans willing to gamble that AEC scientists will not be proven wrong in the future—perhaps because of the newness of the science.

The AEC and the electric power industry are confident that the risk is so small that it is worth taking.

POWER FIRM'S ADS COST OVER \$71,000

BALTIMORE, September 10.—A Public Service Commission spokesman said today an accounting shows that the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company has spent more than \$71,000 so far on advertising its nuclear power plant under construction at Calvert Cliffs.

The commission ordered the accounting to help determine whether the advertising cost was in the public interest because the ads are paid for with income from electricity rates and try to convince the public of the plant's safety.

NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some very important testimony was heard today by the House Antitrust Subcommittee concerning the Newspaper Preservation Act.

To me this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be presented this year and I certainly plan to work for its passage. So much of our time in Congress is spent in trying to effectively manage our fiscal affairs that we take for granted other matters that also need tending.

Simply stated, the purpose of the Newspaper Preservation Act is to guarantee freedom of information to the public. In a democratic society the dissemination of information and opinion is essential to the continuance of a free society. However, more and more communities are being served by one newspaper and thus getting only one viewpoint.

Increasing costs are forcing newspapers to drop by the wayside, but the Newspaper Preservation Act would permit a failing newspaper and a successful one to merge their plants, equipment, advertising, even circulation, yet maintain separate editorial policies and staffs.

From personal observation in my congressional district I know the effectiveness of a joint newspaper operating arrangement. I am referring to the Knoxville News-Sentinel and the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal, which began in 1957 with the News-Sentinel performing the circulation, advertising, accounting, and mechanical operations of the Journal. News and editorial identities of the two papers have continued entirely independent of each other.

There is no substitute for a newspaper either as a means of communication or advertising. It serves the public and the

business world in special ways. I think it is the duty of the Congress to pay attention to these needs. It is our responsibility to see that our communities do not become one-voice towns.

The number of one-newspaper towns has risen sharply—85.6 percent of our towns with daily newspapers have only one newspaper to read. In 1910 we had 2,202 English language dailies in the United States and now we have some 1,500. Of great significance is the fact that there has been no successful new daily of general circulation established in any city of more than 200,000 since 1941.

The joint newspaper operating arrangement is not new, in fact, it is about 40 years old and has certainly proved its worth over the years.

If and when the Newspaper Preservation Act comes before the House for a vote this year I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING—MILITARY STYLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, time was when military recruitment and command training was accomplished by the flying of the colors, and the beat of the drum accompanied by fife and bugle.

Nowadays socio-military advisers—more interested in social experiments than in national defense—feel that patriotism and love of country are outdated methods of communication and motivation with today's youth. The socio-military complex apparently feel it necessary to stoop to the use of vulgarity, religious slurs, drug usage, and insensible drivel in order to adapt our military leaders to conform to the deviations of the undesirables among our youth.

One would think that these youth are the misfits and freaks which the military would screen out—not search out. Strength is in quality not in numbers. The day when the military took a boy and gave back a man are gone. Rather, the design is now that the boys are to remake the men. Everyone is out of step but the "goof-off."

What caliber of military force can be developed through administering sensitivity training of this type to the officers in our armed services? Yet, the Director of the Office of Information for Armed Forces defends the use of taxpayers' money under the authority of the Department of Defense to proliferate this garbage.

I include a news report from the Pittsburgh Press for July 27, 1969, and a reply from the Department of Defense, Office of Information for Armed Services:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 27, 1969]

SHOCK ART JOLTS PUBLIC ON YOUTH

(By Mike Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Dept. is showing public audiences a painting entitled the "Next Supper" in which Jesus is depicted smoking pot.

And the disciples as they appear in Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper" are replaced

September 11, 1969

in order (left to right by Spider Man, Charlie Brown, Bugs Bunny, Jughead (as Judas Iscariot), Archie, Capt. Midnight (as John, "The Beloved Disciple"), Mickey Mouse, Superman, Santa Claus, Thor, Scrooge, McDuck and Batman.

GAP PORTRAYED

But the Pentagon hasn't really become a pagan house of worship mocking the Christian faith.

The painting is part of a 50-minute presentation designed to portray the "Communications gap" between today's "New Generation" and the "Establishment" or "System" (everyone over 25).

Crammed full of art posters like the "Next Supper," underground newspapers, and underground film produced by college students on a \$50 budget, and slides including one showing a needle injecting heroin into a scarred human arm, the presentation is fast becoming by popular demand a road show for other Government agencies, churches, PTAs and similar community groups.

MESSAGES HIDDEN

Examining the lyrics of some popular songs, the script concludes they have hidden messages which encourage people to take drugs.

While the reception to the Pentagon presentation generally is reported to be favorable, some critics have questioned the Defense Dept.'s role in showing it.

John C. Broger, the man behind the project, says the presentation originally was intended for military commanders to give them an insight into how today's youth communicate with each other.

Outsiders then heard about the presentation and began requesting it, he said.

Mr. Broger, who boasts his presentation has convinced some youthful drug takers to quit the habit and gotten alienated parents and children back together, heads the office of information for the armed forces, a vast network that includes armed forces radio and television service and the Stars and Stripes newspapers in Europe and the Pacific.

BAD TRAITS STRESSED

"We just show what's happening. We don't say whether it's good or bad," Mr. Broger said.

His presentation, however, stresses heavily the bad traits of some of today's youth and adults.

"The New York Times estimates that a hundred million people in the U.S. use some form of mind altering drug (including alcohol)," says the narrator.

"It's estimated that 30 to 50 per cent of the college students have tried pot (marijuana) at least once. Over half repeat. . . Last year over 35 tons of heroin were confiscated by the Bureau of Narcotics. . . two and a half times more than the year before and six times more than the year before that."

POP SONGS CITED

Popular songs depicted as describing drug use include the Beatles "1967 Album of the Year" with the line: "I get high with a little help from my friends;" "Fire Poem by Arthur Brown," "Mr. Businessman" and "Don't Step on the Grass."

The underground poster "Next Supper" shows Christ with a pile of marijuana and a hose with high pressure nozzles in his hand to supply marijuana smoke to the whole group.

Although not part of the presentation, a Broger aide who presents the show said the communications gap between youth and adults was underscored for him when the Bob Hope troupe was entertaining troops in Vietnam last Christmas.

Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, U.S. commander in Vietnam, held up his fingers in the V sign to the troops at one performance.

The result was laughter from thousands of the young men.

To Gen. Abrams, the V was the "Victory" sign of World War II days. The laughing soldiers recognized it as the peace symbol of the younger generation.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, OFFICE OF INFORMATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES, OASD (M&RA), Washington, D.C., September 5, 1969.

Hon. JOHN R. RABICK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RABICK: This is in reply to your letter of August 22, 1969 which enclosed a newspaper article in the *Pittsburgh Press* of Sunday, July 27, concerning a Defense Department presentation on Youth Communications.

The Defense Department audio-visual presentation was carefully researched and produced to meet the growing need of military commanders to understand the challenge of communicating effectively with a new generation of servicemen who have grown up with a completely different outlook on life. Why—is the subject of our presentation.

The presentation includes a poster entitled "Next Supper" which is commercially produced and sold by many stores catering to youth. The "Next Supper" poster is used among youth and is one of several in the presentation because this is clear evidence of a growing attitude by many of our youth toward religion and the acceptance of drugs. The posters and other media illustrate that youth are not reluctant to employ shock techniques in expressing their nonacceptance of moral standards set by the older generation.

A large group of Service chaplains have seen the presentation and while some were shocked at individual examples of youth media, all agreed that the briefing was relevant and helpful in understanding the problems of today's military commanders—as well as parents—in their effort to effectively communicate with today's youth.

The "Next Supper" was not used in any way that implied approval of the posters or their messages, nor was its use intended to disparage the Christian principles of our heritage.

Leaders of several national and international Christian gatherings where the presentation has been seen have commented: ". . . one of the most significant presentations of our national convention . . . a masterpiece in communication on one of the most important subjects confronting our nation today . . . we wish this could be given in all of the more than 30,000 churches we serve." (National Association of Evangelicals.)

"I commend you and your staff for the work you are doing—work that is scholarly, timely, effective." (Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

"I was attracted to your presentation as helping us to distinguish the true from the false." (Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship-International.)

More than any other group, pastors and church officials who have seen the presentation have been enthusiastic in their acceptance of its message. They unanimously endorse it and continue to recommend wider showings to other church groups.

It is unfortunate that a newspaper headline overshadowed the real purpose of the presentation. The effectiveness and extremely favorable response which it has generated from audiences who have seen the entire briefing has caused them to depart with a renewed sense of responsibility toward our youth. The sole intent of the presentation, as stated in the news story, is ". . . intended for military commanders to give them an insight into how today's youth communicate with each other." Be assured that ". . . the Pentagon hasn't really become a pagan house of worship mocking the Christian faith."

I trust this answers your concern and I personally assure you that the entire presentation does nothing to demean the sanctity of the Christian faith.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. BROGER, Director.

THE U.S.S. "DOLPHIN"—A RESULT OF QUALITY WORKMANSHIP AT PORTSMOUTH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate, and the readers of the *Record*, the following "letter to the editor" which appeared in the September 8, 1969, edition of the *Portsmouth Herald* of Portsmouth, N.H. It is from John R. M. Donnell, commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Dolphin*, a "one of its kind" experimental auxiliary submarine that was specifically designed for deep-diving operations.

The *Dolphin*, the construction of which was completed in 1968 by the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, has been in service since its commissioning and, as pointed out by Commander Donnell, is proving to be one of the Navy's outstanding technological achievements.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent after reading such a statement by the commanding officer of a vessel of this kind that the work performed by the men at Portsmouth is the finest that can be found anywhere. It offers conclusive evidence that the closure order of 1964 which would result in the termination of operations in Portsmouth should and must be rescinded. In order to keep pace with the defense needs of this Nation, it is essential that a facility that is as accomplished and efficient as the shipyard at Portsmouth remain available to produce the highly specialized equipment crucially needed to keep our Nation secure.

We in New Hampshire are proud of the men at Portsmouth. We realize the great skill with which they are able to perform, and recognize the contributions they are making to their community and their Nation. Those to whom the Nation looks for leadership and protection, both in the military and the civilian side of government, should recognize these facts also.

The letter is as follows:

MAN IN MIDDLE

To the Editor:

Speaking as a "man in the middle," I concur with your editorial comments concerning the lack of recognition that the Portsmouth-Kittery Shipyard workers received for their outstanding achievement—*Dolphin*. She is truly one of the most noteworthy technological achievements the United States has made in years. However, in defense of the Navy management, of which I am not a part, publicity concerning *Dolphin* is complicated by various classification problems. Hopefully, these problems will be worked out because, as a very grateful member of *Dolphin's* crew, I would like to see the shipyard workers receive full recognition for having designed and built such a superb ship.

JOHN R. M. DONNELL, Commanding Officer, U.S.S. *Dolphin*.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, all America grieved when they heard the sad news of the passing of the minority leader of the Senate, Everett Dirksen. I know this is true, because I was in my home district on Sunday afternoon when the news came over the car radio while I was making some last minute visits before returning to Washington. I heard such expressions as, "He was a grand guy," "There will never be another like him"; and, "He was the greatest orator of all time."

It is natural that there is a sense of sadness at the death of a very popular national figure who became a legend during his own lifetime. But along with sadness and shock, there must be a sense of frustration among the American people at having snatched from the council of Government a great leader at a time when outstanding leadership is so sorely needed in our Nation and in the world.

It was not my privilege to have known him as well as some of my colleagues. Here a few years ago, during a certain spring when he was making repeated trips home, it was my good fortune to be on the same plane with him from Washington to Chicago on several occasions. On one or more of these times, it was my privilege to sit beside him and to enjoy a visit en route. But when I was beside him, and at other times when I was on the plane, I observed that no sooner was the plane airborne than he opened his attaché case and went to work. For a man of his years, you would expect that he would use this flight time as an opportunity to rest, but on each of these trips that we traveled together I noticed that he spent his time reading reports from his staff and perhaps preparing remarks to be made in his home State.

I mention these incidents in order to emphasize that while Mr. Dirksen was a brilliant man, a magnificent speaker, and a great leader of his party in the Senate, he was also imbued with the idea that there is no substitute for hard work.

So many things have been said and written about this distinguished American. But I think the thing that impresses me most is a remark attributed to him wherein he explained that he worked very hard at his job so that when his time came it would be regarded that he had helped, at least, to turn over to his children and grandchildren a country that was at least as good as his generation had inherited from its forebears. He so eloquently said that he hoped it would never be that his grandchildren would say to him, "You were on the scene; why did you let things get into such bad shape?" If more of us took this view, we would be more diligent in our efforts and work just a little harder, then our descendants could be a little more assured that they would have passed on to them the same great heritage that had been handed down to our generation.

It was my privilege to take note of another facet of his personality that convinced me he was really genuine. I am convinced he did not adopt his well-known mannerisms just for the benefit of others. Some observers have suggested that his use of the hoarse whisper was a kind of dramatic gesture. Because of those trips on the plane together I prefer to believe otherwise. Those inflections, expressed by the raising and lowering of his voice were a part of his thinking process. On the trips when I sat beside him on the plane he made no studied effort to impress anyone. It was simply normal for him to place emphasis upon his thoughts by changing the level of his voice and by the use of inflection. The manner of his speech was not reserved for oratory alone. It was the same in his personal conversation. It was a part of the man.

Those of us who listened to President Nixon in the rotunda heard him describe the late Senator Dirksen as "a politician," but then the President went on to say he used that term in the very finest sense of the word. In the opinion of some of us present this was as fine a tribute as could be paid to any Member of Congress.

On Wednesday of this week I had occasion to take a constituent over on the Senate side. That body was in adjournment out of respect for one of their distinguished leaders. When we walked on the floor there on his desk was the one marigold of the species he had pleaded to be made the national flower. In the rotunda, the President said Mr. Dirksen could be described in the same way as his beloved marigolds, "hearty, vivid, exuberant, colorful and uniquely American." Mary McGrory, a staff writer for the Washington Evening Star carried that parallel a step further when she described the passing of the minority leader of the Senate by saying "a bright flower is gone."

Everett Dirksen was a giant of public life. He was certainly one of the most powerful Senators of all time and perhaps the most dominant figure of the Republican Party of the 1960's. He was counsel to Presidents but, most of all, he regarded himself as a servant of the people. I can honestly say that along with those Members of his Party that were close to him, as a Democrat, I can say that I am going to miss Ev, too. I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen, Senator and Mrs. Baker, and the others of his family.

REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, BY THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF NEW YORK

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has prepared a very thorough report citing the need to abolish the electoral col-

lege and change the present presidential election system in favor of a direct, popular election.

The report makes several points.

First, direct election would eliminate the chance that the popular vote winner would not become President. In the past, there have been three Presidents who were elected although they lost the popular election.

Second, direct election would end the inequities resulting from the allocation of electoral votes among the States combined with the winner-take-all unit vote. Under the present system the number of electoral votes allocated to the States do not reflect either increases in population in the States or the voter turnout, whether it be large or small. And there is the discrepancy in the voter-elect vote ratios of the different States. For instance, California has one electoral vote for six times the number of voters as in Alaska.

Third, direct election would eliminate the possibility of an election being thrown into the House where there would be the risk of wheeling and dealing and the rejection of the candidate who is preferred by the greatest number of voters.

Finally, direct election would eliminate the potentially dangerous office of the presidential elector. Under the present system, an elector can disregard the will of his constituency and vote in the electoral college for a candidate who did not receive the highest number of votes in his State. Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of North Carolina did just that in 1968.

In examining proposed alternatives to the present electoral college system—the district plan, the proportional plan, and the automatic plan—the committee found each inadequate in solving the basic problems.

The need for election reform is clear, and this report marshals strong arguments for the abolishment of the electoral college.

Since the House is now considering House Resolution 681 to provide for the direct popular election of President and Vice President, I believe this report will be helpful to those Members who may still require persuasion. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

(By the committee on Federal legislation, the Association of the Bar of the city of New York)

INTRODUCTION

The 1968 election clearly demonstrated that the electoral college system of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents is in need of reform. The possibility of the election elevating the popular-vote loser to the Presidency, or of a deal in the electoral college, or of an election thrown into the House of Representatives to be decided under a formula distorting the most elementary principles of self-government, has served as a clear reminder of the inadequacies of the present system. The election supported on every count the indictment rendered in January 1967 by the American Bar Association Commission on Electoral College Reform that the present system is "archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous and dangerous."

In 1967 this Committee issued a report

Footnotes at end of article.

recommending the abolition of the electoral college and the substitution of a direct-vote system. In our report we stated that direct election of the President and Vice President was "feasible," "highly desirable," and "conforms to modern concepts of democracy and to the expectations of the great majority of the people."² On May 16, 1967 the Association of the Bar of the City of New York adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this Association favors the proposal and adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President which would abolish the electoral college and provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President."³

We have reviewed our 1967 report in the light of the events of 1968 and strongly believe that the 1968 election confirms the fairness, justice and wisdom of a system of direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States. We endorse and urge adoption of the proposed amendment embodied in S.J. Res. 1, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969), which is co-sponsored by Senator Birch Bayh and 41 other Senators and which incorporates the recommendations made by the American Bar Association Commission on Electoral College Reform.⁴ This proposal closely parallels S.J. Res. 2, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967), which we dealt with in our 1967 report. The proposed amendment requires a popular plurality of at least forty percent to be elected President and Vice President, and in the event no candidate receives that number, a popular vote runoff between the top two candidates.

The Committee wishes to incorporate herein and reaffirm the views expressed in our 1967 report in favor of the proposed amendment. There, we stated, among other things, that—

"The 40% runoff provision is necessary to avoid the possibility of a relatively small minority electing a President. It seems that, as demonstrated by previous history, the likelihood of splinter groups being able to prevent any candidate from getting at least 40% of the vote is extremely remote, and that therefore the incentive for additional national parties will remain scant. Indeed, by removing even the theoretical possibility of becoming President with, say 25% of the vote, such incentive may actually be lessened. While we recognize that minority parties might have some additional leverage if a runoff were actually required to be held, there is a high degree of improbability that such a runoff will ever be necessary. We therefore conclude that so uncertain a prospect of 'leverage in the sky' would be unlikely to induce a proliferation of political parties, particularly in view of the manifold difficulties, monetary and otherwise, in the way of mounting a serious Presidential campaign. In any event, assuming that a state of facts ever did arise in which a runoff would be required, we regard the leverage that then would exist as less objectionable and dangerous than the alternative which the same state of facts might present in the absence of a runoff provision: the election of a candidate having the support of only a relatively small fraction of the voters, without an opportunity for the supporters of the other candidates to choose among the front-runners.

"We believe that 40% is a reasonable figure and that a national runoff election is the most desirable manner of selecting the winner in such a case. We see no reason why the people should not elect the President in all cases. Any procedure involving a congressional vote risks the election of a candidate who would not be the popular choice and, as the ABA Commission stated, 'an election in Congress is likely to involve political deals

and pressures and to place the President in a position of indebtedness to those who voted for him.' We agree with the ABA Commission that the practical aspects of a runoff election can be worked out."⁵

In our 1967 report we expressed certain minor reservations about the precise formulation of S.J. Res. 2, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967). S.J. Res. 1, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969) meets almost all of the Committee's objections.⁶

DIRECT ELECTION

Direct, popular election is the only system that would eliminate all of the structural flaws inherent in the electoral college.

First, it is the only system that would eliminate the ever-present hazard that the winner of the popular vote will not be the electoral vote winner. Three times in our history a President has been elected with fewer popular votes than the losing candidate.⁷ Sixteen times a shift of less than 1% of the total popular vote cast would have elevated the popular vote loser to the Presidency. For a while during the 1968 election, it appeared that the outcome would be at odds with the popular vote. The possibility of such a misfire occurring in the future is cause in itself to justify the abolition of our antique electoral college.

Second, it is the only system that would eliminate the voting inequities which flow from the method by which electoral votes are allocated among the states and from the operation of the winner-take-all laws. Under the system electoral votes are awarded on a basis other than population; population changes occurring between decennial censuses are not reflected in the apportionment; each state casts a fixed number of electoral votes regardless of voter turnout;⁸ minority votes cast in a state are completely discarded; and voters of similar disposition throughout the country are prevented from pooling their popular votes across state lines. The system involves "competing inequities." Small state voters benefit from the fact that all states are entitled to three electoral votes regardless of size. Large state voters benefit from the unit rule whereby their states are able to award large blocs of electoral votes.

Without attempting to deal with the question of which of the two inequities is greater,⁹ we believe, as we stated in our 1967 report, that

"the time is past when we can afford to have a privileged position for some classes of voters built into our political structure. Since 'one person, one vote' has become a most important principle of our voting structure, no citizen's vote should have any more weight than any other's—above all in this most important of elections."¹⁰

Third, a popular vote system would eliminate the danger of an election being decided in the electoral college by a relatively small group of electors, or being thrown into the House of Representatives under the "one state, one vote" rule with the consequent risk of wheeling and dealing and the rejection of the candidate who is preferred by the greatest number of voters. The 1968 election, more than perhaps any other election, underscored the potential for disaster and crisis that inheres in the present system. If President Nixon had lost California, or the States of Missouri and Ohio, or three border States, no candidate would have had a majority of the electoral votes. The power to choose the President would have shifted to the electoral college, where Mr. Wallace would have had the ability to choose the President and Vice President of the United States by releasing his forty-five electors so that they could vote for one of the major candidates. There was much speculation in the country at the time that if no major candidate had a majority of the electoral votes, Mr. Wallace would have attempted, in the forty-one day period between Novem-

ber 5 and December 16, 1968, to make a "deal" under which he would release his electoral votes in exchange for concessions on national issues or for the right to designate persons for certain offices.¹¹ There was also speculation that Mr. Wallace's electors would attempt to make "deals" on their own.

If the election had gone to Congress for decision, a number of frightful possibilities would have emerged. The congressional balloting would not have commenced until January 6, 1969, two weeks before Inauguration Day. Success in the House of Representatives would have required the votes of twenty-six, or a majority, of the states. Under the rules of the House, the candidate winning a majority of the votes cast by a state delegation would receive that state's vote. A state would forfeit its vote if its delegation was tied. Since in the current Congress Democrats control twenty-six state delegations (five of these states having cast their electoral votes for Wallace), Republicans control nineteen, and five state delegations are evenly divided, and since a number of congressional candidates had pledged prior to November 5, 1968 to vote for the popular vote winner in their districts, both major candidates would have had considerable difficulty obtaining the required twenty-six votes by Inauguration Day.

If the House had failed to make a choice by January 20, 1969, the Vice President chosen by the Senate would have had to act as President until a President was chosen and qualified. He would likely have been hesitant to make decisions or take any real initiative during his interregnum. Moreover, the eventual choice by the House of Representatives could have resulted in the awkward situation of the country having a President of one party and a Vice President of another.

If, despite a large Democratic majority, the Senate had been unable or unwilling to choose a Vice President prior to a decision by the House, the Speaker of the House would have had to assume the powers and duties of President on Inauguration Day in accordance with the provisions of the Succession Law of 1947.

Fourth, popular election would abolish the useless and potentially dangerous office of presidential elector. The ability of pledged electors to vote against their party nominees in the electoral college, which was illustrated by the defection of Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of North Carolina in our most recent election and by similar defections in the elections of 1960 and 1956, makes a mockery of our election process, under which electors are chosen to reflect, not disregard, the will of the people.

OBJECTIONS TO DIRECT, POPULAR ELECTION

We have considered but fail to be persuaded by any of the objections made to direct, popular election of the President.

One objection that has been made is that it poses a serious threat to the two-party system. The objection is premised on the assumption, rarely supported by any documentation, that the electoral college system of electing the President substantially contributes to the two-party system. An extensive body of political research, brought to light by the American Bar Association Commission on Electoral College Reform, points to numerous reasons for the two-party system.¹² The electoral college is seldom mentioned as one of these reasons.

Among the institutional factors given are nature of the Presidency itself, as a single member office, our state party structure, and the selection of representatives by plurality vote from single member districts. None of these factors would be altered by a direct-vote system. On the contrary, we believe that direct election would operate to strengthen the two-party system. It would eliminate the inordinate leverage that third parties have

Footnotes at end of article.

under the present system, which was demonstrated most dramatically by the 1968 election, and it would provide incentive to the minority party in "one-party" states since every vote would count.

Another objection against direct, popular election is that it would destroy the federal system. We believe this objection was effectively answered by Senator Mike Mansfield in 1961, when he said:

"The Federal system is not strengthened through an antiquated device which has not worked as it was intended to work when it was included in the Constitution and which, if anything, has become a divisive force in the Federal system by pitting groups of States against groups of States. As I see the Federal system in contemporary practice, the House of Representatives is the key to the protection of district interests as district interests, just as the Senate is the key to the protection of State interests as State interests. These instrumentalities, and particularly the Senate, are the principal constitutional safeguards of the Federal system, but the Presidency has evolved out of necessity, into the principal political office, as the courts have become the principal legal bulwark beyond districts, beyond States, for safeguarding the interests of all the people in all the States. And since such is the case, in my opinion, the Presidency should be subject to the direct and equal control of all the people."¹³

It is also argued that direct, popular election of the President would involve endless vote counting disputes that could delay the outcome of the election for a long period of time. This argument ignores the fact that under the electoral college system, a few popular votes can shift large blocs of electoral votes and possibly change the outcome of the election. In a 1968 election, for example, a shift of approximately 55,000 popular votes in two states would have changed the outcome, while, if a direct election system were in effect, a shift of approximately 250,000 votes would have been required. In our view, the vote counting problems that might be encountered under a direct election system are no different in kind from those that potentially exist under any system of election, whether direct or indirect. These matters have been effectively dealt with in popular elections of other officials and, in our opinion, can be handled, by appropriate federal and state legislation, in a popular election of the President.

Another objection to direct election is that it would eliminate the one hold on power in the federal government that the urban population centers have. As we noted in our 1967 report:

"The dramatic demographic changes of the last several generations lead us to suspect that elimination of the electoral college system would not now produce any significant change in the type of candidate selected or in the way presidential campaigns are conducted. Whatever the system, we doubt that candidates and campaigns appealing primarily to rural or small-town voters any longer have any real prospect of success in a country in which an increasingly larger majority lives in large cities or suburbs of large cities."¹⁴

It should also be noted that in the post World War II period, presidential and vice presidential candidates have come from all regions of the country and from both large and small states. Many of the candidates have developed national reputations as a result of their service in the United States Senate.

Under a system of direct, popular election all votes would be important. Voters of similar disposition in various states would be able to pool their votes, where, under the present system, the "winner-take-all" laws make this impossible.

OTHER PROPOSALS

A number of other proposed constitutional amendments relating to the election of the President and Vice President are pending in Congress. These fall into three general categories. One is the district vote system, which would require electors to be chosen by the people from single-member districts within each state, with two electors running at large.¹⁵ The second, the proportional vote system, would divide the electoral vote of each state in accordance with the popular vote cast in the state.¹⁶ The third, commonly referred to as the automatic or unit vote proposal, would retain the "winner-take-all" feature of the present system, eliminate the office of presidential elector, change the manner of handling contingent elections, and make other housekeeping improvements in the system.¹⁷

In his February 20, 1969 message on electoral reform, President Nixon expressed his personal preference for direct election but said he felt it had little chance of passage.¹⁸ Accordingly, he recommended that Congress consider a plan that would (i) abolish the office of elector, (ii) allocate the electoral votes "in a manner that may more clearly approximate the popular vote than does the present system", (iii) make a 40% electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President, and (iv) provide for a popular vote runoff election between the top two candidates when no candidate has received at least 40% of the electoral vote in the regular election. Of the proposals pending in Congress, only the proportional and district vote plans would be able to meet the President's criteria.¹⁹

In our view, the district, proportional and automatic vote proposals fall far short of the type of overhaul that is required. A modern electoral system should be—indeed, must be—responsive to the will of the people. That is, it should assure that the candidate with the most popular votes will be elected, and that every voter has the same chance to influence the outcome of the election. As President Nixon himself noted during the presidential campaign: "I think that if the man who wins the popular vote is denied the Presidency, the man who gets the Presidency would have very great difficulty in governing."²⁰

The district, proportional and automatic vote proposals are deficient in a number of respects. They would leave open the hazard of the popular vote winner losing the election, and retain the inequities which necessarily attach to the formula by which electoral votes are apportioned among the states. While the district and proportional vote proposals would likely split a state's electoral votes and thereby eliminate the inequity in the present system favoring the larger states, they would continue the two bonus votes accorded each state and, consequently, retain the inequity favoring the smaller states.

In addition, the district vote system would continue the winner-take-all rule at the district level, would make it possible for the popular vote loser in a state to receive more electoral votes than the popular vote winner, and would encourage partisan interests to gerrymander electoral districts for political advantage. The proportional vote system, it appears, would increase the influence of "one-party" states and encourage splinter groups to disrupt the party structure by playing a greater role in presidential elections.

In the final analysis, therefore, direct, popular election is the only real alternative to the present system. We regard as unfortunate President Nixon's view that Congress should "concentrate its attention on formulating a system" other than direct election, since it could not win the requisite Congressional and state approval. There was a time when this practical objection to direct

election had merit. When that was the case, the proportional and district vote plans were thoroughly considered and then defeated.

We believe that the climate of opinion in the United States has changed substantially during recent years and that direct election is no longer an "impractical" proposal. Public opinion polls, the results of a poll of state legislators conducted by Senator Quentin Burdick,²¹ the support accorded the proposal by Senators and Representatives of both parties, from both small and large states, and by such organizations as the American Bar Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, AFL-CIO, and National Federation of Independent Business lead to the conclusion that direct election is capable of enactment. We are hopeful that President Nixon will yet give his active support to direct, popular election, since the last election has made it clear that this is the only reform that would be of a lasting nature.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, we support the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for direct, popular election of the President and Vice President.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York: Eastman Birkett, Chairman; Thomas L. Bryan, John F. Cannon, Harvey P. Dale, Nanette Dembitz, Ambrose Doskow, John D. Feerick, Robert L. Friedman, Robert J. Geniesse, Louis Henkin, Robert M. Kaufman, Kenneth J. Kwit, David Levitan, Jerome Lewine, Arthur Liman, Jerome Lipper, James H. Lundquist, Edward A. Miller, Gerald Oscar, Alan Palwick, Leonard B. Sand, Myra Schubert, Leon Tykulska, Irving Younger.

FOOTNOTES

¹ American Bar Association, *Electing the President* 3-4 (1967).

² 6 Reports of Committees of N.Y.C.B.A. Concerned with Federal Legislation 9 (1967) (herein referred to as the 1967 Report).

³ 22 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 385 (1967).

⁴ S.J. Res. 1 is substantially the same as H.J. Res. 179, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969), which was introduced by Representative Emanuel Celler. Accordingly our endorsement is equally applicable to H.J. Res. 179.

⁵ 1967 Report 14.

⁶ It fails to provide for a new popular election in the case of the death of both winning candidates, which we suggested in our 1967 report. S.J. Res. 1, as did S.J. Res. 2, simply leaves the matter to Congress.

⁷ John Quincy Adams, with fewer popular and electoral votes than Andrew Jackson, was chosen President by the House of Representatives in the election of 1824. In the election of 1876, Samuel J. Tilden lost the Presidency by one electoral vote, although he had over 250,000 popular votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes. In 1888, Benjamin Harrison defeated Grover Cleveland, who had 100,000 more popular votes.

⁸ In the 1968 election, for example, almost 590,000 more people voted in Connecticut than in South Carolina and yet each had 8 electoral votes. In Illinois over 550,000 more people voted than in Ohio although both states have 26 electoral votes. The ratio of electoral votes to voters was 1 for 27,658 in Alaska, 1 for 97,387 in Arizona, 1 for 124,683 in Kansas, and 1 for 181,289 in California.

⁹ Compare J. Thornton, "An Analysis of Electoral College Reform," *The Alabama Lawyer* (1968), with J. F. Banzhaf, III, "One Man, 3.312 Votes: A Mathematical Analysis of the Electoral College," 13 *Villanova Law Review* 303 (1968).

¹⁰ 1967 Report 13.

¹¹ See U.S. News & World Report, September 30, 1968, at 34, quoting an interview with Mr. Wallace.

¹² See V. Key, Jr., "Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups", 210 (5th ed., 1964); C. Rossiter, "Parties and Politics in America", 8 (1962); W. Goodman, "The Two Party System in the United States", 30-32 (1956); E. Schattschneider, "Party Government", 69-84 (1942); A. Sandler, "Political Parties in the United States", 50-56 (1966).

¹³ 107 Cong. Rec. 350 (1961).

¹⁴ 1967 Report 12-13.

¹⁵ Among the district vote plans are S.J. Res. 12, 25, H.J. Res. 104, 108, 313, 357, 430, 440, 478, 517, 530 and 575 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969). S.J. Res. 25 would abolish the office of elector.

¹⁶ The proportional vote plans include S.J. Res. 2, 4, 33, H.J. Res. 19, 34, 97, 192, 298, 299, and 345, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

¹⁷ Included among the automatic vote plans are H.J. Res. 1, 6, 181, 188, 189, 256, 346, and 362, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

¹⁸ 115 Cong. Rec. H1160 (1969).

¹⁹ It is interesting to note that had these plans been in effect in 1960, Nixon would have defeated Kennedy for the Presidency, with Kennedy having more popular votes. *Pierce, The People's President*, 358-59 (1968).

²⁰ Quoted in Cong. Q. No. 43, pt. 2, 2955 (Oct. 25, 1968).

²¹ Cong. Q. Weekly Rep., Dec. 16, 1966, at 3030.

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the tax reform bill of 1969 is, I believe, one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered by Congress in decades.

Tax legislation, however, is an extremely complex subject and very difficult to explain to laymen.

Last month, the Evening Star published an excellent series of articles on the House version of the tax reform bill.

I have found these articles, written by Sylvia Porter, an excellent aid in explaining the basic provisions of the House-passed version of the bill, and I am happy to insert them in the RECORD for the use of my colleagues at this point:

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969—I

(By Sylvia Porter)

The House-passed 1969 Tax Reform Bill would hit hundreds of thousands with higher taxes while offering future tax rate cuts to all individual taxpayers.

Dozens of reform provisions would bar or limit procedures now used by millions in the middle-upper brackets to shelter income from high tax rates. Many of these reforms would hit transactions which already have taken place this year.

The reform targets would range from such exotic techniques as tax-sheltered investments in cattle, oil, equipment leasing, etc.

In collaboration with The Research Institute of America, I'll explain the proposals, pinpoint their effective dates and, in some cases, suggest what you might do to minimize an adverse impact on you.

Most important, I'll alert you to the blockbusters in the bill, so you may follow these of personal importance as the proposals start to move next month through the next stages—the Senate Finance Committee, Senate, House-Senate Conference Committee—to final compromise form.

To hundreds of thousands—businessmen, professional men, entertainers, athletes,

etc.—the single most crucial change in the '69 bill wasn't even dreamed of when the House began the process of tax loophole closing. It's not even a "reform!"

It is the proposed new 50 percent tax ceiling on earned income—which would give all of you with high earned income a special break for taxable years beginning after '69. Your earned income would not be taxed at a higher than 50 percent rate, regardless of the amount of your earned income or other taxable income. Remaining taxable income would be taxed at regular rates up to the maximum.

Now contrast this reduced top 50 percent rate with the proposed ultimate higher top capital gains rate of 32½ percent and the ultimate top regular rate of 65 percent. These new rate relationships would produce an extraordinarily drastic reshuffling of tax planning in such key areas as compensation plans for executives, tax-sheltered investments (oil, cattle, real estate, equipment leasing, etc.), choice of operating in a corporate or unincorporated form, etc.

With the present spread between a 25 percent capital gains ceiling and a top 70 percent ordinary income rate, millions have good reason to seek compensation or fees in the form of capital gain; to tax shelter your income with investments that produce big deductions now; to try to operate as a corporation with a top bracket of 48 percent, etc.

But would you, an executive, try for capital gain compensation that may be deferred, "lumpy," etc., just to qualify for a 32½ percent top rate—if you had the choice of receiving immediate, ordinary cash compensation taxed at no more than 50 percent?

Would the high bracket businessman or professional, invest in cattle, oil, etc., to shield 50 percent income now—against a 32½ percent tax on a profit later, if the profit does in fact show up later?

The odds are that relatively few of you would.

In summary, this one provision would go far toward ending gimmickry in tax planning. For example:

1. Investing in tax shelters to offset high-bracket earnings would be hard hit;

2. Deferred compensation would have little advantage for high-bracket earners and many other fringe benefits would similarly lose value;

3. Converting earned income to capital gain would be less valuable and your method of doing business might be altered.

Since the 50 percent ceiling rate on earned income would take effect in 1970, immediate tax planning is called for.

To the extent that you—the businessman, professional, entertainer and the like in a high bracket—can effectively push forward your income from '69 to '70, you might save as much as \$200 in taxes on every \$1,000 so shifted.

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969—II

One of the most indefensible injustices in the income tax laws—the discrimination against the widow, the widower, other single taxpayers—would be wiped out or drastically reduced by the House-passed tax-reform bill.

If you would be eligible for this proposed tax break, follow this change through Congress.

If you are a widow or widower, you can get the benefits of income splitting tax rates—just as married couples do—if you have a dependent child living in your household. Under current law, this break is available only in the two years immediately succeeding the year your spouse dies.

Under the House bill, for years beginning after 1969, you would continue to receive the full benefits of income splitting and use the joint return rates as long as you maintain a home which serves as a household for a dependent child.

Favorable head of household rates are now available to unmarried taxpayers only if you have a child or someone who qualifies as a dependent living in your household or if you maintain a household for a dependent father or mother. The proposed law would add the following two groups of taxpayers to those eligible for this tax break in years beginning after 1969, assuming they are not married at the close of the taxable year:

1. All widows and widowers whose spouse died before the start of the taxable year—regardless of age—who cannot qualify for the surviving spouse tax break described above.

2. Any individual who is age 35 or over. You would not have to maintain a household for dependents to qualify; you would be "intermediate tax rate individuals."

Other major tax breaks are an increase in the standard deduction and a new "low income allowance."

You can, under present law, elect to take a standard deduction instead of itemizing your personal deductions. The maximum is \$1,000 for married persons filing a joint return.

Under the House reform bill, the standard deduction would be increased—and would be the larger of the "percentage standard deduction" or the "low income allowance." The percentage standard deduction would be raised this way for taxable years beginning after 1969:

Tax year beginning in —	Percent	Maximum amount
1970.....	13	\$1,400
1971.....	14	1,700
1972, etc.....	15	2,000

The minimum standard deduction would still be available in 1970, but it would be known as the basic allowance and it would be supplemented by an additional allowance—the two becoming the new low income allowance. This allowance—in addition to the \$600 for each of the taxpayer's exemptions—would eliminate entirely or substantially reduce the taxes of millions in low brackets.

For instance, a married couple with four children and income of \$4,650 now pays \$39 in tax on a joint return; they would pay nothing. Here is how the low income allowance would benefit taxpayers in 1970:

If number of exemptions is—	No tax if income is under—	Tax cut if income is under—
1.....	\$1,700	\$3,300
2.....	2,300	3,700
3.....	2,900	4,100
4.....	3,500	4,500
5.....	4,100	4,900
6.....	4,700	5,300
7.....	5,300	5,700
8.....	5,900	6,100

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969—III

If you have been investing over the years in search of capital gains to be taxed at comparatively favorable rates, be warned now—the tax reform bill as passed by the House would hit you hard.

Much of the tax savings individuals have obtained from capital gains would be cut, much of the tax benefit obtained from capital losses would be reduced, some of the capital gains breaks you have been able to use would be wiped out, the spread between the ultimate top tax on capital gains and the ultimate top tax on earned income would be narrowed to 17½ percent.

Preliminary soundings suggest that despite intensive lobbying by the securities industry and businessmen directly affected, the Senate will go along with the slap at capital gains benefits. Here are the major proposals:

1. Under today's law, only 50 percent of a long-term gain is subject to tax, and the

tax rate on this 50 percent cannot exceed 50 percent. The result is a 25 percent tax ceiling on the full gain, exclusive of surcharge.

For sales and dispositions made after July 25, 1969, this maximum alternative tax ceiling would be removed—a blow to anybody in the over 50 percent tax bracket.

The maximum tax on long-term capital gains would go to 35 percent under current rates, before surcharge, and even higher with a surcharge. When the proposed individual tax rate cuts take full effect and the surcharge ends, the maximum capital gains tax rate would become 32½ percent—against 25 percent today.

2. The alternative capital gains tax rate for corporations would be raised from today's 25 percent to 30 percent before surcharge. Corporations with taxable incomes of \$25,000 or less would still pay at the 22 percent rate. Corporations with over \$25,000 would be subject to the new 30 percent maximum. The effective date would be after July 31, 1969.

3. Under today's law, long-term capital gains can be realized on capital assets held for more than six months. This would be lengthened to a holding period of more than 12 months. The effective date would be years beginning after July 25, 1969.

4. Under today's law, an individual who has an excess of net long-term capital losses over net short-term capital gain, can deduct such losses dollar-for-dollar from ordinary income up to \$1,000 each year.

This would be changed to permit only 50 percent of net long-term capital losses over net short-term capital gains to be used to reduce ordinary income. The unused 50 percent could not be carried over; it would be lost. But you could continue to deduct short-term capital losses in full. The effective date: years beginning after July 25, 1969.

However, net long-term capital losses carried over from a year beginning before July 26, 1969 would not be subject to the new reduction by 50 percent for long-term capital losses applied against \$1,000 of ordinary income each year. You could continue to deduct these carried-over long-term losses, to the extent not offset against capital gain, dollar-for-dollar as at present up to \$1,000 of ordinary income each year.

5. Other blows: lump sum distributions from employee benefit plans would be taxed at least partly as ordinary income; sales of letters, memoranda, by persons who created them would result in ordinary income; livestock would have to be held longer to qualify for capital gain. This is real tax reform.

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969—IV

As far as the majority of middle-income taxpayers is concerned, tax relief, if any, in the 1969 tax reform bill is far in the future.

President Nixon has said that he is "disappointed" by the House action on his "revenue recommendations"; Treasury Secretary Kennedy has gone beyond this and has warned that the administration will oppose some of the House tax proposals when they are taken up in the Senate next month; there is mounting criticism that the House-voted tax cuts, totaling \$9.2 billion through 1972, would endanger essential federal spending.

The widely heralded tax relief is mighty "iffy" in addition to being well in the future.

For calendar 1969, there would be no rate cuts. The surcharge already has been extended at 10 percent to yearend, and the House bill would continue it at 5 percent to mid-1970. Actually, you probably would pay more in taxes in calendar 1969 than in 1968 because of the higher 10 percent surcharge rate throughout the year.

For calendar years beginning in 1970, high income individuals would get the benefit of the 50 per cent tax ceiling on earned income; many low income taxpayers would get the

benefit of the bigger standard deduction and the low income allowance; single persons 35 or over and all widows and widowers would get major tax rate breaks.

Not until calendar years beginning in 1971 and 1972 would all of us get tax rate cuts working out to about 5 per cent. The top rate would be cut from the current 70 per cent to 65 per cent for taxable years beginning after 1971.

Here is a table which suggests how you might be affected (surcharge not included).

If you are single, under 35 or married filing separately . . .

(In percent)			
Your taxable bracket is—	You pay 1969-70 rate	1971 rate	1972 rate
\$6,000 to \$8,000	25	24.0	23
\$12,000 to \$14,000	36	35.0	34
\$20,000 to \$22,000	48	46.0	44
\$32,000 to \$38,000	55	52.5	50
\$50,000 to \$60,000	62	60.0	58

If you are married filing jointly or surviving spouse . . .

(In percent)			
Your taxable bracket is—	You pay 1969-70 rate	1971 rate	1972 rate
\$6,000 to \$8,000	19	18.5	18
\$12,000 to \$16,000	25	24.0	23
\$20,000 to \$24,000	32	31.0	30
\$32,000 to \$36,000	42	41.0	40
\$44,000 to \$52,000	50	48.5	47

If you are head of household, single 35 or over, widows or widowers . . .

(In percent)			
Your taxable bracket is—	You pay 1969-70 rate	1971 rate	1972 rate
\$6,000 to \$8,000	22	21.5	21
\$12,000 to \$14,000	31	29.5	28
\$20,000 to \$24,000	40	38.5	37
\$32,000 to \$36,000	48	46.5	45
\$50,000 to \$52,000	56	54.5	53

Another area in which tax relief is promised starting for years after 1969 involves moving expenses. In essence, the House bill would liberalize the present definition of moving expenses to include these three new categories: pre-move house-hunting costs; temporary living expenses at new principal job location; cost of selling the old residence, buying a new residence or terminating a lease.

Still other changes would not only make tax reduction through income averaging available to many more taxpayers but would also greatly simplify your income averaging computations. The effective date would be taxable years beginning after 1969.

The proposed relief is not to be sneezed at—but it's hardly the immediate bonanza the headlines of recent days have suggested.

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969—V

Historians may argue for years whether the 1969 tax reform drive was set off by the disclosure that no federal income tax at all was paid on 155 tax returns with more than \$200,000 of income in 1967 or whether this outrage simply added to the wide resentment over the tax-cost of living squeeze. No matter—the fact is that the 1969 bill, as passed by the House, would end or drastically curtail many of the tax saving maneuvers that the wealthy avoiders of taxes have been using with such success.

Thus, the advantages of capital gains would be cut. The various benefits of paying executives deferred compensation or restricted stock would be limited or almost en-

tirely disappear. The various tax sheltered investments that produce current deductions for oil, cattle, real estate, equipment leasing would have only limited value compared to their present usefulness. Exempt interest from state and local bonds would no longer provide absolutely complete tax shelter.

Since each of the reforms would strike only a relatively limited group, here is only a brief summary of the provisions.

Deferred compensation over \$10,000 a year would be taxed at the rates in effect when earned, although the tax could be deferred until the compensation was paid.

A minimum tax would have to be paid despite the taxpayer's otherwise tax sheltered income. Exempt interest, farm losses and capital gains would be used in computing the "limit on tax preferences" (LTP) which would determine the tax.

Taxes, interest and other personal itemized deductions would become partly nondeductible in proportion to an individual's tax preferences.

Interest over \$25,000 attributable to investment indebtedness would be deductible only to the extent of investment income and capital gains.

Restricted stock and other property given to an executive or employee generally wouldn't produce any tax break.

Installment basis reporting would be limited where payments are not spread over the installment period and where the debt can be easily traded.

Charitable contributions would be substantially changed. Deductions for appreciated property would be limited; the maximum deduction would be raised to 50 percent, but unlimited deductions would be phased out; bargain sales to charity would lose part of their tax benefit, etc.

Farm losses used to convert ordinary income into capital gain would be hit; livestock would be subject to depreciation recapture and major benefits would be restricted.

The use of depreciation as a tax shelter would generally be restricted. Speedy depreciation of real estate would be limited to new buildings and only new housing could use the best breaks.

The tax advantages of private foundations would be cut and their activities would be strictly regulated. All would have to pay a 7½ percent tax on their investment income.

The oil and gas percentage depletion would be reduced from 27½ percent to 20 percent and the percentage depletion rates for other natural resources also would be cut for years beginning after July 22, 1969.

State and municipal bonds could be issued as taxable obligations with the federal government making up part of the extra cost.

The lobbies are now descending on Congress. Before reaching President Nixon's desk, the bill will be drastically re-written.

These five columns have been designed to help taxpayers participate in this developing debate.

THE HONORABLE BARRATT O'HARA

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the words said here today about the Honorable Barratt O'Hara pale into nothingness when compared with the deeds of the man himself. Barratt was a truly good friend and we all feel his loss greatly. What a life this great man had—decorated soldier, sportswriter, scrappy and successful criminal attorney, elected State official, explorer,

newspaper editor and author, movie producer, radio performer and, at an age when most men are thinking about retirement, Member of the House of Representatives. At 66 years of age Barratt came to this body and for 18 years he was one of its outstanding Members—as a legislator and as a man. He was a keen defender of the oppressed and many, many times lent his sharp mind and wit to causes of the underdog. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and a champion of the struggling new nations of that continent. He was a warm man, a friendly man; a man ever ready to help or, should the need be, to fight. I consider myself fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have known Barratt O'Hara for many years and to call him friend. In fact, one of my fondest possessions is an autographed copy of the book he wrote on prize fighting, "From Figg to Johnson." Barratt O'Hara is gone now and we probably will not see his like again, but we were indeed fortunate to know such a man at all. To his sons and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM P. FAY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened over the unexpected passing of the very able and gracious Irish Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable William Patrick Fay.

It was just a few weeks ago that I hosted a luncheon in his honor in the House Restaurant and it was a distinct privilege for me to become better acquainted with this outstanding diplomat. His warmth and dignity reflected great credit on the Irish Republic and he did much during his service in Washington to strengthen those bonds of friendship which exist between his country and our own.

With our mutual good friend, Dr. Ping Chen, we enthusiastically discussed Dr. Chen's successful "Ireland project," which enabled 19 American students from Eastern Illinois University and other universities to travel to Dublin for summer studies.

I particularly cherish the authoritative study on Dublin, Ireland's capital, by the Honorable Desmond Guinness, president of the Georgian Society, which the Ambassador sent to me as a souvenir of our meeting.

Ambassador Fay told me that he very much looked forward to visiting Hawaii, and I deeply regret that now I will not be able to extend the special aloha of our Island State to this illustrious representative of the Emerald Isle.

I treasure my brief but warm friendship with Ambassador Fay and feel a keen sense of loss over his death. Indeed, the entire world community has lost a valued citizen.

To Mrs. Fay and surviving members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

HIGH HOLIDAYS 5730

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, September 13 is a significant day for those of the Jewish faith for it marks the beginning of the Jewish religious New Year 5730.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the Congress and my constituents and friends of the Jewish faith in observing the advent of the Jewish high holidays beginning with Rosh Hashanah on September 13 and ending with Yom Kippur on September 27.

Rosh Hashanah is a most solemn day, distinguished by reflection, prayer, and penitence. It is a holy day on which Jews all over the world assemble in synagogues to ask God's forgiveness for man's sin and to pray for the unification of mankind. "Unite all of us in the bond of brotherhood" is the beginning of one of the beautiful, thousand-year-old prayers associated with this holy day.

On Rosh Hashanah, or New Year, the shofar, or ram's horn, is sounded. The blowing of the ram's horn on this day has a deep symbolism. It is considered so important that the day has been called "the day of the clarion call." Only a man of outstanding character is permitted to sound the shofar, and its shattering sound is meant to awaken man's conscience to renew his faith and to return to God.

September 27, the Day of Atonement, or Yom Kippur, is always observed solemnly. It is the climax of 10 days of penitence with which the Jewish New Year commences. This is the most sacred day of all—for on this day the Lord judges each individual. Jews fast all day, confess and repent, and ask forgiveness from the Lord and from their fellow man. In turn, they freely forgive their neighbors and look forward to a good new life.

The Jewish tradition of setting apart 1 day in every year to concentrate to their utmost ability on the spiritual advancement of man is without parallel in the history of humanity. And the fact that for thousands of years Jews all over the world have united in prayer and repentance on the very same day is immeasurable in its significance, particularly when one realizes the impediments that have been placed in the way of Jewish religious observances and the oppressive religious persecution to which the Jews have been subjected for centuries.

Denial of freedom to worship, wherever and whenever it occurs, is a crime against our common humanity and a violation of the noblest aspirations of the spirit of man. In recent years the Soviet Union has imposed severe restrictions on the religious freedom of the

Jews residing within the Soviet Union. Therefore, when the 91st Congress convened in January 1969, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion. By the passage of this resolution, we shall reaffirm to the Soviets and to all nations our belief that mankind the world over has the inherent and inalienable right to religious freedom.

During the celebration of the Jewish high holidays, we recall once again the suffering endured by the Jewish people, and mankind's conscience cries out against the betrayal of human rights which they have tragically experienced. In the coming year, I do hope that the Jewish people may have freedom from persecution and may enjoy peace and prosperity.

As the Congressman for the Seventh District of Illinois, where many of my friends and constituents of the Jewish faith reside, I take great pleasure, with the advent of the high holidays 5730, in extending my greetings and best wishes to them for the new year.

NATION NEEDS DRASTIC WELFARE OVERHAUL

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Times-Picayune recently published an excellent editorial commenting on President Nixon's recent proposal to overhaul the Nation's welfare system.

This is an extremely perceptive editorial, presenting some timely and incisive thoughts on this subject. I am therefore inserting it in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

NATION NEEDS DRASTIC WELFARE OVERHAUL

It is easy to agree with President Nixon that the welfare system is ripe for overhaul. Whose welfare the present structure benefits has always been obscure.

Not the abysmally poor, surely, whether individuals or family units. Not urban centers or states either, for they find their troubles compounded. And not the vast middle class which bears most of the growing costs of welfare without seeing any improvement.

While there will be ready agreement with the President over the necessity for drastic change, whether it be called junking or reformation, at the point of methodology the harmony of opinion departs.

In a nation so able in thinking out matters of science and technology, the lack of clear thinking on the plight of the poor and the turning of social liabilities into social assets has been appalling.

The welfare system has long been sterile, bankrupt in its outlook. The best it could hope for is successive welfare generations.

Instead of the required transfusion of fresh thinking and approaches, the easy out at all levels—federal, state and city—has been to substitute hypodermics of growing appropriations to keep a hopelessly unworkable system alive. And this is not to say the funding was ever adequate.

Mr. Nixon's plans for fixed basic incomes

for the poor, turning more federal revenues to states, and returning manpower programs to states and localities will not necessarily be recognizable in what is finally enacted by Congress.

Whatever does emerge, the price tag will be costly by the standard of past budgetary criteria. But in terms of today's wasted manpower potential, erosion of social values and a perpetuation of a feeling of frustration and hopelessness, what could approach the terrible cost of the present grossly malfunctioning welfare system?

THE FAA'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANOTHER AIR TRAGEDY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's fatal crash of a student-piloted small plane and a jet airliner with 82 persons near Indianapolis is another black mark on the Federal Aviation Administration's spotty record in the field of air safety.

The crash occurred under ideal flying conditions. It could have been averted. Had the small plane been under positive control of the FAA's control tower at Weir-Cook Municipal Airport, 83 persons would be alive today and a multi-million-dollar jet aircraft would not be reduced to random bits of scrap metal.

The FAA, either because of bureaucratic hardening of the arteries or just plain fear of incurring the displeasure of one segment of the aviation industry, has repeatedly turned away my demands that it use its regulatory powers to control the dangerous mix of small, slow, and often inadequately equipped general aviation planes and the larger faster commercial airliners. Tuesday's crash makes it imperative that the FAA take immediate action to:

First, institute positive control on aircraft using or flying over airports serving commercial airlines;

Second, ban all student pilots from such air space; and

Third, set plane capability and pilot proficiency standards so the inexperienced pilot and the inadequately equipped plane can be kept out of congested air corridors and airports.

The Air Line Pilots Association yesterday expressed its concern and its recommendations on this problem to the FAA, and I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of ALPA's letter to FAA Administrator Shaffer:

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1969.

JOHN H. SHAFFER,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: On March 9, 1967 a mid-air collision between a Douglas DC-9 and a Beach Baron Model 55 occurred 6.5 miles northwest of Urbana, Ohio and 26 people died.

On September 9, 1969 a mid-air collision occurred between an Allegheny DC-9 and a Cessna 140 near Indianapolis, Indiana and 83 people died. The Air Line Pilots Association participated in the National Transportation Safety Board's investigation into the cause of the Urbana, Ohio, accident and on

October 19, 1967, issued a report of its findings, a copy of which was forwarded to the then Administrator, William F. McKee, on that date. The report of the Air Line Pilots Association made the following two recommendations to prevent similar accidents:

"1. That air traffic in areas of poor radar coverage be curtailed or routed around it.

"2. That all aircraft operating in terminal areas be required to be in contact with the appropriate control facility before proceeding within thirty miles of the area."

No action was taken by the Administrator to invoke either of these recommendations. After two years the same situation exists and we have experienced another mid-air collision which has taken the lives of many more members of the traveling public.

If the Federal Aviation Administration had implemented either recommendation made by ALPA, the possibility of this latest mid-air collision would have been tremendously reduced and most probably the accident would not have happened. The FAA's bewildering cries of lack of finances to improve the safety of airline travel are not valid in this instance, since procedural changes are all that are required and as such would not cost one red cent.

The admittedly poor situation which permitted the Urbana, Ohio accident has not been improved and only good fortune has delayed a second mid-air disaster for 32 months.

Unless immediate action is taken by the Federal Aviation Administration to prevent the operation of aircraft in areas of poor, or non-existent, radar coverage and to prevent the intrusion of unknown aircraft into high density approach areas, mid-air collisions will most certainly continue to occur.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. McDONALD,
ALPA, Region III Accident Investigator.

THE RESERPINE DEFECTIVENESS STUDY EMPHASIZES IMPORTANCE OF FDA NATIONAL CENTER FOR DRUG ANALYSIS AT ST. LOUIS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration is now making public an important report on a national study it has conducted at the National Center for Drug Analysis in St. Louis on the quality and reliability of the output of 58 firms producing the important prescription drug Reserpine, which is used for lowering blood pressure, producing a calming effect, and slowing the pulse rate.

This study shows a rather dramatic improvement in the situation when compared to the results of a similar study made by the Food and Drug Administration in 1967. But the latest survey also shows that significant numbers of defective Reserpine tablets have been getting out into the market.

There is reassurance in the FDA position that the degree of defectiveness in potency in the samples which deviated from USP standards, is not regarded as a hazard to health. Nevertheless, and considering the fact that 87 percent of the formulators whose products were tested were able to meet specifications and comply with the USP standards for Reserpine, the patient dependent upon this drug—or upon any other drug pre-

scribed by a doctor to achieve an anticipated result based on the doctor's understanding of the drug's purity and strength—should be assured that the product he is being sold is, in 100 percent of cases, exactly what the doctor ordered.

In the case of Reserpine, as demonstrated by the findings in the St. Louis testing of all brands on the market at the time the samples were collected, this assurance has not been present.

The USP standard for Reserpine calls for potency ranging between 90 and 110 percent of declared active ingredient. In the 1967 survey, several samples were found to be superpotent, and were designated as moderate to serious hazards; the lots from which they came were subsequently called back from the market. No superpotent samples were discovered in the latest survey. But 35 of 956 samples tested, or 3.7 percent, were found defective, mostly for subpotency; these were found in 10 of the 154 "batches" included in the test, for a batch defectiveness rate of 6.5 percent.

Of the 58 firms whose products were found on sale at the time the samples were collected across the country, eight were found to have produced substandard tablets. These eight firms produced more than 13 percent of the Reserpine manufactured during the period covered by the survey. The technical details of the test methods, the names of the firms involved, and the batch-by-batch test results for each firm are included in the report.

DRUG TESTING TECHNIQUES AT ST. LOUIS

The Food and Drug Administration was encouraged by the fact that in the previous survey, in 1967, the defectiveness rate of the samples tested was 9.4 percent compared with the latest survey's 3.7 percent. Of course, this is a sharp improvement in only a little more than 1 year's time.

The existence of the St. Louis FDA National Center for Drug Analysis undoubtedly has contributed very importantly to this dramatic improvement in reliability of a drug which came under sharp public attack in 1967, and which was immediately made a subject for intensive reliability testing in the St. Louis facility.

Any drug whose reliability or uniformity is in serious doubt because of variations in production or lack of adequate care in distribution should be subjected to periodic quality testing by FDA. The St. Louis facility was established in 1966 to handle this assignment and has been doing an outstanding job, according to the testimony of FDA officials.

Following my remarks, I am submitting as exhibit A an article from the publication "FDA Papers" describing the function and activities of the center.

The St. Louis National Center for Drug Analysis was established originally in my city, Mr. Speaker, because many of the functions of the existing district office of FDA were being merged into the Kansas City regional office, making available in St. Louis necessary laboratory space, and highly skilled scientists and technicians who could do on a large scale what the FDA district offices around the country had each been trying to do on a very small scale, under adverse conditions.

**ST. LOUIS CENTER TO BE EXPANDED—BUT
FUTURE IS IN DOUBT**

The FDA office in St. Louis has always had a close relationship with the community, including our very effective St. Louis Consumer Federation. When the transfer of many of its functions to Kansas City was being considered, I did not object, or attempt to block the change because I was assured that this facility would be used in an even more important manner in protecting American consumers, by becoming a central drug reliability testing facility for the entire country.

Our outstanding universities in the St. Louis area were enthusiastic about the location of a drug testing center there, and scientists in our FDA office who wanted to stay in St. Louis rather than move to Kansas City, were qualified for and anxious to participate in the work of setting up and conducting a drug testing center.

The Reserpine study is just one of many such studies it is constantly making. It has, according to the testimony of the FDA Commissioner before the Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year, 46 highly skilled and trained pharmaceutical chemists and support staff, and is an outstanding installation.

H.R. 13111, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare passed by the House on July 31, contains funds for seven additional people to expand the work being done at St. Louis, at an additional annual cost of \$188,000.

Land has been set aside adjacent to the Veterans' Administration facilities in St. Louis to build a new National Center for Drug Analysis to put into operation on a much broader scale the experience gained in the St. Louis Center on a pilot or experimental basis.

However, there is now a battle within the executive department over the eventual location of the new facility. Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., Commissioner of Foods and Drugs, testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee that his agency believes the new and expanded facility should be constructed in St. Louis. But I understand that there is a drive within HEW's many and far-flung bureaucracies to have this facility constructed instead in North Carolina.

**TESTIMONY BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE**

Mr. Speaker, herewith are the comments made in the hearing of the Appropriations Subcommittee on this issue when Dr. Ley was questioned by Representatives NATCHER and HULL about the National Center for Drug Analysis:

[Excerpt from hearings on H.R. 13111 making Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare]

NATIONAL CENTER FOR DRUG ANALYSIS

Mr. NATCHER. Dr. Ley, what is the National Center for Drug Analysis? Where is it located? What is it doing? Why does it need seven more people and an additional \$188,000 for the fiscal year 1970?

Dr. LEY. I think that you should know about it. The National Center for Drug Analysis was created in St. Louis in the summer of 1966. The stimuli for its creation were several. The scientific stimulus was that drug analysis on a large-scale basis required an

instrumentation and a capability in terms of personnel and physical support that are not readily available in each one of district laboratories. So that it seemed very logical to develop an automated laboratory which could handle large-scale chemical analyses of drug products in the marketplace in this country.

The second reason St. Louis was chosen, was that in the district itself, the workload was changing in nature so we could hardly justify its continuation as a district. Quite frankly, there was a building and there was a staff of people trained in the analytical chemical area, so that we drew upon both the building and staff and converted from a district to a drug analysis laboratory on a pilot basis.

Mr. NATCHER. At that point, Dr. Ley, in a different appropriation don't you have some money for a new building?

Dr. LEY. We have money for a building. We are considering the location of NCDA either in St. Louis or another area.

Mr. NATCHER. You have been bragging on this building you were using. You don't mean to tell us that you want to throw this aside this quickly and build a new one?

Dr. LEY. Mr. Chairman, when one tries a pilot study of this sort, one is happy to do with whatever facilities one can get. That was the case in St. Louis. To construct a permanent NCDA facility, we plan to reprogram some \$3,900,000 from two construction projects, the St. Louis and New Orleans District offices, which we now consider of lesser priority. The estimated design and construction schedule cannot be determined at this time.

Mr. HULL. Would you yield at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. NATCHER. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. Dr. Ley, where would you like to locate the Center and why?

Dr. LEY. If it is at all possible, I would like to locate the National Center for Drug Analysis in the St. Louis area. The primary reason is because we are presently operating the facility with 46 highly skilled and trained pharmaceutical chemists and support staff. Relocation of the facility outside of the St. Louis area would probably result in significant losses of these personnel. In addition, we already have the land set aside in the St. Louis area for this facility adjacent to a Veterans' Administration installation. We expect to share with them to the greatest extent possible the utilities and maintenance costs. We believe also that by remaining in St. Louis we would lessen to a great extent the logistic problems which are attendant to moving a laboratory oriented function and reduce the loss of productivity which can result from a major geographic change.

Mr. NATCHER. What about the seven people? Are they necessary?

Dr. LEY. They are necessary, Mr. Chairman, in order to expand the analytical capabilities of the Center. Our projection of sample analyses in this facility beginning in 1968 started with 7,500 samples annually, and up to 1970 it is increased to 18,000 samples. Assuming the increase in staff requested and the instrumentation which is also involved, we propose by 1974 we will be doing 100,000 samples annually. There may be three, four, or 10 separate analyses per sample.

**ST. LOUIS COOPERATION MADE, AND MAKES, THE
DRUG TESTING CENTER OUTSTANDING**

Mr. Speaker, the same factors which led FDA to select St. Louis originally for the National Center for Drug Analysis are still present: we are centrally located so that drug samples from all over the country can be sent there quickly; we are one of the greatest transportation centers of the Nation; furthermore, the skilled scientists are there, and they have the outstanding universities in the St. Louis area available to them in continuing their advanced educations. These

same universities, I might add, are excellent resources to the FDA itself in providing expert assistance in developing and carrying out a scientific program or in researching a scientific problem.

I sincerely hope that FDA will be able to fulfill the promise it made to us in St. Louis several years ago, when our FDA district office was largely consolidated with Kansas City in order to make room at St. Louis for the National Center for Drug Analysis. The promise was that if the experiment worked, and if it demonstrated the value of a consolidated testing program to replace very limited testing in a local office around the country, the new facility would be constructed in St. Louis.

The fact that FDA has been submerged somewhat in a so-called super agency, the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, should not change promises solemnly made in good faith by both FDA and the St. Louis community. Career Government people in regional and district offices throughout the country are frequently moved around like sacks of cement in order to satisfy the whim of some official who wants locations changed without regard to the cost to or the convenience of those affected.

I trust that will not be permitted in this instance.

EXHIBIT A

[From "FDA Papers," May 1967]

**NATIONAL DRUG TESTING CENTER; A NEW
APPROACH TO DRUG CONTROL
(By Winton B. Rankin)**

The increasing incidence of recalls and other indicators have demonstrated the need for a new approach to control of drugs in the United States. The most important groups of drugs must be sampled and tested according to a plan that gives FDA a statistically reliable indication of the character of the drug supply of the Nation.

The need for revised control was shown dramatically in a survey of 20 therapeutically important groups of drugs conducted by FDA in the spring of 1966. More than 8 percent of the 4,700 lots covered in the survey were found to deviate significantly from their required potency. However, the nature of the survey does not make it possible to predict from these data the condition of the total drug supply.

Present calculations show that from 150,000 to 300,000 lots of drugs should be sampled and examined per year to keep abreast of the situation. Further, to determine that individual dosage units, of important drugs meet the required standards—as well as composite samples representing several units—it may be necessary to conduct as many as a million individual analyses per year. When this figure is compared with the 37,000 drug assays conducted in FDA's field laboratories in the year ending June 30, 1966, it is apparent that new methods of analytical control must be developed.

Most of the drug analyses in FDA's 18 field laboratories are performed on a unit production basis. One sample is tested at a time. Even where a few samples of the same drug are handled simultaneously, as is now possible with some products, a tremendous amount of laboratory time is devoted just to assembly and dismantling of equipment as the analyst moves from one type of examination to another. It would be unwise to deal with the anticipated increase in drug samples by increasing the number of analysts, the amount of equipment, and the square feet of laboratory space devoted to unit production methods if better methods of handling the workload can be devised.

Two improvements deserve early exploration:

(1) Increased use of assembly line or mass production techniques.

(2) Development and use of automated or semiautomated analytical procedures.

Both of these have been used to some extent in FDA laboratories. Mass production techniques have been employed with samples for pesticide, radioactivity, and certain vitamin examinations in the field laboratories. Semiautomated analyses are currently performed in making certain tests on antibiotics, tests for sugar in blood samples (during potency tests on insulin), and in some color additive analyses. There is good reason to believe that the time required for a majority of the present routine control tests can be reduced materially.

FDA is making a pilot study in its St. Louis laboratory, to determine whether the need to expand its drug testing capability several fold can best be met by establishing a National Drug Testing Center to handle most routine drug samples. Samples of anticoagulants and tranquilizers from the entire United States will be shipped to St. Louis for examination.

This pilot operation started on February 20, 1967, under the supervision of Dr. Daniel Barnes, Project Officer, formerly Deputy Director of the Bureau of Science.

The laboratory is being rearranged to permit better use of existing equipment such as ultraviolet and infrared spectrophotometers and gas-liquid chromatographs. Additional advanced equipment (such as a spectrophotofluorometer, semiautomatic micro balances, and modules assembled in trains to permit automated analyses of such drugs as corticosteroids and barbiturates) will be tried as it can be obtained. Extra technical and clerical help will be supplied to assist the professional analysts.

The Agency is seeking advice and assistance from others who have studied the automation of analytical work. In particular, through the Contact Section of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, it is seeking suggestions from those drug manufacturers who are using automated or semiautomated techniques in the production or control of finished drugs.

If the pilot study shows the expected improvements, additional groups of drugs will be directed to the St. Louis laboratory. Ultimately, the experiment could lead to the establishment of a National Drug Testing Center where large numbers of drugs can be examined at a fraction of today's cost, and where advanced research can be performed to improve procedures and equipment for drug analyses.

If the Center is established, the FDA field laboratories will retain their capability of examining drug samples. This is necessary to permit on-the-spot tests in emergency situations. Further, such laboratories probably will continue to make examinations that do not yet lend themselves to mass production techniques. These laboratories will also continue to handle products that are sampled in such small volume that use of the newer procedures offers no significant economies.

There were several reasons for selecting St. Louis as the site for the trial:

1. The city is centrally located and has good transportation facilities for delivery of shipments from various parts of the country.

2. The educational facilities in the area are excellent. FDA hopes to establish closer liaison with them to secure expert assistance in developing its program. The existence of these facilities will also make it easy for FDA employees to continue their training while on the job.

3. A high percentage of the professional personnel in the FDA laboratory there already have considerable training and expertise in drug work.

4. Certain administrative and district boundary changes which were desirable for other reasons at St. Louis make it possible to conduct the test there with minimum disruption of ongoing food and drug activities. (Food samples previously analyzed in St. Louis will be directed to other Districts.)

5. FDA is scheduled to get a new building to house the facility there. If a National Drug Testing Center is to be established, the building can be constructed to meet any special needs of the Center.

The St. Louis trial could have an impact beyond the drug area. It may be desirable to establish national testing centers for performing other types of control analyses which involve large numbers of samples.

This trial represents another step in FDA's continuing search for better methods of evaluating and stimulating improvement of the Nation's drug supply.

THE LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARD

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, lead poisoning continues to plague our city children relentlessly.

Just recently, the public has become aware of this disease, its nature, and its effects. It strikes those children who live in slum housing where old paint remains, peels, and falls easily within their reach.

The children become afflicted with lead poisoning but seldom is the disease reported until it has reached its critical stages, resulting in epilepsy, cerebral palsy, permanent mental retardation, and death.

In New York City alone, it has been estimated that between 25,000 and 30,000 children per year suffer from this silent epidemic.

I have introduced three bills, H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699 which are aimed at slowing down and, hopefully, stopping this dread disease. In July, 18 of my colleagues joined me in reintroducing these bills as H.R. 13256, H.R. 13254, and H.R. 13255.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared on September 5 in Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The article, "Lead Poisoning: A Preventable Childhood Disease of the Slums," was written by Mark W. Oberle. It stresses that we know the causes and cures for this disease, and we must do all that is in our power to eliminate it.

I urge my colleagues to read this article and to support the legislation which will combat and eradicate this silent epidemic. The article follows:

LEAD POISONING: A PREVENTABLE CHILDHOOD DISEASE OF THE SLUMS

(By Mark W. Oberle)

Lead poisoning was once an occupational disease commonly associated with painters, devotees of moonshine liquor, and an occasional curious child. But lead as a health hazard has come under increasing scrutiny. New York City once averaged 500 cases of lead poisoning a year; the City Health Department now estimates that a "silent epidemic" of lead contamination may be affecting as many as 25,000 slum children, who pick up the lead

from chipping leaded paint in old buildings. Lead poisoning has sparked local political skirmishes and suggestions for increasing federal regulations and aid.

The diagnosis of classical lead poisoning includes a high blood content of lead, plus convulsions, vomiting, anemia, and cramps—external symptoms that can be readily confused with those of other, less dangerous illnesses if a physician is not looking specifically for lead. In severe cases, the marrow and central nervous system can be damaged, and death or mental retardation can result. Since lead often accumulates slowly over a period of months, a child can carry a dangerously high level of lead without exhibiting any of the external symptoms. No one is quite certain how widespread lead poisoning is, but the number of U.S. children with abnormally high blood levels of lead may be as high as 225,000. Children accumulate the lead by eating nonfood objects, such as chips of leaded paint, even if they are not hungry—a phenomenon known as "pica" (a reference to the magpie and its indiscriminate eating habits).

Since the 1940's, leaded paint has been replaced by cheaper, titanium-dioxide-based paints, and many localities have banned the use of leaded paint for interior surfaces. But in some older cities where, in the poorer sections, many house walls have peeling coats of old leaded paint, several studies have indicated that some 5 to 10 percent of children between the ages of 1 and 6 have abnormally high blood levels of lead.

Once a lead-poisoning case is detected, the child is usually hospitalized for several days and treated with chelating agents—chemicals that bind the lead ion and remove it from body tissue. These chelating agents include BAL, an anti-nerve-gas drug, and EDTA, a chemical familiar in biochemical research. Before chelation therapy was developed, 66 percent of severe lead poisoning cases were fatal, said J. Julian Chisholm, associate professor of pediatrics at Johns Hopkins Medical School. With early detection and treatment, this figure has probably dropped to less than 5 percent, he added.

But of the survivors, brain damage still occurs in more than 25 percent of the children. After returning home from treatment, children often resume their paint-eating habits, and if they again come down with lead poisoning, the risk of permanent brain damage increases to "virtually 100 percent," Chisholm said.

"After treatment they become complete vegetables," said Hyman Merenstein, associate professor of pediatrics at the New York Downstate Medical Center. During his lifetime, a severely retarded individual can cost health agencies \$250,000 in special training and custodial care, Merenstein said. "The horror of it is that lead poisoning is a completely preventable disease. . . . When we used to have ten polio cases, the whole city rose up in arms, but when 30,000 kids are affected with lead poisoning, nobody notices."

The long-term solution to the problem is to remove the old leaded paint or to replace the houses. But paint removal is often expensive and, when done at all, often does not include removal from the ceiling or upper walls, social workers say.

In New York, several rent strikes have been organized after a lead-poisoning incident. "Since the City is not about to enforce the rules, the citizens have to take it upon themselves," said Wendel O. Richel, coordinator of a lead-detection project near New York. Such rent strikes can be particularly successful, Richel said, because "a landlord can always accuse the tenant of putting a hole in a wall, but he can't accuse him of putting lead in a building."

As a stop-gap measure, several communities have launched screening programs to detect lead early in young ghetto children. In Chicago, the City Board of Health has

screened over 100,000 children since 1966. Henrietta Sachs, director of the lead-poisoning clinic, said that the number of high lead levels detected had dropped by roughly a half during each year of the program, and that the cases detected were less severe than might ordinarily have been expected before the screening program. By contrast, the New York City Health Department tested blood samples from only 5,000 children last year, and these were referrals from city hospitals and clinics, and not children tested as a result of an extensive neighborhood screening program. Community health groups have complained that the city was moving too slowly in establishing a screening program, especially after the city postponed a decision on a biochemical supply company's offer of 50,000 free lead testing kits until late in August, when the optimum testing season was closing. Felicia Oliver-Smith, director of the city's lead-poisoning program, explained that the city had doubts about the test's reliability and also suffered from a lack of technical manpower to handle a mass screening program. Several community groups complained that the test was the best available, at least for the summer of 1969. "The bureaucratic wheels are so rusty that they can't even move with free oil!" said one laboratory worker.

On the federal level, 19 congressmen have submitted a series of three bills to provide federal aid for testing programs and assistance in eliminating peeling paint from ghetto dwellings. The bills have not been scheduled for committee action and have received little general support, but many community leaders feel confident that they could deal with the problem even within the present legal framework.

At a national conference on lead poisoning, sponsored by the Scientists' Committee for Public Information and other groups, René J. Dubos of Rockefeller University said that "the problem is so well defined, so neatly packaged with both causes and cures known, that if we don't eliminate this social crime, our society deserves all the disasters that have been forecast for it."

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME: PART V—POLLUTION: CAN OUR ENVIRONMENT BE SAVED?

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, almost every thoughtful citizen of this country realizes that we face great problems in preventing further deterioration of our environment, to say nothing of restoring it to conditions of an earlier generation.

That awareness is reflected daily in the growing number of complaints from individuals concerning situations in their own communities, complaints which, I am sure, every Member has received. The increasing literature on pollution, the changing attitudes of many organizations as they focus on the problem, including conservationists, scientific and professional organizations, and political groupings, also reflect this growing awareness.

Congress is not insensitive to this growing pressure, and has, in fact been at work through many of its committees, and through the enactment of much legislation, in efforts to reach solutions.

POISONING OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

It is probably unnecessary for me to cite detailed examples of how serious the situation has become. There is hardly a major urban area in which air pollution does not degrade the quality of living—and there are many, such as my own city of Los Angeles, in which it imperils life, property and normal workings of the community. Because this poisoning of the atmosphere increases slowly and insidiously over a long period of time—more than 25 years in the case of Los Angeles—corrective action has always been characterized as "too little and too late."

Pollution of our Nation's water supply has likewise crept up on us unaware. Major rivers and lakes are great sewers, water in them unfit for human consumption, or even human contact in most cases. This blight has spread to underground water sources in many areas, and increasingly we find the oceans themselves beginning to show the impact of man's disregard for his environment.

The land suffers its own kinds of damage. Waste products of civilization spread over it. Garbage, rubbish, old autos—every kind of junk—cover vast reaches, in every open space, beside every highway and byway. Forests and mountains have been laid waste to supply man's needs. Pesticides and other chemicals of every type have been spread, without regard to nature's balance, and in some cases poisoning the land for generations.

Our technological onrush has created newer forms of environmental pollution unknown to a simpler culture. Radioactive wastes are beginning to pose a potential threat, whether through accident or merely elapse of time. Underground nuclear explosions—for weapons tests, to experiment with their use in releasing gas and oil, and for excavation—leave great reserves of underground radioactivity. Nuclear powerplant wastes, whether buried in caves or sunk to the ocean bottom, cannot remain permanently contained. Waste heat from nuclear reactors, as well as from conventional powerplants, is measurably affecting the temperature of streams and estuaries, changing surrounding ecology.

Noise, long a modest inconvenience of an urban industrialized civilization, is becoming more dangerous and its effects threaten to spread from urban to rural environments as tests go on of the newest supersonic aircraft. Even conventional aircraft noise has already become unbearable in the vicinity of increasingly crowded urban airports.

Pollution of oceans and beaches by the release of huge quantities of oil apparently now has become a normal hazard today. Vast increases in the volume of offshore drilling, and the use of supertankers in ever larger numbers for transporting oil around the world, leave little hope that this form of pollution will abate.

While we may think that pollution mainly concerns cities, any exploration of rural areas or even wild and uninhabited portions of the country shows that proposition to be false. Overcrowding and pollution has become a characteristic of almost all the more desirable and accessible natural recreation areas of this country. Even less accessible lo-

cations, reached only by hiking, canoeing, or flying, frequently will be found contaminated by a careless civilization. Particularly apparent are the thousands of square miles of once beautiful country that have been devastated by logging for lumber and pulp or by strip mining and other destructive tactics.

THE ESSENTIAL DILEMMA

As environmental destruction and poisoning becomes more obvious, and more dangerous, more thought gets devoted to analysis of basic causes. And to a growing number of observers, it has become obvious that there is a simple relationship between the number of human beings on earth and their impact on the environment. The more people, the more pollution. The population explosion over the last 100 years, and more particularly over the last generation, has created unexpected and almost uncontrollable hazards for man's environment. Paradoxical as it may seem, the fact that there appears to be no end in sight to presently geometrically increasing population growth rates in the world may be the greatest threat to man's survival on earth. This threat is the "population bomb."

Accentuating this problem of population growth is the increasing trend toward urbanization by industrial and industrializing societies. In the cities we see the most massive fouling of the environment. Not only are air, water, and land reduced to the most hazardous levels of pollution that human life can tolerate, but this is generally coupled—particularly in city slums and ghettos—with overcrowding and with conditions of social and economic deprivation which constitute still another form of pollution. And there seems to be no slackening in this drive for human beings to live in and move to larger and larger cities.

Inability or failure to do an effective planning job to protect the environment has worsened pollution problems. Since this problem has never been experienced on the scale it has now reached, there is little precedent for the kinds of action necessary. Responsibility for the necessary far-reaching efforts are fragmented among many different kinds and levels of public organizations. Basic knowledge required for effective pollution control is frequently lacking.

THE "GOOD LIFE" SYNDROME

Of the many causes contributing to this crisis of our environment now confronting us the one that may be the most difficult to correct is bound up in our own concepts of "the good life." We cause pollution and despoilment of the environment through our deification of continually increasing production and consumption of material goods. Almost from birth each of us is inculcated with the goal of consuming more, and the economy of which we are so proud is geared to meeting that goal. The country's great corporations have developed to a fine art the techniques of creating markets for the consumption of increased quantities of unnecessary—sometimes even harmful—commodities. Some examples may help to make this point clearer.

As a nation we consume more food and drink per capita than any other nation.

We insist further that it be antiseptically produced, expensively processed, and artistically packaged in a multitude of ways. All this creates waste and pollution. From the farmers, whose budget must now include large sums of money for new chemicals to increase production and eliminate pests, through the processors, packers, canners, and distributors, whose budget also must now include added frills to stimulate consumption, to the doctors, dentists, and psychiatrists whose practice is now devoted to correcting the problems of overeating and overdrinking, our mania for consumption creates waste and pollution and despoils the environment. Each person in this country now discards as solid waste—in garbage, and the paper, glass, metal, plastic, and what-have-you which contained the original product—close to 1 ton per year. Practically all this refuse returns to pollute the environment in one way or another.

THE AUTOMOBILE SOCIETY

An even more astonishing and destructive feat of consumption results from our worship of the automobile. There are approximately 80 million passenger cars in use in this country today. I would make a rough guess that each car consumes about 2½ tons per year of hydrocarbons—mostly gasoline—or the equivalent of 1 ton per person for each man, woman, and child in the United States. The waste products of this consumption are emitted into the air, and the total annual amount of our pollutants in this country amounts, coincidentally, to about 1 ton per person—200 million tons—the largest percentage coming from automobiles. To this pollution of the atmosphere by the automobile must be added the perennial several million tons of junk automobiles which are generally stacked, artistically, alongside main thoroughfares.

WASTE OF ALL SORTS

In terms of sheer volume of consumption and waste, few people realize the amazing amount of water consumed by our style of living. We have tended to assume that water was available in unlimited quantities, and have increased domestic consumption continually to the point where it now amounts to close to 1 ton per day for each person in the country. Industrial and agricultural uses consume additional massive amounts. This water, heavily laced with organic materials, chemical poisons, and miscellaneous byproducts, is, of course, all wasted to the underground water table, streams, lakes, or the oceans, and causes pollution—in fact, destruction—of most of our surface water supply.

The drive toward continually increased consumption, fueled by the need for constant increases in the size and profitability of our industrial economy, causes us to welcome the easily destroyed toys, the short-lived household item, the throwaway container, the annually restyled automobile, appliance, or clothing, and the host of other gadgets we excel in producing. As we chase ourselves around the upward spiral of increasing consumption, we devour the resources of the earth and return them to the land, air, and waters as waste. The

only result of this process will be to condemn our descendants to living in a true wasteland.

An inventory of causes of pollution and environmental destruction would not be complete without mention of another cultural trait inherited from our early days as pioneers on a new continent; that is our propensity to view nature as something to be conquered and subdued. It was, and is, almost an article of faith with many of our most dynamic entrepreneurs that God placed the bounty of nature here for us to take. As we considered God's power to be unlimited, so did we consider nature's resources equally unlimited. All that was required was skill and hard work to wrest bounties from nature. It was hard for those pioneers, and their modern descendants, to conceive the earth as a closed and limited system, one whose resources must be conserved and reused for the continued existence of man. And harder still to conceive of themselves as a part of nature, a link in a delicate chain which, if destroyed, destroys man with it.

I have made this brief examination of the nature and causes of environmental pollution problem primarily as a prelude to outlining some possible solutions. This suggested framework will necessarily be brief, for to remedy all the problems emanating from man's impact on his environment would require nothing less than a complete cultural revolution, and that moves way beyond the scope of my effort today.

POPULATION CONTROL

First—and absolutely vital—is a national policy of limiting the rate of growth of our own population, and contributing our maximum effort to limiting the population growth rate of the remainder of the world. I have stressed this in connection with my introduction earlier this session of legislation (H.R. 9107, H.R. 9108 and H.R. 9109) embodying the recommendations of the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning, contained in that committee's report of November 1968. Every concerned citizen must now realize that exploding world population not only threatens the environment, but also threatens our ability to solve most of mankind's problems—including the problem of human survival itself.

URBAN LIFE AND URBAN CONTROL

As the mayor of every leading city will testify, conditions of urban life in this country must be drastically changed. This can be achieved only if we begin to devote our highest priority to resolving urban problems, not only in allocation of tax dollars, but in the distribution of trained manpower, technological innovation, and imagination. If the human condition will be based upon a pattern of urban living, as seems to be the unavoidable situation at least for the near future, urban living must be designed to protect human values.

Two aspects of organizing urban living systems must be examined and must be improved as a top priority. First, the structure of urban administrative power—capacity to make decisions and deliver services—must be rationalized.

That is, problems of the total urban region must be susceptible to prompt and adequate analysis, to decision, and to action by appropriate locally controlled central authority with adequate resources and an adequate legal basis.

In a sense, in our cities we have reached the situation which confronted the Founding Fathers after the initial 10 years under the Articles of Confederation. Those articles were inadequate to control affairs of the States and their largely rural scattered population of 4 or 5 million citizens.

Therefore, the Constitutional Convention was assembled to create a new structure adequate to needs of all the people.

Such is the situation today with our urban areas. Power to act is fragmented into hundreds of different, and semi-autonomous jurisdictions in each urban area, and even in these separate jurisdictions, executive power frequently gets hamstrung.

A new urban-directed legal structure must be created, just as in 1787 a new Constitution was written for the United States. This design need not be that of a highly authoritarian urban dictatorship. It may well be any of several other structural forms, just as the Constitution evolved a new type of Federal basis to meet our national needs. But there must be provision for central analysis of problems, for future planning for establishment of guidelines for urban development—particularly of land—and for executive power authorized to act quickly and effectively on all major problems.

Second, centralized and effective executive power must be complemented by a new concern for effective citizen participation in establishing policy for the urban area as well as for the total environment. In my opinion this will require establishment of a new community-based unit of political participation—one I have outlined in an earlier discussion here on the House floor—through which citizens may help form policy and oversee its implementation. Such a political unit would not administer or deliver services, but would provide the vital element of citizen feedback and control to the administrative structure. Only through such a mechanism will we be able to stem the tide of alienation and fear of "city-hall" so characteristic of a large part of urban populations.

Having made these two structural changes in urban organization, we are then in a position to look at some other urban problems affecting quality of life and impact of the city on its environment. In approaching these other problems, I think it is now necessary that we consider the city as an integral system. The various aspects of that system must be related into much more of an organic whole.

A deliberate effort must be made to design and build neighborhoods and communities which bring together opportunities for work, shopping, education, recreation, cultural, and other activities in ways which minimize travel and other wasteful time for individuals. Economical and convenient mass transportation facilities must be provided to minimize use of personal vehicles. Waste disposal

systems must be designed on a total urban basis. Technology must be developed to maximize reuse or recycling of waste materials, particularly metals, glass, paper, and water.

Much more emphasis must be placed on characteristics of material commodities such as quality, permanence, and simplicity rather than ephemeral styling, complexity, and short life. As a people, we must learn to live a kind of life which does not require exploitation and destruction of all the earth's resources—either living or inanimate—but which requires instead living in both balance and harmony.

While much of what is immediately required to reduce the adverse impact of the city on its environment requires large capital investments—in water treatment plants, for example, to restore water quality—in the long run, a properly structured city can operate more economically and efficiently than our existing urban chaos in both Government costs and in costs to private citizens for their normal activities.

This will particularly be true if in the process of creating a nonpolluting city we also achieve a city without large blocs of alienated, impoverished, uneducated, and unhealthy citizens. We may then aspire to an urban life containing the ingredients for enlarging the human spirit rather than degrading it—as is now so often the case.

NEW CITIES

While I am commenting on metropolitan reform, it is appropriate to mention the pressing need to apply similar efforts and planning to improve smaller cities, and to create experimental new cities. The benefits, if any, which accrue from metropolitan living, do not continue to increase as urban size grows. I deem it important to encourage excellence in cities of all sizes and in rural areas, as well as acting to avoid continued urban-directed immigration, if we are to provide the cultural diversity vital to a healthy society.

Development of new towns, incorporating innovative social and technological advances is quite feasible and has been demonstrated by prototypes created by private enterprise. The latest of such planned new towns was announced September 9, an \$800 million development for 20,000 people near Anchorage, Alaska. As described in news reports, the city will be totally climate controlled on a year-round basis. It will be reached by an aerial tramway running over the ocean and hence be free from automobiles and trucks.

Under these circumstances, the outlook is for a largely nonpolluting city. I suggest encouragement and financial assistance for large numbers of such experimental cities should be given by the Federal Government.

GOVERNMENT ACTION

A great part of the damage to our air, land, and water today arise from the pollution-causing actions of individuals and enterprises. These actions are in accord with past patterns ignorant of environmental limits of absorbing pollution without damage to man himself. But to-

day, those individuals and enterprises must take a new responsibility; they can no longer follow the old patterns, the conventional wisdom. They must be willing to pay the required costs of alleviating the impact of their individual activities on environmental quality for the welfare of all.

EDUCATION

Admittedly, vast areas of ignorance exist about the nature and permissible limits of pollution of the environment. This ignorance must be ended. In many areas of science today, dedicated professionals are working to achieve this goal. In some cases professional associations of scientists are furthering and supporting such research as a contribution to total human welfare.

It is the ultimate responsibility of all the people acting through their Government to insure that action is taken to maintain a healthy and satisfying environment. This responsibility must include defining the problem, establishing standards, and apportioning the costs on an equitable basis. Undoubtedly, in dividing the costs of correcting environmental pollution, a fair share must be first given to those whose actions cause the pollution. Those individuals and business enterprises which have traditionally dumped their wastes free of charge must now accept the burden of preventing and eliminating this pollution. This requirement in itself may have a healthy effect in changing the overall sense of values about certain kinds of economic activities and products.

Our immediate peril is that already we may be "too little and too late" as seems to be the case in Los Angeles with its smog problem. I hope through my efforts to focus attention on these issues—now, by legislation and in other ways—to avoid that peril. And in the process, it may help create the more humane environment which we all desire and need.

THE OMNIBUS ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Today, I am introducing legislation establishing what I consider the strongest program yet set before the Congress to determine national concern and national machinery to maintain environmental quality. I term my bill the "Omnibus Environmental Quality Act of 1969" because it brings together series of policies and tools—all of which I feel are necessities in this crucial area.

The bill contains the Declaration of National Environmental Policy already passed by the Senate; this policy objective is both comprehensive and powerful. In its key statement it recognizes that each person "has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to preservation and enhancement of the environment."

The ultimate fate of Government control of environmental quality largely will be determined by the mechanism set up to do the job. At present, there is a proliferation of authority to act in a number of different Federal agencies. The Agriculture Department deals with pesticides, for instance, while the Interior Department deals with lakes and streams and the Coast Guard deals with coastal pollution. The Secretary of Health, Edu-

cation, and Welfare administers the air pollution laws.

Such diffusion of Government management of the environment has been one reason that serious problems have gone almost unnoticed until they are so large that they can no longer be avoided. Better coordination and regulatory power is imperative if Government can successfully act to contain the ever-mounting attacks on the environment. For that reason, my bill proposes a permanent National Commission for Environmental Protection, a regulatory agency for environmental affairs similar to already existing agencies which deal with other functional areas.

The five man commission would have the continuing responsibility:

To review proposed projects, facilities, programs, policies and activities of the Federal Government which may adversely affect environmental quality;

To review and appraise existing projects, facilities programs, policies and activities of the Federal Government which affect environmental quality and make recommendations with respect thereto to the President and the Congress;

To set priorities with respect to problems involving environmental quality;

To advise the President on matters involving environmental quality and to make recommendations to him with respect thereto;

To collect, analyze, bring together, collate, digest, interpret and disseminate data and information, in such form as it deems appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

To conduct studies and research, by contract or otherwise, into problems and other matters involving or relating to environmental quality;

To develop criteria and promulgate standards defining desirable levels of environmental quality;

To consult with and advise other representatives of governments, and to utilize, with their consent, the services of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State or political subdivision thereof, accept and utilize the services of the agencies of such State or subdivision;

To assist the President by clearing and coordinating departmental policies and activities affecting environmental quality;

To assist in the consideration and, where necessary, in the preparation of proposed Executive orders and proclamations affecting environmental quality;

To keep the President informed of the progress of activities by agencies of the Federal Government with respect to work proposed, work actually initiated and work completed by any such agencies which affect environmental quality;

To assist the President in efforts to achieve environmental quality in the community of nations; and

Where appropriate, to participate in behalf of the public interest as an intervenor in proceedings before State and Federal courts and administrative agencies.

The situation in Congress regarding

the environment is greatly similar to that within the Executive agencies; it is horribly fragmented and uncoordinated. Short of comprehensive congressional reform and reshuffling of functional activities, I do not foresee major changes coming at the committee level. However, I do feel that we can better coordinate and plan congressional policies regarding the environment, and for that reason, I propose establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Environmental Quality. The Joint Committee would: conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of appropriate matters contained in any environmental quality report transmitted to the Congress and recommend any such studies and investigations to the appropriate standing committees of the Congress; and make an annual report to the Congress and the appropriate committees of Congress on or before March 1 of each year on environmental quality.

Government activities must be synchronized with activities ongoing in the private sector if we are to achieve a complete national program for environmental control. Certainly, I feel that the indignation and anger I have seen coming from my constituents over the past months indicates that a large amount of alienation already exists over these issues. As with many other topics of both national and local concern, individual citizens feel they are left out when it comes to making decisions and acting on problems of the environment.

Therefore, my bill also contains a Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. This committee would be composed of 15 members selected from Government and private sector, and hopefully would include representation from concerned citizen's groups.

The committee would report at least once each year to the President and to the Environmental Quality Commission on the state and condition of the environment; provide advice, assistance, and staff support to the President on the formulation of national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality; and obtain information using existing sources, to the greatest extent practicable, concerning the quality of the environment and make such information available to the public.

I believe this omnibus environmental quality bill would provide the direct and broadbased effort which is essential if we are to maintain and improve the world around us. I hope all my colleagues take a serious look at this approach and I hope to receive their support for it.

Yet, this bill is at best a framework, and it does not deal specifically with current problems. In the coming weeks, I hope to introduce a series of bills which have critical relevance to present environmental problems. Included in these bills will be new and vital measures affecting air pollution and water quality.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the Record a number of news stories which relate to this statement and to the overall problem of environmental quality.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 10, 1969]

POLLUTION CALLED PERIL TO ALL LIFE (By Victor Cohn)

NEW YORK, September 9.—Man's pollution has now become a danger to all life on earth. Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, President Nixon's science advisor, told the American Chemical Society here today.

"I assure you the present administration is committed" to combat this, he pledged in his first major public report as executive secretary of the new federal Environmental Quality Council which the President himself heads.

He then disclosed three areas in which the administration would soon move:

It will be "looking very hard," he promised, at establishing a federal agency to pre-study the effects of such everyday chemicals as the housewife's new enzyme presoaks and detergents. (Among other agents that should be screened by such an agency "before they are released"—according to a plea from a concerned biologist speaking at the same meeting—are "gasoline additives, all pesticides, fertilizers, fumes from chemical and power plants and heat and radioactivity from nuclear plants.")

"The government will move hard against auto pollution," DuBridge predicted. Federal law now calls for a nationwide standard, starting in 1970, stipulating that new cars may not emit more than 180 parts per million of unburned hydrocarbons. Following California's lead, DuBridge forecast, this should soon be reduced to 120 parts (compared with 900 parts emitted by cars built before 1966.) Also, he said, lead must be eliminated from gasoline and all exhaust emissions must be even more radically reduced—"or else quite new forms of engines will have to be developed."

The administration, he said, hopes to "stimulate" both local communities and whole regions to join in building better sewage treatment plants and requiring more thorough treatment of industrial wastes. The council will also study possible federal criteria.

DuBridge spoke on the most radical thought of the day—the idea of screening common chemicals before release—in response to Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Nature Systems at Washington University, St. Louis.

Commoner's very place on the program testified to the new concern in conservative institutions of society with pollution. A kind of male counterpart of the late Rachel Carson, he has been organizing "concerned scientists" for years to speak up against despoiling the globe.

"Five years ago I'd never have been on this platform, or on the same platform with President's science adviser," he observed.

Today he said:

"We all live in one system—a global ecosystem consisting of cycles within cycles that tie together plants, animals and micro-organisms—and we change it at our peril. We have to change it, but we ought to weigh costs against benefits."

"Unless we begin to consider the effects on this ecosystem of new substances I am convinced we will risk our survival."

"We have reached the point where we should not release any new substances without understanding the ecological consequences." And some single federal agency, he said, should be responsible for advance studies.

DuBridge replied in agreement: "Unfortunately we now have no agency in government responsible for making such anticipatory studies. I hope such an agency comes into being."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1969]

POLLUTION THREATENS TO DEPRIVE WORLD OF VENICE'S TREASURES (By Marquis Childs)

VENICE.—This fabulous city in peril of its very existence stands as a symbol of the plight of the western world. Pollution of air and water and the rapid encroachment of a massive industrial complex threaten to erase in a short span of years the city of canals that has been the magnet for travelers and lovers of beauty for centuries.

Ordinary cities may be resigned to the blight of smog and pollution. But Venice is a treasure house of art and architecture. Those treasures are rapidly deteriorating.

The great paintings—the Titians, the Tintoretto's, the Veroneses—and the monuments are like defenseless invalids. Still aglow with the splendid past, they cannot save themselves. Not a single museum or church is air-conditioned to keep out the dampness and the smog with its high sulphur and carbon monoxide content.

The question is being seriously asked today: Can Venice be saved? The lagoon is dying, a victim of chemical wastes from the industrial center of Marghera, with its huge refineries hardly 10 minutes away as the crow flies, and the human wastes of the adjoining city of Mestre, with its dreary sub-standard housing.

To save the city will mean an effort costing hundreds of millions of dollars. Industrial practices in Marghera will have to be drastically altered to reduce the poisons loosed in the air and the water. Central to the salvation of this unique historical treasure house is the control of the tides as they flood in from the sea, lapping higher and higher each year with the disaster of the ultimate flood ever nearer.

When the Republic of Venice held sway over much of the East in the 16th and 17th Centuries, the Venetians understood how vital it was to preserve the life of the lagoon. The threat of extinction then came from silt pouring in from three rivers—the Piave, the Brenta and the Sile. The lagoon was gradually filling up.

The *magistra ti alle acque*, the magistrate of all the waters, wielding overwhelming power, took a heroic decision. The course of the rivers was to be deflected so they would run into the open sea. Impossible, said the cautious citizenry. That was understandable, since it involved a project not inferior to the excavation of the Panama Canal. With the relentless drive over many years, the project was carried through and the lagoon and Venice were saved.

Saving the lagoon today will mean a project not unlike that in scope. As the industrial complex of Marghera has expanded during the past 40 years, the delicate balance between land and water has been progressively undermined. The demands of industry drain off the subsoil water. Land is reclaimed along the lagoon, narrowing its course. One of the spectacles is the procession of big tankers and freighters past the ancient city, with the hazard of a single accident that could be totally destructive.

Prescriptions come from a variety of committees, both public and private. Yet even with the government in Rome is concerned—after all tourism is Italy's principal hard-currency earner—so little seems to happen. The Venice Rotary Club invited three Dutch specialists in control of the sea, knowledgeable since a considerable part of Holland is below sea level, to conduct a study. While they declined to make definitive recommendations, they urged that all work on the lagoon of whatever kind be stopped immediately until a thorough plan could be agreed on. They recognized how imminent was the peril.

As the canals grow dank and filthier, a reflection of the fundamental problem of the

waters, Venetians move out to Mestre. The city declined in population between 1951 and 1968 from 192,000 to 130,000. There are 3,000 abandoned houses and many of the noble palaces are reduced to slum dwellings. Moving to Mestre, the Venetian has his little car and becomes part of the consumer economy.

The tourists flooding through St. Mary's Square in the last week of summer are as carefree as ever. In that marvelous free space surrounded by so much beauty and without the menace of the motorcar, they saunter with happy abandon. The facade of the cathedral gleaming in the afternoon sun is like foam frozen in multicolored forms. And the bronze horses, looted from Constantinople as they had been looted from Rome, look down in serene disdain.

The young are everywhere. Many of them are hitchhikers with packs on their backs, speaking every language. The band at Florian's plays the same gay, schmaltzy music that for a hundred years or more has carried out over the square. The headlines in this curious summer of pause and uncertainty carry the threat of a new cycle of wars. The water laps over the quays, suggesting what is to come in the high-tide season of late fall. But the crowds are bent on the pleasure of this brief moment.

Venice can be saved. An impressive series of articles in *Corriere della Sera* has alerted the country to the peril. Determined spirits such as Countess Anna Maria Cigona are leading the fight. Venice can be saved if the will is there. With Venice as a symbol, that is the question posed for the West in a far larger context in the struggle between the technological present and the historical past.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1969]

\$800-MILLION ALASKA CITY IS PLANNED

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, September 9.—An Oklahoma company announced plans today for an ultra-modern, self-contained \$800 million community across Knik Arm from the city of Anchorage.

Tandy Industries of Tulsa, billing its venture "Seward's Success," said it would be the world's first totally climate-controlled city. The year-round temperature will be 68 degrees throughout the complex.

Top officials of the firm said at a news conference today construction of the first section, costing an estimated \$170 million, will begin next June. Completion is scheduled in two years.

The first section, with housing for 5,000 persons, will include a 20-story central building called the Alaskan Petroleum Center, plus a commercial mall.

The long-range plan calls for expenditure of \$800 million over a 10-year period, with living accommodations for 20,000 persons.

Although officials would give no specifics, it was apparent the developer has at least partial commitments from many of the increasing number of oil companies operating in Alaska.

Announcement of the huge project came the day before the sale of leases on 450,858 acres of Alaska's North Slope.

Transportation from Anchorage to the revolutionary city will be by high-speed aerial tramway across Knik Arm, an offshoot of Cook Inlet waters. There will be no automobiles or trucks in "Seward's Success," at least for the initial phases.

GRIM REMINDER: CASUALTIES GOING UP

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we have all been encouraged by the recent lull in

combat activity in Vietnam, and we all are certainly 100 percent behind our Commander in Chief in his efforts to bring about an honorable peace in Southeast Asia and to reduce the number of U.S. combat casualties.

At the same time, we cannot allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security, a feeling that peace is "just around the corner." We must recognize that there still may be much very difficult fighting ahead, and we must be careful not to judge the whole war by the trends evident from only the past few weeks.

Putting matters in longer range perspective is an article from the August 2 issue of the Armed Forces Journal which points out, among other things, that, first, the U.S. casualty rate over the past 6 months has, probably contrary to popular opinion, gone up instead of down, when compared to the preceding 6 months; second, there has been considerable progress made toward the goal of having the South Vietnamese forces take over more of the combat burden; third, largely as a result of this, the South Vietnamese forces have been suffering much greater casualties themselves; and, fourth, the often controversial "kill ratio"—used by some as a yardstick to measure the progress of the war—has declined sharply as a result of all these other factors.

The Armed Forces Journal article, written by Mrs. Pamela Canova and Journal Managing Editor James D. Hessman, is, I believe, of considerable importance, and I insert the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE CASUALTY REPORTS: SOME STARTLING STATISTICS

(By Pamela Canova and James D. Hessman)

Despite the very recent lull in combat activity—and the cautiously optimistic recognition of same by top Defense Department and White House officials—the harsh fact is that U.S. military forces in Vietnam have suffered approximately 30% more combat deaths in the first six months of the Nixon Administration than in the last six months of the Johnson Administration.

And this in spite of the fact that there are no longer any U.S. casualties in or over North Vietnam; that the U.S. Forces in Vietnam—unlike those in the earlier days of the conflict—are seasoned, experienced combat veterans; that the U.S. now has a firm in-country operational base from which to operate, and has virtually solved many of the nagging equipment problems of earlier years; and that enemy forces have been decimated in quality and in quantity—the official count of "enemy dead" as 19 July 1969 (the latest statistics available prior to Journal press time) was 531,122.

And this also in spite of the fact that the Nixon Administration has been waging—and largely winning—an aggressive campaign to have the South Vietnamese Armed Forces take over more of the combat burden.

A Journal analysis of various official source documents on Vietnam battle casualties reveals that:

From 20 July 1968 through 18 January 1969—the last six months of the Johnson Administration—the United States suffered 4,894 combat deaths, or an average of 188.2 per week. During the period 19 January 1969 through 19 July 1969—the first six months of the Nixon Administration—the U.S. suffered 6,358 battle deaths, or an average of 244.5 per week, some 30% higher than the last six months under President Johnson.

The relative statistics on "U.S. Wounded" are somewhat similar: 31,557 U.S. personnel,

or 1,645.2 per week, were wounded in the last six months of the Johnson Administration, 45,563, or 1,752.4 per week (about 6% higher), were wounded in the first six months of the Nixon Administration.

The much heralded "kill ratio" has changed dramatically—climbing from 4.81 in the first half of 1968 to 5.50 in the second half of 1968, and to 6.73 in the first three months under President Nixon, but dropping sharply to 2.76 in the second three months under President Nixon.

The "Vietnamization" of the war, however, has been rapidly accelerated under President Nixon (if the raw casualty statistics are any indicator). In the first half of 1968 the South Vietnamese Armed Forces (RVNAF) lost 14,117 men in combat, compared to the 9,420 U.S. military personnel lost in combat, for a ratio of approximately 3:2. In the first three months of the Nixon Administration the comparable figures were: RVNAF—3,579; U.S.—3,292; 1.09:1. In the second three months of the Nixon Administration the figures had dramatically changed—to: RVNAF—13,560; U.S.—3,066; 4.4:1.

President Nixon is having no more success than did President Johnson in getting other Free World forces to take over more of the fighting in South Vietnam. During the last year of the Johnson Administration, the "Free World Forces" (other than U.S. and RVNAF) suffered an average of 18.8 deaths per week; under President Nixon the weekly average has been 17.9 deaths per week. Except for minor qualifications the figures are relatively comparable.

CRUEL DILEMMA

The Journal figures underscore the cruel military and political dilemma facing President Nixon: with little more than a year to go before the 1970 Congressional elections he is under massive and constant political pressure to reduce the U.S. casualty rates by any means possible. If he does so too abruptly, however—and particularly if there is no reciprocal scaling down of enemy forces in South Vietnam—there inevitably will be an even greater increase in the number of South Vietnamese casualties, and a further drop in the kill ratio. These results could bring about a political crisis in South Vietnam and this in turn could enable the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong to achieve politically what they have been unable to do militarily—win control of South Vietnam.

It is not "Mr. Nixon's War," and never was. But the Southeast Asia conflict already is eight and one-half years old, by far the longest war in U.S. history. And the President knows that, rightly or wrongly, he will be blamed for whatever happens from here on in. He knows also that if the conflict is not honorably resolved prior to next year's elections, both he and the Republican party could take a fearful licking at the polls.

NIXON TAKES ACTION

Recognizing the problem, the President has not been standing still. He has already, in fact (1) met with South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu on Midway Island and persuaded him of the necessity for the RVNAF to assume more of the fighting; (2) followed up the Midway meeting by directing the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. troops—mostly combat personnel—from South Vietnam; (3) expressed his "hope" at a White House press conference that he would meet and possibly beat the timetable set forth by former Secretary of Defense Clark M. Clifford, who advocated—in the July issue of Foreign Affairs—the withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops by the end of this year and the removal of the remainder by the end of 1970; and (4) dispatched JCS Chairman General Earle G. Wheeler, USA, to South Vietnam to make an assessment of the current military situation and see what else could be done to expedite the Vietnamization of the war.

All of these efforts have not paid off in im-

mediate results, however. As The Journal analysis shows (see table), the U.S. death rate during the last six months President

Johnson was in office was 188.2 per week. The rate for President Nixon's first six months is 244.5 per week.

TOTAL VIETNAM COMBAT CASUALTIES

	1st half 1968	2d half 1968	Total 1968	1st quarter 1969	2d quarter 1969	1st 6 months 1969
U.S. combat deaths (all services).....	9 420	4,894	14,314	3,292	3,066	6,358
RVN Armed Forces deaths.....	14,117	6,365	20,482	3,579	13,560	17,139
Free world forces deaths.....	615	363	978	240	226	466
Total deaths, all Allied forces.....	24,152	11,622	35,774	7,111	16,852	23,963
Enemy deaths.....	116,251	63,920	180,171	47,894	46,672	94,566
Ratio of enemy dead to Allied dead.....	4.81	5.49	5.06	6.74	2.76	3.95

WEEKLY AVERAGE OF VIETNAM CASUALTIES

	Casualty rate, President Johnson's last year			Casualty rate to date under President Nixon		
	1st half 1968	2d half 1968	Average for year 1968	1st quarter 1969	2d quarter 1969	1st 6 months 1969
U.S. combat deaths:						
(a) Army.....	227.5	125.5	175.9	167.2	176.3	171.8
(b) Navy.....	11.6	6.2	8.9	9.3	5.5	7.4
(c) Marine Corps.....	119.2	54.5	86.9	73.8	50.8	62.3
(d) Air Force.....	5.0	2.1	3.5	2.1	3.2	3.0
Total.....	362.3	188.2	275.3	253.2	235.8	244.5
U.S. wounded:						
(a) Army.....	1,468.5	795.9	1,132.4	1,287.7	1,222.7	1,255.2
(b) Navy.....	68.8	45.8	57.3	78.8	49.3	64.1
(c) Marine Corps.....	750.2	364.1	557.1	478.3	364.2	421.1
(d) Air Force.....	22.2	7.9	15.1	14.8	8.9	11.9
Total.....	2,309.7	1,213.7	1,761.7	1,859.7	1,645.2	1,752.4
Non-U.S. combat deaths:						
(a) RVNAF.....	542.9	244.8	393.9	275.3	1,043.1	659.2
(b) Free world forces.....	23.7	13.9	18.8	18.5	17.4	17.9
(c) Enemy.....	4,471.1	2,458.6	3,464.8	3,684.2	3,590.2	3,637.2

Note: 1st half 1968 includes casualties from Jan. 20, 1968, through July 20, 1968; 2d half 1968 includes casualties from July 21, 1968, through Jan. 18, 1969; 1st quarter 1969 includes casualties from Jan. 19, 1969, through Apr. 19, 1969; 2d quarter 1969 includes casualties from Apr. 20, 1969, through July 19, 1969.

The war, of course, has a momentum all its own and Mr. Nixon could not reasonably have been expected to be able to make any abrupt change for at least the first several months after taking office. He was probably powerless, for most practical purposes, to prevent the U.S. combat death rate from climbing, as it did, to 253.2 during the first three months he was in office. During the second three months of his Administration the rate dipped slightly, to 235.8, still significantly higher than the Johnson Administration's closing 188.2 rate. Whether the July lull is a harbinger of better things to come still is speculative, which probably is one reason Administration spokesmen are so cautious in their assessment of the current military situation.

PEAKS AND VALLEYS

The casualty lists, like the war itself, have followed a peaks-and-valleys configuration—bursts of intense fighting followed by periods of retrenchment and regrouping. In the first half of 1968, for example, the U.S. suffered an average of 362.3 deaths per week, almost twice the weekly rate of the second half of the year. The lower casualty rate for the second six months followed, of course, after President Johnson ordered a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and after the Paris peace talks began.

This also has significant political implications. When peace finally does come to Southeast Asia, Democrats are sure to point out, with some justification, that it was President Johnson, and not President Nixon, who started the beginning of the end. (The Republicans, of course, would then counter—also with some justification—that it was President Johnson who escalated the war in the first place, after which the Democrats would retort by tracing the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia back to President Eisenhower, etc., etc., ad nauseam.)

RVNAF LOSSES UP

Although success in bringing down the U.S. casualty rate has been less than hoped for—and probably much less than the gen-

eral public has been led to believe, because of press reports about the recent slowdown in combat activity—President Nixon has achieved considerable progress in turning over more of the fighting to the RVNAF. The South Vietnamese have from the beginning suffered heavier losses in combat than have the U.S. Forces. The ratio has varied from time to time, however. During the first six months of last year, for example, the U.S. lost 362.3 men per week, the RVNAF 542.9, approximately a 2:3 ratio. During the second six months of last year the figures were: U.S. 188.2; RVNAF 244.8; approximately a 3:4 ratio.

During the first three months of the Nixon Administration the ratio was 1:1.09 (U.S.—253.2; RVNAF—275.3), or almost even, for all practical purposes. During the following three months—presumably after President Nixon had reached “an understanding” with South Vietnamese officials as to the conduct of the war—the picture changed dramatically. The South Vietnamese death rate climbed sharply, while the U.S. death rate dropped slightly. The rates for the three month period: U.S.—235.8 men killed per week; RVNAF—1,043.1, or approximately 1:4.4.

LOWERED KILL RATIO

These figures are reflected in the declining “kill ratio,” a sometimes-controversial yardstick used to indicate, very roughly, how well or how poorly the war is progressing. The kill ratio in the past has been somewhat erratic, but not spectacularly so. It climbed, for example, from 4.81 (enemy deaths to one allied death) in the first half of 1968, to 5.50 in the second half of 1968, and increased, again, to 6.73 during the first three months of the Nixon Administration. During the next three months, however, it plummeted to 2.76. The kill ratio for Mr. Nixon's first six months in office is an overall 3.95, significantly lower than the 5.03 overall 1968 ratio.

The kill ratio takes on added significance when one considers that U.S. combat forces still have been heavily involved in the fight-

ing. Without the continued pressure on the enemy by American troops, it is certain that the enemy's total dead count would have been significantly lower than it was. This means that, if all U.S. combat forces are withdrawn—either from South Vietnam entirely, or to rear echelon areas within South Vietnam (as some have suggested)—the enemy death rate can be expected to drop, and the RVNAF death rate can be expected to climb even higher.

If this happens, the final results could be disastrous. South Vietnam still is not too stable politically. The country has been ravaged by war for a number of years. Part of the country still is under Viet Cong control. The South Vietnamese forces already have lost (as of 20 July) 91,476 men in the conflict. Additional thousands—perhaps hundreds of thousands—of South Vietnamese civilians have been killed in the war, or murdered by the Viet Cong. (The South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington estimates the number at between 150,000 and 200,000.)

North Vietnam, too, has suffered heavily. Over half a million men (Viet Cong and North Vietnamese combined) have been killed in battle. Many thousands of others have defected or have been captured by the Allied Forces. Thousands more North Vietnamese, both military and civilian, can be presumed to have died during the U.S. bombing offensive against North Vietnam.

But North Vietnam has a few items on the plus side. It has received considerable help from the USSR and from Communist China. And it has been waging the war in the other man's territory. North Vietnam itself has been free from bombing raids now for close to a year and a half. It has had time to repair its battered supply lines and to mend, somewhat, its broken economy. But most of all, it has a dictatorial regime and an almost absolute power over its own long-suffering citizens which enables it to stifle internal opposition and dissent to the war and thereby, in effect, ignore the military realities of the situation.

AGONIZING DECISIONS

President Nixon, of course, has no such option open to him. He is responsible to an intelligent, articulate, and often impatient electorate. He cannot ignore the casualty lists, nor other U.S. commitments, both internal and domestic.

But the President stated unequivocally that the United States will not abandon South Vietnam to the Communists. He also has stated his determination to reduce U.S. combat casualties, and to let the South Vietnamese military take over more of the fighting. He already has gone far toward achieving both these ends. He has started in some respects to de-escalate the war. And the enemy has apparently responded somewhat by reducing the level of combat activity.

If the recent lull continues, well and good. If it does not, if the enemy once again steps up the pace, the President will have some agonizingly difficult decisions to make.

STATISTICS IN PERSPECTIVE

As grim as the U.S. casualty rate is, the figures cannot be taken at face value and must be considered in perspective. In 1968, for example, according to the National Safety Council, some 55,200 Americans were killed in automobile accidents; 28,500 were killed in home accidents; 20,500 in public accidents or accidents connected with recreation, transportation (other than motor vehicles), public buildings and natural disasters; and 14,300 in industrial accidents.

More people have died on U.S. highways since 1909 than in all the wars in U.S. history. More Navy men (500), in fact, were killed world-wide in traffic deaths last year than lost their lives in Vietnam. The same is true of the Air Force, which lost 184 men in combat in Vietnam in the statistical year 20 January 1968 through 18 January 1969,

but lost 414 men in traffic accidents worldwide in calendar year 1968.

Finally, thanks largely to the introduction of such items as the Medevac helicopter and the MUST (Medical Unit Self-Contained Transportable) hospital, deaths in Vietnam from all combat causes (killed in action, died of wounds, died while captured, and declared dead from a missing status) were held to a rate of 21.7 per thousand average troop strength per year, according to Army Surgeon General statistics. This compares to a rate of 43.2 for Korea, and 51.9 for the WWII European Theater of Operations, from June 1944 (D-Day) through May 1945. In addition, the Army Surgeon General also reports the medical save rate (the percentage of wounded who survive after reaching medical facilities) in Vietnam is slightly over 97.5 percent, which was the save rate recorded in Korea (the WWII rate was 95.5 percent; the WWI rate 91.9 percent). The record Vietnam medical save rate was achieved, moreover, despite the fact that, because of the rapid evacuation of wounded made possible by the increased use of helicopters, many mortally wounded personnel—who would not survive in any case—now reach hospitals alive, and are therefore counted against the medical save rate.

STATES ADVISED OF ORIGINAL ROLE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's approach to the governing of our Nation and his view of what Federal-State relations should be differ considerably from that of his immediate predecessors.

In the accompanying editorial, the San Diego Union comments on what it rightly calls "the President's rational approach."

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Sept. 3, 1969]

PRESIDENT REVERSING POWER FLOW—STATES ADVISED OF ORIGINAL ROLE

The flow of power from the states to Washington, D.C., has been unprecedented during the decade of the 1960s.

This week President Nixon promised the governors of the United States of America, meeting at Colorado Springs, that he intends to reverse the tide.

It was a frank, realistic speech, one which chronicled the aspirations and milestones of a nation, but also was forthright in analyzing failures of the past.

Central to Mr. Nixon's presentation to stewards of the 50 state governments was the dominant theme of the new federalism, which he reiterated time and again. Washington, the President served notice, "will no longer try to go it alone. Washington will no longer dictate without consulting."

Perhaps the most startling example of what can happen if the federal government forges ahead in assumed omniscience was Mr. Nixon's reminder that we have spent the incredible sum of \$250 billion in the last five years for social programs only to reap "a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division."

Although he has calmly presented a massive blueprint of his new federalism to Congress and the people, Mr. Nixon has deliberately avoided an all-knowing, hurried approach to solving the problems before us.

Unlike most of his predecessors during the last three decades, the President did not pre-

sent a detailed laundry list of proposals to Congress during his initial days in office. He did not seek to dazzle the nation with frenzied motion and illusions of miraculous progress during his first 100 to 200 days in office.

The metier of the Nixon Administration has been careful study, thorough planning, a steady pace and an effort to re-establish credibility in government. The result has been presentation of major legislative proposals ranging from control of inflation and withdrawal from Vietnam to a crackdown on crime and tax reform. In spite of the low profile of the Nixon recommendations, he has constantly gained in public confidence.

By pulling the program together at one time for the governors, President Nixon should gain even more respect for his rational approach. The entire thrust of his new philosophy is contained in one paragraph of his speech—"As we look ahead to the '70s we can see one thing with startling clarity: there is far more to be done than any one level of government could possibly hope to do by itself. If the job is to be done, a greater part of it must be done by the states and the localities themselves, and by the people themselves."

And the obvious corollary of that concept was the President's warning that there should be no illusions that there can be fiscal rainfall from Washington to wash away the nation's ills.

This is what the President called new federalism. But, begging his pardon, we do not believe that it is entirely new.

It is the same philosophy of federalism that engrossed the Founding Fathers of our nation and the one that has served the United States of America well for nearly two centuries.

OKINAWA REVERSION POLICY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 11, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in November, Prime Minister Sato of Japan will be here in Washington to discuss the question of Okinawa with President Nixon. The results of these meetings will have important consequences for the future relations of our two countries. If the suggestions I am about to offer are followed, I believe that the outcome could also have an important salutary effect on our overall Asian policies.

I strongly suggest that Okinawa revert back to Japanese control and that our bases there operate under the same conditions as any military base in Japan.

If Okinawa does not soon revert to the Japanese and the bases are not placed under the same status as other bases in Japan, we run the serious risk that this may significantly contribute to establishment of a Japanese Government unfriendly to the United States. Several public opinion polls note that the Japanese people very much favor altering Okinawa's present status and show overwhelming sentiments against free, unrestricted use of the American bases there. This position is mirrored by three major opposition parties and by the increasing tendency of the governing Liberal Democratic Party to seek a settlement along those lines.

The Japanese view our control of Okinawa and the presence of our bases there

as a remnant of occupation. Many consider our Asian policies as Japan's chief danger and assert that our presence, far from serving to protect them, places them in peril of war and possible nuclear disaster. They have reason to fear the very existence of the bases, aside from the potential danger of being attacked, since the bases store nuclear weapons and until recently also held biological agents.

The fact that a great many Japanese do not consider us as their protectors and view our Asian containment policies as aggressive and provocative toward China and other Asian Communist countries deserves full consideration. The occupation of Okinawa is based on certain premises about the aggressive intentions of the Chinese Government. If these assumptions, which up to the present we have tended to take as given, are found to be fallacious, as I think they are, then the conclusions which follow from such assumptions may also be invalid. A number of Asian scholars have called for a complete reassessment of current American thinking: I believe the time is ripe for such evaluation. If anything, the present situation in Vietnam strongly suggests that our adventurism in that part of the world needs immediate attention.

I do not think we can blame the Japanese if they face political realities in their part of the world and wish to establish normal friendly relations with the two powerful neighbors, the Soviet Union and mainland China.

An unfortunate aspect of our recent policy toward Japan has been the U.S. Government insistence in the last few years to undo the excellent work that was done in discrediting militarism in Japan and establishing a powerful, prosperous nation. In view of Japan's past history we should not be surprised if they do not share our desire to create a large military establishment and wish to have some control over the weapons held in its territory. Yet our Government would have Japan return to its former militarism so that it could assist us in promoting what we consider to be the security interests of Asia, although Asians often do not agree.

While our Government frequently preaches self-determination, it seems deaf to the wishes of the very people it claims to support and defend. In spite of the possible ill effects to their economy, the Okinawans have shown their support last year for reversion to Japan by electing as their chief executive one who campaigned on a platform of "immediate, all-out, unconditional reversion."

Again, I repeat that I believe the most sensible thing to do is to return Okinawa to Japanese control and place American bases there under the identical arrangements as our other bases in Japan. I think we should recognize that the Japanese have a right, as any nation does, to bar nuclear weapons and to be consulted when military facilities on its territory are used for combat operations abroad. No nation can be expected to risk being involved in war, including nuclear destruction, without participation in the decisions involving its own territory.

On September 6 A. D. Horne's analysis of the Okinawan question appeared in the Washington Post, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS SEEKING ASSURANCES IT CAN USE OKINAWA AS BASE

(By A. D. Horne)

Negotiations over the return of Okinawa to Japan will reach a critical phase on Friday when Japanese Foreign Minister Kiichi Aichi visits Washington for a third round of talks with Secretary of State William P. Rogers.

The United States, diplomatic sources said in interviews last week, has offered to meet Japan's 1972 target date for reversion of Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands provided it can win detailed advance assurances that Okinawa's giant base complex, valued by the Pentagon at \$3 billion, can continue to be used as Washington requires to meet threats to security in an arc ranging from South Korea to South Vietnam.

Japan, these sources indicated, still resists giving explicit advance assurances as part of a reversion agreement. Instead, the Japanese negotiators reportedly are stressing that Tokyo will cooperate with Washington in any emergency after reversion in applying to Okinawa the rules that now govern U.S. bases in Japan.

These rules bar the bases' use for combat unless there is "prior consultation" with Tokyo, and in effect bar the introduction of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear issue, informants said, has not yet been resolved in three months of negotiations, despite initial reports that the United States had decided to remove the weapons from Okinawa as part of reversion. One version has it that the United States now seeks Japan's advance agreement to return the nuclear weapons to the island in emergency situations after reversion, but other sources dispute this.

Officially, the United States has never acknowledged storing nuclear weapons on Okinawa. But their presence is an open secret; leftist politicians on the island reportedly even have counted 3000 warheads in a nuclear census conducted through collaborators among the 30,000 or more Okinawans employed at the U.S. bases.

Another open secret figuring in the negotiations is use of the island's Kadena Air Force Base for B-52 bombing missions against suspected enemy concentrations in South Vietnam. U.S. negotiators, according to informed sources, are asking for language in the reversion agreement that could allow the B-52 raids from the island to continue if the Vietnam war is still being fought in 1972.

The form that the reversion agreement

would take is still to be decided, the sources said. With America's foreign commitments the subject of continuing controversy on Capitol Hill, the administration is said to be considering a form of agreement that would be submitted to Congress, at least for informal clearance.

Critics of U.S. military involvement overseas, such as Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), have been demanding a voice for the Senate in such nontreaty matters as the renewal of the 1952 bases agreement with Spain and the status of the 1965 military contingency arrangement with Thailand.

In recognition of the Thai and other commitments controversies here, informants said, both governments are ruling out any secret agreement or "contingency plan" as part of the reversion arrangements.

But the domestic opposition to Okinawa reversion is likely to come from more hawkish quarters. Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (D-Va.) attacked reversion in a Senate speech just before Aichi's arrival for the opening round of negotiations at the start of June. And Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.) used his syndicated newspaper column in mid-August to argue that the island "is now owned by the U.S. by right of conquest" and that "to dilute our control of Okinawa in any way whatsoever might be very inimical to American security."

Japan, informants said, has promised to expand its "self-defense forces"—a euphemism used because the postwar constitution bars Japan's rearmament—to protect Okinawa after reversion. Japanese negotiators, these sources said, have suggested that the United States then could send home that portion of its 40,000-man force assigned to the island's defense. The Pentagon, however, is said to reject this, arguing that all troops on the island are there for regional, not local, defense.

Since the second round of talks between Rogers and Aichi in Tokyo at the end of July, discussions have continued there between Japanese Foreign Ministry officials and the U.S. team whose key member is National Security Council staffer Richard L. Sneider, technically a temporary "senior adviser" to U.S. Ambassador Armin H. Meyer.

These talks, the sources said, have focused on details of the reversion arrangements. One of the issues raised by Sneider, for instance, is the future of a Voice of America transmitter on the island that broadcasts to

the Chinese mainland less than 400 miles away.

Most of the other details now under discussion in Tokyo involve money—primarily, the balance of payments effects of reversion, and the financial arrangements for transferring to Japanese ownership the public facilities built for Okinawa by the United States since 1945.

The Treasury has sent experts to the island to survey the balance of payments problem. These include conversion of the Ryukyuan currency from dollars to Japanese yen—the Japanese estimate of money in circulation on Okinawa is \$500 million.

The United States seeks, and probably will get, a guarantee that reversion will not add to the U.S. balance of payments deficit. As part of the bargain, the American negotiators want Japan to assume the debts of the waterworks, sewage system and other U.S.-built utilities on the island.

Before World War II, Okinawa was among the poorest prefectures of Japan. Its economic prospects for reversion are not bright, even if the U.S. bases continue to pour an estimated \$260 million a year into the economy. The main crops—sugar and pineapples—are heavily subsidized by Japan.

Now, however, there are plans to make economic use of the island's strategic location and of the harbors and air strips built by the United States. One idea advanced by Japanese businessmen is for an Okinawa free trade zone, where travelers could purchase goods duty-free as they now do in Hong Kong.

The separate proposal, made this summer by a Tokyo consulting firm under contract to the Japanese government, is for development of Okinawa as an oil refining center for all Japan. Standard Oil of New Jersey already plans to build a \$55 million, 80,000-barrel-a-day refinery on the island, and Gulf Oil is building a \$39 million crude oil terminal on a nearby islet as a central storage and shipping point for East Asia markets. At least two other U.S. firms seek licenses to build refineries.

All this crude oil would come to Okinawa from Middle East sources. Last week, however, Japanese geologists reported discovery of a huge underwater oil field in the East China Sea near the southernmost Ryukyus group, the Senkaku Islands, about 100 miles from Taiwan. Development of these oil deposits, with reversion of the Ryukyus, could dramatically alter Japan's present role as a \$1 billion-a-year importer of oil.

SENATE—Friday, September 12, 1969

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Reverend George R. Davis, D.D., minister, the National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, we would not cross over the threshold of any human experience, without the recognition of Your existence, power, and presence. You are invisible but real, quiet but powerful, humble but in command of the universe and of history. In our prayers especially now we would remember those who labor in these historic Chambers for the welfare of our Nation, and the world. Grant them strength for their labors, inspiration for their souls, comfort in times of stress, and freedom from a sense of futility. We still believe with all our hearts in the glorious origin, purposes, and dreams of this Nation. Grant us not

to falter, and not to fail, as we press onward toward a shining goal, in the name of Him who is the Wonderful Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 10, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR THE HEALTH OF SCHOOL AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the report on the Special Project Grants for the Health of School and Preschool Children, as provided for in P.L. 89-97, Title II, Sec. 206. This report concerns Sec. 532 of the Social Security Act (subsequently redesignated as Sec. 509) which authorizes a program of project grants to assist communities in providing comprehensive